



GRADUATE COURSE OUTLINE

EES 1135 ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGE & HUMAN HEALTH  
Tuesday 1300 – 1600; EV 502

INSTRUCTOR: Dr. Leonard J.S. Tsuji  
Tel: 416-208-5088  
e-mail: [leonard.tsuji@utoronto.ca](mailto:leonard.tsuji@utoronto.ca)  
Office: Highland Hall Rm 206  
Office hours: By appointment

**COURSE DESCRIPTION**

OVERVIEW

The didactic portion of this course will take a holistic approach to the issue of environmental change and human health. Environmental change and human health issues are often complex and require a holistic approach where the lines between different disciplines (i.e., natural, physical, health, social sciences, and humanities) are often obscured. Environmental change, as defined in this course, includes the biophysical and built (social, cultural, political) settings. Human health is broadly defined to include the concept of wellbeing. Case studies will be used to introduce students to issues, such as: toxicants and toxins. Concepts introduced in these case studies – such as, the etiology of disease – will provide the foundation for the hands-on portion of the course. In this part of the course, students will learn how to write a CV (Curriculum Vitae) and complete a Tri-Council grant proposal. Students will learn about the different elements of a grant proposal required for success; while, honing their researching, writing, and presenting skills. Students will also increase their content knowledge about the environmental health issue they have chosen for the grant proposal.

LECTURES

See course schedule.

TUTORIALS

Work will be directed and self-guided. This course is an introduction to student-centred learning; as many of you may be unfamiliar with this approach to education, I will briefly describe and contrast teacher-centred and student-centred learning.

Teacher-centred instructional strategy is referred to as pedagogy. Pedagogy is derived from the Greek words *paid* (child) and *agogus* (guide or leader). Learning in this environment is content driven with the teacher transmitting knowledge to the student. The teacher diagnoses the needs and establishes the goals for the student unilaterally. Evaluation is also the domain of the teacher and incentives are external (e.g., passing a test) rather than internal (e.g., satisfying one's own curiosity). In contrast to this approach is student-centred, student-driven learning, androgogy. Androgogy is derived from the Greek words *aner* (adult)/*andros* (man) and *agogus*. Learning in this framework is process driven, facilitating the acquisition of skills that allows for life-long learning. The student learns under the guidance of a facilitator/tutor. The student plays an active role in setting educational goals and in the evaluation process. Incentives are both external and internal (Knowles, 1975). In a student-centred learning environment, students are empowered to take greater control of their own education, which has been shown to translate into greater academic success (Cummins, 1986). The problem-based learning (PBL or issue-based learning) approach is a student-centred approach. PBL strategy is used worldwide in professions such as medicine, law and business. Furthermore, PBL cannot be defined as a single instructional strategy; several different levels or categories have been identified (e.g., lecture-based case, case-based lectures, case method, modified case-based, problem-based, and reiterative problem-based), as reviewed by Barrows (1986). Although different categories of PBL have been identified, one underlying feature of all types of PBL relates to the use of problems/issues somewhere in the instructional sequence (Barrows, 1986).

The **problem-based instructional sequence** generally begins when a paper problem/task, video, or patient (real or simulated [actor]) is presented that raises a question(s) or poses a problem(s)/task(s) that the learner is **unable to answer/complete using only prior knowledge** (Barrows, 1986; Roberts, White & Fitzpatrick, 1995; Caplow et al. 1997). The PBL process usually proceeds as follows:

1. free inquiry;
2. the identification of words or concepts that need to be defined or clarified;
3. the identification of major aspects of the problem/task;
4. the listing of phenomena that require further elaboration;
5. hypotheses generation and differential diagnosis/assessment;
6. collation of information including tests;
7. formulation of learning objectives/issues and study questions;
8. assignment of individual tasks to members of the group;
9. independent study;
10. presentations by individual students of the results from their independent study;
11. re-examination of the original problem, and formulation of questions that require further elaboration;
12. self/peer/tutor assessment (Caplow et al. 1997; DesMarchais & Chaput, 1997).

