

AGENDA

NOTE: Members who wish to have items moved from the Consent to the Regular Agenda should contact the University Secretariat before the Senate meeting. Members may also request to have items moved when the Agenda is presented for approval.

Page

A. OPEN SESSION

OPENING REMARKS

1. APPROVAL OF AGENDA – OPEN SESSION

CONSENT

2. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING – SEPTEMBER 8, 2021 (OPEN SESSION)

REGULAR

3. BUSINESS ARISING

4. ENQUIRIES

5. COMMUNICATIONS

3 - 7

Information
[COU Update](#)

6. REPORT FROM GRADUATE COUNCIL

8

Information
[Graduate Council Report](#)

7. REPORT FROM UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL

9 - 10

Information
[Undergraduate Council Report](#)

8. REPORT FROM THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

11

Approval/Information
[Executive Committee Report](#)

12 - 17

Approval
[1. Policy Framework](#)

18 - 20

Information

[2. Graduate Expectations Arising from the McMaster Vaccination Policy](#)

9. REPORT FROM THE COMMITTEE ON APPOINTMENTS

21 - 22

Approval

[Committee on Appointments Report](#)

23 - 55

1. Faculty Grievance Policy

[a. Revised - Faculty Grievance Policy](#)

[b. New - Faculty Respondent Option for External Recommendation of Sanctions Policy](#)

56 - 67

2. Terms of Reference

[a. Distinguished Business Research Professor](#)

[b. Establishment of the Fairley Gadsby Research Chair in Fluvial Geomorphology](#)

[c. Establishment of the Ronald Barr Professorship in Pediatric Oncology](#)

[d. AbbVie Chair in Education in Rheumatology](#)

10. OTHER BUSINESS



Academic Colleagues

August 17-18, 2021: Zoom Meeting

Agenda

*Materials provided for items marked ***

Evening meeting, Tuesday, August 17, 2021, 6:00 – 8:00 pm

Conversation with Steve Orsini on COU priorities

COU President and CEO Steve Orsini spoke to the group on COU's priorities for the coming year.

Reopening: The government has announced policy directives, including booster shots for the immune-compromised, and the Ministry of Health announced additional steps to prepare for a fourth wave. COU and Colleges Ontario, along with the Toronto Board of Trade, have called for a vaccine mandate and safe pass. The Ontario Undergraduate Student Alliance also endorsed this call. COU's COVID-19 Reference Table continues to meet regularly and share best practices.

Institutional Autonomy: In April, the government introduced Bill 276, Schedule 16, which establishes Northern Ontario School of Medicine (NOSM) as a degree-granting university and severs its degree-granting partnerships with Lakehead and Laurentian. COU's concern stems from the absence of due process and consultation with the sector, which sets a precedent that threatens universities' autonomy.

The Ministry's speculation that a lack of financial transparency led to Laurentian's bankruptcy also threatens institutional autonomy. Ontario's Universities are among the most fiscally transparent institutions in Canada. COU is developing a four-point plan that will flag financial difficulties far enough in advance to head off the possibility of bankruptcy.

Financial sustainability: University operating grants on a student weighted basis have declined by 21% since 2007- 2008. Tuition cuts and freezes have eliminated billions in potential revenue for the sector. This had led to an overreliance on revenue from international students and services, sources which are vulnerable to global events such as travel restrictions and international disputes.

In the discussion that followed, Colleagues raised concerns about developing a common reopening plan with 34 local public health authorities that may be issuing conflicting mandates, concerns about how an immunization policy could be enforced, and the need for funding for improvements to infrastructure.

Colleagues meeting, Wednesday, August 18, 2021, 9:00 am – 12:00 pm

1. Welcome and COU Overview (Cecilia Brain)**

Cecilia Brain presented an overview of COU's structure and activities for the benefit of new Colleagues. Colleagues suggested inviting the COU EDI group and/or Indigenous faculty group to attend a future meeting.

See *Attachment 2: COU Overview*

2. COVID-19 Reopening (Michelle Cyr)**

Michelle Cyr presented an overview of COU's COVID-19- related activities, such as the formation of a COVID-19 Reference Table, a Legal Counsels' Working Group, and the current state of reopening policies. At the time of the meeting, 19 Universities were requiring vaccinations for all in-person activities.

Colleagues requested clarification on how vaccine exemptions will be determined and enforced, and how research activities will be classified with regard to distancing and capacity requirements.

See *Attachment 3: Reopening Deck*

3. COU update (Cecilia Brain)**

See *Attachment 4: COU Update*

4. OHDP and Intellectual Property update (Sharan Sriskantharajah)

The Ontario Health Data Platform (OHDP) fosters innovation, collating data from all universities. While Ontario's universities support the OHDP's goals, universities and other research institutions share some concerns about the platform's research agreement.

To gain access to the portal, institutions must sign a research agreement, which includes a clause stipulating that any new IP created through access to OHDP will be owned by province. This limits commercialization and deters private sector investment in research. The university sector has been working with Ontario hospitals and other stakeholders to communicate these concerns. COU is currently in discussions with other institutions to negotiate an agreement that will benefit all parties involved.

5. Planning for October Meeting**

Colleagues discussed the merits of a pre-selected list of topics for discussion at the next Council meeting on October 22, and decided to provide the Executive Heads with a short-list of preferred topics:

- The role of universities in society
- Teaching-stream faculty
- Cohort hiring
- Mental health

The Co-Chairs will prepare a memo presenting these options to the Executive Heads for their consideration. The topic of “student perspectives” was floated as a strong candidate for discussion at the April 2022 Council meeting.

See *Attachment 5: Options for Council Meeting Discussion Topics*

6. Committee Reports

Quality Council (Andrew McWilliams)

- Approvals of new programs (OnTech, UofT, Waterloo), revised IQAP (Algoma), major modification annual reports (Windsor) and FARS (Brock, UOttawa, St Paul University) proceeded as normal.
- In response to an inquiry regarding whether arm’s length external reviewers could return to the same program twice, Council members noted that there will be some specialty programs for which a returning reviewer may be unavoidable, and so, in the future will be advising programs to attempt to secure two new external reviewers, but if this is not feasible, only one reviewer may be a returning reviewer.
- The Senior Academic Director provided an update on the OCAV working group on micro-credentials which has outlined a draft document of principles for micro-credentials, including a section how micro-credential’s quality assurance would be included in IQAP.
- MCU has a separate working group established for the micro-credential portfolio, which will include options regarding the quality assurance of micro-credentials but has done so without consulting with the sector. The Provincial Government sees micro-credentials as a way to kickstart the economy post-COVID, and potentially a model that could revamp how post-secondary education is delivered. Barriers for there to be transfers of micro-credentials across colleges, universities and Indigenous Institutes represents a challenge. Concerns over the threat of this potential disruptions were discussed and efforts to advocate on behalf of the sector are ongoing.
- A key Contacts Exchange Forum was held on June 21 to seek feedback on how to improve opportunities for informal networking and sharing of best practices.
- A memo will be sent to universities to remind them when announcing new programs that have not yet been approved by the Quality Council to include a ‘subject to Quality Council approval’ proviso in press releases, websites, etc.
- The Chair of the Audit Committee provided an update on the Audit Executive Committee’s work on the implementation of the new audit protocols in preparation for the next cycle of audits.

Budget and Audit Committee (Doug Ivison)

The Budget and Audit Committee held its last meeting of 2020-21 on Friday, May 14, 2021 via Zoom. The committee reviewed the forecast for 2020-21 budgets and the proposed budgets for 2021-22.

The forecast for COU General Operations budget was for a surplus of \$175,000 and a positive variance of \$539,000, largely due to lower expenses resulting from the pandemic, as the budget had assumed that normal operations would resume in September 2020, and that did not occur. As a result, the proposed 2% increase in member assessments can be deferred to the next budget cycle. Moreover, as COVID-19 restrictions on COU operations are expected to continue

for Fall 2021 at least, the proposed capital and operating expenses in the 2021-22 General Budget Operation are 1.6% below those in the 2020-21 budget.

COVID-19 restrictions also led to projected savings of \$78,000 in the Quality Assurance Secretariat budget. As a result of that and projected continuing savings due to COVID-19 restrictions in 2021-22, the planned 12% increase in member assessments for both 2021-22 and 2022-23 can be reduced to an 8% increase in both years.

The Ontario Universities' Application Centre (OUAC) experienced a decline in expenses due to the cancellation of the Ontario Universities Fair (OUF) and other savings related to COVID-19. This will continue in 2021-22 as OUF has been cancelled for 2021, though OUAC is forecasting a return to normal working conditions at some point in 2021-22. As a result of these savings, OUAC was able to provide a significantly increased distribution payment to members over what was budgeted for 2020-21, while maintaining a small surplus. The proposed budget for 2021-22 includes a \$170,000 surplus.

The Committee approved the 2021-22 budgets for the COU Secretariat, the Office of Health Sciences, Quality Assurance, and OUAC.

Executive Council (Kim Hellemans)

1. President's Report
 - Steve Orsini gave a brief overview of the COU, highlighting the devastating impact of COVID-19 on revenue; while we saw an initial deficit of >360K, we are now in surplus > 175K
 - We are seeing an increase in spending on professional services, and executive heads need to make key decisions in terms of investing in 3rd parties, studies, and reports on the benefit of the sector particularly leading up to the election
 - We will have a very busy year
2. Treasurer 's Report
 - COU and OUAC worked well; some challenges but OK now
 - We are operating at low GIC rates; have implemented an electronic fund transfer to automate pay processes
 - Invoices can now operate online, seeing improved efficiency as we have achieved paperless pay system from end to end.
3. Report from the May 14, 2021 Budget and Audit Committee meeting
 - 2021-2022 includes 0% increase in assessment
 - Institutions paying at top end are protected; those paying at low end are paying their share.
4. Approval of 2021-22 Budgets
 - a. 2021-22 COU Secretariat Budgets **
 - b. 2021-22 Office of Health Sciences Budgets **
 - c. 2021-22 Quality Assurance Budgets **
 - d. 2021-22 Ontario Universities' Application Centre Budget **
 - All budgets approved

Note: assumption for next budget cycle is that in person meetings will resume in January 2022, but will be reduced in frequency

Note 2: budget support key priorities (policy, analysis, advocacy, members)

7. Other business

Land Acknowledgements were scheduled for the next three meetings:

October 13: Darren Ivison

December 7: Abdel Omri

February 15: Jingyu Li

Attachments:

- 1) Agenda
- 2) COU Overview Deck
- 3) Reopening Presentation
- 4) COU Update
- 5) Council Meeting Discussion Topics

Next meetings: October 13, 6-9pm and October 20, 9-12pm. Council Meeting will take place October 22, 9-11am.



