

**CONSENT AGENDA  
to the Open Agenda of the 600<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Board of Governors**

**Thursday, February 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2017  
Room 2440R River Building, Carleton University**

**4.1 ITEM(S) FOR APPROVAL**

**4.1.1 Approval of minutes of the previous meeting and Business arising from the Minutes**

- a) Approval of the Open Session Minutes of the 599<sup>th</sup> meeting on December 1, 2016.

**4.2 ITEM(S) FOR INFORMATION**

**4.2.1 Committee Minutes**

- a) Building Program Committee
  - 147<sup>th</sup> Meeting, November 9<sup>th</sup>, 2016
  - 148<sup>th</sup> Meeting, November 25<sup>th</sup>, 2016
- b) Community Relations and Advancement Committee
  - 101<sup>st</sup> Meeting, November 22, 2016
- c) Finance Committee
  - 285<sup>th</sup> Meeting, September 20, 2016
  - 286<sup>th</sup> Meeting, November 15, 2016

**4.2.2 Minutes from Senate Meeting**

- Approved Minutes from October 2016 Senate meetings were circulated in advance.

**4.2.3 Cyclical Review Reports**

- a) Bachelor of Humanities Program
- b) MA in Religion and Public Life Program
- c) Undergraduate and Graduate Program in Sociology

**Minutes of the 599<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the  
Board of Governors**

**Thursday, December 1, 2016 at 4:00 p.m.  
Room 2440R River Building, Carleton University**

<b>PRESENT:</b>	Dr. F. Afagh	Mr. K. Evans (phone)	Mr. G. Owens
	Mr. F. Alhattab	Mr. D. Fortin (phone)	Dr. R. O'Reilly Runte
	Ms. D. Armstrong (phone)	Ms. C. Gold (phone)	Dr. E. Sloan
	Mr. M. Bueckert	Mr. O. Javanpour	Ms. C. Switzer
	Dr. C. Carruthers (Chair)	Mr. I. Lee	Mr. A. Tattersfield
	Ms. G. Courtland	Dr. P. Merchant	Mr. A. Ullett
	Ms. L. A. Daly	Mr. J. Nordenstrom	Ms. L. Watson
	Mr. J. Durrell (phone)	Dr. B. Örmeci	Mr. B. Wener (phone)
		Ms. J. Ostrajanskiy	Mr. M. Wernick (Vice Chair)
<b>REGRETS:</b>	Ms. D. Alves	Mr. D. Craig	Ms. R. Thompson
			Mr. N. Nanos
<b>STAFF:</b>	Ms. S. Blanchard	Dr. R. Goubran	Ms. B. Springer
	Dr. M. Butler	Mr. S. Levitt	Ms. J. Sugar
	Ms. J. Conley	Dr. M. Neufang	Mr. T. Sullivan
	Mr. N. Connolly	Mr. M. Piché	Mr. T. Stewart
	Mr. D. Cumming	Dr. P. Ricketts	Mr. J. Tomberlin
	Ms. A. Goth		Mr. B. Winer

---

**OPEN SESSION**

**1. CALL TO ORDER AND CHAIR'S REMARKS**

The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. and welcomed all attendees, guests and observers. The Open Session was live-streamed to Southern Hall 617 and was audio recorded for the purpose of accuracy of the minutes.

**2. DECLARATION OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

The Chair asked for any declarations of conflict of interest from the members. There was one conflict of interest on Agenda Item 5.3.3 declared by Mr. Owens.

### **3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

It was requested by Mr. Bueckert to add an emergency motion related to supporting the Neuroscience Department the Chair suggested it be discussed under Agenda Item 5.3.3.

Mr. Tattersfield moved, and it was seconded by Mr. Javanpour, that the agenda be approved as presented. The motion carried.

The Chair asked for a moment of silence for Mr. Wes Nicol who was a significant supporter of Carleton University.

### **4. APPROVAL OF THE CONSENT AGENDA**

The Chair noted that the Nominating Committee's Terms of Reference will be reviewed by the Governance Committee to formalize student membership.

Ms. Daly moved, and it was seconded by Ms. Watson, that the Open Consent agenda with the exception of the item 4.1.2 Finance Committee Terms of Reference be approved. The motion carried.

Mr. Bueckert moved that the Finance Committee Terms of Reference be amended with the composition of the committee to include one undergraduate and graduate student and consultations with students and other stakeholders during the budget process. There was no seconder to the motion.

It was indicated that changes to Terms of Reference should go to the Governance Committee.

