

MScN Program, School of Nursing, York University
GS/NURS 5145 3.0 Canadian Health Care System Reform: Issues & Debates
Winter, 2018

Course Director: Jacqueline Choiniere

Office: HNES 341

Contact: 416-736-2100 ext 30010

jacchoin@yorku.ca

Calendar Course Description

The course critically examines current issues and debates in the ongoing reform of the Canadian Health Care System. The influence of global political, economic and social contexts on health reform directions are analyzed, offering nurses additional tools to assess the implications of current reform directions for those who receive and those who provide health care.

Expanded Course Description

Utilizing a critical, feminist political economy perspective, the historical development and ongoing tensions and conflicts in who receives, provides, governs and pays for health care in Canada will be examined. This course explores the influence of global political, economic and social contexts, including gender, class and race on the social determinants of health, with a particular focus on health care accessibility. This course provides MScN students with additional tools to “*understand and critique the social, cultural and political contexts in which individual, group, community and global health is lived*” (program statement), thus preparing nurses for leadership roles in health care and health policy. In promoting a critical awareness and understanding of the upstream influences on Canadian health care reform, nurses are better prepared to influence the direction of that reform.

Learning Outcomes

1. Analyze the historical and current influences of global political, economic and social contexts on the Canadian health care system;
2. Critically appraise the assumptions underlying various approaches to health system organization and reform;
3. Analyze the implications of health care reform on those who receive and those who provide care, taking gender, class, race and ethnicity into account;
4. Analyze the implications of current reform directions for different sectors within the health care system.
5. Analyze ongoing tensions in provision, governance and financing of health care in Canada.
6. More effectively engage with the systemic values, assumptions, and structures that limit possibilities for human health and healing.

Resources

There is no course textbook. There are required readings to provide critical background and analysis of the global political, economic and social forces on the social determinants of health as well as on the health care system. These readings appear in the weekly course There are also recommended readings

in the outline that may be helpful to you – particularly in your papers. In addition, you are responsible for locating and accessing the resources required to support your focus of learning in this course.

Academic Integrity

As a graduate student, you are expected to be aware of the importance of academic integrity and to be familiar with *York's Senate Policy on Academic Policy*. Violations of academic integrity have serious consequences. Ignorance of the policy does not constitute a valid defence. Before you begin the course, please read the material on Academic Honesty. If you follow the link it will take you to the FGS Academic Honesty information as well as providing an additional link to the SPARK Academic Honesty tutorial: <http://gradstudies.yorku.ca/current-students/regulations/academic-honesty/> I would strongly recommend that you carefully review the material in the Academic Honesty Tutorial that is linked. This is critically important information for all of your written work.

5. Summary of Learning Evidences and Evaluation Weightings

- Essay proposal and annotated bibliography 25%
- Facilitate seminar 20%. Once per term (depending on selected topic) the 2 (or 3) students who are assigned to that topic will jointly prepare and post an on-line presentation, based on that topic.
- Essay 35% (Each student will prepare a 15 – 18 page paper that is related to the topic area the student has selected).
- Participation 20% (The participation mark will be calculated from the strength of each students' weekly postings)

Evaluation Elements, Methods and Due Dates

Elements	Completed-by
1. Individual proposal + Annotated bibliography (25%)	Week Five, (Monday, Feb 5th at midnight)
2. Seminar Presentation with partner(s) (20%)	Weeks Six through Eleven
3. Individual essay based on your selected topic (35%).	Week Twelve (Tuesday, April 3rd at midnight)
4. Contribution to Community of Learning (20%)	Throughout the term, according to schedule,

Expanded Description of Learning Evidences

- 1) Individual Proposal + Annotated Bibliography (25%):** You are asked to prepare a proposal and an annotated bibliography for your upcoming essay outlining a reform/reform direction that you will promote (in your essay) within the specific sector that you have selected (which is also the sector that you have chosen for your presentation). Your chosen topic should reflect a current reform issue within that health care sector. You will be working with one other student to prepare a symposium presentation on reform within the sector (more detail about the presentation below), but each of you is required to submit an individual proposal/annotated bibliography and an individual essay.