School of Graduate Studies

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

Phone 905.525.9140
Ext. 23679
Fax 905.521.0689
<http://www.mcmaster.ca/graduate>

REPORT TO SENATE
from the
GRADUATE COUNCIL

For Information

I. Change to Award Terms

At its meeting on September 14th Graduate Council approved the following change to award terms:

Name of Trust Fund: DSB Management Information Systems Scholarship

Original award terms: Established in 1999 by the Faculty of Business. Preference will be given to students entering the MBA program, specializing in Management Information Systems who demonstrate a high degree of scholarship.

TFOC Approved Change: Established in 1999 by the Faculty of Business. Preference will be given to students in the MBA program, specializing in Business Analytics who demonstrate a high degree of scholarship.

II. Delay in Instituting the Mandatory Thesis Requirement of the Research Plagiarism Checking Policy

At the same meeting Graduate Council approved a delay in instituting the mandatory thesis requirement of the Research Plagiarism Checking Policy.

**REPORT TO SENATE
from the
UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL**

FOR INFORMATION

I Undergraduate Council Committee Assignments

At its September 28, 2021 meeting, the Undergraduate Council ratified the Undergraduate Council Committee Assignments for the 2021-2022 academic year.

II Terms of Award

At the same meeting, the Undergraduate Council reviewed for approval: a) three new awards, b) twelve new bursaries c) eight changes to award terms and d) the removal of two awards from the Undergraduate Calendar.

a) New Awards

The Hamilton Industrial Environmental Scholarship in Sustainable Chemistry
The Dr. Phillipa Heritage Memorial Scholarship in Science
The Norman G. Koether Scholarship

b) New Bursaries

The Ballik Indigenous Bursary
The Chris Clark Bursary
The Colin Jarvis Memorial Bursary
The Dr. Herman Kleerekoper and Biology Faculty of 1954 Bursary
The Justice Russell J. Otter Bursary
The Julie and Ahmed Patel DeGroote School of Medicine Bursary
The Olena Pyndyk Bursary
The Rotary Club of Burlington Central - Burlington Student Bursary
The Violet Gertrude Terryberry Scott Bursary
The Molly Smith Nursing Bursary

The Western Union Business Solutions Bursary Fund
The Frederick G. Black and Gwendolyn J. Atkinson MD Bursary

c) Changes to Award Terms

The Citizen Action Group Award in Memory of Harry Penny
The Cranston Prizes

The CSEP/SCPE Undergraduate Student Award
The DeGroote School of Business Alumni Undergraduate Scholarship
The Les Prince Bursaries
The Dr. John A. Pylypiuk Scholarship
The Morris and Sarah Rosenhead Memorial Prize
The Hadrian Manufacturing Inc. The Peters Family Bursary

d) **Awards Removed from the Undergraduate Calendar**

The James R. (Jamie) Greilich Memorial Academic Grant
The Living Proof Academic Grant

III **Closure of Web Design Certificate Program**

At the same meeting, the Undergraduate Council received, for information, the closure of the Web Design Certificate Program.

Documents detailing items for information are available for review on the [Secretariat's website](#).

Senate: October 20, 2021

REPORT TO SENATE
FROM THE
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Open Session (Regular Agenda)

1. McMaster University Policy Framework

On September 29, 2021, the Senate Executive Committee approved the establishment of the proposed Policy Framework for McMaster.

Senate Executive Committee now recommends,

that the Senate approve for recommendation to the Board of Governors, the establishment of the proposed Policy Framework for McMaster University, effective October 28, 2021.

2. Actions Taken on Behalf of Senate: Graduate Expectations Arising from the McMaster Vaccination Policy

On September 29, 2021, the Senate Executive Committee approved, on behalf of Senate, the establishment of the Graduate Expectations for McMaster Vaccination Policy. This item is for information.

SENATE: FOR APPROVAL/INFORMATION
October 20, 2021

TO: Senate Executive Committee

FROM: Andrea Thyret-Kidd, University Secretary

RE: Policy Framework

The University Secretariat has prepared a policy framework document that is intended to help standardize processes and requirements related to developing, revising, and rescinding Senate and Board policies. It also outlines and/or defines a number of important policy areas, including the responsible executive, review timeframes, non-substantive revisions, and accountabilities.

The proposed Policy Framework was developed to provide guidance and to promote consistency across McMaster's policy environment. Initially, the primary focus of the Framework is for policies approved by the Senate and Board of Governors. It is hoped that the Framework will become the primary reference document guiding campus-wide policy processes at McMaster.

The Policy Framework was developed with consultation from the President–Vice-Presidents group and representatives from the MUFA executive. A copy of the proposed Framework is attached with this memo.

It is recommended that,

the Senate Executive Committee approve, for recommendation to the Senate and Board of Governors, the establishment of the proposed Policy Framework for McMaster University, effective October 28, 2021.

**SENATE EXECUTIVE: September 29, 2021
FOR APPROVAL**

Complete Policy Title

McMaster University Policy Framework

Policy Number (if applicable):

Approved by

**Senate
Board of Governors**

Date of Most Recent Approval

Date TBD

Date of Original Approval(s)

Date TBD

Supersedes/Amends Policy dated

Responsible Executive

University Secretary

Policy Specific Enquiries

University Secretary

General Policy Enquiries

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

DISCLAIMER:

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

SECTION I – INTRODUCTION

1. McMaster University is an international leader recognized for exceptional research, innovation, and teaching and learning. In order to maintain the highest standards of quality, the University strives to develop and maintain policies that facilitate good governance, accountability, equity, and the effective achievement of its mission and vision.
2. The objective of McMaster's Policy Framework is to provide students, staff, and faculty with clear, transparent and equitable processes for developing, revising, and reviewing policies approved by the Senate and Board of Governors. This document seeks to ensure that the University's policy environment operates based on principles of good governance, equity, and openness. Furthermore, it will provide definitions of key terminology and outline the primary processes for establishing, revising, and rescinding policy documents. It will also describe the responsibilities of senior leaders in the policy process.
3. Individuals and areas looking to establish, revise, or rescind Board and/or Senate policies are expected to comply with the provisions outlined in this Policy. To promote consistency and transparency, the University requires all policies submitted to governing bodies in a common format.

SECTION II – DEFINITIONS

4. **Policy:** a document providing guiding principles to facilitate the achievement of the University's mission and vision based on good governance, informed decision making, consultation, and high standards. A policy will articulate responsibilities, oversight, and compliance in its subject area, and outline the processes and standards that are a mandatory requirement for all individuals and groups operating on behalf of the University.
5. **Procedure:** a set of required processes to be used in conjunction with a policy or policies, to ensure consistency and fairness in achieving a policy objective(s).
6. **Guidelines:** documents created to provide members of the University community with guidance, including best practices, when applying or implementing policies. Guidelines are to be read in combination with Board and Senate policies and are considered advisory, as opposed to mandatory.
7. **Approver:** the governing body, either the Senate and/or Board of Governors, responsible for oversight and approval of a policy document.
8. **Responsible Executive:** the Senior Academic Officer or Senior Administrative Officer who has responsibility for the operation and implementation of the Policy.
9. **Policy Inquiry Contact:** the position responsible for addressing questions or operational matters related to a policy, as delegated by the Responsible Executive.
10. **Policy Review:** a voluntary or mandated review of an existing policy with the objective of ensuring it is meeting the current standards required at McMaster University.

SECTION III – JURISDICTION

11. This Policy applies to campus-wide policies and procedures requiring approval at the Board of Governors and/or Senate. Policies specific to a Faculty, Department, or operational unit are outside the purview of McMaster's Policy Framework, but can adopt it should they wish to do so.
12. The procedure for revising or amending the McMaster University Revised Policy And Regulations With Respect To Academic Appointment, Tenure And Promotion (Tenure and Promotion Policy), including Supplementary Policy Statements, are outlined in the Tenure and Promotion Policy.

SECTION IV – PROCESS

13. The establishment of new policies and the revision or rescinding of existing policies will comply with the standards articulated within this Policy and will receive approval from the Senate and/or Board of Governors. If a new policy supersedes an existing policy, a separate motion is required through governance to officially terminate the policy being replaced.
14. All new and revised policies will be submitted to governance, following consultation with the University Secretariat.
15. Responsible Executives will ensure that new policies are provided to key stakeholders for comment and consultation, as appropriate. Where a policy has a significant impact across campus, consultation should be sought from the University community.
16. The University Secretariat should be contacted at the beginning of the process to provide advice on governance pathways for policy approvals, including proposals to revise or rescind policies. It is expected that all policies and procedures will be reviewed by the appropriate committee prior to submission to the Senate and/or Board of Governors.
17. As an institution, McMaster is committed to promoting inclusive excellence through campus-wide equitable practices. Throughout all policy processes, including drafting, reviewing, and consultation, consideration should be given to equity, diversity, and inclusion. Policies should use inclusive language, seek to remove barriers to equity, promote accessibility and fairness, and wherever possible be reviewed by diverse members of the campus community, including members of communities who experience social inequities.
18. When a proposal is being made to re-name a policy, it requires approval through the full governance process.
19. Policies are effective upon final approval by either the Senate or Board of Governors, unless the approved resolution stipulates a later date.

SECTION V – NON-SUBSTANTIVE REVISIONS

20. It is recognized that, from time to time, policies will require updates that are necessary, but non-substantive. At the request of the Responsible Executive, the University Secretariat may make the following non-substantive changes to policies: employee title changes, inclusion of gender-neutral language, name

changes, and grammatical/editorial corrections. Such revisions do not require approval from the University's governing bodies but shall be reported for information to the Chair of either Senate or Board of Governors, as applicable.

SECTION VI – ACCOUNTABILITY

21. The Responsible Executive is accountable for:
- a) developing and maintaining policies within their area of oversight. In some instances, it may be appropriate to strike a cross-functional group or ad hoc committee to propose new policies or review existing policies. In these cases, the process will be overseen by the Responsible Executive (or delegate);
 - b) ensuring an equity lens is applied to the Policy and appropriate consultation has taken place prior to submission to McMaster's governing bodies;
 - c) communication and implementation of the policy following approval; and
 - d) interpretation of the Policy.
22. The University Secretariat is responsible for:
- a) ensuring good governance throughout the policy approval process;
 - b) managing and storing policy records;
 - c) posting policies on its policy webpage;
 - d) providing administrative assistance and policy coordination, in cooperation with Responsible Executives; and
 - e) developing a policy review schedule of Board and Senate policies and working with Responsible Executives to meet review deadlines.

SECTION VII – POLICY REVIEW

23. It is expected that policies will be reviewed by the Responsible Executive within 5 years of the most recent approval. Reviews may be conducted earlier at the request of the Responsible Executive, Senate, or Board of Governors.
24. The Responsible Executive, in consultation with the University Secretary, will determine the scope and format of the review process. In specific cases it may be appropriate to consult with the policy owner on the review process required. For some policies it will be sufficient to undertake a smaller review focused on ensuring it is up-to-date and in compliance with relevant standards, while others, due to institutional changes or complexity, will require a comprehensive review by a working group or ad hoc committee.