Why should we use the PBL approach?

Research in cognitive psychology offers three roles for PBL: contextual acquisition of facts and concepts; transfer of principles and concepts; and pattern recognition (Norman, 1988,

1989, 1991; Norman & Schmidt, 1992). It is well established in the field of psychology that knowledge is better remembered in the context it was originally presented (Norman, 1988). Further, the elaboration of knowledge (e.g., discussion) at the time of learning has been shown to enhance comprehension and retrieval (Schmidt, 1983; Norman, 1991; Norman & Schmidt, 1992). The objective of the PBL approach in the present course is to accumulate environmental health knowledge, and gain experience in presenting ideas/concepts in the context of a simulation (i.e. case studies and grant proposal writing). Exposure to different types of problems/issues during PBL, allows mastery of general principles, concepts, and processes that can be mobilized when similar problems are encountered, as long as the problems/issues are recognized as being similar (Norman, 1991; Norman & Schmidt, 1992). Pattern recognition requires the accumulation of a wealth of prior examples/experiences. Once an extensive database has been assembled, recognition is quite rapid (Norman, 1988, 1991). Lastly, PBL has been proven to be a viable alternative to the teacher-centred approach and students generally enjoy this approach (see e.g., Caplow et al. 1997).

In the tutorial portion of this course, students will learn how to write a Curriculum Vitae (CV) and complete a Tri-Council grant proposal. Work in the tutorial will be directed (by the professor) and self-guided. Students may work by themselves, as pairs or in larger groups on the grant proposal. This course builds upon student-centred learning.

## **COURSE OBJECTIVES**

By the end of the course the student should be able to do the following:

1. describe the interrelationships between environmental change and human health;
2. understand the general principles important in assessing environmental health;
3. evaluate environmental health issues from an interdisciplinary perspective;
4. write a Curriculum Vitae and grant proposal.

**Table 1.** Essential elements of the student-centred approach.

---

- collaborative/cooperative learning occurs in small groups
  - groups meet 2-3 times per week
  - facilitators act by guiding the learning activities
  - basic facts and principles, and all other knowledge acquisition, are learned in the context of hands-on activities
  - there is no compartmentalization of material into subjects and disciplines, that is, a holistic approach is employed
  - early exposure to real life scenarios, hands-on learning with the accumulation of theoretical knowledge and practical experience occurring simultaneously
  - formative evaluations
  - summative evaluations are drastically decreased in number, eliminated, or non-numerically graded<sup>1</sup>
  - emphasis on skill development (e.g., critical appraisal)
  - learning is self-directed with the student defining his/her own learning goals by selecting appropriate experiences
  - learning is open-ended with no boundaries
- 

<sup>1</sup>Formative evaluation occurs throughout the learning process and is used to facilitate learning by identifying deficiencies so that revision can occur. Summative evaluation measures departure from a course or program (Arthur, 1990).

Sources: Neufeld & Barrows, 1974; Hamilton, 1976; Barrows, 1986; McAuley & Woodward, 1988; Neufeld, Woodward & MacLeod, 1989; Dolman & Schmidt, 1994; Blumberg et al. 1995; Jayawickramarajah, 1996; Kaufman & Holmes, 1996; DesMarchais & Chaput, 1997; Gijsselaers, 1997.

## **SCHEDULE (subject to change)**

### **Week 1: Sept 10**

#### **Lecture 1**

- Introduction to environmental health terminology and concepts

#### **Case Study #1**

- Differential diagnosis (toxicants) and definitive diagnosis
- Creation of working groups and discussion of who will be responsible for what with respect to the oral presentation.
- Work on Case Study #1

#### **Tutorial 1**

##### **Curriculum Vitae**

- Discussion of the elements of a CV.
- Organizing CV material into categories.

##### **Tri-Council Grant Proposal**

- Identifying potential issues/topics for the grant proposal and working towards a research question/statement.
- Deciding whether to work singly or in a group.

