Course description

The McMaster Health Forum is an inter-faculty initiative committed to improving health outcomes through collective problem-solving. As part of its commitment to prepare action-oriented leaders for addressing pressing health challenges creatively, the Forum sponsors this practicum. Students will come to understand the types of decisions that can have an impact on health, the roles of different organizations involved in making these decisions, and the types of influences on these decisions. To accomplish this, students will organize, prepare for, and participate in simulations of both hospital and Local Health Integration Network (LHIN) board meetings, both provincial and federal cabinet meetings, World Health Assemblies, and a United Nations (UN) General Assembly plenary or high-level meeting focused on a health topic. The meeting-preparation work will include conducting literature reviews and documentary analyses about a health challenge and the context in which a decision about it will have to be made (e.g., hospital catchment area, province or WHO member state). Students will play different roles in different simulations.

Course objectives

By the end of this course, students will be able to:

conceptually…

- apply policy analytic frameworks and tools to contemporary health challenges
- understand the factors that influence decision-making, including institutions (like rules about who gets to make what types of decisions and how), interests (like medical associations), ideas (like values and research evidence), and ‘external’ political and economic events, among others
- compare and contrast decision-making processes and outcomes between different contexts (e.g., levels of decision-making) and issues (e.g., degree of politicization)

practically…

- undertake a literature review and documentary analysis
- write a briefing note
- persuasively communicate about a pressing health challenge, options for addressing it, and preferences for a particular option
- chair a meeting
- prepare meeting minutes
Instructor

Firas Khalid
Office: MML-417
E-mail: Firas Khalid on LearnLink

Course assistant

Julie Baird
Office: MML-417
Tel: +1 905-525-9140, extension 22121
E-mail: Julie Baird on LearnLink
Web: www.mcmasterforum.org

Course location

DialogueSpace
McMaster Health Forum
Mills Memorial Library (MML) 417

Course schedule

Thursdays, January 4 – March 29, 2018
Time: 11:30 am - 2:20 pm

Role allocations and topic selection

On the first day of class, students will need to work collectively through how to equitably:

- select two co-chairs (i.e., Chair, Board of Directors for the hospital and LHIN board simulations; Premier for the provincial cabinet simulations; Prime Minister for the federal cabinet simulations; Chair, World Health Assembly (WHA) for the WHO simulations; and Chair, UN General Assembly plenary or high-level meeting for the UN simulations) for each of the simulations;
- select two secretaries for each of the simulations;
- select two weeks in which they will play one of four particularly prominent roles and prepare and submit written briefing notes; and
- select two weeks in which they will play one of four other active roles.

Note that students should not play any of these roles in both simulations taking place on the same day and, if they have applied to professional schools that hold interviews in the second half of the course, they should try to avoid playing particularly prominent roles in that part of the course. Note also that some simulations are longer than others, others take place over two consecutive weeks to allow students to experiment with coalition building and negotiation, and still others are both longer and take place over two consecutive weeks. Students should update the ‘session roles’ form posted on LearnLink with these details as soon as they’re finalized.

On the first day of class, co-chairs will work together to provisionally identify a topic that will be the focus for the meeting that they will co-chair. The topic must be one that was actively under consideration by the corresponding governing body within the last twelve months (and it cannot
be one chosen for another simulation). They may consult with other students playing particularly
prominent roles (or other active roles) in the meeting that they will co-chair and with the
instructor or teaching assistant.

Weekly activities and deadlines

At least one week prior to each simulation, the co-chairs must assign roles to all students who are
not playing one of the four particularly prominent roles or one of the four other active roles.
Once these roles have been allocated, it is each student’s responsibility to ensure that his or her
roles are filled either by themselves or by someone with whom they make a ‘trade.’ Students do
not need to notify the instructor, teaching assistant or course assistant about such changes,
however, they must notify the co-chairs of any such changes.

At least 48 hours prior to the start of each class (whether or not the simulation they’re involved
in comes first or second), the co-chairs must:

- post to the relevant LearnLink folder:
  - a completed ‘simulation roles’ form (with the final statement of the topic and the final
    roster of roles being played in the simulation),
  - a completed ‘seating allocation’ chart; and
- notify the students in particularly prominent roles how much time they have to give their
  presentations and whether they should use their own name or the name of the person
  currently in the role that they are playing (however, most students will find it easier to use
  their own name in all simulations).