SECTION VII – RELATED DOCUMENTS

[Board of Governors By-Laws](#)

[Senate By-Laws](#)

[Accessibility Policy](#)

[Policy Statement on Inclusive Communications](#)

[Statement on Building an Inclusive Community with Shared Purpose](#)



School of Graduate Studies

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

Phone 905.525.9140
Ext. 23679
Fax 905.521.0689
<http://www.mcmaster.ca/graduate>

REPORT TO SENATE EXECUTIVE
from the
GRADUATE COUNCIL

For Approval

I. Graduate Expectations Arising from the McMaster Vaccination Policy (Attachment)

At its meeting on September 14th and via e-ballot on September 16th, Graduate Council approved the establishment of the Graduate Expectations arising from the McMaster Vaccination Policy.

It is now recommended that Senate approve the establishment of the Graduate Expectations for McMaster Vaccination Policy for inclusion in the General Regulations in the Graduate Calendar 2021-2022, effective September 29, 2021.

GRADUATE EXPECTATIONS ARISING FROM THE MCMASTER VACCINATION POLICY

The ongoing COVID-19 pandemic has resulted in unique infection risks and serious health consequences. This academic regulation has been developed to comply with public health regulations and McMaster's Vaccination Policy.

All graduate students attending University property are considered **"On-Site Community Members"**. To be/remain enrolled in McMaster courses with in-person components, they must provide proof that they are fully vaccinated or obtain an exemption from the University on the basis of substantiated human rights grounds. Students are encouraged to complete this process as soon as possible. Before attending University property each day, all On-Site graduate students must also complete the MacCheck screening questionnaire.

Graduate students who do not want or need to attend University property but who regularly work or study at sanctioned off-campus sites and interact with other employees or students are considered **"Off-Site Community Members"**. This includes students enrolled in clinical placements, cooperative work experiences or other external experiential course requirements. Off-Site students must also provide proof that they are fully vaccinated or obtain an exemption from the University to be/remain enrolled in their programs. Depending on the situation, McMaster may also require Off-Site students to complete MacCheck, but will communicate these requirements directly to the affected students. Finally, Off-Site students must comply with any additional external protocols at their worksite or study site.

Students in the Faculty of Health Sciences who are involved in learning in the clinical environment must also meet requirements under the FHS Policy Regarding Submission, Verification, and Sharing of COVID-19 Vaccination Status for Learners in Clinical and Workplace-Based Placements.

FOR FALL TERM 2021 AND SUBSEQUENT TERMS DURING ACADEMIC YEAR 2021/22

1. All students are required to visit the **MacCheck** digital tool to register their vaccination information as soon as possible. The deadline for submitting a request for exemption is September 19, 2021 at 11:59 p.m. ET.
2. On-Site graduate students who have uploaded proof of their vaccinations, or have received an exemption from the University, will be able to continue their enrolment in Fall Term 2021 and future terms during academic year 2021/22. Off-Site graduate students will also be able to complete their off-campus work or student program after they have uploaded proof of their vaccinations, or have received an exemption, as long as they also comply with any additional protocols in place at their site or through the Faculty of Health Sciences.
3. **Students must also complete the daily MacCheck screening within the hour before accessing University property for any reason. A successful screening result on MacCheck is required for any visit to campus.**
4. Enrolment in the Fall Term 2021 will be cross-checked between September 7th and October 18th to identify those students who have not met the requirements of the McMaster

Vaccination Policy.

Beginning October 18th, On-Site graduate students enrolled for Fall Term 2021 who have not completed their vaccinations or who have not received an exemption from the University **will be “withdrawn in good standing”**.. (International graduate students enrolled in programs but not yet able to arrive in Canada due to study permit delays will not be subject to the Oct 18th deadline.)

- a) Students who are withdrawn will receive tuition reimbursement (net of scholarship and stipend arrangements at October 31st) for Fall 2021 and registration in degree components for the term will be removed from their transcript.
 - b) Students enrolled in programs whose degree offerings are designated by the program to be entirely virtual or non-clinical Off-Site placements in Fall 2021, will be allowed to remain enrolled until Dec 31st.
 - c) Students with OSAP are also encouraged to contact the Registrar’s Office to understand any OSAP implications.
 - d) Students who are in the final term of their degree (i.e. expecting to complete all remaining degree requirements in Fall 2021) and have no reason to be on campus will be allowed to remain enrolled and complete their degree. Graduate program offices will be consulted by the School of Graduate Studies to verify completion expectations. In the event of unanticipated delays in completion, a student should be directed to the Associate Dean of the Faculty hosting the graduate program for guidance.
 - e) Questions regarding the prospects for future readmission should be directed to the Associate Dean of the Faculty hosting the graduate program.
5. **Any student found to be in violation of the Vaccination Policy is prohibited from accessing University Property and may be subject to outcomes and/or sanctions under the *Code of Student Rights and Responsibilities*.**

REPORT TO THE SENATE
FROM THE
COMMITTEE ON APPOINTMENTS

Open Session (Regular)

On September 20, 2021, the Committee on Appointments approved the following recommendations and now recommends them to Senate for approval:

1. Faculty Grievance Policy

a. Revised – Faculty Grievance Policy

It is now recommended,

that Senate approve, for recommendation to the Board of Governors, the amendments and name change to the Faculty General Grievance Procedure, as circulated, effective October 28, 2021.

b. New – Faculty Respondent Option for External Recommendation of Sanctions Policy

It is now recommended,

that Senate approve, for recommendation to the Board of Governors, the establishment of the Faculty Respondent Option for External Recommendation of Sanctions Policy, effective October 28, 2021.

2. Terms of Reference

a. Distinguished Business Research Professor

It is now recommended,

that Senate approve the revised terms of reference for the Distinguished Business Research Professor.

b. Establishment of the Fairley Gadsby Research Chair in Fluvial Geomorphology

It is now recommended,

that Senate approve the establishment of the Fairley Gadsby Research Chair in Fluvial Geomorphology.

c. Establishment of the Ronald Barr Professorship in Pediatric Oncology

It is now recommended,
that Senate approve the establishment of the Ronald Barr Professorship in Pediatric Oncology.

d. AbbVie Chair in Education in Rheumatology

It is now recommended,
that Senate approve the revised terms of reference for the AbbVie Chair in Education in Rheumatology.

SENATE: FOR APPROVAL
October 20, 2021

Complete Policy Title

Faculty Grievance Policy

Policy Number (if applicable):

DRAFT 12 (for Senate & Board)

Approved by

**Senate /
Board of Governors**

Date of Most Recent Approval

**TBD/
TBD**

Date of Original Approval(s)

May 26, 1999 / June 10, 1999

Supersedes/Amends Policy dated

Faculty General Grievance Procedure
May 26, 1999 / June 10, 1999

Faculty Grievance Review Panel Guidelines for
Hearing Committees, September 28, 1993

Responsible Executive

Provost and Vice-President (Academic)

Policy Specific Enquiries

Provost and Vice-President (Academic)

General Policy Enquiries

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

DISCLAIMER:

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION I: INTRODUCTION.....	1
PREAMBLE	1
SCOPE	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
SECTION II: PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES.....	4
OTHER OPTIONS	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
TIME LIMITS.....	4
CONFLICTS OF INTEREST	4
CONFIDENTIALITY	4
PROTECTION FROM REPRISAL	4
ADVISOR / REPRESENTATION	5
DATA GATHERING & RECORD KEEPING	5
POLICY REVIEW.....	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
REVISION OF THIS POLICY.....	5
SECTION III: GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES.....	6
MEDIATION	6
INFORMAL RESOLUTION	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
FORMAL RESOLUTION.....	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
RESPONDENT	6
GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE	6
PROCEDURAL VARIATIONS	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
FORMAL HEARING.....	13
SECTION IV: PROCEDURAL RULES FOR TRIBUNAL HEARINGS.....	16
Submissions and Disclosure.....	16
Closed Hearings	17
Parties	18
Onus, Burden of Proof and Basis of Decision.....	18
Representation	18
Administrative and Legal Support.....	18
Other Parties	18
Recess or Adjournment	18
Evidence.....	17

Witnesses	17
Recording	19
Similar Questions of Fact or Policy	19
WRITTEN HEARINGS	19
Notice of Written Hearing	19
FORMAL HEARINGS	19
Notice of Hearing	19
ORDER OF THE HEARING	20
DELIBERATIONS	21
DECISION	22
OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS	22
APPENDIX A: GRIEVANCE REVIEW PANEL	24
HEARING COMMITTEE SELECTION	24
APPENDIX B: Faculty association observers at hearings	25
APPENDIX C: JURISDICTION	Error! Bookmark not defined.
EXCLUSIONS	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
APPENDIX D: RELATED POLICIES	26
APPENDIX E: GLOSSARY OF TERMS	Error! Bookmark not defined.

SECTION I: INTRODUCTION

PREAMBLE

1. This Policy is designed to provide McMaster University faculty members with prompt and impartial adjudication of grievances arising from their employment relationship with the University.
2. This Policy is intended to facilitate and promote informal resolution of grievances and to furnish a formal mechanism of grievance resolution when informal means are unsuccessful. Mediation as a means of resolution of grievances is the preferred method for formal resolution of grievances. Only the most serious grievances which have not been resolved by mediation are appropriate for a Hearing.

TERMS AND DEFINITIONS

3. For the purpose of interpreting this document:
 - a) words in the singular may include the plural and words in the plural may include the singular;
 - b) members of the Administration, and Decision-Makers in this Policy may, where necessary and appropriate, delegate their authority;
 - c) **established practice** means a practice which is identifiable, certain, known and in force as of the date of the decision or action that is the subject of the grievance. The onus to show that such a practice exists rests upon the party who seeks to rely upon it;
 - d) **Faculty Association** means either the [McMaster University Faculty Association](#) or the [Clinical Faculty Association](#);
 - e) **faculty member** means those employees of the University or of a college affiliated with the University who hold the academic rank of professor, associate professor, assistant professor or lecturer, and includes clinical faculty;
 - f) **grievance** means a complaint against an administrative decision made by a Person with Administrative Authority;
 - g) **Grievor** may be an individual faculty member or a group of such members;
 - h) **Initial Decision-Maker** means the person with administrative authority that made the initial decision that is the subject of the grievance;
 - i) **MUFA** means the McMaster University Faculty Association;
 - j) **Person with Administrative Authority** means members of the Administration: the President, Vice-President, Vice-Provost, Dean, Associate Dean, Vice-Dean, Department Chair, Director of a Program, School, Institute or Centre);

- k) **Provost** means the Provost and Vice-President (Academic);
- l) **President** means the President and Vice-Chancellor; and
- m) **Respondent** means an individual University administrator that is a Person with Administrative Authority to remedy the grievance.