So, for example (and these are only examples), if your topic area is long-term residential care, for the proposal and subsequent essay, one of you may decide to focus on the transition of residents into a long-term care residence and another may decide to focus on how to ensure quality of life/quality of care for residents. If your topic area is the acute care sector, one of you may decide to focus on the current policy of designating certain patients as requiring alternative level of care (ALC), the other one of you may decide to focus on interprofessional care. If your topic is nurses and the nursing profession, one of you may decide to focus on how reform has influenced care and what constitutes care, while another one of you may decide to focus on the changes in who provides care. **I am happy to chat with you if you have any questions about possible topic areas.** The topic you decide on for your proposal/annotated bibliography - and subsequently for the essay - is up to you. It does have to speak to the implications of reform and make suggestions for how things could be (in other words, propose a reform direction). Again, I am happy to discuss it with you should you have any questions.

Each student will prepare a 3-4-page proposal (double-spaced, 12-point font, using APA), **plus** an annotated bibliography of 6 relevant articles or policy documents (beyond course readings). The annotated bibliography should be in addition to the 3-4-page proposal. At least four of your sources must be from peer-reviewed journals. In the proposal, you should:

- Outline the problem/issue that you will address within the selected topic area.
 - This should include a brief review of what is contributing/has contributed to this problem/issue and why (I'm looking for some recognition of upstream forces here including political, social, economic forces), including why it is important that it be addressed (drawing on the literature).
- Your proposal should also present your thesis/main argument (a statement specifying what you are arguing that could/should be done). You should also provide a brief discussion of 2 to 3 sub-arguments that will support your thesis in your essay (drawing on the literature as appropriate). The expectation is not that your proposal will contain all of the sub-arguments that will appear in your essay, but that you should give the reader a sense of a few of them.
- Your annotations should be in alphabetical order, provide the full citation of the source (APA style), describe the thesis/main argument of your article, and offer a couple of sentences to indicate why it is useful for your paper. In general, you should be able to include 2 annotations per page.

Your proposal & annotated bibliography is due on February 5th, by midnight

2) Seminar Presentation/Leading Discussion with partner(s) (20%):

As described above, you will be responsible – with one other colleague (and in one case, two other colleagues) for preparing a PowerPoint presentation and leading the discussion on your topic for one of the weeks between 6-11 (inclusive). The focus within your presentation is to lead discussion/analysis about some of the issues within your topic area, the path of reform to this point, and a discussion about possible ways forward.

Your PowerPoint presentation will be the focus of discussion for the entire class for that week. Thus, in addition to the presentation, you are asked to include 3 to 4 questions that will encourage discussion. Ideally, your power point should include between 25 and 35 slides, **not** including title page and references.

Requests for topics/presentation week will be accepted on a first come, first served basis. As you will see, the topics have already been scheduled during weeks 6 to 11 (inclusive).

Requests for topics can be made starting on January 8th. Once there are 2 individuals ‘signed up’ for a topic, it will be closed until others are filled. One of the topic areas will have 3 students, but I won’t assign a third until there are two individuals in all the other weeks. To indicate a preference for a topic, email Jacqueline (jacchoin@yorku.ca) on or after January 8th.

Expectations for Posting Presentations

On the **Monday of the week you are scheduled to present** (one of weeks 6 –11), the individuals responsible for presenting and leading the symposium for that week will send their joint PowerPoint Presentation to Jacqueline jacchoin@yorku.ca **by 5PM on Monday of that week**. Jacqueline will post the presentation on line (by Tuesday morning) and set up the forum for discussion. Your PowerPoint should identify at least two key (and new) readings for the rest of the class, and include three to four critical questions for discussion. A critical question is one that focuses on an idea that is particularly meaningful or significant (as opposed to something trivial or of minor importance), and one that invites reflection, dialogue, and/or debate. Questions should enable each group member to take the lead in stimulating discussion related to their own portion of the presentation. The critical questions are intended to be the starting point for discussion. However, the group is free to take the subsequent discussion in any direction it wishes. The symposium discussions will take place between Tuesday afternoon and the following Monday afternoon.

