

WESTERN UNIVERSITY
LONDON CANADA

Department of Psychology
Fall/Winter 2025

Psychology 9611

Performance Appraisal and Related Issues

1 Description

Drawing on research in industrial and organizational psychology, this course explores how psychological theories and methods can be applied to measure and manage job performance, a central criterion in work settings. Students will engage with classic and contemporary approaches to performance evaluation, including theoretical models, the development and validation of performance appraisal instruments, and topics on the evolving management of performance, such as feedback delivery and electronic monitoring of employees.

Time and Location: Thursdays, 1:00pm to 4:00pm [REDACTED]

Enrollment Restrictions

Enrollment in this course is restricted to graduate students in psychology, as well as any student that has obtained special permission to enroll in this course from the course instructor as well as the Graduate Chair (or equivalent) from the student's home program.

2 Course Information

Instructor: Jose A. Espinoza
Office: SSC 8406
Office Hours: By appointment
Email: jespinoz@uwo.ca (I aim to respond to emails within 24 hours Monday–Friday and within 48 hours on Saturday and Sunday.)

Course Format

This is a seminar-style course that is organized around weekly readings of theoretical and/or empirical papers on a selected topic. Classes may involve some lecture content delivered by the instructor, but the focus is on round table discussion. For most classes, students will be the primary facilitators of discussion on the assigned papers. Students are expected to attend having fully read the assigned readings and with sufficient preparation to be active participants in all aspects of course activities.

3 Course Materials

No specific textbook is required. Readings will be assigned on a weekly basis in accordance with the lecture schedule in this document. These readings will be available online through the OWL

course website linked to the “Course Readings” tool. Any other materials assigned for students to engage with will also be linked from the course website on OWL.

4 Course Objectives and Learning Outcomes

Upon completion of this course, students should be able to:

Learning Outcome	Learning Activity	Assessment
<i>Depth and Breadth of Knowledge</i> - Describe and evaluate major models and contemporary research on job performance, appraisal, and management. - Explain how performance appraisal relates to broader constructs (e.g., motivation, organizational citizenship, and counterproductive work behaviour).	Weekly readings, Round table discussions.	Class participation, Reflection papers, Project paper.
<i>Knowledge of Methodologies</i> Critically assess methodological approaches to performance appraisal.	Weekly readings, Round table discussions.	Class participation, Discussion questions, Reflection papers, Project proposal and paper.
<i>Application of Knowledge</i> - Use principles of performance measurement to design or critique performance appraisal and management systems. - Integrate theory and empirical findings to propose evidence-based improvements to organizational practices.	Round table discussions, Student-led discussion, Independent research for project.	Student-led discussion, Project presentation and paper.
<i>Communication Skills</i> - Communicate theoretical and empirical knowledge on performance appraisal and management orally and in writing. - Engage in critical and respectful discussion about controversies and unresolved issues in performance appraisal and management.	Round table discussions, Student-led discussions.	Class participation, Student-led discussions, Reflection papers, Project presentation and paper.
<i>Awareness of Limits of Knowledge</i>	Weekly readings, Round table discussions,	Class participation, Discussion questions,

- Recognize contextual and social factors that influence performance appraisal and management. - Consider ethical concerns and potential biases in performance appraisal and management and their implications for fairness and defensibility.	Student-led discussions, Independent research.	Student-led discussions, Reflection papers, Project presentation and paper.
<i>Autonomy and Professional Capacity</i> - Formulate research questions and accompanying study designs related to performance appraisal and management. - Demonstrate critical thinking, engagement, and collegiality in scholarly discussion.	Round table discussions, Student-led discussion, Independent research for project, Project presentation.	Class participation, Discussion questions, Student-led discussions, Project presentation and paper.

5 Methods of Evaluation

Evaluation	Due Date	Weight
Class Participation	Ongoing throughout term.	20%
Discussion Questions	Weekly on Wednesdays at 11:59pm.	10%
Student-led Discussion	According to schedule developed in first meeting.	20%
Reflection Papers	Twice during term on Wednesdays at 11:59pm.	10%
Paper 1	According to student selection.	5%
Paper 2	According to student selection.	5%
Research Project		40%
Proposal	Mar. 06 at 11:59pm.	5%
Presentation	On one of Mar. 26, Apr. 01, or Apr. 09	10%
Paper	Apr. 10 at 11:59pm.	25%

Students will receive outlines and instructional materials for each assignment via the course website on OWL. The following are brief summaries of the evaluation components.