### **Week 2: Sept 17**

#### **Lecture 2**

##### **Case Study #2**

- Differential assessment (toxins, infectious diseases, runoff, effluents, spills, and climate change) and definitive assessment

##### **Case Study #1**

- Work on group oral presentation.

#### **Tutorial 2**

##### **CV**

- A rough draft of each persons' CV should be completed.

##### **Grant**

- Finalizing the issue/topic and research question/statement for the grant proposal.
- Initial discussion of who will be responsible for what with respect to the grant proposal.

### **Week 3: Sept 24**

#### **Lecture 3**

##### **Case Study #1**

- Group oral presentation of Case Study #1

##### **Case Study #2**

- Start work on group oral presentation for Case Study #2

### **Tutorial 3**

#### **CV**

- Hand in completed CV

#### **Grant**

- Work on Introductory Comments/Background and the main objective for the grant proposal.

### **Week 4: Oct 1**

#### **Lecture 4**

##### **Case #2**

- Work on group oral presentation

#### **Tutorial 4**

- Work on the Context, Current State of Knowledge and Methods sections.

### **Week 5: Oct 8**

#### **Lecture 5**

##### **Case Study #3**

- Antibiotic resistance and the way forward

##### **Case Study #2**

- Group oral presentation

#### **Tutorial 5**

- Continue work on grant proposal

### **Week 6: Oct 15**

#### **Lecture 6**

**\*In-class open-book test** worth 17%, on lecture material and readings for Weeks 1-5.

#### **Tutorial 6**

- No tutorial

### **Week 7: Oct 22**

#### **Lecture 7**

##### **Posters**

- Elements of a good poster

##### **Case #4**

- New working groups
- Working groups choose an issue/topic for Case Study #4

#### **Tutorial 7**

- Work on grant proposal.

## **Week 8: Oct 29**

### **Lecture 8**

#### **Case #4**

- Work on issue/topic, and poster and oral presentations

### **Tutorial 8**

- Work on grant proposal.

## **Week 9: Nov 5**

### **Lecture 9**

#### **Case #4**

- Work on issue/topic, and poster and oral presentations

### **Tutorial 9**

- Work on grant proposal.

## **Week 10: Nov 12**

### **Lecture 10**

#### **Case #4**

- Case Study #4 group poster presentations

### **Tutorial 10**

- Work on grant proposal.

## **Week 11: Nov 19**

Oral or poster presentation of grant proposal

## **Week 12: Nov 26**

Oral or poster presentation of grant proposal

**\*A hardcopy of the written grant proposal, as well as the electronic version of the oral presentation slide deck or poster presentation are due by Nov. 26.**

## EVALUATION

EVALUATION	Percentage of final course grade	Description	Due Date/Activity Date
Curriculum Vitae	3%	Grading will be on a Pass/Fail scale with a pass = 3% and a fail = 0%.	Tuesday Sept. 24
12-minute group oral presentation of Case Study #1	5%	Please see Table 2	Tuesday Sept. 24
12-minute group oral presentation of Case Study #2	5%	Please see Table 2	Tuesday Oct. 8
In-class open-book term test	17%	Open-book <b>test</b> on lectures and readings (Weeks 1-5) The open-book test will be held during the regular lecture period. The test will assess content knowledge and understanding of material. <b>No laptops or electronic devices are allowed to be used during the test.</b>	Tuesday Oct. 15
12-minute group oral presentation of Case Study #4	10%	Please see Table 2	Tuesday Nov. 12
Poster presentation of Case Study #4	10%	Please see Table 3	Tuesday Nov. 12
Self assessment	5%	Based on tutorial work with respect to four categories (responsibility, information contributed, communication, global/overall assessment; Table 2). Your self-assessment mark must be within the range of your groups' peer assessment. If not, the minima of your peer assessment will also be used as the self-assessment mark.	Tuesday Nov. 26 prior to grant proposal presentations.
Peer assessment	5%	The peer-assessment mark is the average mark you receive from your peers, based on tutorial work with respect to four categories (Table 2).	Tuesday Nov. 26 prior to grant proposal presentations.