At least three hours prior to the start of each class, simulation participants playing particularly
prominent roles must post to the relevant LearnLink folder:
- an e-version of their briefing notes; and
- an e-version of any slides that they are planning to use.
Also, by the same time, simulation participants having played the role of secretary in a
simulation the previous week must post to the relevant LearnLink folder:
- an e-version of their minutes.

Prior to the start of each class, simulation participants:
- who are playing particularly prominent roles must hand in to the teaching assistant a hard
  copy of their briefing notes for that week; and
- who played the role of secretary in a previous week must hand in to the teaching assistant a
  hard copy of their minutes for the preceding week.

Note that your participation grade will suffer if one or more of these one-week, 48-hour and
three-hour deadlines are missed. Your participation grade will not suffer if you are affected by
other students’ failures to meet these deadlines.

Prior to the start of each simulation, the co-chairs should:
- ensure that each simulation participant has a placard that provides the name of the participant
  (in large letters) and their role (in smaller letters);
- ensure that simulation participants are prepared to start the simulation on time;
• decide what constitutes quorum and how they are going to deal with any proposed amendments to motions put forward;
• ensure that they have practiced getting to a clear motion/resolution, as well as to a clear statement about:
  o who made the motion,
  o who seconded it,
  o number in favour,
  o number opposed,
  o number abstaining,
  o whether the motion/resolution passed; and
• ensure that as many students as possible have the opportunity to participate actively in the simulation (which can include using break-out groups or other techniques, particularly in weeks when there is only one simulation).

This last point is particularly important.

During each simulation, simulation participants should:
• be listening actively and identifying opportunities to contribute where appropriate;
• place their placard vertically when they wish to be added to the speaking roster and return their placard to the horizontal position as soon as they have spoken;
• avoid using laptops and phones unless they are taking minutes or have a time-limited, simulation-specific reasons for using them; and
• (if microphones are being used for the simulation) turn on their microphone to speak and turn it off immediately afterwards (and quietly prompt their colleagues to do the same when needed).

The simulations will run for 65 minutes (11:30-12:35 and 12:45-1:50) in weeks when two simulations are scheduled (with the de-brief running from 1:55-2:15), and for 110 minutes with a ten-minute break (11:30-1:20) in weeks when one simulation is scheduled (with the de-brief running from 1:30-2:15).

During the de-brief, simulation participants should be prepared to discuss:
• how does what happened compare to what happened in ‘real life;’
• what went well with the simulation(s);
• what could have been improved with the simulation(s); and
• what did you learn from the experience.

Note that it will be at the teaching assistant’s discretion, based on your particular circumstances, as to whether you need to complete a make-up assignment if you miss a simulation. All students missing more than one simulation will need to complete a make-up assignment. The make-up assignment will involve reviewing the audio/video recording of the simulation you missed and writing a one-page de-brief about the simulation, covering the same points as noted above. The make-up assignment will be due one week after the start of the missed class (unless negotiated differently with the teaching assistant, again based on your particular circumstances).