Class Participation (20%)

The focus on round table-style discussions in this course requires active engagement from students to facilitate learning. Therefore, students are expected to complete all assigned readings before class and come prepared to share insights, raise questions, and respond thoughtfully to peers. High-quality participation reflects critical engagement with the readings, the ability to integrate and apply theoretical ideas, and demonstration of a collegial approach to discussion. The participation grade will be based on both the quality and consistency of contributions, as well as evidence of preparation and professionalism (e.g., attendance, punctuality, attentiveness). Midway through the term, the instructor will provide informal feedback to help students gauge whether their participation is meeting expectations and to support full engagement from all students.

Discussion Questions (10%)

Each week, students must submit **two** discussion questions based on the assigned readings. Questions should be posted to the course discussion board (under “Discussions” on OWL) by the evening before class: **Wednesdays at 11:59pm**. All students will have access to the weekly submitted discussion questions. This “joint pool” of questions is designed both to help students prepare for round table discussions and to provide a foundation of ideas for participation in class. High-quality questions will reflect critical engagement with one or more readings and stimulate meaningful dialogue during class. Students who are leading the discussion for a given week (see below) are exempt from submitting discussion questions and will instead be expected to review the submitted questions in preparation to lead the class.

Missing or Late Submissions: Discussion questions require timely submission to allow for their use during class discussion. As a result, discussion questions submitted after the deadline will be subject to a 50% penalty. Discussion questions that are not submitted by the class’s start time will be assigned a grade of zero.

Student-led Discussion (20%)

Working in pairs, students will be responsible for leading **two** class discussions during the term. Discussion leaders will facilitate a critical conversation about the assigned readings for that week. In some cases, there may be multiple groups leading discussion in each week responsible for different sets of readings. To begin, discussion leaders may provide a summary of the key ideas, findings, and debates from the readings. To support this, students are encouraged to prepare PowerPoint slides to highlight major points, present discussion prompts, or link ideas across readings.

Most of the allotted time should be devoted to facilitating the round table discussion about the readings. Discussion leaders may integrate research beyond the readings to further discussion and/or provide additional perspectives.

Evaluation will be based on the quality of preparation, depth of analysis, and effectiveness in stimulating and managing discussion. A schedule for student-led discussions will be developed during the first meeting of the class.

Absent Discussion Leaders: Discussions leaders who cannot attend their scheduled date due to exceptional circumstances beyond their control must communicate with the instructor as soon as possible. In cases where it is clear that the discussion leader could not have reasonably attended their scheduled date, the portion of the grade allotted to this component will be transferred to the Project Presentation (5%) and Project Paper (10%).

Reflection Papers (10%)

Students will complete **two** reflection papers (each worth 5%) during the term. Each paper should be a maximum of 500 words (title pages, appendices, and references will not count toward this limit). These should be in APA format, double-spaced, in 12-point Times New Roman with 1-inch margins. Each paper must be based on the assigned readings for a specific week. A strong reflection paper will demonstrate critical engagement with the readings to develop a complementary or opposing viewpoint and may suggest future avenues for research. Students may

draw on some literature beyond the assigned readings in their reflection papers but, ultimately, the focus should be on the student's commentary.

Students may select which two weeks they wish to write on but must submit each paper by the posted due date for that week through OWL under "Assignments." This due date is always on the evening before the class in which the readings will be discussed: **Wednesdays at 11:59pm.**

Missing and Late Submissions: Considering the substantial flexibility for the completion of this evaluation component, Reflection Papers will **not** be accepted after their due date. However, students who email the instructor (jespinoz@uwo.ca) **before** the due date briefly describing exceptional circumstances beyond their control (entirely at the instructor's discretion) that prevent the timely submission of a Reflection Paper will receive an automatic 48-hour "grace period" to submit.

Research Project (40%)

The primary evaluation component in this course is research project in which students will develop a novel research question and an accompanying empirical study in an area relevant to performance appraisal or management. Importantly, students must develop a question that is distinct from their thesis or dissertation topic (although these may be related). The project comprises multiple components with due dates throughout the term and are intended to provide students with the opportunity to develop their project in steps, receive feedback from the instructor and their peers, and improve the quality of the final paper.