SCOPE

- 4. A grievance is a complaint that the interpretation or application of a duly enacted policy or established practice of the University by any *Person with Administrative Authority* (clause 3.j.), has not been fair, just or reasonable to the Grievor.
- 5. This Policy is open to all faculty members as defined under clause 3.e. above. However, any such faculty member who is covered by a collective agreement of a certified union or appointed through SPS A3 (*Procedures for Other Appointments except in Health Sciences*) or SPS A4 (*Procedures for Other Appointments within the Faculty of Health Sciences*) shall not be eligible to use this Policy.
- 6. The same complaint may not be filed under another University policy and this Policy contemporaneously.
- 7. Grievances about the following matters **are not** within the jurisdiction of this Policy:
 - a) decisions made and procedures under the jurisdiction of a University policy for which specific review or appeal procedures exist, such as in the:
 - (i) [*Discrimination and Harassment Policy*](#);
 - (ii) [*Sexual Violence Policy*](#);
 - (iii) [*Research Integrity Policy*](#);
 - (iv) Section III and IV of the [*Tenure & Promotion Policy*](#), regarding Tenure & Promotion and Appeal Procedures;
 - (v) Faculty Career Progress/Merit (CP/M) Plan;
 - b) disciplinary measures imposed by a Tribunal under the [*Code of Conduct for Faculty and Procedures for Taking Disciplinary Action*](#), at Stage 4;
 - c) decisions to suspend a faculty member under Section V of the *Tenure and Promotion Policy*;
 - d) decisions made by a Tribunal convened under Section VI of the *Tenure and Promotion Policy*;
 - e) decisions or recommendations made by a Faculty Grievance Tribunal under this Policy;
 - f) remuneration (salary and/or benefits). Nothing in this clause is intended to affect adversely the rights of persons to take complaints about their remuneration to the Provincial Pay Equity Commission if

they have been unable to resolve them to their satisfaction within the University; and

- g) policies enacted and decisions made by University (the Senate and the Board of Governors) and Faculty governance bodies.
8. Grievances about the following matters **are** within the jurisdiction of this Policy:
- a) disciplinary measures imposed under the [Code of Conduct for Faculty and Procedures for Taking Disciplinary Action](#) at Stages 1, 2 and 3; and
 - b) disciplinary measures imposed outside of the context of a University policy.
9. For example, and for greater clarity, while it may be perceived as such, an administrative decision affecting a faculty member is not in itself harassment. Under the *Discrimination and Harassment Policy* harassment means engagement in a course of *vexatious* comment or conduct that is known or ought reasonably to be known to be unwelcome. "Vexatious" comment or conduct is comment or conduct made without reasonable cause or excuse.

ADVICE AND GUIDANCE

- 10. Faculty members should consult with the relevant faculty association (either the [McMaster University Faculty Association](#) or the [Clinical Faculty Association](#)), to determine the most suitable policy or procedures to exercise.
- 11. Other resources for faculty are the University Secretariat, the Equity and Inclusion Office, the Faculty of Health Sciences Professionalism Office (only for members of that Faculty), or Employee/Labour Relations, as appropriate.

SECTION II: PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES

TIME LIMITS

12. Prompt adjudication of grievances is predicated upon adherence to the time limits set out in this Policy. Where time limits are not specified all parties are expected to make reasonable efforts to respond in a timely manner. Time limits, including those which apply to mediation, may be extended by mutual agreement of the parties.
13. A Grievor who fails to meet a time limit loses the right to proceed to the next stage. If a Respondent fails to meet a time limit, the Grievor shall have the right to proceed to the next stage.
14. Disputes about time limits (e.g., when the Grievor ought reasonably to have known the decision or action that is the subject of the Grievance) shall be adjudicated by the Chair of the Grievance Review Panel.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

15. Faculty members and persons with administrative authority will disclose conflicts of interest or other circumstances which may reasonably introduce or appear to introduce bias into any academic or administrative decision to which they may be a party.
16. Parties to the procedures shall exercise their good judgement regarding conflict of interest and recuse themselves accordingly.

CONFIDENTIALITY

17. Confidentiality shall be enjoined on all parties involved in any stage of this Policy. This does not preclude the discreet disclosure of information in order to elicit the facts of the case or as required by law which includes compliance with a summons or order from another administrative tribunal or court.
18. The University, and its employees and agents, will protect personal information and handle records in accordance with the [Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act](#) ,

PROTECTION FROM REPRISAL

19. The University prohibits reprisal or threats of reprisal against any faculty member who makes use of this Policy or participates in proceedings held under its jurisdiction. An individual who believes they are the subject of a reprisal or threat of reprisal shall report this to the Provost's Office, or to the President's Office. Any individual found to be making such reprisals or threats will be subject to appropriate disciplinary action.

ADVISOR / REPRESENTATION

20. Grievors may be accompanied by an advisor or counsel at any stage of the procedures outlined in this Policy. The advisor or counsel may represent the Grievor at the Hearing. The costs of any accompaniment or representation are the responsibility of the Grievor.

UNIVERSITY SECRETARIAT

21. The University Secretariat is the administrative office responsible for the scheduling and holding of Hearings before the Tribunal and for the training of Tribunal members.

DATA GATHERING & RECORD KEEPING

22. Records related to a grievance shall be retained by the Provost's Office for seven years after last use.
23. Hearing files shall be retained by the University Secretary for seven years after last use and may be retained longer at the discretion of the University Secretary. The Tribunal's Report shall be retained permanently.
24. The Chair of the Grievance Review Panel is responsible for providing a written, anonymized, statistical report to the Chairs of the Senate and the Board of Governors, and the President of MUFA. In order to protect confidentiality, the statistical report will be held over until a sample size of five has been reached. The report will then provide statistics on a **rolling three-year basis**. This report may include recommendations for clarification of or changes to University policies, practices or procedures. The report could also contain a summary of the MUFA Special Enquiries and Grievances Chair's activities if submitted.

POLICY REVISIONS

25. Proposals for amending this Policy may be made by the Chair of the Grievance Review Panel, the University administration, the Senate, MUFA, or the Clinical Faculty Association. When such proposals are made, there shall be consultation among these parties.
26. If the Senate Committee on Appointments and the MUFA Executive agree that the revisions are minor and reach agreement on the revisions, the amendments will be presented to Senate by the Senate Committee on Appointments.
27. Otherwise, an *ad hoc* drafting committee will be established, and shall consist of 3 members named by the Senate Committee on Appointments and 3 members named by the MUFA Executive.
28. The *ad hoc* drafting committee shall review the proposed amendments and formulate revisions for submission to the Senate and the Board of Governors for approval.

SECTION III: GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES

29. Faculty members may contact MUFA for advice regarding this Policy and for assistance in formulating and pursuing a grievance.
30. Clinical faculty members who are not members of the McMaster University Faculty Association should consult with the Clinical Faculty Association for advice.
31. Every effort shall be made to resolve the complaint in a timely and collegial manner.

Mediation

32. Each year the Provost and the President of MUFA shall jointly establish a list of six (6) mediators. In addition, on an *ad hoc* basis, additional mediators may be agreed upon.
33. Internal mediators or external third-party mediators may be used for mediation. The Provost will propose a mediator. Both parties shall be given the opportunity to object in writing to the proposed mediator.
34. The mediator, who must have had no previous involvement in the case, shall hear both sides of the dispute and shall remain impartial. They shall hold all information in strict confidence and shall issue no public report or statements on the mediation. The mediator may not subsequently be a member of the Tribunal which hears the case if it proceeds to a Hearing, nor may they be called as a witness before a Tribunal.
35. With the mutual consent of the parties, mediation may be requested at any stage in the Policy not already stipulated and timelines for further steps revised accordingly.
36. The costs of mediation will be borne by the University.

Respondent

37. The Respondent is an individual University administrator that is a Person with Administrative Authority to remedy the grievance. Normally, the Initial Decision-Maker reports directly to the initial Respondent with respect to their administrative duties. The Initial Decision-Maker is normally not a Respondent under these procedures.
38. In the case of a Committee decision, the Initial Decision-Maker will be the administrative officer at the level to which the Committee reports, i.e., in the case of a Departmental Committee it will be the Chair of the Department, of a Faculty Committee it will be the Dean, of a University Committee the appropriate Vice-Provost, Vice-President or the President.

Deadline to Initiate a Grievance

39. The grievance must be brought **within 21 business days** after the Grievor knows, or ought reasonably to have known, the grounds for the grievance.

TYPE A GRIEVANCE

40. A Type A Grievance is when the **Initial Decision-Maker** is a:
- a) Department Chair;
 - b) Centre Director; or
 - c) Program/School Director.
41. The **Respondent** is normally the Faculty Dean. In the Faculty of Health Sciences, the Executive Vice-Dean & Associate Vice-President (Academic) is normally delegated as the Respondent.
42. An unexplainable lack of action/response by either party will allow either party to proceed to the next step in the procedure.

Informal Resolution with Initial Decision-Maker

43. The Grievor shall request to meet with the Initial Decision-Maker to informally discuss a resolution to the grievance.
44. The Initial Decision-Maker shall arrange a meeting **within 14 business days of receipt** of the request.

Informal Resolution with Respondent

45. If a resolution cannot be reached, the Grievor may choose to proceed to the next step, and shall **within 7 business days** after the meeting with the Initial Decision-Maker, request to meet with the Respondent to informally discuss with the Respondent a resolution to the grievance.
46. The Respondent shall arrange a meeting **within 14 business days of receipt** of the request.

Mediation with Initial Decision-Maker

47. If a resolution cannot be reached, the Respondent shall:
- a) notify the Provost's Office of the grievance **within 7 business days** after the first meeting between the Grievor and the Respondent; and
 - b) arrange for mediation between the Grievor and the Initial Decision-Maker to commence **within 14 business days** of the Respondent's informal resolution meeting with the Grievor.

Written Decision from Respondent

48. If mediation is not successful in bringing about a resolution to the grievance, **within 14 business days from the first day of mediation**, the grievance shall be:
- a) presented in writing to the Respondent:

- (i) the written grievance shall specify the nature of the grievance; and
 - (ii) the remedy sought;
 - b) a copy shall be provided to the Provost's Office; and
 - c) at the Grievor's discretion, a copy may be provided to MUFA.
49. The **Respondent** shall respond to the Grievor in writing **within 14 business days** following receipt of the written grievance, with a copy provided to the Provost's Office.

Request for Hearing

50. If the grievance is not resolved to the Grievor's satisfaction, the Grievor may, **within 21 business days of receipt** of the decision, make a written request for a Hearing (see Section IV: Written Request for a Hearing).



TYPE B GRIEVANCE

51. A Type B Grievance is when the Initial Decision-Maker is a:
- a) Dean (in the Faculty of Health Sciences, “Dean” and/or “Executive Vice-Dean & Associate Vice-President (Academic)”);
 - b) Institute Director; or
 - c) University Committee or Equivalent.