In the week following any simulation in which students played particularly prominent roles, they are strongly encouraged to view the audio/video recording of the simulation in order how to improve their contributions in future simulations and in future meetings of any type.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Agenda</th>
<th>Simulation details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>January 4</td>
<td><strong>Course overview</strong></td>
<td>Not applicable (N/A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Role allocations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Topic selections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Introduction to health policymaking and decision-making in Canada</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Review of Forum handouts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Review of sample agenda, briefing note, and minutes (and assessment of the briefing note and minutes using the evaluation templates)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Review of the photo/video release form</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunity to attend HHS board meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Preparation for next week’s simulation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>January 11</td>
<td><strong>Hospital board meeting simulation</strong></td>
<td>Simulation topic: TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hospital board 1</td>
<td>Examples of prominent roles if the topic were supporting ethical decision-making at Hamilton Health Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• HHS Clinical &amp; Organizational Ethicist, who proposes an ethical framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Simulation topics: TBA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 January 18</td>
<td>Debrief and preparation for next week’s simulation and implementation plan</td>
<td>Examples of prominent roles if the topic were lengthy alternative levels of care (ALC) wait times</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hospital board meeting simulations</td>
<td>• Assistant VP, Clinical Planning, who proposes a strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hospital board 2</td>
<td>• Vice President (VP) Medical / Chief Medical Officer, who reacts on behalf of staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hospital board 3</td>
<td>• Chief Executive Officer, who focuses on the communications issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Debrief and preparation for next week’s simulation</td>
<td>• VP Finance, who discusses financial issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• CEO, Hamilton CCAC, who presents the CCAC perspective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 January 25</td>
<td>LHIN board meeting simulation</td>
<td>Simulation topics: TBA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LHIN board 1</td>
<td>Examples of prominent roles if the topic were conversion of the McMaster University Medical Centre emergency room to a children-only facility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LHIN board 2</td>
<td>• Chief Executive Officer of Hamilton Health Sciences, who presents the proposal for consideration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Debrief and preparation for next week’s simulation</td>
<td>• LHIN Director of Planning and Integration #1, who presents the LHIN’s duties and obligations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• City Councillor for Westdale, who provides the community view</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Chief of Obstetrics, who provides their view</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Examples of prominent roles if the topic were a mental health and addictions strategy for the LHIN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• LHIN Chief Executive Officer, who provides an overview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 1</td>
<td><strong>Provincial cabinet meeting simulation</strong>&lt;br&gt;Provincial cabinet 1 (part 1)&lt;br&gt;Debrief and preparation for next week’s simulation&lt;br&gt;Simulation topic: TBA&lt;br&gt;Examples of prominent roles if the topic were the expansion of physician assistants in Ontario&lt;br&gt;• Minister of Health, who provides a background of the challenges faced by the Ontario health system&lt;br&gt;• Deputy Minister of Health, who provides an overview of the PA pilot program&lt;br&gt;• Lead, Program Evaluation, who present results of the pilot program&lt;br&gt;• President, OMA, who provides the perspective of physicians&lt;br&gt;• President, Ontario Registered Nurses Association, who provides the perspective of nurse practitioners in Ontario</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 8</td>
<td><strong>Provincial cabinet meeting simulation</strong>&lt;br&gt;Provincial cabinet 1 (part 2)&lt;br&gt;Provincial cabinet 2&lt;br&gt;Debrief and preparation for next week’s simulation&lt;br&gt;Simulation topics: TBA&lt;br&gt;Examples of prominent roles if the topic were hospital pay-for-performance [financial], access to care in rural communities [delivery] or scope of practice [governance]&lt;br&gt;• Minister of Health, who presents the relevant proposal&lt;br&gt;• Minister #2 (TBD), who provides their perspective of the issue&lt;br&gt;• Minister #3 (TBD), who provides their perspective of the issue&lt;br&gt;• Expert, who provides the current state of the evidence on the proposal&lt;br&gt;• President, relevant provincial health providers association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 15</td>
<td><strong>Federal cabinet meeting simulation</strong>&lt;br&gt;Federal cabinet 1&lt;br&gt;Simulation topics: TBA&lt;br&gt;Examples of prominent roles if the topic were health services for the armed forces or First Nations, ban on direct-to-consumer advertising for pharmaceuticals or enforcing violations of the Canada Health Act in...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal cabinet 2</td>
<td>Alberta or Quebec</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Debrief (about the simulations and the Canadian</td>
<td>- Minister of Health, who presents the relevant proposal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>simulations as a whole)</td>
<td>- Expert, who summarizes the research evidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Minister #1 (TBD), who provides their perspective of the issue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Minister #2 (TBD), who provides their perspective of the issue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Deputy Minister of Health, who presents the implementation issues and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>lessons learned from other similar proposals or jurisdictions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>March 1</td>
<td>Post-simulation analysis due</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Introduction to health policymaking in low- and middle-income countries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and at global levels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Preparation for next week’s simulation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>March 8</td>
<td>World Health Assembly simulation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Simulation topics: TBA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Examples of prominent roles if the topic were global eradication of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>measles or primary health care</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Assistant Director-General of Family and Community Health, who makes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the submissions on behalf of WHO’s Secretariat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Representative, Member State #1 (TBD), who endorses the proposed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>resolution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Representative, Member State #2 (TBD), who opposes the proposed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>resolution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Chair of technical secretariat convened by WHO on this issue, who</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>presents the evidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Director, relevant foundation or public-private partnership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Simulation topics: TBA</td>
<td>Examples of prominent roles if the topic were intellectual property or international recruitment of health professionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| March 15   | **World Health Assembly simulation**                                   | **Examples of prominent roles if the topic were intellectual property or international recruitment of health professionals** | • Assistant Director General for Public Health, Innovation and Intellectual Property OR Health Systems and Services who makes submissions on behalf of WHO’s Secretariat  
• Representative, Member State #1 (TBD), who endorses the proposed resolution  
• Representative, Member State #2 (TBD), who opposes the proposed resolution  
• Chair of technical secretariat convened by WHO on this issue, who presents the evidence  
• Deputy Director, World Trade Organization (WTO) or International Labour Organization (ILO) |
|            | WHA 1 (part 2)                                                         |                                                                                       |                                                                                                                 |
|            | WHA 2 (part 2)                                                         |                                                                                       |                                                                                                                 |
|            | Debrief and preparation for next week’s simulation                     |                                                                                       |                                                                                                                 |
| March 22   | **UN General Assembly plenary or high-level meeting**                  | **Examples of prominent roles if the topic were accelerating progress towards the MDGs** | • Director General, WHO, who provides an update on the progress towards health-related MDGs  
• Secretary General, who proposes the resolution and commitments  
• Co-facilitator of the inter-governmental negotiating committee (Denmark), who presents the views of supporting member states  
• Co-facilitator of the inter-governmental negotiating committee (Senegal), who presents the views of opposing member states  
• Representative of civil society organizations |
|            | UN plenary/meeting 1                                                  |                                                                                       |                                                                                                                 |
|            | UN plenary/meeting 2                                                  |                                                                                       |                                                                                                                 |
| March 29   | De-brief (about the international simulations as a whole)             |                                                                                       |                                                                                                                 |
|            | Course evaluation                                                     |                                                                                       |                                                                                                                 |
Related readings