Written hard copy of the grant proposal	20%	Environmental health topic of your choice but must be approved by the instructor. Digital submissions will not be accepted.	Tuesday Nov. 26
Grant proposal oral or poster presentation	20%	Please see Table 2 or Table 3	Tuesday Nov. 19 or 26

## IN-CLASS TEST

The open-book test will be held during the regular lecture period. The test will assess content knowledge and understanding of material. **No laptops or electronic devices are allowed to be used during the test.**

## 12-MINUTE ORAL PRESENTATION

The presentation will be structured around the environment-and-health issue selected. The student(s) will present on their topic in the format of a 12-minute PowerPoint presentation, followed by 3 minutes for questions as time permits.

**Table 2.** Evaluation Criteria for the oral presentation has been divided into 4 categories (scale extremes are described) (modified from McMaster University, undated, *Student Presentation Evaluation Criteria*).

<p><b>1. Responsibility</b> 0 = Late for presentation. Disorganized. Poor time management. 10 = Punctual. Well organized. Excellent time management.</p>
<p><b>2. Information</b> 0 = No new information was presented. Information was irrelevant. Information was not factual. 10 = A lot of new information was presented. All information was relevant.</p>
<p><b>3. Communication</b> 0 = Unable to communicate information and ideas. Explanations were confusing and/or verbose. 10 = Clearly communicated ideas and information. Explanations were clear and concise.</p>
<p><b>4. Global Assessment</b> (overall assessment including intangibles) 0 = Unacceptable presentation. 10 = Outstanding presentation.</p>

## POSTER PRESENTATION

Your poster presentation will be structured around the environment-and-health issue you have selected for Case Study #4 (and/or for the Tri-Council grant proposal). The student will refer to the Arts & Science Co-op Student Poster Guide (UTSC, 2017) on QUERCUS for a general introduction to poster planning and production.

Students shall **provide an electronic copy (PowerPoint format) and a hard copy (printed on letter sized paper) of her/his poster no later than November 12 by email to the instructor for Case Study #4 and by November 26 if you have chosen the poster format for your grant proposal.** Failure to do so will incur a mark of 0% as a final poster grade.

The maximum allowable area (length x width) is **3 x 4 feet**. All text size shall be a minimum of **24 point resolution** (keep it concise and emphasize the key points).

Choice of poster colours is restricted only in the sense that it shall be readable (e.g. black text on white backgrounds, white text on blue backgrounds).

**Format:** Posters should consist of a title, student(s) name and affiliation, student's professional e-mail address, project summary, introduction and context, specific topic rationale and objectives, sections including discussion, implications/conclusions, literature cited.

**Table 3.** Evaluation Criteria for the poster presentation has been divided into 4 categories (scale extremes are described) (modified from McMaster University, undated, *Student Presentation Evaluation Criteria*).

<p><b>1. Required Components</b> (Title, Author(s) &amp; Affiliations, Summary, Sections, Graphics, References)            0 = No required components included in poster.            10 = All required components included and exceptional layout (e.g. poster guides the reader).</p>
<p><b>2. Information</b>            0 = No new information was presented. Information was irrelevant. Information was not factual.            10 = A lot of new information was presented. All information was relevant.</p>
<p><b>3. Communication</b> (including but not limited to writing style, grammar and spelling)            0 = Unable to communicate information and ideas. Explanations were confusing and/or verbose.            10 = Clearly communicated ideas and information. Explanations were clear and concise.</p>
<p><b>4. Global Assessment</b> (overall assessment including intangibles)            0 = Unacceptable poster presentation (e.g. unreadable text. poor graphics)            10 = Outstanding presentation.</p>

## GRANT PROPOSAL GUIDELINES

The grant proposal's topic/issue is open to your choice, with approval from the instructor. Guidelines must be strictly adhered to (e.g., page format, font size and style, grant proposal length, etc.).