The budget process is an open process that is developed over a period of months across campus. Faculty and staff discuss their needs and priorities with their Department Chairs which are then discussed with the Deans and Directors and at Faculty Board. The budget priorities then go to the Vice-Presidents. There are then budget hearings and the budget is built on these discussions. The budget is then submitted to the Board of Governors Finance Committee which recommends to the Executive Committee and then the Board. Students can submit items to their Chairs and Directors for consideration. Students can also make appeals during the open hearing which will be organized in the New Year.

The Finance Committee were tasked with looking at the consultation process for the budget. The principle of consulting with stakeholders is one that is supported and will be looked at and brought back to the Board.

Mr. Tattersfield moved, and it was seconded by Mr. Nordenstrom, that the Finance Committee Terms of Reference be approved, as presented. The motion carried.

## 5. ITEM(S) FOR APPROVAL

### 5.1 Sexual Violence Policy

The Sexual Violence Policy, a feedback report entitled: *Community Update: Sexual Violence Policy*, and feedback received since the Community Update report were circulated prior to the meeting. Ms. Blanchard and Ms. Sugar were invited to give a verbal presentation summarizing the process for creating the policy.

The Feedback Report included responses to all the feedback submitted and heard in October 2016. There were 140 individual submissions of feedback as well as feedback from CUPE 2424, CUASA, GSA and student groups.

Training, education and resources will be examined as of January 2017. The University is committed to offering students the resources needed and recently a counsellor with experience in trauma and sexual violence counselling has been added to the Health and Counselling Services team.

Ms. Sugar, Ms. Blanchard and Mr. Levitt were congratulated on their work on the policy and the wide-ranging amount of consultation done during its creation.

Mr. Evans and Dr. Sloan followed the policy development on behalf of the Board of Governors since September 2016. They were both aware of the feedback being received from the community and noted that concerns were often conflicting. The policy represents the best possible document to address concerns of the community and to stay within the legislation of the province.

It was asked if a representative from Equity Services was at the Board meeting and if they support the policy being presented. Ms. Sugar responded that the policy is jointly owned between the Office of the Vice-President (Students and Enrolment) and Equity Services and that they support the policy being presented although they were not present at the meeting.

It was asked if there were an assurance that the policy will be revisited before the three year mandatory review period. Ms. Blanchard responded that there is a need to have the policy in place for a certain period of time before it can be reviewed. If there is something that is totally not working in the process then a review would address that particular part of the policy. An annual report to the Board is built-in the policy.

A Governor asked if the OVPSE has responded to the “Response to the Community Update on the Sexual Violence Policy” document from CUASA, SUPE 2424, CUPE 4600, and the

GSA dated November 23, 2016. Ms. Sugar responded that they have not had the chance to meet with the groups since November 23, 2016 but will be meeting with representatives from the unions and student groups following this meeting.

A Governor asked about the process for the submission of the policy to the Ministry and if they have the authority to scrutinize/approve the policy? Amendments to the MTCU Act and the corresponding regulations require the university to have the procedures and protocols in the policy. Formally the Government will not be reviewing the policies of the universities but we are legally required to have the policy in place meeting the requirement of the statute and the regulations by January 1, 2017. There are information requirements for reporting to MTCU and there are groups through COU which are working on how the reporting will be done in January. There is a requirement to report to the Board which is part of the policy.

A Governor asked if the policy could be challenged in a court of law. It could be if the complaint or the respondent asked for a judicial review application if they were not happy with the result after going through the Review and Appeal Committees.

Mr. Tattersfield moved, and it was seconded by Ms. Daly, that it be resolved that the Sexual Violence Policy as presented to this meeting and without any amendment is hereby approved and adopted by the Board of Governors. It was carried with three apposed (Mr. Owens, Mr. Bueckert and Mr. Alhattab).

## 5.2 Board Community at Large Member for Search Committee for the Vice-President (Research and International)

Nimal Rajapakse resigned as of November 1, 2016 and Rafik Goubran is Interim Vice-President (Research and International). The Vice-President (Research and International) Search Committee is being formed and two Community-at-Large members from the Board are needed to serve on the committee. The search will be a full external search but internal candidates will be considered.

Dr. Runte moved, and it was seconded by Mr. Lee, to approve Dr. Merchant and Mr. Nordenstrom as the Community-at-Large members for the Search Committee for the Vice-President (Research and International) Search Committee, as presented. The motion carried.

### 5.3 Approval of Building Designs

#### 5.3.1 Schematic Design for the new School of Business Building

A presentation was given to the Building Program Committee on the conceptual design on November 9<sup>th</sup>, 2016 for the new the Nichol Building which will house the School of Business. It was approved for recommendation to the Board.