General

Supplementary

Hospital board meetings
  - Chapter 2: What is the Board’s governance role?
  - Chapter 4: Duties and obligations of individual directors
  - Chapter 14: Meeting processes
  - Form 34: Meeting minutes best practices
- Board member profiles. Available online at http://www.hhsc.ca/body.cfm?id=316

Local Health Integration Network (LHIN) board meetings

Provincial cabinet meetings

Federal cabinet meetings

World Health Assemblies

United Nations (UN) General Assembly plenary or high-level meeting

Supplementary resources

Data and research evidence

Canadian Institute for Health Information (CIHI) for data about the Canadian health system
http://www.cihi.ca

World Health Organization for data about health and health systems
http://www.who.int/en

Cochrane Library for systematic reviews of the effects of clinical interventions
http://www.thecochranelibrary.com

Health Evidence for systematic reviews of the effects of public health interventions
http://healthevidence.org

Health Systems Evidence for systematic reviews and many other types of documents addressing a range of questions related to health systems
http://healthsystemevidence.org/
PubMed for single studies when no systematic reviews can be found

Hospitals

Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care: Hospitals

Government of Ontario: Public Hospitals Act
http://www.e-laws.gov.on.ca/html/statutes/english/elaws_statutes_90p40_e.htm

Ontario Hospital Association
http://www.oha.com/

Ontario Hospital Association: Governance Centre of Excellence
http://www.thegce.ca/Pages/default.aspx#1

Hamilton Health Sciences
http://www.hamiltonhealthsciences.ca

Hamilton Health Sciences: Board of Directors
http://www.hamiltonhealthsciences.ca/body.cfm?id=316

Local Health Integration Networks

Local Health Integration Networks
http://www.lhins.on.ca/home.aspx

Local Health Integration Networks: Hamilton Niagara Haldimand Brant LHIN
http://www.hnhblhin.on.ca/home.aspx?LangType=4105

Provincial cabinet

Government of Ontario

Government of Ontario: Cabinet
http://news.ontario.ca/cabinet/en

Government of Ontario: Cabinet Committees
http://www.premier.gov.on.ca/team/committees.php?Lang=EN

Government of Ontario: Legislative Assembly of Ontario
http://www.ontla.on.ca/web/home.do

http://www.e-laws.gov.on.ca/navigation?file=home
Government of Ontario: Ministries
http://www.ontario.ca/government/ministries

Federal cabinet

Government of Canada
http://www.canada.gc.ca/home.html

Government of Canada: Cabinet Committees

Government of Canada: Parliament of Canada

Government of Canada: Privy Council Office
http://www.pco.gc.ca

World Health Organization

World Health Organization
http://www.who.int/en/

World Health Organization: Governance
http://www.who.int/governance/en/index.html