<http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/funding-financement/nfrf-fnfr/exploration/2018/competition-concours-eng.aspx> (last accessed 30 aug 2019; Text below is presented verbatim, but abbreviated.)

## **New Frontiers in Research Fund – Exploration**

### **Context**

The New Frontiers in Research Fund (NFRF) will invest \$275 million over the next five years, and \$65 million ongoing, to support international, interdisciplinary, fast-breaking and high-risk research. It is comprised of three streams to support groundbreaking research:

- **Exploration** will generate opportunities for Canada to build strength in high-risk, high-reward and interdisciplinary research;
- **Transformation** will provide large-scale support for Canada to build strength and leadership in interdisciplinary and transformative research; and
- **International** will enhance opportunities for Canadian researchers to participate in research with international partners.

The fund is administered by the Tri-agency Institutional Programs Secretariat (TIPS), which is housed within the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC), on behalf of Canada's three research granting agencies: the [Canadian Institutes of Health Research](#) (CIHR), the [Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council](#) (NSERC) and SSHRC.

### **Description**

The objective of this inaugural competition is to generate opportunities for researchers to conduct high-risk, high-reward and interdisciplinary research not available through funding opportunities currently offered by the three agencies. It seeks to inspire highly innovative projects that defy current research paradigms, propose a unique scientific direction, bring disciplines together beyond the traditional disciplinary approaches, and/or use different perspectives to solve existing problems.

### **Nominated principal investigator**

The nominated principal investigator must be an independent researcher at their primary affiliation.

An **independent researcher** is an individual who:

- engages in research-related activities that are not under the direction of another individual; and
- has an academic or research appointment that:
  - commences by the [effective date of funding](#);
  - allows the individual to pursue the proposed research project, to engage in independent research activities for the entire duration of the funding, to supervise trainees (if applicable, as per his or her institution's policy), and to publish the research results; and

- obliges the individual to comply with institutional policies concerning the conduct of research, the supervision of trainees (if applicable) and the employment conditions of staff paid with tri-agency funding.

The nominated principal investigator will:

- be responsible for the direction of the proposed activities, with the co-principal investigator (if applicable);
- assume the administrative and financial responsibility for the grant; and
- receive all related correspondence from the agencies.

### **Co-principal investigator**

The **co-principal investigator** must be considered an [independent researcher](#). The co-principal investigator shares responsibility for the direction of the proposed activities.

### **Co-applicants**

**Co-applicants** contribute to the proposed activities. Co-applicants can be [independent researchers](#) or can be, but are not limited to, practitioners, policy-makers, educators, decision-makers, health-care administrators, Indigenous elders, Indigenous knowledge keepers, community leaders, or individuals working for a charity.

### **Collaborators**

**Collaborators** do not need to be affiliated with an eligible institution. Any individual who will contribute to the project is eligible to be a collaborator. Collaborators do not have access to grant funds and are expected to bring their own resources. Collaborators do not include individuals whose activities on the project will be supervised by the nominated principal investigator, co-principal investigator or co-applicants.

### **Subject matter**

Projects must be high-risk and high-reward [**but for our simulation, the project does not have to be**] and may involve any disciplines, thematic areas, approaches or subject areas eligible for funding across the tri-agencies.

Projects must be interdisciplinary.

Projects may range in value and duration, up to \$250,000 over two years (\$125,000 per year) and can be at any point in the research and development spectrum. Eligible projects include those with specific short- to medium-term objectives, as well as discrete phases in a program of longer-range research.

## **Review Process**

Applications will be adjudicated through a competitive process. To better promote groundbreaking, disruptive, and interdisciplinary research, the agencies will explore innovative merit review processes as they launch successive competitions, and processes may differ from one round to the next.

## **Indigenous research**

SSHRC's [Guidelines for the Merit Review of Indigenous Research](#) should be used as reference for researchers preparing applications related to [Indigenous research](#).