Guidelines for PowerPoint Presentations

Your PowerPoint presentation should use the ‘*Notes Page*’ function, which allows you to provide the class with “briefing notes,” beneath each slide. To access the *Notes Page* function, look in the ‘VIEW’ menu on the top bar of the PowerPoint screen. Using the Notes Page function will let you provide more information than slides alone would allow.

Expectations and Tips for Discussion Facilitation

The students who are responsible for the symposium presentation are also responsible for initiating, facilitating and sustaining the discussion, including soliciting feedback on your presentation ideas/issues and pursuing the ideas of other students. The students in

the virtual audience are expected to engage with the presentation ideas in a substantive way.

3) Individual essay (35%):

This 15 - 18-page paper (exclusive of title page, appendices and references) will:

- Identify a problem/issue within your selected sector, how it has come to be a problem/issue, how/why the path of reform has contributed to it, why it needs to be addressed;
- Discuss how the problem/issue is linked to political, social, economic and professional contexts
- You will state your thesis – which recommends an alternative to the current reform direction, including why it is important to move in that direction for health and health care. (This is known as an argument-based essay. In other words, you are taking a position on an issue – that draws on your synthesis of the literature.
- Your paper will also include sub or supporting arguments that bolster your thesis.
- In addition, you are asked to articulate an action plan for the nursing profession and individual nurses to help achieve your recommended reform.

4) Contribution to Community of Learning (20%)

The purpose of the online discussion in this course is to create a learning community for students engaged in a variety of fields of practice. The discussion forums provide opportunities for students to respond to the topics and readings for the week and to share ideas, experiences, knowledge, and resources regarding their own personal change project. In this way each person contributes to each other's learning. Between weeks 1 and 5 (inclusive) the professor will prepare the PowerPoint presentations to introduce the topic/s for discussion. As you will see, The topics during these five weeks will discuss health care reform – as linked to upstream political, economic and social forces – with many focusing on one or more of the sectors that you will be further exploring in your presentation, your proposal/annotated bibliography and ultimately in your essay. I will set up a discussion forum for each week, where we can all share our analysis/comments.

Students are required to log on to the Moodle course discussion website and post an initial and a reply contribution to each weekly discussion. **Postings will occur between Tuesday afternoon (after the presentation is mounted) and the following Monday at 4PM.** You are expected to post an initial comment and a reply comment. **Your postings should demonstrate critical analysis and synthesis of the readings and presentation for that week.** The goal is for all to contribute to the scholarly learning community by sharing ideas, experiences, knowledge, and resources, thereby expanding opportunities for learning and mutual support. Online participation is critical to your learning since knowledge comes through the debate that occurs in scholarly dialogue.

Scholarly dialogue means conducting reflective and critical discussions in a safe and supportive environment. You postings should demonstrate your critical reflection on the presentation and readings for the week **supported by direct reference to the assigned readings and the presentation.** Please note: postings that fail to address the readings and/or presentation

for the week will not receive high marks. There will be one forum for each weekly discussion. **Your postings will be assessed according to the evaluation rubric (included in this outline).**

**** Please note: there will be no presentation posted, nor postings expected during the week of Feb. 19th to 25th**

Suggested Topics for Proposal/Annotated Bibliography/ Presentation & Essay:

- 1. Mental Health Care**
- 2. Long-term Residential Care**
- 3. Community Care**
- 4. Public Health Care**
- 5. Acute Care**
- 6. Nurses & the Nursing Profession**

These are general topic areas and you are asked to select an issue within the general topic area and focus on it for your presentation, your annotated bibliography and your essay. As you can see, 5 of the 6 topic areas deal with sectors within the health care system. The last topic on the list deals with nurses and nursing. You will see many, many discussions of these issues in both the required and the recommended readings listed later in this outline. Of course you are also expected to go beyond these readings as well.