World Health Organization: Basic Documents
http://www.who.int/gb/bd/

World Health Organization: World Health Assembly
http://www.who.int/mediacentre/events/governance/wha/en/

World Health Organization: Americas

United Nations

United Nations

United Nations: Main Bodies

United Nations: Global Issues on the UN Agenda

United Nations Millennium Development Goals
http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/
United Nations Social Development Goals
https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/sdgs

United Nations: News Centre

United Nations: Bibliographic Information System
http://unbisnet.un.org/

United Nations Association of the USA: Model UN Preparation
http://www.unausa.org/munpreparation

Canadian International Model United Nations
http://www.caimun.ca/
McMaster Health Forum Practicum (HS 4YY3)
Evaluation

Evaluation components

Three written briefing notes (3 x 10% = 30%)

On two occasions over the course of the term, each student will be required to prepare a one-page written briefing note that they will distribute as a handout and use as the basis for their presentation (in a “key” role) at the start of the meeting. The briefing notes should be written from the perspective of the role that the student will be playing and make a clear position statement. Care should be taken by students to use one or more conceptual frameworks (e.g., 3I+E framework) to organize their thinking but, when writing the briefing note (or giving a presentation based on the briefing note), to highlight those points that best advance their position on the issue (e.g., leading with strong arguments in favour, such as compelling data and research evidence, widely held values, and stakeholder support, as well as ‘innoculating’ against areas of weakness and, if appropriate, establishing their expertise on the topic). Students are also expected to use a style of argumentation (e.g., using a powerful anecdote and avoiding jargon, acronyms and other barriers to communication) that best engages their audience, as well as an approach to formatting (e.g., using headings, bullets and bolding to draw attention to key points) that facilitates rapid scanning. Students should consider carefully how to address points that could cause embarrassment if their briefing note (or the presentation based on it) entered the public domain.

In addition, students working in groups of three must prepare one additional briefing note, in the same format as above, but not to be circulated to the class. (If the class size is not divisible by three, one or two groups may be comprised of only two students.) The group may choose which week they would like to submit this additional briefing note, however, they are strongly encouraged to submit it at least two weeks after at least one of them has submitted their first briefing note (to ensure that they have had the opportunity to learn from the feedback provided about this first briefing note).

The e-version of each written briefing note is due three hours prior to each simulation (by posting on LearnLink) and the hard copy of the written briefing note is due at the start of the class in which the corresponding simulation is taking place. The e-version and hard copy must match exactly. Note that if the simulation is the second simulation of the class, the written briefing note is still due at the start of the class (not at the start of the simulation).

Meeting minutes (10%)

Each student will serve as the Secretary to the relevant decision-making body for one of the simulations. In this role, the student will be expected to prepare two- to three-page minutes that highlight the essential details from the meeting. These
details normally include: 1) a listing of who was present and absent, which includes the co-chairs and minute-taker(s) and whether quorum was reached, any ‘out-of-the-ordinary’ rules invoked such as motions requiring more than a majority vote and closing debate early, and whether conflicts of interest were identified (and, if so, how they were handled); 2) who briefed the group, their positions on the issue, and the rationales provided for these positions; 3) the key themes that emerged in the discussion (while taking care to avoid a transcript or ‘he said, she said’ approach); 4) the resolution; and 5) a brief summary of the rationale for the resolution and, if appropriate, the communication plan. For each motion/resolution (e.g., accepting the agenda, going ‘in camera,’ passing the resolution, adjourning the meeting), the necessary details include a listing of who made the motion, who seconded it, the number in favour, the number opposed, the number abstaining, and whether the motion/resolution passed. Students should consider carefully how to address points that could cause embarrassment if their minutes entered the public domain (which in most cases they will). Minutes for any part of the simulation that was held in camera must be submitted separately and count towards the page limit.

The minutes are due at the start of the next class after the corresponding simulation took place. Note that if the next class falls during Reading Week, the minutes are due at the start of the class the week after Reading Week. The minutes should also be posted in the LearnLink folder for the corresponding simulation.

Post-simulation analysis (10%)

Upon completion of the Canadian simulations, students working in groups of three must prepare a two-page post-simulation analysis that thoughtfully considers what they have learned from participating in at least two of the meeting deliberations, working according to established procedures, and making decisions that were influenced by various factors. (Again, if the class size is not divisible by three, one or two groups may be comprised of only two students.) Students will also be asked to reflect upon how they felt when making a particular decision or advocating for a particular perspective.