52. The **Respondent** is normally the Provost. However, where appropriate the Provost may refer the grievance to the relevant Vice-Provost or Vice-President, or to the President, and that person will become the Respondent.

53. An unexplainable lack of action/response by either party will allow either party to proceed to the next step in the procedure.

Informal Resolution with Initial Decision-Maker

54. The Grievor shall request to meet with the Initial Decision-Maker to informally discuss a resolution to the grievance.

55. The Initial Decision-Maker shall arrange a meeting **within 14 business days of receipt** of the request.

Informal Resolution with Respondent

56. If a resolution cannot be reached, the Grievor may choose to proceed to the next step, and shall **within 7 business days** after the meeting with the Initial Decision-Maker, request to meet with the Respondent to informally discuss with the Respondent a resolution to the grievance.

57. The Respondent shall arrange a meeting **within 14 business days of receipt** of the request.

Mediation with Initial Decision-Maker

58. If a resolution cannot be reached the Respondent shall:
- a) notify the President’s Office of the grievance **within 7 business days** after the first meeting between the Grievor and the Respondent; and
 - b) arrange for **mediation** between the Grievor and the Initial Decision-Maker to commence **within 14 business days** of the Respondent’s informal resolution meeting with the Grievor.

Written Decision from Respondent

59. If mediation is not successful in bringing about a resolution to the grievance, **within 14 business days from the first day of mediation**, the grievance shall be:

- a) presented in writing to the Respondent:
 - (i) the written grievance shall specify the nature of the grievance; and
 - (ii) the remedy sought;
 - b) a copy shall be provided to the President's Office; and
 - c) at the Grievor's discretion, a copy may be provided to MUFA.
60. The Respondent shall respond to the Grievor in writing **within 14 business days** following receipt of the written grievance, with a copy provided to the President's Office.

Request for Hearing

61. If the grievance is not resolved to the Grievor's satisfaction, the Grievor may, **within 21 business days of receipt** of the decision, make a written request for a Hearing (see Section IV: Written Request for a Hearing).



TYPE C GRIEVANCE

62. A Type C Grievance is when the Initial Decision-Maker is a Vice-Provost or Vice-President.

63. The Respondent is the President.

64. An unexplainable lack of action/response by either party will allow either party to proceed to the next step in the procedure.

Informal Resolution with Initial Decision-Maker

65. The Grievor shall request to meet with the Initial Decision-Maker to informally discuss a resolution to the grievance.

66. The Initial Decision-Maker shall arrange a meeting **within 14 business days of receipt** of the request.

Informal Resolution with Respondent

67. If a resolution cannot be reached, the Grievor may choose to proceed to the next step, and shall **within 7 business days** after the meeting with the Initial Decision-Maker, request to meet with the Respondent to informally discuss with the President a resolution to the grievance.

68. The President shall arrange a meeting **within 14 business days of receipt** of the request.

Mediation with Initial Decision-Maker

69. If a resolution cannot be reached the President shall arrange for **mediation** between the Grievor and the Initial Decision-Maker to commence **within 14 business days** of the President's informal resolution meeting with the Grievor.

Written Decision from Respondent

70. If mediation is not successful in bringing about a resolution to the grievance, **within 14 business days from the first day of mediation**, the grievance shall be:

a) presented in writing to the President:

(i) the written grievance shall specify the nature of the grievance; and

(ii) the remedy sought; and

b) at the Grievor's discretion, a copy may be provided to MUFA.

71. The President shall respond to the Grievor in writing **within 14 business days** following receipt of the written grievance.

Request for Hearing

72. If the grievance is not resolved to the Grievor's satisfaction, the Grievor may, **within 21 business days of receipt** of the decision, make a written request for a Hearing (see Section IV: Written Request for a Hearing).



TYPE D GRIEVANCE

73. A Type D Grievance is when the Initial Decision-Maker is the President, they shall be referred to as the Respondent.

74. An unexplainable lack of action/response by either party will allow either party to proceed to the next step in the procedure.

Informal Resolution with Respondent

75. The Grievor shall request to meet with the Respondent to informally discuss a resolution to the grievance.

76. The President shall arrange a meeting **within 14 business days of receipt** of the request.

Mediation

77. If a resolution cannot be reached the Respondent shall arrange for **mediation** between the Grievor and the Respondent to commence **within 14 business days** of the Respondent's informal resolution meeting with the Grievor.

Written Decision from Respondent

78. If mediation is not successful in bringing about a resolution to the grievance, **within 14 business days from the first day of mediation**, the grievance shall be:

a) presented in writing to the Respondent:

(i) the written grievance shall specify the nature of the grievance; and

(ii) the remedy sought; and

b) at the Grievor's discretion, a copy may be provided to MUFA.

79. The Respondent shall respond to the Grievor in writing **within 14 business days** following receipt of the written grievance.

Request for Hearing

80. If the grievance is not resolved to the Grievor's satisfaction, the Grievor may, **within 21 business days of receipt** of the decision, make a written request for a Hearing (see Section IV: Written Request for a Hearing).



SECTION IV: WRITTEN REQUEST FOR A HEARING

81. If, after receipt of the written decision from the Respondent, the grievance is not resolved to the Grievor's satisfaction, the Grievor may **within 21 business days** of the date of the decision letter, file a ***Request for a Hearing Form***, with the University Secretariat.
82. The **Request for a Hearing** shall contain:
 - a) the details of the grievance;
 - b) a statement describing the grounds for the grievance;
 - c) a statement of the relief sought;
 - d) names of witnesses to be called;
 - e) the name of the Grievor's legal counsel or advisor, if applicable;
 - f) any documents the Grievor wishes to submit to the Tribunal as evidence in support of their position;
 - g) their decision on whether they agree to the Observer attending the Hearing;
 - h) their decision on whether they agree to the Observer receiving the Hearing Record; and
 - i) a copy of the Respondent's written decision.
83. The University Secretariat shall acknowledge receipt of the grievance and inform the Chair of the Grievance Review Panel (or Vice-Chair) of the request for hearing.
84. The University Secretariat shall forward a copy of the request for a hearing and supporting documentation to the Respondent and ask them for a written response to the *Request for a Hearing Form*.
85. The University Secretariat also shall inform the relevant faculty association that there is to be a Hearing under this procedure and, if the Grievor so consents, shall invite the faculty association to send an Observer.
86. Within **21 business days of the receipt** of the request for a written response to the *Request for a Hearing Form*, the Respondent shall deliver to the University Secretariat a written reply to the Grievor's Request for a Hearing and shall submit the following information:
 - a) preference for open or closed Hearing;
 - b) opinion on whether the grievance falls within the scope of this Policy;
 - c) names of witnesses to be called; and

- d) name of Respondent's counsel, if any.
87. The University Secretariat shall forward a copy of this reply to the Grievor.
88. The purpose of a Hearing is to provide the aggrieved faculty member or group of faculty members, within the institutional framework of the University, an impartial adjudication of their grievance.
89. The Tribunal, composed of three members of faculty who have not been previously involved in the decision being grieved against, is empowered to review the evidence, both written and oral, upon which the decision was based.
90. The members of the Tribunal shall be the sole judges of the facts and shall render a decision which, in their judgement, is fair and just in the circumstances.
91. The matter will be considered by a Tribunal under the *Procedural Rules for Hearings*, Section V.

SECTION V: PROCEDURAL RULES FOR HEARINGS

92. Hearings shall be conducted in accordance with the principles of procedural fairness, namely the rights to receive notice, to be heard, and to know the case against one. Adjudications and Hearings shall follow the applicable procedural rules specified in the [Statutory Powers Procedure Act \(SPPA\)](#) and set out in this Policy. The Tribunal shall have the right to control its own process, and, in this regard, if the Tribunal determines that variations to the procedures would lead to a fair, just, and efficient resolution of the Hearing, it has the power to make any Order in furtherance of this objective.
93. Where any procedural matter is not dealt with specifically in this Policy or the *SPPA*, the Tribunal may, after hearing submissions from the parties, establish an appropriate procedure.
94. Any procedural requirement contained in this Policy may be waived with the consent of the Tribunal and of all the parties.

Settlement

95. Parties are encouraged to settle any and all disputes prior to a hearing before the Tribunal. In the event that the issue is settled between the parties **prior** to any hearing before the Tribunal, the grievance may be withdrawn by mutual agreement of the parties. Once a Hearing has commenced, however, any settlement proposed by the parties must be approved by the Tribunal before the matter can be dismissed or resolved.

Submissions and Disclosure

96. Parties to the Hearing are required to make written submissions prior to the Hearing, as both Parties have a right to know the case to be met and must be given a fair opportunity to respond. Disclosure also helps the Parties prepare for the hearing.
97. Written submissions must include:
- a) a list of all witnesses the Party intends to call to testify; and
 - b) a copy of all arguably relevant documents or other evidence in their possession;
 - c) and any such evidence shall be made available to the members of the Tribunal and to all parties prior to the Hearing.
98. Prior to a Hearing, members of the Tribunal shall be provided with:
- a) the Grievor's complaint in the *Request for a Hearing Form*, which includes the details of the grievance, a statement of the issue or issues in dispute, a statement of the remedy sought, and documentation, including the written decision from the Respondent and any responses from all previous stages of the grievance; and
 - b) all written or other documentary evidence submitted by the parties.

99. Members of the Tribunal must not hear evidence or receive representations regarding the substance of the case other than through the procedures described in this Policy.

Evidence

100. Parties to the Hearing have the right to present evidence in support of their case to the Tribunal and to see any written or documentary evidence presented to the Tribunal.
101. The Parties are expected to produce all arguably relevant documents (with normal limitations of privilege, etc.), a **minimum of 10 business days prior** to the Hearing.
102. The Tribunal has the power to require production of written or documentary evidence by the parties or by other sources.
103. The Tribunal has the power to rule on the admissibility of evidence.

Witnesses

104. Parties to the Hearing, and the Tribunal, have the right to call, question, and cross-examine witnesses. Other than the parties, witnesses are present in the Hearing room only during the time they are testifying.
105. Any person appearing before the Tribunal as a witness shall be required to give evidence under affirmation or oath.
106. The Tribunal has discretion to limit the testimony and questioning of witnesses to those matters it considers relevant to the disposition of the case.
107. **Parties are responsible for contacting their own witnesses; for making all arrangements for witnesses to attend the Hearing;** for paying any costs associated with their appearance before the Tribunal; and for absorbing the costs of any legal counsel attending on their behalf.
108. The Tribunal Chair has the power to compel an unwilling witness to attend, and parties may contact the University Secretariat to request the Chair's assistance in this regard. The power to compel a witness is derived from the *Statutory Powers Procedure Act*. An unwilling witness may be compelled by the Chair under summons to testify where the written request by the party for the summons demonstrates the witness' testimony is relevant and related to the alleged facts of the case.