Results and Discussion: Note that this evaluation component is a proposal for a research project and does not require the execution of study. Therefore, students are not expected to present results (real or simulated), but may wish, in their Discussion, to consider anticipated results (supportive of predictions or otherwise) in describing the potential implications or limitations of the proposed research.

Proposal (5%)

In the first component, students will submit a proposal outlining their research question, an expected structure for their final paper, and an initial annotated bibliography with example articles indicative of an early literature search. Components of the expected structure may include "headings" and accompanying descriptions for the introduction, a broad method, and anticipated results and discussion.

Length may vary but the proposal should be between 500-750 words (excluding title page, references, annotated bibliography, etc.). The proposal should be in APA format, double-spaced, in 12-point Times New Roman with 1-inch margins. The proposal will be submitted through OWL under "Assignments".

The instructor may reach out to the student to further discuss their proposal in relation to modifying the research question or to provide other feedback for their consideration as they move forward.

Missing and Late Submissions: Any proposal submitted after the due date will incur a penalty of 20% per day for each the day the proposal is late (including weekends). This penalty will

accumulate until it amounts to a 100% penalty on the grade, at which point the proposal will no longer be accepted. However, students who email the instructor (jespinoz@uwo.ca) before the due date briefly describing exceptional circumstances beyond their control that prevent the timely submission of the proposal will receive an automatic 48-hour “grace period” to submit the proposal without penalty. After this 48-hour grace period, penalties will be incurred for late submissions.

Presentation (10%)

During the last two classes of the term (and the third, if necessary), students will deliver an approximately 20-minute presentation on their research project to their peers. This will be followed by 5-10 minutes of questions from the audience. This component provides students with the opportunity to demonstrate their developing insight into the topic of their project and to receive collegial feedback from their peers and the instructor.

Students are encouraged to prepare a presentation, including PowerPoint slides, that provides an overview of their research question, the supporting literature and theoretical rationale, and their proposed method. Students should treat this presentation as akin to one delivered at a conference to colleagues in the field who are familiar with the core concepts and literature of the area, but may not have expertise in the presenter’s specific research topic.

Absent Presenters: Presenters who cannot attend their scheduled date due to exceptional circumstances beyond their control must communicate with the instructor as soon as possible. In cases where it is clear that the presenter could not have reasonably attended their scheduled date, the presentation will be moved forward to a future meeting of the class. When it is not possible to reschedule the presentation, the portion of the grade allotted to this component will be transferred to the Project Paper (10%). Students are made aware of the substantial impact the missing their presentation can have on the quality of their paper as it deprives them of the opportunity to receive essential feedback from the instructor and their peers.

Paper (25%)

The last evaluation component for the project is a final paper to be submitted at the end of the course. In this paper, students will provide: 1) provide a brief literature review and develop the theoretical rationale for their project; 2) state their research questions and/or hypotheses; 3) specify the method for the empirical study of their research questions; and 4) discuss potential implications, limitations, and directions for future research.

The final paper should be a maximum of 4,000 words (excluding title page, references, tables, figures, etc.). The paper should be in APA format, double-spaced, in 12-point Times New Roman with 1-inch margins. The paper will be submitted through OWL under “Assignments”.

Missing and Late Submissions: Any paper submitted after the due date will incur a penalty of 20% per day for each the day the paper is late (including weekends). This penalty will accumulate until it amounts to a 100% penalty on the grade, at which point the paper will no longer be accepted. However, students who email the instructor (jespinoz@uwo.ca) before the due date briefly describing exceptional circumstances beyond their control that prevent the timely submission of the paper will receive an automatic 48-hour “grace period” to submit the paper without penalty. After this 48-hour grace period, penalties will be incurred for late submissions.

6 Class Schedule

Identifying Readings: See *Reading List* below the class schedule to identify relevant readings for each week. These readings are available on the OWL course site. The assigned readings may be adapted, removed, or exchanged. Any changes will occur at least two weeks ahead of the class in which they will be discussed.