The analysis is due at the start of the next class after the Canadian simulations are completed (see the course schedule for the exact date).

Participation in and preparation for 10 simulations (50%)

Students’ participation in discussions, and preparation for each simulation, will be evaluated each week and then summarized at the end of the semester according to a structured rubric.

Please provide both your name and your student number on each assignment (and in the case of group submissions, the names and student numbers of all students in the group).
The page limits should be respected using Times New Roman 12-point font (or equivalent) with single spacing between lines and letters and 1-inch margins, not counting references (which can appear on an additional page). If a font, font size, spacing or margin size is used other than as requested, you will be asked to re-submit an electronic copy of what you handed in, which will be reformatted, and any text that appears after the prescribed page limit will not be read.

A late written assignment will be penalized by 5% (i.e., 5 marks out of 100) for each 24-hour period it is late. The first 24-hour period begins at the start of the class in which it is due. If you are submitting a hard copy of a written assignment late, please submit it to course assistant (who is located in the Hub at the McMaster Health Forum, which is MML-417). If you are handing in your assignment on a weekend, please submit it in electronic form and hand in a hard copy form to the course assistant the next business day.

Please note that you must immediately follow up with the teaching assistant regarding the nature of any relief for missed academic work. When requesting relief for absences from classes lasting up to three days using the McMaster Student Absence Form, please provide the time frame that you were unwell so that the teaching assistant can establish the nature of the relief. Failure to follow-up with the teaching assistant immediately may negate the opportunity for relief.
### Written briefing note

**Student name(s):** _____________________________________  
**Student number(s):** __________________________________________  
**Evaluator:** ___________________________  
**Simulation #:** ___________________  
**Date:** _______________________________  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Position statement (15)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- clear statement of the position being taken with regard to the issue being discussed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- clear description of the perspective (e.g., organizational role) being brought to the discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rationale for the position taken (60)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- clear articulation of the points that advance the position being taken on the issue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- e.g., leading with strong arguments in favour, such as compelling data and research evidence, widely held values, and stakeholder support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- e.g., ‘innoculating’ against areas of weakness (and appropriately addressing points that could cause embarrassment if they entered the public domain)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- e.g., if appropriate, establishing expertise on the topic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- style of argumentation that best engages the audience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- e.g., using a powerful anecdote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- e.g., avoiding jargon, acronyms and other barriers to communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- approach to formatting that facilitates rapid scanning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- e.g., using headings, bullets and bolding to draw attention to key points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conclusion (15)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- conclusion consistent with the position statement and rationale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General (10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ideas presented fluently and make good sense</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ideas flow logically from one point to another</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- spelling, grammar and punctuation correct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- paper presented neatly and legibly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
General comments:

Grade (out of 100): _____

Grade (out of 100 after deducting 5 marks for each day the assignment was late): _____

Evaluator's signature: ____________________
Meeting minutes

Student name: ___________________________  Student number: _______________
Evaluator: ___________________________  Simulation #: __________________
Date: _______________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formalities (15)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- listing of who was present and absent, which includes the co-chairs and minute-taker(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- clear statement about whether quorum was reached</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- clear description of any ‘out-of-the-ordinary’ rules invoked, such as motions requiring more than a majority vote and closing debate early</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- whether conflicts of interest were identified and, if so, how they were handled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discussion points (60)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- clear description of who briefed the group, their positions on the issue, and the rationales provided for these positions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- clear description of the key themes that emerged in the discussion (while taking care to avoid a transcript or ’he said, she said’ approach and appropriately addressing points that could cause embarrassment if they entered the public domain, which in most cases they will)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decisions taken (15)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- clear statement of the resolution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- clear description of the rationale for the resolution and, if appropriate, the communication plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
General (10)
- for each motion/resolution (e.g., accepting the agenda, going ‘in camera,’ passing the resolution, adjourning the meeting)
  - who made the motion
  - who seconded it
  - the number in favour
  - the number opposed
  - the number abstaining
  - whether the motion/resolution passed
- ideas presented fluently and make good sense
- ideas flow logically from one point to another
- spelling, grammar and punctuation correct
- paper presented neatly and legibly

General comments:

Grade (out of 100): _____

Grade (out of 100 after deducting 5 marks for each day the assignment was late): _____