Closed Hearings

109. Hearings shall be held *in camera* unless either the Grievor or the Respondent requests that the Hearing, or some part of the Hearing, should be held in public. In the event of such a request, the Tribunal shall hear representations from all parties. In making its ruling, the Tribunal shall consider whether matters of

an intimate financial or personal nature are to be raised, whether there is an issue of public safety involved, the desirability of holding an open Hearing and other relevant circumstances.

Parties

110. Parties to a Hearing shall include:

- a) the Grievor; and
- b) the Respondent.

Onus, Burden of Proof and Basis of Decision

- 111. The **balance of probabilities** is the test to be met to show, by the weight of the evidence presented, that all of the facts necessary to make a determination that an injustice or error have occurred, have a greater likelihood of being true than not.
- 112. The Grievor has the onus to present evidence to satisfy the Tribunal that, on a balance of probabilities, the interpretation or application of a duly enacted policy or established practice of the University by the initial Decision-Maker has not been fair, just or reasonable to the Grievor.
- 113. The principles and procedures described in this section shall apply to all proceedings before the Tribunal. Tribunals shall not be charged with investigative duties.

Advisor / Representation

- 114. Parties have the right to be advised or represented by an Advisor or legal counsel. The costs of any representation are to be borne by the party retaining such representation.
- 115. An Advisor is a person of the individual's choice who acts in an advisory role (e.g., friend, family member, legal counsel), but is not a witness or potential witness in the matter.

Administrative and Legal Support

- 116. Administrative support for the Tribunal will be provided through the University Secretariat. Legal counsel for the Tribunal shall be provided as needed through the University Secretariat.

Other Parties

- 117. If other persons, in addition to the Grievor and the Respondent, have been specified as parties to the proceedings, the Hearing procedure shall be altered by the Tribunal to provide an opportunity for such additional parties to be heard.

Recess or Adjournment

- 118. The Tribunal may consider and grant a recess or an adjournment at the request of either party to allow them to review written or documentary evidence submitted at the Hearing.

119. The Tribunal may grant an adjournment at any time during the Hearing to ensure a fair Hearing.

Recording

120. Although the Hearing shall be recorded in order to obtain an accurate record of the proceedings, such recording is done for convenience purposes only and the malfunction of the recording device or subsequent loss of the recording shall not invalidate, in any way, the related Hearing.
121. The recording shall be held in confidence by the University Secretariat for a period of three years from the last date of the Hearing. Any party to the Hearing may request access to the recording and the reproduction thereof, upon reasonable notice and payment of the reasonable costs associated therewith.

Similar Questions of Fact or Policy

122. If two or more proceedings before the Grievance Review Panel involve the same or similar questions of fact or policy, the Chair of the Panel, after seeking written input from the parties, may decide:
- a) to consolidate the proceedings or any part of them; or
 - b) to hear the proceedings at the same time; or
 - c) to hear the proceedings one immediately after the other.

WRITTEN HEARINGS

Notice of Written Hearing

123. The parties shall be given reasonable, written notice of the Written Hearing submission deadlines.
124. The notice shall include the process and timelines for submissions for the Written Hearing. Any party whose reasons for failing to participate in the process that are not considered valid by the Tribunal's Chair, or whose failure to participate may cause unreasonable delay, shall be notified that the Tribunal will proceed in that party's absence.

HEARINGS

Notice of Hearing

125. A Hearing shall be commenced as soon as possible following the appointment of the Tribunal.
126. An attempt shall be made to schedule the Hearing at a time and place convenient for the Tribunal and for the parties to the Hearing. However, any party whose reasons for absence are not considered valid by the Tribunal's Chair, or whose absence may cause unreasonable delay, shall be notified that the Tribunal will proceed in that party's absence.
127. The parties shall be given reasonable, written notice of the Hearing.

ORDER OF THE HEARING

128. The first item of business for the Tribunal shall be to confirm the Hearing shall be closed, in accordance with the procedure set out above, or to hear and rule upon representations in favour of an open Hearing.
129. At the outset of the Hearing, the Chair shall:
- a) identify the nature of the case;
 - b) review the order of the Hearing;
 - c) note for the record the documentary information submitted by the parties to the Hearing, including any preliminary or procedural orders;
 - d) note the names of the witnesses for each party;
 - e) confirm the likely dates for sitting and the projected length of the Hearing;
 - f) raise, or request the parties to raise, any and all preliminary issues concerning composition of the Tribunal and other unaddressed procedural matters; and
 - g) proceed to deal with any matters raised in (f) above before the commencement of the substantive portion of the Hearing, by either proceeding directly to the Hearing or considering and rendering a decision on matters raised in (f) above.
130. The Grievor is the first party heard.
- a) Grievor's opening statement shall contain:
 - (i) a brief description of the grievance including what interpretation or application of a duly enacted policy or established practice of the University by the Respondent they believe was not fair, just or reasonable to the Grievor; and
 - (ii) what remedy they are seeking.
 - b) Grievor's case provides factual support to show why their grievance should be remedied and may include any or all of the following:
 - (i) Grievor's oral testimony;
 - (ii) oral testimony of Grievor's witnesses; and
 - (iii) documents or other written evidence in support of this testimony.
 - c) Questioning of the Grievor and their witnesses by the Respondent and/or by the Tribunal occurs at the close of each person's testimony.
131. Following the completion of the Grievor's case, the Respondent presents their case.

- a) Respondent's opening statement shall contain:
 - (i) a brief reply to the Grievor's claims; and
 - (ii) the main arguments of their defence.
 - b) Respondent's case presents the evidence to support their defense, which may include any or all of the following:
 - (i) Respondent's oral testimony;
 - (ii) oral testimony of Respondent's witnesses; and
 - (iii) documents or other written evidence in support of this testimony.
 - c) Questioning of the Respondent and their witnesses by the Grievor and/or by the Tribunal occurs at the close of each person's testimony.
132. Grievor's Reply: The Grievor and their witnesses have the right to offer testimony or other evidence in reply to the issues raised in the Respondent's case.
133. After the testimony of each witness, the Tribunal may, in addition to asking questions of the witness, request copies of such documents mentioned in testimony as the Tribunal in its discretion sees fit.
134. **After this point in the Hearing, no new evidence or witnesses may be introduced.**
135. The parties are entitled to make closing arguments, and to summarize briefly the main points of their cases, in the following order:
 - a) Grievor;
 - b) Respondent; and
 - c) Grievor's reply, if necessary.
136. The Tribunal may alter the order described above in the interest of fairness to any or all of the parties.
137. While procedural fairness is essential, the Tribunal reserves its right to direct, curtail or encourage the organisation of witnesses, testimony and evidence in the interests of enhancing the clarity, relevance, and efficiency of the proceedings.
138. The Tribunal shall first warn, then caution, and may prohibit from continuing in such a manner, any party presenting testimony, evidence, argument or materials which are, in the reasonable opinion of the Tribunal, irrelevant, unprovable, defamatory, vexatious or specious, or which impede or prevent the Tribunal from conducting the Hearing or reaching a decision.

DELIBERATIONS

139. The Tribunal shall deliberate in closed session and shall reach a decision. After deliberation and decision in closed session solely with members of the Tribunal is complete, the Tribunal may solicit the assistance of the University Secretariat and legal counsel regarding the precise form or wording of any order and reasons for judgement to support its decision and may request information on the range of decisions for previous cases heard under the Policy.

DECISION

140. The Tribunal Report shall normally be issued **within 90 business days** from the last day of the Hearing.
141. The Tribunal Report shall be sent to the:
- a) Grievor;
 - b) Respondent;
 - c) President; and
 - d) Faculty Association Observer (if one attended the hearing).
142. Where the Tribunal deems appropriate, affected parties may receive information about the decision and/or remedies that have a direct impact on them, within the constraints of relevant legislation.
143. The Tribunal will report its majority decision regarding the findings and remedies.
144. The report shall include:
- a) the membership of the Tribunal;
 - b) the background of the case, including the nature of the grievance;
 - c) a summary of the cases of the parties;
 - d) the Tribunal's majority findings;
 - e) the Tribunal's majority decision and the reasons for the decision; and
 - f) any ordered remedies and/or recommendations.
145. The President shall implement the decision promptly and shall notify all those eligible to receive the Tribunal's report, of the implementation of the decision.
146. The Tribunal shall not have jurisdiction to change any of the provisions of a duly enacted policy or established practice of the University.

OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS

147. Apart from its duty under these procedures to hear and decide the matters properly brought before it, any Tribunal may make recommendations or suggestions to University bodies or members. Such recommendations are offered for informational purposes and shall be distinct and separate from the decision.

APPENDIX A: GRIEVANCE REVIEW PANEL

GRIEVANCE REVIEW PANEL MEMBERSHIP

1. The President of the University and the President of the Faculty Association shall jointly appoint a full-time tenured/CAWAR faculty member as Chair of a Grievance Review Panel for a two-year term. The two Presidents, in consultation with the Chair, shall appoint 8 full-time, tenured, CAWAR or permanent faculty members, with at least one chosen from each Faculty, to a Grievance Review Panel for staggered three-year terms and shall appoint one or more of the members as Vice-Chair(s). The Chair shall have the authority to delegate to the Vice-Chair(s).

TRIBUNAL SELECTION

2. When the University Secretariat receives the written grievance, the University Secretariat shall inform the Chair of the Grievance Review Panel that a Tribunal needs to be established.
3. Within fourteen **(14) business days of receipt** of the written grievance by the University Secretariat, the Chair of the Grievance Review Panel (or a Vice-Chair in case of conflict of interest or absence), shall establish a Tribunal.
4. The Committee shall consist of the Chair or a Vice-Chair of the Grievance Review Panel, who shall act as Chair of the Tribunal, and two other members of the Grievance Review Panel.
5. The Chair shall select members of the Tribunal who have no conflict of interest; for example, they shall not be members of the same Department as the Grievor or Respondent, nor shall they have made a substantive contribution to the decision being grieved. These are examples only and are not intended to limit the range of conflicts of interest. The Chair must have scrupulous regard to real and perceived conflicts of interest.
6. The Chair or Vice-Chair of the Grievance Review Panel shall propose the membership of the Tribunal.
7. The University Secretariat shall forward to the Grievor and the Respondent the proposed membership of the Tribunal. Both parties shall be given the opportunity to express, in writing, **within 14 business days**, any objections they may have concerning the proposed membership of the Tribunal.
8. After careful consideration of any such objections, the Chair or Vice-Chair of the Grievance Review Panel shall either confirm the members of the Tribunal or propose a revised membership. The Panel Chair shall approve the Tribunal Chair and Tribunal members and, through the University Secretariat, shall so inform the Tribunal members, and the parties to the Hearing.
9. The University Secretariat shall ensure that all members of the Tribunal receive appropriate training to discharge their responsibilities.