Dates	Topic	Readings	Notes
Jan. 8	Introduction and Organizational Meeting		Discussion of class expectations and organization of discussions.
Jan. 15	Foundations for Performance Appraisal	DeNisi & Murphy (2017); Pulakos et al. (2019); Murphy & Cleveland (1995, pp. 1–30).	
Jan. 22	Methodology and Job Performance	Cascio & Aguinis (2011), Ch. 4–5; Rotundo & Sackett (2002).	
Jan. 29	Is Performance Management Necessary?	Adler et al. (2016) + responses (see “Adler Responses” heading).	15 responses but much shorter than other readings.
Feb. 05	Assessing Performance	Tziner et al. (2005); Goffin & Olson (2011); Woehr & Huffcutt (1994); Bernardin et al. (2009).	
Feb. 12	Job Analysis	Catano et al. (2019), Ch. 4; O’Neill et al. (2013); Goffin et al. (2011).	
Feb. 14-22	Reading Week. No Classes.		
Feb. 26	360-degree Evaluations	Balzer et al. (2004); Harris & Schaubroeck (1988); Nowack & Mashihi (2012); Bracken & Rose (2011).	
Mar. 05	Performance Feedback	Kluger & DeNisi (1998); Anseel & Sherf (2024); Ashford et al. (2016); Keeping & Levy (2000); Speer (2018).	
Mar. 12	Counterproductive Work Behaviour	Belschak & Den Hartog (2009); Berry et al. (2007); Marcus & Schuler (2004); Spector et al. (2006).	

Mar. 19	Electronic Monitoring	Ravid et al. (2020); Siegel et al. (2022); McNall & Roch (2007).	
Mar. 26	Project Presentations 1		
Apr. 01	Project Presentations 2		
Apr. 09	Project Presentations 3 + Writing Day		

Reading List

- Adler, S., Campion, M., Colquitt, A., Grubb, A., Murphy, K., Ollander-Krane, R., & Pulakos, E. D. (2016). Getting rid of performance ratings: Genius or folly? A debate. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 9(2), 219–252.
- Ashford, S. J., De Stobbeleir, K., & Nujella, M. (2016). To seek or not to seek: Is that the only question? Recent developments in feedback-seeking literature. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 3(1), 213–239.
- Balzer, W. K., Greguras, G. J., & Patrick H. Raymark. (2004). Multisource feedback. In Thomas, C. J. (Ed.), *Comprehensive handbook of psychological assessment: Industrial and organizational assessment* (Vol. 4, pp. 390–411). Wiley.
- Belschak, F. D., & Den Hartog, D. N. (2009). Consequences of positive and negative feedback: The impact on emotions and extra-role behaviors. *Applied Psychology*, 58(2), 274–303.
- Bernardin, H. J., & Smith, P. C. (1981). A clarification of some issues regarding the development and use of behaviorally anchored rating scales (BARS). *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 66(4), 458–463.
- Berry, C. M., Ones, D. S., & Sackett, P. R. (2007). Interpersonal deviance, organizational deviance, and their common correlates: A review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(2), 410–424.
- Bracken, D. W., & Rose, D. S. (2011). When does 360-degree feedback create behavior change? And how would we know it when it does? *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 26(2), 183–192.
- Catano, V. M., Hackett, R. D., & Wiesner, W. H. (2019). *Recruitment and selection in Canada* (7th edition). Nelson.
- Cascio, W. F., & Aguinis, H. (2014). *Applied psychology in human resource management* (7th edition). Pearson.
- Cleveland, J. N., Murphy, K. R., & Williams, R. E. (1989). Multiple uses of performance appraisal: Prevalence and correlates. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74(1), 130–135.