Evaluator's signature: ____________________
Post-simulation analysis

Student name(s): _____________________________________

Student number(s): ____________________________________

Evaluator: ___________________________ Simulation #: __________

Date: _______________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statement of the issue (15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- clear description of the Canadian simulations being reviewed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- clear description of the perspectives (e.g., organizational roles) they brought to the discussions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessons learned (30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- clear description of the lessons learned from participating in the meeting deliberations, working according to established procedures, and making decisions that were influenced by various factors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings experienced (30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- clear description of the feelings experienced when making a particular decision or advocating for a particular perspective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion (15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- conclusion consistent with the descriptions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General (10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ideas presented fluently (in full paragraphs) and make good sense</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ideas flow logically from one point to another</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- spelling, grammar and punctuation correct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- paper presented neatly and legibly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
General comments:

Grade (out of 100): ____

Grade (out of 100 after deducting 5 marks for each day the assignment was late): ____

Evaluator's signature:  ____________________
McMaster Health Forum Practicum (HS 4YY3)
Evaluation

Participation

Student name: ___________________________  Student number: __________
Evaluator: ___________________________  Simulation #s: __________
Date: _______________________________

For each statement below, circle the number that corresponds to the following ratings:

never rarely sometimes usually always
1 2 3 4 5

I. Academic skills
1. Demonstrated evidence of adequate preparation for roles and discussion 1 2 3 4 5
2. Demonstrated ability to identify pertinent issues 1 2 3 4 5
3. Demonstrated ability to apply relevant concepts and information 1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

II. Presentation skills
1. Provided clear position statements and rationales for the positions 1 2 3 4 5
2. Used a presentation style that engaged the audience 1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

III. Co-chairing skills
1. Provided colleagues with what they needed to participate meaningfully 1 2 3 4 5
2. Engaged colleagues actively in achieving a clear outcome 1 2 3 4 5
3. Gave the ‘minute-takers’ what they needed for defensible minute 1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

IV. Group skills
1. Actively participates by posing questions and providing information 1 2 3 4 5
2. Listens/reads and responds appropriately to others 1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

Grade (out of 100): _____
Evaluator's signature: __________________
You are expected to exhibit honesty and use ethical behavior in all aspects of the learning process. Academic credentials you earn are rooted in principles of honesty and academic integrity.

Academic dishonesty is to knowingly act or fail to act in a way that results or could result in unearned academic credit or advantage. This behaviour can result in serious consequences, e.g., the grade of zero on an assignment, loss of credit with a notation on the transcript (notation reads: “Grade of F assigned for academic dishonesty”), and/or suspension or expulsion from the university.

It is your responsibility to understand what constitutes academic dishonesty. For information on the various kinds of academic dishonesty please refer to the Academic Integrity Policy located at http://www.mcmaster.ca/academicintegrity/.

Plagiarism -- the submission of work that is not one’s own or for which other credit has been obtained -- is one form of academic dishonesty. When a student submits an assignment, it is assumed that the work is solely that of the student. Plagiarism is an inexcusable offence in the university, but some students seem uncertain about what in fact constitutes plagiarism. The basic rules are straightforward:

1) Do not copy out text from articles that have been written by others and offer it as your own work.
2) If you need to quote text written by another author(s), copy the passage accurately, enclose it in quotation marks, and reference it appropriately.
3) If you wish to paraphrase (or summarize) results, conclusions, or an original idea or opinion that has been published by another author(s), give a reference to the article.

To knowingly submit unoriginal work without appropriate acknowledgment and references is an act of plagiarism. This form of academy dishonesty is a very serious matter. An instructor faced with instances of academic dishonesty will charge those responsible in accordance with McMaster’s Academic Integrity Policy (http://www.mcmaster.ca/academicintegrity/).

In this course we will not be using a software package designed to reveal plagiarism, however, teaching assistants may check select text from an assignment or take-home examination using Google or another internet search engine to determine if the text has appeared in articles that have been written by others. Also, students may be asked to defend their papers orally.
McMaster Health Forum Practicum (HS 4YY3)
On-line Course Elements

In this course we will be using LearnLink. Students should be aware that when they access the electronic components of this course, private information such as first and last names, user names for the McMaster e-mail accounts, and program affiliation may become apparent to all other students in the same course. The available information is dependent on the technology used. Continuation in this course will be deemed consent to this disclosure. If you have any questions or concerns about such disclosure, please discuss this with the course instructor.