APPENDIX B: FACULTY ASSOCIATION OBSERVERS AT HEARINGS

1. As described in *Procedural Rules for Hearings*, the Faculty Association is permitted, subject to the consent of the Grievor, to send an Observer to any Hearing.
2. The function of the Observer is to allow the Faculty Association to monitor the workings of the Policy of which it is a joint author. It is important that the University have full confidence in the Policy. The presence of a Faculty Association Observer is an additional guarantee of fairness and may provide information leading to an improved policy.
3. The University Secretariat shall send a copy of these guidelines to the Grievor when a Hearing is initiated and request the Grievor's consent (a) to the presence of a Faculty Association Observer, and (b) if so, to all the documentation being provided to the Observer. The University Secretariat shall notify the Faculty Association of the faculty member's response. If the Grievor consents, the University Secretariat shall request the Faculty Association to provide the name of the Observer.
4. The Observer should be an active or retired member of the Faculty Association and should be at "arm's length" from the case. The Observer does not attend on behalf of the Grievor and should avoid interacting with any of the parties. At no time should the Observer engage the parties or the Tribunal in any discussions regarding the matter being heard.
5. The Observer must be familiar with the most recent version of this Policy including the *Procedural Rules for Hearings*, Appendix E.
6. Seating arrangements at the Hearing are at the discretion of the Chair. The Observer may not speak without invitation from the Chair. The Observer is not entitled to be present when the Tribunal members recess for discussion among themselves.
7. The Observer shall be provided with all the documentation available to the Grievor, subject to the Grievor's consent. This documentation shall be considered confidential and must be surrendered to the Chair at the close of the Hearing.
8. The Observer shall receive a confidential copy of the Tribunal Report.
9. After the Hearing is over the Observer should ask the parties separately, and outside of the presence of the Tribunal, if they were satisfied with the process followed and whether they wish to make any comment on the process.
10. The Observer shall write a report of the proceedings for the President of the Faculty Association using the *Observer Report on a Hearing* as provided by MUFA. They shall limit comment to procedural matters and take care not to quote either from confidential documents or utterances, unless it is absolutely necessary to do so to make a point concerning procedural issues.
11. The Observer report should include a statement of what proportion of the Hearing the Observer attended and a description of any comments on, or expressions of dissatisfaction with, the Policy by either party. The report should not be confidential, except that any quotations from confidential documents/utterances be confined to a confidential appendix to which only the Presidents of the University and of the Faculty Association should have access. If major procedural irregularities are noted by the Observer, the President of the Faculty Association should inform the President of the University.

APPENDIX C: RELATED POLICIES

This Policy is to be read in conjunction with the following policies, procedures, etc. Any question of the application of this Policy or related policies shall be determined by the Provost and Vice President (Academic), and in conjunction with the administrator of the other policy or policies. The University reserves the right to amend or add to the University's policies and statements from time to time (this is not a comprehensive list):

- [Career Progress/Merit Plan](#)
- [Code of Conduct for Faculty and Procedures for Taking Disciplinary Action](#)
- [Discrimination and Harassment Policy](#)
- [Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act](#)
- [Group Conflict and Senate Mediation Procedures](#)
- [Ontario Human Rights Code](#)
- *Removal policy (Section VI of the [Tenure and Promotion Policy](#))*
- [Research Integrity Policy](#)
- [Sexual Violence Policy](#)
- [Statement on Building an Inclusive Community with a Shared Purpose](#)
- [Statement and Guidelines on Inclusive Communications](#)
- *Suspension policy (Section V of the [Tenure and Promotion Policy](#))*
- *T&P Appeal (Section IV of the [Tenure and Promotion Policy](#))*
- [Violence in the Workplace, Policy on](#)
- [McMaster University Policy on Accessibility](#)

Complete Policy Title

**Faculty Respondent Option for External
Recommendation of Sanctions Policy**

Policy Number (if applicable):

DRAFT 07

Approved by

**Senate /
Board of Governors**

Date of Most Recent Approval

Date 2021

Date of Original Approval(s)

Supersedes/Amends Policy dated

Responsible Executive

Provost and Vice-President (Academic)

Policy Specific Enquiries

[Provost and Vice-President \(Academic\)](#)

General Policy Enquiries

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

DISCLAIMER:

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

INTRODUCTION AND SCOPE

1. The option for an External Recommendation of sanctions (External Review) is only available to faculty member Respondents in hearings conducted under the jurisdiction of the:
 - a) *Code of Conduct for Faculty and Procedures for Taking Disciplinary Action*;
 - b) *Discrimination and Harassment Policy*;
 - c) *Research Integrity Policy*; and
 - d) *Sexual Violence Policy*.
2. External Reviews shall be limited to a hearing where one or more of the recommended sanctions are of greater severity, which shall include all forms of discipline, up to and including termination, that:
 - a) withhold remuneration from the faculty member;
 - b) restrict access to University resources (including office/laboratory space and interaction with individuals);
 - c) restrict access to University services (including computing, communication, and finances); and/or
 - d) alter normal job duties (research, teaching and service).
3. For the purpose of interpreting this document:
 - a) words in the singular may include the plural and words in the plural may include the singular;
 - b) **MUFA** means the McMaster University Faculty Association; and
 - c) **Tribunal** means a duly constituted Tribunal or Hearings Committee.

EXTERNAL REVIEW REQUEST

4. The request for an External Review must be made, in writing, to the Tribunal when the Respondent makes their closing arguments.
5. The University Secretariat, on behalf of the Tribunal, shall forward the request to the relevant faculty association (MUFA or the Clinical Faculty Association).
6. The faculty association shall have **10 business days** from receipt to submit their response to the University Secretariat, either their agreement to bear half the costs associated with the External Review or declining to bear the costs.
7. The University Secretariat shall forward the response to the Tribunal and the parties to the hearing. If the faculty association declined to bear the costs, the Respondent shall have **10 business days** from receipt to respond with either their agreement to bear half the costs associated with the External Review or declining to bear the costs.

Costs

8. In order for an External Review to proceed, either the relevant faculty association and/or the Respondent must agree to bear half the costs associated with the External Review.
9. Contingent upon the agreement of the faculty association and/or the Respondent, half the costs associated with the External Review will be borne by the University.

EXTERNAL REVIEWERS

10. Each year the President of the University and the President of MUFA shall jointly establish a list of six (6) External Reviewers. In addition, the two Presidents may identify, on an *ad hoc* basis, additional individuals to be included on the list of External Reviewers.
11. External Reviewers will normally be individuals who demonstrate active involvement in labour arbitration in the higher education sector in Ontario as a consensually appointed neutral single arbitrator or chair of boards of arbitration.
12. External Reviewers must have the appropriate background/training to be able to review the case. Cases under the *Discrimination and Harassment Policy* or the *Sexual Violence Policy*, require appropriate background/training in the area of discrimination and harassment as identified under those policies.

Selection of an External Reviewer

13. Selection of the External Reviewer will be based on availability to conduct the review within **60 business days**.

Confidentiality

14. Confidentiality shall be enjoined on all parties involved in this Policy. This does not preclude the disclosure of information as required by law which includes compliance with a summons or order from an administrative tribunal or court.
15. The University, and its employees and agents, will protect personal information and handle records in accordance with the [Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act](#).

Review Process

16. The External Reviewer shall be provided with:
 - a) the Tribunal's findings;
 - b) the sanction submissions from both parties to the Hearing (if submitted); and
 - c) any previous findings of violation by the Respondent of the relevant Policy.
17. The University Secretariat shall provide the External Reviewer with additional documents upon request

pertaining to University policies and processes.

18. The External Reviewer cannot review or retry the facts and findings of a Tribunal. The External Reviewer may ask clarifying questions.
19. The External Reviewer may consider the severity of the offence, previous findings of violations of the relevant policy, precedent in case law, and any other relevant legal principles.
20. The External Reviewer will provide to the Tribunal a sanction recommendation based on relevant precedent in the (Ontario) post-secondary landscape. The External Reviewer sanction recommendation will be shared with both parties to the Hearing.

Tribunal

21. The Tribunal will consider the recommendations from the External Reviewer in their deliberations regarding sanctions.

TO: Senate Committee on Appointments

FROM: Dr. Khaled Hassanein, Dean, DeGroote School of Business

DATE: August 31, 2021

RE: Distinguished Business Research Professor Terms of Reference

On behalf of the Faculty of Business, we are pleased to recommend the attached updated Terms of Reference for the **Distinguished Business Research Professor**. The terms have been updated to include an annual course relief to align it with other DeGroote Research appointments.

The Distinguished Business Research Professor honours internationally recognized scholars who are research focused and student centred, and is used to both retain and recruit such scholars.



cc: S. Tighe
D. Welch

Attach (2)

September 2021

TERMS OF REFERENCE

DISTINGUISHED BUSINESS RESEARCH PROFESSOR

General

The DeGroote School of Business honours internationally recognized scholars who are research focused and student centred. The honorific of Distinguished Business Research Professor is used to both retain and recruit such scholars. The DeGroote School of Business will only have one holder of the professorship at this time.

Responsibilities of the Professorship

Holders of the Professorship will have a full time, tenure-stream position in the DeGroote School of Business. They will possess an outstanding record of scholarship. They will continue to advance learning and discovery through exceptional scholarship. They will be excellent citizens of the DeGroote School of Business, participate fully in implementing its vision and mentor new scholars by inspiring them to achieve further insight, innovation, and professional success.

Selection Process for the Professorship

The Dean of the DeGroote School of Business will appoint a Nomination and Selection Committee. This committee will nominate suitable candidates based on their scholarly achievements and the committee, following its deliberations, will recommend an appointment to the Dean. Thereafter, the Dean of the DeGroote School of Business will report its appointment to the Senate Committee on Appointments.

Term

The appointment to the professorship will be for an initial five-year period, with the understanding that renewal for an additional term is possible following a favourable review. The incumbent will acknowledge being the holder of the Distinguished Business Research Professorship in all professional communications within and external to the university.

Other Considerations

The holder will receive an annual stipend of \$12,000, and will receive the equivalent of one course relief per year.



October 2014

TERMS OF REFERENCE

DISTINGUISHED BUSINESS RESEARCH PROFESSOR

General

The DeGroote School of Business honours internationally recognized scholars who are research focused and student centred. The honorific of Distinguished Business Research Professor is used to both retain and recruit such scholars. The DeGroote School of Business will only have one holder of the professorship at this time.

Responsibilities of the Professorship

Holders of the Professorship will have a full time, tenure-stream position in the DeGroote School of Business. They will possess an outstanding record of scholarship. They will continue to advance learning and discovery through exceptional scholarship. They will be excellent citizens of the DeGroote School of Business, participate fully in implementing its vision and mentor new scholars by inspiring them to achieve further insight, innovation, and professional success.