There was a discussion regarding enrolment and faculty hiring in the Sprott School of Business and the rationale for adding the Nichol Building to campus. Enrolment has been on an upward trend since 2005. The building would also add much needed additional teaching space for the entire campus. No underground parking will be included with the building and the parking area currently in front of the University Centre will be removed to create a quad. The parking garage was constructed with this in mind.

Ms. Watson moved, and it was seconded by Dr. Sloan to approve the Schematic Design for the new School of Business Building, as presented. The motion carried.

#### 5.3.2 Design Concept for the Student Commons Building Addition

The conceptional design of the Student Commons Building Addition was approved for recommendation to the Board at the November 7<sup>th</sup>, 2016 Building Program Committee meeting. The project will add approximately 75,000 sq ft. and will cost approximately \$38 million. Mr. Alhattab thanked administration for their support on this project. The addition is an exciting opportunity for future students and will add more study space, lounge space, and food options for students. CUSA will be holding a plebiscite to ask students to decide on a motion to fund the project, which will involve a \$40 increase in fees per semester once the building is completed. If the referendum results are in favour of funding the addition for both CUSA and GSA, a design team will be hired and the actual design plan will return to the Building Program Committee.

The Chair of the Finance Committee requested that in the next set of approval and control documents, the Cost Estimate be checked for consistency.

Mr. Alhattab moved and it was seconded by Mr. Lee to approve the design concept for the Student Commons Building Addition subject to funding, as presented. The motion carried.

### 5.3.3 Final Design of the Carleton University Institute for Advanced Research and Innovation in Smart Environments (ARISE) Building

The project is to repurpose the existing Life Sciences Building to create the Carleton University Institute for Advanced Research and Innovation in Smart Environments (ARISE). The project has received Strategic Investment Funding (SIF) from the federal government and must meet the requirements of the funding agreement. One of the requirements is substantial completion by April 30, 2018.

The original design brought to the Building Program Committee was sent back for reconsideration and on November 25<sup>th</sup>, 2016 the Building Program Committee approved for recommendation to the Board the final design of the ARISE Building. The Board was assured that the normal process was followed for the approval of the final design even under the reduced timeframe. Pre-qualification for general contractors went out on November 13<sup>th</sup>, the tender for a general contractor will not go out until January 2017 and the performance standards for the construction will be followed; promptly and effectively according the building code.

Ms. Watson moved and it was seconded by Mr. Javanpour to approve the Final Design of the Carleton University Institute for Advanced Research and Innovation in Smart Environments (ARISE) Building and the related funding, as recommended by the Building Program and Finance Committees. The motion carried.

Mr. Bueckert moved and it was seconded by Dr. Ormecci that the Board of Governors of Carleton University direct senior administration, including the President, Vice-President (Academic) and Provost, Vice-President (Finance & Administration) to meet with faculty, staff and students of the Department of Neuroscience to re-open the agreement with the University of Ottawa to develop a comprehensive plan for moving labs currently located in the Life Sciences Research Building in the best interest of these campus stakeholders and that the labs in the Life Science Research Building not be moved until a plan for the move is developed and agreed upon to the satisfaction of all parties. The motion was defeated.

There was a discussion regarding the Neuroscience Department's move to the University of Ottawa Smyth location. The Board was reassured that the entire administration including the Dean of Science is doing everything possible to make the move with as little disruption as possible to teaching and research.

### 5.4 Approval of Funding for Design and Documentation of the new School of Business Building

The Finance Committee met on November 15<sup>th</sup>, 2016 and had a presentation from the Dean of the Sprott School of Business on the business case and the enrolment statistics

for the school. The Finance Committee approved the recommendation to the Board for funding the design and documentation up to two million dollars.

Mr. Wener moved and it was seconded by Dr. Merchant to approve on recommendation of the Finance Committee, the Funding for Design and Documentation of the new School of Business Building up to two million dollars, as presented. The motion carried.

#### 5.5 Approval of Consent to Act As A Governor

The Consent to Act As A Governor document was circulated to the Board prior to the meeting for consideration as recommended by the Governance Committee. The document differs from the Code of Conduct because the Code of Conduct outlines the duties and conflict of interests of a Governor and the Consent to Act As A Governor is a procedural document that records the Governors consent as a qualified Governor and Member, consent to participate via telephone or electronically and abide by the Bylaws of the Board. The consent document would be required to be signed at the beginning of a Governor's term while the Code of Conduct would be signed annually. The requirement for a photograph was discussed and it was stipulated that the photograph will be optional.

Mr. Evans moved and it was seconded by Mr. Javanpour to approve the Consent to Act As A Governor Document with #6 as optional, as presented. The motion carried.