## **Sex-and gender-based analysis**

Sex- and gender-based analysis (SGBA) is an approach that systematically examines sex-based (biological) and gender-based (socio-cultural) differences between men, women, boys, girls and gender-diverse people. The purpose of SGBA is to promote rigorous science that is sensitive to sex and gender.

## **Selection criteria**

The following criteria will be used to evaluate applications:

### **Interdisciplinarity**

The NFRF is intended to support meritorious projects that are not currently funded or could not easily be funded through existing agency-specific programs. Therefore, applications will need to clearly demonstrate that they are combining disciplines.

### **Multidisciplinary review panel**

A multidisciplinary and multi-sectoral review panel composed of national and international members with broad expertise will convene to evaluate the applications according to the selection criteria. To uphold the program's commitment to non-discrimination and equity, and to ensure the highest quality of review, members of the panel will be diverse.

## **Information Required to Complete an Application**

A complete application includes the following information:

1. Complete profiles for the Nominated principal investigator, co-principal investigator and co-applicants (if applicable). Complete profiles include information about affiliation(s), fields of research, and keywords.

## 2. The Proposal:

- **Research Team's** Biographical Information (attachment, maximum of **two pages**)
- **Proposed research** project (attachment, maximum of **five pages**)
- **References** (attachment, maximum of **one page**)

[We will use CIHR formatting guidelines (<http://www.cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/29300.html>)

**Instructions for preparing and formatting documents. CIHR has simplified its formatting requirements.**

- Use a font size of 12 point, black type. Maximum of six lines per inch. No condensed/narrow fonts, type, or spacing.
- Insert a margin of 2 cm (3/4 inch) - minimum - around the page.
- Indicate your name, the project title and the section title (e.g., Summary of Research Proposal) at the top of each page. Indicate the page number clearly at the bottom of each page.
- Observe page limitations, additional pages may NOT be added unless specified.
- Use only letter size (21.25 X 27.5 cm / 8.5" X 11") white paper/background for all attachments.]

### **Summary of Research Proposal**

Include the title of the project and summarize your research proposal. Note that your summary cannot exceed **one page**.

### **Research Team's Biographical Information**

Maximum length: **two page**

Explain how the knowledge and experience of each researcher (nominated principal investigator, co-principal investigator and co-applicants, as applicable) relates to the expertise needed to accomplish the project objectives, and how the contributions of the collaborators will be integrated.

### **Proposed Research Project**

Maximum length: **five page**

[We will use CIHR guidelines (<http://www.cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/29300.html>)

**In the Research Proposal you should explain:**

- a. **What you want to do (central hypothesis, research question, specific objectives)**
- b. **Why this is a reasonable thing to do (review of previous work done on the subject matter, rationale)**
- c. **Why this is important (new knowledge to be obtained, improvements to health which will result) [Anticipated Outcomes/Benefits]**
- d. **How you are going to do it (work plan, timelines, detailed descriptions of methods, analysis and discussion/interpretation of results, pitfalls, ways around the pitfalls, alternatives)]**

## Literature References

Maximum length: **one page**

Use this section to provide a list of literature references.

**CIHR REVIEW CRITERIA** as an example of how proposals are evaluated

### 1. [Research Approach](#)

- Clarity of the research question.
- Completeness of the literature review and relevance
- Clarity of rationale and methods
- Feasibility including recruitment of subjects, project timeline, preliminary data...
- Anticipation of difficulties

#### **Strengths**

- 

#### **Weaknesses**

- 

### 2. [Originality of the Proposal](#)

- Potential for the creation of new knowledge.
- Originality hypotheses/research questions addressed, novel technology/methodology, and/or novel applications of current technology/methodology.