Discussion/postings Assessment Criteria

Criteria	Maximum 2 Marks per Criterion	Maximum 1 Mark per Criterion	Failure: 0 Marks per Criterion
Participation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participates in each assigned discussion topic • Posts insightful comments and questions that prompt further discussion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participates in each assigned discussion topic, but does not post comments or questions to prompt further discussion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not participate during the assigned week
Application of Content	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Content from readings and presentations are analyzed/ incorporated into the discussion • Offers own/new interpretations of discussion material 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some content from readings is incorporated into the discussion, but does not reference source. An appropriate reference might be (Falk Rafael, p. 10.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion contains no reference to content from readings • Short perfunctory postings
Level of Analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responses demonstrate critical analysis and synthesis of content from readings and relevant course resources. • Critiques points made by other students 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responses demonstrate some analysis and synthesis of content from readings, but needs further depth and breadth 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responses are superficial and/or lack analysis and synthesis of content from readings

Evaluation Rubric for Presentation:

Criterion	Excellent	Good/Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
Substance (20)	<p>Demonstrates in-depth knowledge/ understanding of key sector issues and the relevant readings/sources;</p> <p>Demonstrates excellent, critical analysis & synthesis of key arguments/assumptions, and implications</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Relevance to health & health care - Assessment of how well issues are substantiated <p>Comprehensive policy responses identified for health and health care</p> <p>Draws on related/relevant issues from media, political events, practice experiences, to illustrate issue.</p> <p>Relevant information is included in speaker's notes (20 - 16)</p>	<p>Demonstrates knowledge & some understanding of key sector issues.</p> <p>Some analysis of key arguments/assumptions and implications of issue.</p> <p>Some potential policy responses identified for health & health care</p> <p>Reasonable link to issue from media, political events, practice evident;</p> <p>Speaker's notes are lacking in information (15 - 12)</p>	<p>Presentation fails to demonstrate knowledge/ understanding of key issues.</p> <p>Little/no analysis of key arguments/ assumptions or implications of issue</p> <p>Inadequate discussion of possible policy responses for health and health care</p> <p>Not well linked to issue from media, political events, practice evident;</p> <p>Speaker's notes are scant and confusing (11 - 0)</p>
Visual effectiveness & Clarity (10)	<p>Presentation is logically developed from introduction to conclusion and flows well with good transitions between topics/ideas</p> <p>Point of view is clearly articulated</p> <p>Precise and concise use of language in slides and notes</p> <p>No major errors in grammar, spelling, or APA format (10 -8)</p>	<p>Logic can be followed but better transitions between ideas are needed</p> <p>Point of view is discernable</p> <p>Slides/notes could be more precise/ concise</p> <p>Few errors in grammar, spelling, or APA format (7)</p>	<p>Presentation is choppy and disjointed</p> <p>Point of view is unclear</p> <p>Clumsy use of language; overly busy slides and notes</p> <p>Major errors in grammar, spelling, or APA format (6 - 0)</p>
			Overall Score

Marking Rubric for Proposal/Annotated Bibliography and Essay:

Criteria	C Conditional	B to A- Satisfactory to Very Good	A to A+ Excellent to Exceptional
<p>Communication Grammar, Spelling, Sentence Structure Logical Flow, Adherence to APA Guidelines, Clarity, Use of Language, Originality, Voice of Writer apparent</p>	<p>Quite a few errors and problems in grammar, expression, logical flow, APA.</p> <p>Could benefit from help from Writing Centre to improve technical aspects of writing.</p>	<p>Some errors evident but expression is logical and coherent.</p> <p>More attention to Proofreading / Wider vocabulary will improve quality and expression.</p>	<p>Almost / Completely technically flawless. Voice / Experience of author comes through. Sophisticated use of language / sentence structure.</p>
<p>Thinking & Inquiry Able to grasp and respond to elements of the essay question. Organizes, synthesizes ideas, and concepts. Develops questions to extract meaning and significance of literature and personal experience.</p>	<p>Missing key element/s.</p> <p>Overly descriptive. Weak integration of relevant literature in exploring problems/ issues/ processes.</p> <p>Cursory/no synthesis (of various sources/ conclusions)</p> <p>Critical thinking not evident/not developed.</p>	<p>All elements of the essay are included.</p> <p>Integrates and synthesizes a limited / range of literature.</p> <p>Raises questions in order to evaluate helpfulness of the literature</p> <p>Good level of critical thinking evident.</p>	<p>Integrates, synthesizes and critiques wide range of literature.</p> <p>Goes beyond course content to utilize additional literature including content from group presentations.</p> <p>Offers original observations and raises significant questions that have potential to enable incisive critique.</p>
<p>Understanding and Application Utilizes concepts, models, theories processes information and knowledge arrived at through questioning to form compelling conclusions, solve problems, generate alternatives and provide critique.</p>	<p>Concepts, models, theories and processes are weakly described and little or no attempt to apply them to “real” situations is apparent, and application is insufficiently supported / elaborated.</p>	<p>Concepts, models theories and processes are described and good application to real situations is evident.</p>	<p>Utilizes a firm grasp of the literature and course concepts to create a framework to situate own understanding and application.</p> <p>Writing evidences ability to generate alternatives to “what is”, thus generating new possibilities for being and action.</p>

Comments:

Grading:

Grades will be reported in accordance with the Faculty of Graduate Studies' system:

A+	(90 – 100)	(Exceptional)
A	(85 - 89)	(Excellent)
A-	(80 – 84)	(High)
B+	(75-79)	(Highly Satisfactory)
B	(70 – 74)	(Satisfactory)
C	(60 – 69)	(Conditional)
F	(0 – 59)	(Failure)
I		(Incomplete)

For further information please see: <http://www.yorku.ca/grads/calendar/facultyregulations.pdf>

Expectations for written work:

In the following, you can see the importance of critical analysis, logical flow, structure, and content to the grade you will earn. Also, writing style is important so please review the APA-related files posted in Moodle before submitting any assignments.

A+ Exceptional: Thorough knowledge of concepts and/or techniques and exceptional skill or great originality in the use of those concepts/techniques in satisfying the requirements of an assignment. It is outstanding work of exceptional quality. Content is complete, accurate, and at a high level; consistently strong in structure, expression, mechanics (grammar, punctuation, and spelling), and presentation. The paper is well organized, linkages are evident, and the conclusions are logical. It demonstrates an excellent comprehension of the subject; sound critical and analytical thinking; innovative ideas on the subject. Contains original and credible arguments or presentation of the assigned topic with attention to perspectives; excellent use of the literature; draws on a wide range of current and/or relevant sources that serve as the foundation of arguments/proposals. There is evidence of much effort and personal involvement with the topic. Writing style is clear and succinct with correct use of grammar, punctuation, spelling, and referencing format. Errors of expression are infrequent and do not detract from the assignment's effectiveness.

A- to A High to Excellent: Thorough knowledge of concepts and/or techniques together with a high degree of skill and/or some elements of originality in satisfying the requirements of an assignment. Other attributes are similar to "A+" assignment. The principle difference between an "A+" and an "A" assignment is that the grader can find very few or no areas for improvement in an "A+" assignment.

B to B+ Satisfactory to Highly Satisfactory: Good to thorough knowledge of concepts and/or techniques together with a fairly high degree of skill in the use of those concepts/techniques in satisfying the requirements of an assignment. Good to very good quality work with no major weaknesses. Well focused on the topic; clear; explicit; discussion shows more than adequate comprehension of the subject. Some degree of critical and analytical thinking; some use of the literature; most details and perspectives are discussed, but considerations of additional ones would have improved the assignment. Displays some evidence of personal involvement with the topic. In most cases, writing style is clear and succinct with correct structure, grammar, punctuation, spelling, and correct use of referencing format. Errors of expression are occasional rather than chronic and do not obscure meaning.

The principle difference between an “A-” assignment and a “B+” assignment is in the quality of the discussion. A “B” grade is a competent assignment of good quality with no major weaknesses; similar to a “B+” assignment, but with evidence of a lesser degree of critical and analytical thinking.