- DeNisi, A. S., & Murphy, K. R. (2017). Performance appraisal and performance management: 100 years of progress. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102(3), 421.
- Goffin, R. D., & Olson, J. M. (2011). Is it all relative?: Comparative judgments and the possible improvement of self-ratings and ratings of others. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 6(1), 48–60.
- Goffin, R. D., Rothstein, M. G., Rieder, M. J., Poole, A., Krajewski, H. T., Powell, D. M., Jelley, B. R., Boyd, A., & Mestdagh, T. (2011). Choosing job-related personality traits: Developing valid personality-oriented job analysis. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 51(5), 646–651.
- Harris, M. M., & Schaubroeck, J. (1988). A meta-analysis of self-supervisor, self-peer, and peer-supervisor ratings. *Personnel Psychology*, 41(1), 43–62.
- Keeping, L. M., & Levy, P. E. (2000). Performance appraisal reactions: Measurement, modeling, and method bias. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(5), 708–723.
- Kluger, A. N., & DeNisi, A. (1998). Feedback interventions: Toward the understanding of a double-edged sword. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 7(3), 67–72.
- Marcus, B., & Schuler, H. (2004). Antecedents of counterproductive behavior at work: A general perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(4), 647–660.
- McNall, L. A., & Roch, S. G. (2007). Effects of electronic monitoring types on perceptions of procedural justice, interpersonal justice, and privacy. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 37(3), 658–682.
- Murphy, K. R., & Cleveland, J. (1995). Introduction. In *Understanding performance appraisal: Social, organizational, and goal-based perspectives* (pp. 1–30). Sage Publications.
- Nowack, K. M., & Mashihi, S. (2012). Evidence-based answers to 15 questions about leveraging 360-degree feedback. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 64(3), 157–182.
- O'Neill, T. A., Goffin, R. D., & Rothstein, M. (2013). Personality and the need for personality-oriented work analysis. In N. Christiansen & R. Tett (Eds.), *Handbook of Personality at Work* (1st ed., pp. 226–252). Routledge.
- Pulakos, E. D., Mueller-Hanson, R., & Arad, S. (2019). The evolution of performance management: Searching for value. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 6(1), 249–271.
- Ravid, D. M., Tomczak, D. L., White, J. C., & Behrend, T. S. (2020). EPM 20/20: A review, framework, and research agenda for electronic performance monitoring. *Journal of Management*, 46(1), 100–126.

- Rotundo, M., & Sackett, P. R. (2002). The relative importance of task, citizenship, and counterproductive performance to global ratings of job performance: A policy-capturing approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(1), 66–80.
- Siegel, R., König, C. J., & Lazar, V. (2021). *Impact of electronic monitoring on employees: A meta-analysis*. PsyArXiv. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/fk5ez>
- Spector, P. E., Fox, S., Penney, L. M., Bruursema, K., Goh, A., & Kessler, S. (2006). The dimensionality of counterproductivity: Are all counterproductive behaviors created equal? *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 68(3), 446–460.
- Speer, A. B. (2018). Quantifying with words: An investigation of the validity of narrative-derived performance scores. *Personnel Psychology*, 71(3), 299–333.
- Smither, J. W., & Walker, A. G. (2004). Are the characteristics of narrative comments related to improvement in multirater feedback ratings over time? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(3), 575–581.
- Tziner, A., Joanis, C., & Murphy, K. R. (2000). A comparison of three methods of performance appraisal with regard to goal properties, goal perception, and ratee satisfaction. *Group & Organization Management*, 25(2), 175–190.
- Woehr, D. J., & Huffcutt, A. I. (1994). Rater training for performance appraisal: A quantitative review. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 67(3), 189–205.

Adler (2016) Responses

- Bleckman, A. M., Guarino, S. N., Russell, W., Toomey, E. C., Werth, P. M., Whitaker, V. L., & Rudolph, C. W. (2016). The future of performance ratings: Collected thoughts from six emerging scholars. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 9(2), 334–337.
- Burlacu, G. (2016). Eliminating a quantitative measure of performance means our science is starting from square one. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 9(2), 342–343.
- Cardy, R. L., & Munjal, D. (2016). Beyond performance ratings: The long road to effective performance management. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 9(2), 322–328.
- Chawla, N., Gabriel, A. S., Dahling, J. J., & Patel, K. (2016). Feedback dynamics are critical to improving performance management systems. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 9(2), 260–266.
- Gorman, C. A., Cunningham, C. J. L., Bergman, S. M., & Meriac, J. P. (2016). Time to change the bathwater: Correcting misconceptions about performance ratings. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 9(2), 314–322.
- Howard, M. C. (2016). The relationship between the number of raters and the validity of