#### **Strengths**

- 

#### **Weaknesses**

- 

### 3. [Applicants](#)

- Qualifications of the applicants including training, experience/expertise, and independence
- Experience of the applicants in the proposed area of research and the proposed methods
- Appropriateness of the team
- Ability to successfully and appropriately disseminate

#### **Strengths**

- 

#### **Weaknesses**

-

<p>4. <a href="#">Environment for Research</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• personnel, facilities and infrastructure</li> <li>• Suitability of the environment (milieu, project and mentors)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Strengths</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
<p><b>Weaknesses</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>

<p>5. <a href="#">Impact of the Research</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• addresses a significant need or gap in health research</li> <li>• Potential for a significant contribution to the improvement of people’s health in Canada and the world and/or to the development of more effective health services and products.</li> <li>• Appropriateness and adequacy of knowledge dissemination and exchange.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Strengths</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
<p><b>Weaknesses</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>

Evaluation [for the course as a whole] will be carried out in accordance with the Graduate Grading and Evaluation Practices Policy (and how that policy is interpreted and applied in this Dept.)

<http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Governing+Council+Digital+Assets/Polices/PDF/grading.pdf>

**Potential Topics for Grant Proposal**

File can be found posted on QUERCUS

**EMERGENCY PLANNING**

Students are advised to consult the university’s preparedness site (<http://www.preparedness.utoronto.ca>) for information and regular updates regarding procedures relating to emergency planning.

**ACCESSIBILITY NEEDS**

The University of Toronto is committed to accessibility. If you require accommodations for a disability, or have any accessibility concerns about the course, the classroom or course materials, please contact The UTSC Accessibility Services as soon as possible:

<http://www.utsc.utoronto.ca/~ability/>

We also suggest you also refer to the following University of Toronto Scarborough Library link:

<http://utsc.library.utoronto.ca/services-persons-disabilities>



**ACADEMIC INTEGRITY** (Academic Handbook for Faculty (and Staff), UTSC, Office of the Dean and Vice-Principal (Academic) 2012, p. 46)

“Academic integrity is one of the cornerstones of the University of Toronto. It is critically important both to maintain our community which honours the values of honesty, trust, respect, fairness and responsibility and to protect you, the students within this community, and the value of the degree towards which you are all working so diligently.

According to Section B of the University of Toronto's *Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters* (August 1995), which all students are expected to know and respect, it is an offence for students:

- To use someone else's ideas or words in their own work without acknowledging that those ideas/words are not their own with a citation and quotation marks, i.e. to commit plagiarism;
- To include false, misleading or concocted citations in their work;
- To obtain unauthorized assistance on any assignment;
- To provide unauthorized assistance to another student. This includes showing another student completed work;
- To submit their own work for credit in more than one course without the permission of the instructor;
- To falsify or alter any documentation required by the University. This includes, but is not limited to, doctor's notes; and
- To use or possess an unauthorized aid in any test or exam.

There are other offences covered under the *Code*, but these are by far the most common. Please respect these rules and the values which they protect.”

## **PLAGIARISM**

University of Toronto code of Behaviour on Academic Matters states that "it shall be an offense for a student knowingly: to represent as one's own any idea or expression of an idea or work of another in any academic examination or term test or in connection with any other form of academic work, i.e., to commit plagiarism."

For accepted methods of standard documentation formats, including electronic citation of internet sources please see the UofT writing website at:

<http://www.writing.utoronto.ca/advice/using-sources/documentation>

The full Code of Behaviour regulations could be found from consulting

<http://www.sgs.utoronto.ca/facultyandstaff/Pages/Academic-Integrity.aspx>

The University of Toronto has a site license that enables all faculty and students to use Turnitin.com (<http://www.turnitin.com/>), a plagiarism prevention system. For more information on this service please consult

<http://www.teaching.utoronto.ca/teaching/academicintegrity/turnitin.htm>.

## **WRITING AND ENGLISH LANGUAGE**

As well as the faculty writing support, please see English Language and writing support at University of Toronto: <http://www.sgs.utoronto.ca/currentstudents/Pages/English-Language-and-Writing-Support.aspx>

Students have commented that they found the latter address extremely helpful for writing term papers.