C Conditional: Less than satisfactory level of knowledge of concepts and/or techniques together with some skill in using them to satisfy the requirements of an assignment. A less than adequate assignment, it might include fair comprehension of the subject, but some weaknesses in content and/or structure. Discussion is vague even though on topic; important details or perspectives are left out. Minimal use of the literature; minimal evidence of critical and analytical thinking; transitions may be inconsistent; evidence may be occasionally unconvincing or incomplete. At times lacks clarity and succinctness and/or minimal evidence of personal involvement with the topic. Occasional/many errors in structure, grammar, punctuation, spelling, and referencing format, but not so serious or chronic that the assignment is difficult or impossible to understand.

The principle difference between an “B” assignment and a “C” assignment is in the quality of the discussion with the “C” assignment being more vague than the “B” assignment. A “C” assignment may have more errors in structure etc. than are acceptable in a “B” assignment.

Weekly Schedule

Week	Topic	Readings
Week 1 Jan 8 -14	Introduction: Setting the context Introducing perspective & assumptions How do we understand upstream pressures? In particular, how do we understand health reform directions? What is Neoliberalism? What are the tensions and conflicts in accountability demands?	Navarro, V. 2008. Neo-liberalism and its consequences: The world health situation since Alma Ata. <i>Global Social Policy</i> , 8(2): 152-155. Navarro, V. 2009. What we mean by social determinants Of health. <i>International Journal of Health Services</i> , 39(3): 423-441. Hart, J. T. (2004). Health care or health trade? A historic moment of choice. <i>International Journal of Health Services</i> , 34(2) 245-254. Choiniere, J. A. (2011). Accounting for care: Exploring tensions and contradictions. <i>Advances in Nursing Science</i> . 34(4): 330-344.
Week 2 Jan 15-21	More about how these upstream pressures “play out” in health care What are the tensions and contradictions regarding reform directions? What are the tensions when it comes to evidence, patient-centred, what gets valued? How does gender make a difference?	Adams, V., & Nelson, J. A. (2009). The economics of nursing: Articulating care. <i>Feminist Economics</i> , 15(4), 3-29. Varcoe, C. & Rodney, P. (2009). Constrained Agency: The Social Structure of Nurses' Work. In B. Singh Bolaria & H. D. Dickinson (Eds.) <i>Health, Illness and Health Care in Canada</i> (pp. 122-151). Toronto: Nelson Education Ltd. http://ezproxy.library.yorku.ca/login?url=http://www.library.yorku.ca/binaries/Steacie/nurs5145/varcoerodney.pdf Norlyk A., Haahr A., Dreyer P., & Martinsen B. (2017). Lost in transformation? Reviving ethics of care in hospital cultures of evidence-based healthcare. <i>Nurs Inquiry</i> . 24(3). 2017;24:e12187. https://doi.org/10.1111/nin.12187
Week 3 Jan 22-28	Racism/Racialization, Gender & Class What are the intersections? What are the implications for health and health care? What policies and practices could make a difference? How do we understand structural violence? What does it have to do with health care, with nursing?	Anderson, J.M. (2006). Reflections on the social determinants of women’s health exploring intersections: Does racialization matter? <i>Canadian Journal of Nursing Research</i> , 38 (1): 7 – 14. Armstrong, P. 2001. Evidence-Based Health-Care Reform: Women’s Issues. In P. Armstrong, H. Armstrong & D. Coburn (Eds.), <i>Unhealthy Times: Political Economy Perspectives on Health and Care in Canada</i> (pp. 121-145). Toronto: Oxford University Press. http://ezproxy.library.yorku.ca/login?url=http://www.library.yorku.ca/binaries/Steacie/nurs5145/armstrong.pdf