Selection Process for the Professorship

The Dean of the DeGroote School of Business will appoint a Nomination and Selection Committee. This committee will nominate suitable candidates based on their scholarly achievements and the committee, following its deliberations, will recommend an appointment to the Dean. Thereafter, the Dean of the DeGroote School of Business will report its appointment to the Senate Committee on Appointments.

Term

The appointment to the professorship will be for an initial five-year period, with the understanding that renewal for an additional term is possible following a favourable review. The incumbent will acknowledge being the holder of the Distinguished Business Research Professorship in all professional communications within and external to the university.

Other Considerations

The holder will receive an annual stipend of \$12,000.

August 26, 2021

TO: Senate Committee on Appointments

FROM: Dr. Maureen J. MacDonald, Dean, Faculty of Science



SUBJECT: **Terms of Reference and Establishment of the
Fairley Gadsby Research Chair in Fluvial Geomorphology**

On behalf of the Faculty of Science, I would like to recommend the establishment of the **Fairley Gadsby Research Chair in Fluvial Geomorphology**. Through the generous funding provided by donors, this Chair will be supported for five years, with potential renewal upon review (a signed Gift Agreement has been secured). The Chair will be appointed in the School of Earth, Environment & Society in the Faculty of Science. The appointment of the individual to the Chair will be made to the Committee under separate cover.

The request is made in accordance with the *McMaster University Policy Guidelines for Establishing Named Chairs and Professorships*, and has received the approval of the Provost & Vice-President (Academic) (June 14, 2021). The Terms of Reference are attached.

The Faculty of Science looks forward to establishing this Chair as we *Transform our World through Science* and build towards a Brighter World.

Electronic copies to:
File

Attachments

General

The **Fairley Gadsby Research Chair in Fluvial Geomorphology** (the "Chair") in the Faculty of Science at McMaster University is awarded to a faculty member with relevant expertise in the field of fluvial geomorphology. Brad Fairley and Margaret Gadsby have made a generous gift to support this Chair for a five-year term. The Chair will be reviewed at the conclusion of the term.

Details and Duties of the Chair

The individual occupying the Chair shall undertake the normal duties of a tenure-track faculty member in the School of Earth, Environment & Society. It is expected that the Chair will assume a leadership role in research, and undergraduate and graduate education programs that bear on the field of fluvial geomorphology.

Specifically, the Incumbent will:

- As holder of the Fairley Gadsby Research Chair in Fluvial Geomorphology, hold full-time faculty appointment in the Faculty of Science.
- Contribute significantly to the body of scholarship in the field of fluvial geomorphology.
- Undertake the normal duties of a faculty member in the Faculty of Science.
- Acknowledge that appointee holds the "Fairley Gadsby Research Chair in Fluvial Geomorphology" in all publications, lectures, and any other activities in which the faculty member participates.
- As holder of the Chair, provide an annual report of their teaching and research activities to the Director of the School of Earth, Environment & Society and Dean, Faculty of Science who will provide a copy to the Donors.

Selection Process

The Fairley Gadsby Research Chair in Fluvial Geomorphology will be conferred upon the new tenure-track faculty member appointed in the School of Earth, Environment and Society in the same field. The School's selection committee will make the recommendation for the appointment of a candidate to the Chair through the Dean and Faculty Appointments Committee. In accordance with the *McMaster University Policy Guidelines for Establishing Named Chairs and Professorships*, a recommendation for the Chair will be forwarded to the Senate Committee on Appointments.

Financial Details

All funds made available by the Fairley Gadsby Research Chair in Fluvial Geomorphology shall be used for compensation costs of the Chair.

Appointment Term

An appointment to the Fairley Gadsby Research Chair in Fluvial Geomorphology shall be for five (5) years, renewable.

2021

Fairley Gadsby Research Chair in Fluvial Geomorphology - Terms of Reference.docx

September 10, 2021

Senate Committee on Appointments
c/o University Secretariat
Gilmour Hall, Room 210

Re: Establishment of the Ronald Barr Professorship in Pediatric Oncology

On behalf of the Faculty of Health Sciences, I would like to recommend the establishment of the Ronald Barr Professorship in Pediatric Oncology.

Hamilton Health Sciences and McMaster University have both committed funding via research residuals to create a permanent endowment for this Chair. In addition, this endowment is being supplemented with matching funds from the Faculty of Health Sciences. The Professorship will support establishing and maintaining a world-class program in pediatric oncology and contribute through teaching, research, and/or clinical work at McMaster University and McMaster Children's Hospital.

The terms of reference for the Professorship are attached.

Yours sincerely,



Paul M. O'Byrne, MB, FRCP(C), FRSC
Dean and Vice-President
Faculty of Health Sciences

Encl.

PO/bvd

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Ronald Barr Professorship in Pediatric Oncology

General

A transfer of funds has been directed to the Faculty of Health Sciences to provide support for the *Ronald Barr Professorship in Pediatric Oncology*. The incumbent will have demonstrated excellence in the area of pediatric oncology.

Details and Duties

The holder of the Professorship shall be an individual with sufficient educational, research and clinical experience.

Specifically, the Professor will:

- Hold a full-time appointment in the Department of Pediatrics in the Faculty of Health Sciences at McMaster University;
- Be an integral part of the institutional vision towards establishing and maintaining a world-class program in pediatric oncology that exemplifies the central values of the University and the Department of Pediatrics;
- Contribute significantly to the body of scholarship in the area of pediatric oncology, through teaching, research and/or clinical work at McMaster University and McMaster Children's Hospital;
- Undertake the normal duties of a faculty member in the Faculty of Health Sciences and the Department of Pediatrics, including participation in the education programs of the Department.

Selection Process

The Dean and Vice-President of the Faculty of Health Sciences will appoint an appropriate ad-hoc selection committee that shall include, at minimum, the Associate Dean, Research and the Chair of the Department of Pediatrics. The Committee will forward its recommendation to the Senate Committee on Appointments.

Term

An appointment to the Professorship shall be for up to five (5) years, with the understanding that renewal for additional terms is possible.

Acknowledgement

The incumbent will acknowledge that they hold the "*Ronald Barr Professorship in Pediatric Oncology*" in all publications, lectures and other activities supported through the fund.

September 2021



September 10, 2021

Senate Committee on Appointments
c/o University Secretariat
Gilmour Hall, Room 210

Re: Revised Terms of Reference for the AbbVie Chair in Education in Rheumatology

On behalf of the Faculty of Health Sciences, I would like to recommend for approval revisions to the terms of reference for the AbbVie Chair in Education in Rheumatology.

In 2010, a gift was directed to the Faculty of Health Sciences from Abbott Laboratories, Ltd. (now AbbVie Corporation) to provide an endowment fund in support of this Chair.

The terms of reference for the Chair are being updated so that the position is officially aligned with the role of Division Director of Rheumatology in the Department of Medicine.

Thank you for considering this recommendation. Enclosed please find a copy of the original and revised terms of reference.

Yours sincerely,

Paul M. O'Byrne, MB, FRCP(C), FRSC
Dean and Vice-President
Faculty of Health Sciences

Encl.

PO/bvd

Revised Terms of Reference

TERMS OF REFERENCE

AbbVie Chair in Education in Rheumatology

General

In 2010, a gift was directed to the Faculty of Health Sciences from Abbott Laboratories, Ltd. to support the Abbott Chair in Education in Rheumatology. In 2012, the Abbott organization name was changed to AbbVie Corporation and the Chair name was updated. The research, education interests and accomplishments of the incumbent will encompass a broad and comprehensive range of issues.

In revising the terms of reference for this Chair, it is the intent of all parties that the Chair be directly associated with, and its tenure run concurrent with, an appointment to the position of Director, Division of Rheumatology, Department of Medicine, McMaster University.

Details and Duties of the Chair

The holder of the Chair shall be an individual with sufficient educational experience and who has demonstrated interest in and capability to implement the objectives set out below.

Specifically, the chairholder will:

- As the holder of the AbbVie Chair in Education in Rheumatology, hold an appointment in the Department of Medicine in the Faculty of Health Sciences at McMaster University.
- Be an integral part of the institutional vision towards establishing and maintaining a world class Centre of Excellence which exemplifies the central values of the University and the Department of Medicine.
- Contribute significantly to the body of scholarship in the area of rheumatology education through teaching at McMaster University.
- Undertake the normal duties of a faculty member in the Faculty of Health Sciences and the Department of Medicine, including participation in the education programs of the Department.

Selection Process

The Dean and Vice-President of the Faculty of Health Sciences will appoint an appropriate ad-hoc Selection Committee, which shall include, at a minimum, the Chair of the Department of Medicine. The Selection Committee will recommend the appointment of the AbbVie Chair in Education in Rheumatology to the Senate Committee on Appointments.

Term

An appointment to the AbbVie Chair in Education in Rheumatology shall be for up to five (5) years, with the understanding that renewal for additional terms is possible. The incumbent will acknowledge that they hold the “*AbbVie Chair in Education in Rheumatology*” in all publications, lectures and any other activities in which the faculty member participates.

April 2021

Original Terms of Reference

TERMS OF REFERENCE

AbbVie Chair in Education in Rheumatology

General

In 2010, a gift was directed to the Faculty of Health Sciences from Abbott Laboratories, Ltd. to support the Abbott Chair in Education in Rheumatology. In 2012, the Abbott organization name was changed to AbbVie Corporation and the Chair name was updated. The research, education interests and accomplishments of the incumbent will encompass a broad and comprehensive range of issues.

Details and Duties of the Chair

The holder of the Chair shall be an individual with sufficient educational experience and who has demonstrated interest in and capability to implement the objectives set out below.

Specifically the Incumbent Will:

- As the holder of the AbbVie Chair in Education in Rheumatology, hold an appointment in the Department of Medicine in the Faculty of Health Sciences at McMaster University.
- Be an integral part of the institutional vision towards establishing and maintaining a world class Centre of Excellence which exemplifies the central values of the University and the Department of Medicine.
- Contribute significantly to the body of scholarship in the area of rheumatology education through teaching at McMaster University.
- Undertake the normal duties of a faculty member in the Faculty of Health Sciences and the Department of Medicine, including participation in the education programs of the Department.

Selection Process

The Dean of the Faculty of Health Sciences will appoint an appropriate ad-hoc Selection Committee, which shall include, at a minimum, the Chair of the Department of Medicine, and the head of the Division of Rheumatology (or delegate). The Selection Committee will recommend the appointment of the AbbVie Chair in Education in Rheumatology to the Senate Committee on Appointments.

Term

An appointment to the AbbVie Chair in Education in Rheumatology shall be for up to five (5) years, with the understanding that renewal for additional terms is possible. The incumbent will acknowledge that she/he holds the "*AbbVie Chair in Education in Rheumatology*" in all publications, lectures and any other activities in which the faculty member participates.

December 2012