- performance ratings. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 9(2), 361–367.
- Hunt, S. T. (2016). Rating performance may be difficult, but it is also necessary. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 9(2), 296–304.
- Jelley, R. B. (2016). Working with social comparisons in the appraisal and management of performance. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 9(2), 288–296.
- Lake, C. J., & Luong, A. (2016). How will getting rid of performance ratings affect managers? *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 9(2), 266–270.
- Ledford, G. E., Benson, G., & Lawler, E. E. (2016). Aligning research and the current practice of performance management. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 9(2), 253–260.
- Neville, L., & Roulin, N. (2016). Genius or folly? it depends on whether performance ratings survive the “psychological immune system.” *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 9(2), 281–288.
- Rabenu, E., & Tziner, A. (2016). Performance appraisal in a constantly changing work world. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 9(2), 370–377.
- Sorcher, M. (2016). Getting rid of performance ratings. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 9(2), 367–370.
- Wallace, L. E., Stelman, S. A., & Chaffee, D. S. (2016). Ratee reactions drive performance appraisal success (and failure). *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 9(2), 310–314.
- Woehr, D. J., & Roch, S. G. (2016). Of babies and bathwater: Don’t throw the measure out with the application. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 9(2), 357–361.

7 Statement on Academic Offences

Scholastic offences are taken seriously, and students are directed to read the appropriate policy, specifically, the definition of what constitutes a Scholastic Offence, at the following Web site: https://www.uwo.ca/univsec/pdf/academic_policies/appeals/scholastic_discipline_undergrad.pdf.

Plagiarism Detection Software

All required papers may be subject to submission for textual similarity review to the commercial plagiarism detection software under license to the University for the detection of plagiarism. All papers submitted for such checking will be included as source documents in the reference database for the purpose of detecting plagiarism of papers subsequently submitted to the system. Use of the service is subject to the licensing agreement, currently between Western and Turnitin.com (<http://www.turnitin.com>).

Use of AI

The use of generative AI tools such as ChatGPT to produce written work is not permitted unless permission is granted by the instructor for specific circumstances. Any work submitted must be the work of the student in its entirety unless otherwise disclosed. When used, AI tools should be used ethically and responsibly, and students must cite or credit the tools used in line with the expectation to use AI as a tool to learn, not to produce content.

AI Policy for Psychology: Responsible use of AI is allowed in Psychology. This includes using AI for brainstorming, improving grammar, or doing preliminary/background research on a topic.

AI is **not** to be used in place of critical thinking.

The misuse of AI undermines the academic values of this course. Relying on AI to create full drafts or fabricate sources is prohibited. You are ultimately responsible for any work submitted, so it is highly advised that you critically review your Generative AI output before incorporating this information into your assignments.

If you use AI, you must clearly explain its role in your work. **All written assignments will require an AI Usage Statement**, in which you will indicate what tools you have used, what you have used them for, and (broadly) how you have modified this information. Assignments without an AI Usage Statement will not be accepted.

Violations of this policy will be handled according to Western's scholastic offense policies.

8 Accessible Education Western

Western is committed to achieving barrier-free accessibility for all its members, including graduate students. As part of this commitment, Western provides a variety of services devoted to promoting, advocating, and accommodating persons with disabilities in their respective graduate program.

Graduate students with disabilities (for example, chronic illnesses, mental health conditions, mobility impairments) are strongly encouraged to register with Accessible Education Western (AEW), a confidential service designed to support graduate and undergraduate students through their academic program. With the appropriate documentation, the student will work with both AEW and their graduate programs (normally their Graduate Chair and/or Course instructor) to ensure that appropriate academic accommodations to program requirements are arranged. These accommodations include individual counselling, alternative formatted literature, accessible campus transportation, learning strategy instruction, writing exams and assistive technology instruction.

9 Other Information

Students who are in emotional/mental distress should refer to Health and Wellness@Western <https://www.uwo.ca/health/> for a complete list of options about how to obtain help.

Western is committed to reducing incidents of gender-based and sexual violence (GBSV) and providing compassionate support to anyone who is going through or has gone through these traumatic events. If you are experiencing or have experienced GBSV (either recently or in the past), you will find information about support services for survivors, including emergency contacts at the following website:

https://www.uwo.ca/health/student_support/survivor_support/gethelp.html

To connect with a case manager or set up an appointment, please contact support@uwo.ca.

Please contact the course instructor if you require material in an alternate format or if you require any other arrangements to make this course more accessible to you.