		<p>Rankin, J.M. (2015) The rhetoric of patient and family centred care: an institutional ethnography into what actually happens. <i>Journal of Advanced Nursing</i> 71 (3), 526–534. doi: 10.1111/jan.12575</p>
<p>Week 4 Jan 29-Feb 4</p>	<p>How do we understand current reform directions in different sectors?</p> <p>How can we make changes to improve it?</p>	<p>Armstrong, H., Daly, T., Choiniere, J. (2017). Policies and Practices: The Case of RAI-MDS in Canadian Long-Term Care Homes. In Barken, R., & Davies, M.J. (Guest editors). 'Re-imagining the House of Old: Promising Practices in Canadian Long-term Residential Care.' <i>Journal of Canadian Studies</i>, 50(2).</p> <p>Choiniere, J., MacDonnell, J., Campbell, A., & Smele, S. (2014). Conceptualizing structural violence in the context of mental health nursing. <i>Nursing Inquiry</i>, 21(1), 39-50.</p> <p>Pederson, A. & Liwander, A. (2012). Primary care for women in Canada. In P. Armstrong, B. Clow, K. Grant, M. Haworth-Brockman, B. Jackson, A. Pedersen and M. Seeley (Eds.) <i>Thinking Women and Health Care Reform in Canada</i> (pp. 47-75). Toronto: Women's Press. http://ezproxy.library.yorku.ca/login?url=http://www.library.yorku.ca/binaries/Steacie/nurs5145/pedersenliwander.pdf</p>
<p>Week 5 Feb 5 -11</p> <p>proposal & annotated bibliography due on February 5th, by midnight</p>	<p>How do we understand current reform directions in different sectors?</p> <p>How can we make changes to improve it? (cont.)</p> <p>Proposal and annotated bibliography due Feb. 10th 5PM</p>	<p>Teghtsoonian, K. (2009). Depression and mental health in neoliberal times: A critical analysis of policy and discourse. <i>Social Science & Medicine</i>, 69: 28–35.</p> <p>Grenier, A. (2003). Unhinging the Assumptions within Independence: Toward Broader Conceptualization of Diversity and Difference in Home Care. <i>Canadian Review of Social Policy</i> 51: 29-48.</p> <p>Falk-Rafael, A. (2005). Speaking Truth to Power: Nursing's Legacy & Moral Imperative. <i>Advances in Nursing Science</i>, 28(3): 212–223.</p> <p>Kontos, P. C., Miller, K. L., Mitchell, G. J. (2010). Neglecting the importance of the decision making and care regimes of personal support workers: A critique of standardization of care planning through the RAI/MDS. <i>The Gerontologist</i>. 50(3): 352-62.</p>

Week 6 Feb 12 - 18	Student Symposium presentation	Long-term residential care (Readings to be circulated prior to presentation)
Week 7 Feb 26–Mar 4	Student Symposium presentation	Mental Health Care (Readings to be circulated prior to presentation)
Week 8 March 5 - 11	Student Symposium presentation	Public Health Care (Readings to be circulated prior to presentation)
Week 9 Mar 12 -18	Student Symposium presentation	Community Health Care (Readings to be circulated prior to presentation)
Week 10 Mar 19 -25	Student Symposium presentation	Acute Care (Readings to be circulated prior to presentation)
Week 11 Mar 26 – Apr1	Student Symposium presentation	Nurses & the Nursing Profession (Readings to be circulated prior to presentation)
Week 12 April 2 - 8	Wrapping it up	Readings TBA

6. Recommended Reading: While these readings aren't required, you will find them quite useful for your seminar presentation and essay.

Accreditation Canada. (2010). *Canadian Health Accreditation Report: Through the Lens of Qmentum - Exploring the Connection between Patient Safety and Quality of Worklife*. Ottawa, ON: Accreditation Canada

Aiken, L.H. et al. (2002) "Hospital Nurse Staffing and Patient Mortality, Nurse Burnout, and Job Dissatisfaction," *Journal of the American Medical Association*. 288: 1987-93.

Anderson, J. M., Rodney, P., Reimer-Kirkham, S., Browne, A. J., Khan, K. B., Lynam, J. (2009). Inequities in Health and Healthcare Viewed Through the Ethical Lens of Critical Social Justice: Contextual knowledge for the global priorities ahead. *Advances in Nursing Science*, 32 (4), 282–94.