The following are also useful:

Sylvan Barnett, *A Short Guide to Writing About Art*. 5-7th edition (New York: Harper-Collins, 1997)

William Strunk Jr., E.B. White. *The Elements of Style* (New York: MacMillan Publishing)

## **LATE WORK**

LATE PROPOSALS INCLUDING POSTERS WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED unless “there are legitimate, documented reasons [e.g., medical, death in the family] beyond a student’s control” (Academic Handbook for Faculty (and Staff), UTSC, Office of the Dean and Vice-Principal (Academic) 2012, p15).

## **READINGS**

Required readings will be posted on QUERCUS and/or assigned during lectures. Most reference materials will be accessible on the web or online at the UT library.

There are no required or recommended textbooks for the lecture portion of the course.

## Literature Cited

- Arthur, H. (1990). Student self-evaluation: How useful? How valid? *Pedagogue*, 2, 1-6.
- Barrows, H. S. (1986). A taxonomy of problem-based learning methods. *Medical Education*, 20, 481-486.
- Blumberg, P., Cohen, G., Sullivan, P., Ryan, N. (1995). The progress of students who encounter repeated difficulties in a problem-based medical school. *Teaching and Learning in Medicine*, 7(1), 23-28.
- Caplow, J. A., Donaldson, J. F., Kardash, C., Hosokawa, M.(1997). Learning in a problem-based medical curriculum: Students' conceptions. *Medical Education*, 31, 440-447.
- Cummins, J. (1986). Empowering minority students: A framework for intervention. *Harvard Educational Review*, 56(1), 18-36.
- DesMarchais, J. E., & Chaput, M. (1997). A comprehensive continuous preclinical PBL tutor training system. *Teaching and Learning in Medicine*, 9(1), 66-72.
- Dolman, D. J., & Schmidt, H. G. (1994). What drives the student in problem-based learning? *Medical Education*, 28, 372-380.
- Gijsselaers, W. H. (1997). Effects of contextual factors on tutor behavior. *Teaching and Learning in Medicine*, 9(2), 116-124.
- Hamilton, J. D. (1976). The McMaster curriculum: A critique. *British Medical Journal*, May, 1191-1196.
- Jayawickramarajah, P. T. (1996). Problems for problem-based learning: A comparative study of documents. *Medical Education*, 30, 272-282.
- Kaufman, D. M., & Holmes, D. B. (1996). Tutoring in problem-based learning: Perceptions of teachers and students. *Medical Education*, 30, 371-377.
- Knowles, M. S. (1975). *Self-directed learning*. New York, New York: Cambridge The Adult Education Company.
- McAuley, R. G., & Woodward, C. A. (1988). Electives in the McMaster MD programme. *Medical Teacher*, 10(1), 91-94.
- Neufeld, V. R., & Barrows, H. S. (1974). The 'McMaster Philosophy': An approach to medical education. *Journal of Medical Education*, 49, 1040-1050.
- Neufeld, V. R., Woodward, C. A., & MacLeod, S. M. (1989). The McMaster M.D. program: A case study of renewal in medical education. *Academic Medicine*, 64, 423-432.
- Norman, G. R. (1988). Problem-solving skills, solving problems and problem-based learning. *Medical Education*, 22, 279-286.
- Norman, G. R. (1989). Problem-solving skills versus problem-based learning. *Pedagogue*, 1, 1-4.
- Norman, G. R. (1991). Process and outcome of problem based learning: A psychological perspective. *Journal of University of Occupational and Environmental Health*, 14, 350-369.
- Norman, G. R., & Schmidt, H. G. (1992). The psychological basis of problem-based learning: A review of the evidence. *Academic Medicine*, 67(9), 557-565.
- Roberts, J. D., White, A. E., & Fitzpatrick, J. M. (1995). Clinical problem-solving using video simulation: An investigation. *Medical Education*, 29, 347-354.
- Rooney A. et al. 2014. Systematic review and evidence integration for literature-based environmental health sciences assessments. *Environ Health Perspectives* 122:711.
- Schmidt, H. G. (1983). Problem-based learning: Rationale and description. *Medical Education*, 17, 11-16.