Banerjee, A., Daly, T., Armstrong, P., Armstrong, H., Szebehely, M., Lafrance, S. (2012). Structural violence in long-term, residential care for older people: Comparing Canada and Scandinavia. *Social Science & Medicine* 74: 390-98.

Baumann A., O'Brien-Pallas, L., Armstrong-Stassen, M., Blythe, J., et al (2001). *Commitment and care: The benefits of a healthy workplace for nurses, their patients and the system*. Ottawa: Canadian Health Services Research Foundation (CHSRF).

Bridges, W. (1991). *Managing transitions: Making the most of change*. Reading, MA: Perseus Books.

Coughlan, R. and L. Ward (2007) "Experiences of Recently Relocated Residents of Long-Term Care Facility in Ontario: Assessing Quality Qualitatively," *International Journal of Nursing Studies* 44(1): 47-57.

Dee, V., Poster, E. (1995, August). Applying Kanter's theory of innovative change: the transition from a primary to attending model of nursing care delivery. *Journal of American Psychiatric Nurses Association*, 1(4), 112-119.

Doran, D., Mildon, B., & Clarke, S. (2011) Towards a national report card in nursing: A knowledge synthesis. *Canadian Journal of Nursing Leadership* 24(2), 38-57.

- Duxbury, L. & Higgins, C. (2001). *Work-life balance in the new millennium: Where are we? Where do we need to go?* Ottawa: Canadian Policy Research Networks.
- Evans, R.G. (2012). A casualty in the class war: Canada's Medicare. *Healthcare Policy*. 7(3). Feb.
- Falk-Rafael, A. (1999). The politics of health promotion: Influences on public health promoting nursing practice in Ontario, Canada from Nightingale to the nineties. *Advances in Nursing Science* 22(1).
- Garcia, V. H., Meek, K. L., Wilson K, A., (2011). Advancing innovation in health care leadership. *Nursing Administration Quarterly* 35(3), 242-247.
- Hagey, R., Choudhry, U., Guruge, S., Turritin, J., Collins, E., & Lee, R. (2001). Immigrant nurses' experience of racism. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship*, 33, 389-394.
- Lindberg, C. & Clancy, T. R. (2010). Positive deviance: an elegant solution for a complex problem. *Journal of Nursing Administration* 40(4), 150-153.
- Lowe, G. S. (2002). High-quality health care workplaces: A vision and action plan. *Hospital Quarterly* 5(4), 49-56.
- Mulvale, G., Chodos, H., Bartram, M., MacKinnon, M.P., Abude, M., 2014. Engaging Civil Society through Deliberative Dialogue to create the first Mental Health Strategy for Canada: Changing Directions, Changing Lives. *Soc. Sci. Med.* 123,262e268
- Ontario Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care (2010) Excellent Care for All. Toronto, Ontario:
http://www.health.gov.on.ca/en/ms/ecfa/pro/ecfa_act.aspx
- Public Health Agency of Canada. (2017). The chief public health officer's report on the state of public health in Canada, 2017: Designing Healthy Living. Retrieved from: <https://www.canada.ca/en/public-health/services/publications/chief-public-health-officer-reports-state-public-health-canada/2017-designing-healthy-living.html>
- Rankin, J. (2009). The nurse project: An analysis for nurses to take back our work. *Nursing Inquiry*. 16 (4): 275-286.
- Ray, K., De Cicco, J., Lefebvre, N (2011). More time where it matters; Improving work environments in home health care nursing. *Canadian Journal of Nursing Leadership* 24(1), 37-46.
- Registered Nurses Association of Ontario (2002). Toolkit: Implementation of clinical practice guidelines. Toronto, Canada: Registered Nurses Association of Ontario.
- Semeniuk, P., Mildon, B., Purkis, M.E., Thorne S and P Wejr (2010), The BC Educator pathway collaborative framework: Creating the foundation for nursing education capacity. *Canadian Journal of Nursing Leadership* 23(2), 47-59.