### **6. ITEM(S) FOR DISCUSSION**

#### 6.1 Enrolment Report

S. Blanchard and M. Neufang gave a presentation on the enrollment numbers as of November 1, 2016.

Highlights from the presentation include a 1.5 % increase in undergraduate enrolment overall and a 2% increase of new first-year students. The full-time undergraduate students enrolled in degree programs increased by 1.9% and the two-year retention rate remains stable.

Highlights from the graduate statistics included an increase in Masters, PhD and international graduate programs. The number of students in the Masters program increased in three out of five Faculties and the other two Faculties remain stable. At the PhD level, the number of students increased in four out of five Faculties.

There was a thoughtful discussion about student transportation to campus and international student recruitment. Ms. Blanchard and Dr. Neufang were both congratulated on their recruitment success.

**7. ITEM(S) FOR INFORMATION**

7.1 Report from the President

a) Strategic Integrated Plan Update

The Eastern Ontario Economic Development Task Force is under the Community Outreach and Entrepreneurial Outreach parts of the Strategic Plan. The Task Force is developing a Workforce Development Strategy and is engaged with municipal and community services. There are nine educational institutions working together including: Algonquin College, College La Cité, Fleming College, Loyalist College, University of Ottawa, Queen's University, St. Lawrence College, Trent University and Carleton University. These institutions offer hundreds on online courses relevant to individuals developing careers in the municipal or community sector and they have been put together in one accessible location. Discussions are continuing on how to package the courses to meet specific needs of the municipalities and communities. Additional tasks include: i) modeling and simulation of all the former manufacturing and large facilities not being used in Eastern Ontario to repurpose to economic, community and cultural development; ii) improvement of transportation for small regions; iii) micro-co-op emporium between the municipalities/communities and colleges and universities. Companies will submit a problem to solve and a group of interdisciplinary students will solve a particular issue and then move to another company.

b) Provincial Planning Update

The new funding formula from the province of Ontario will likely include: corridors for enrolment, a new tuition framework, provincial requirements, and an updated Strategic Mandate Agreement.

The enrolment corridor needs to be met. International students and certificate programs would not be counted in the targets.

The tuition fee framework is likely to be announced in the coming weeks.

The Strategic Mandate Agreements (SMA) with the province are also up for negotiation. The specific requirements and instructions for the SMA should be coming in December.

7.2 Committee Chair Updates

Building Program Committee had nothing additional to report.

Community Relations and Advancement Committee met on November 22, 2016 where there was discussion around the Board Award Jury and criteria, and an update from Advancement and Communications. There was also an update on the Sexual Violence Policy and a presentation from Mr. Nicholas Connolly on the new Mental Health framework. There was a report from Alumni and Donor Relations on the Alumni Mentors Program which is mentioned as a good opportunity for Board members. Giving Tuesday was a great success raising \$172,000 which was well above the \$150,000 goal.

Finance Committee met on November 15, 2016 where there was a report on the enrolment numbers, building updates including the energy-retro fit, modernization and the capital projects.

Governance Committee had nothing to report since last meeting and will have its next meeting in January 2017.

**8. OPEN-QUESTION PERIOD**

There were no questions.

**9. END OF OPEN SESSION AND BRIEF NETWORKING BREAK**

It was moved by Mr. Tattersfield and seconded by Mr. Ullett that the Board of Governors adjourn the Open Session at 6:53 p.m. The motion carried.

**Minutes of the 147<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Building Program Committee  
Wednesday, November 9, 2016 at 4:00 p.m.  
Room 2440R, River Building**

**MINUTES**

<b>Present:</b>	Mr. D. Craig, Chair Mr. J. Durrell, Vice-Chair Dr. R. O'Reilly Runte Dr. C. Carruthers	Mr. F. Alhattab Dr. B. Örmeci Mr. A. Ullett Ms. L. Watson
<b>Guests:</b>	B. Wener S. Hariri D. Pontarini	D. Meinhard R. Davies D. Bryden
<b>Regrets:</b>	Ms. G. Courtland Dr. P. Ricketts	Mr. M. Wernick
<b>Staff:</b>	Ms. S. Blanchard Mr. D. Boyce Ms. A. Goth Dr. R. Goubran	Ms. K. Hutchence Mr. S. Levitt Mr. M. Piché

**1. CALL TO ORDER AND CHAIRMAN'S REMARKS**

The meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m. The Chair thanked the committee members for attending the first meeting of the new academic year. The Chair stated that we will continue to send materials to committee members one week prior to the meeting.

**2. DECLARATION OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

The Chair asked if anyone on the committee felt the need to declare a conflict of interest regarding any of the items on the agenda. There were no declarations.

**3. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

It was moved by Mr. Durrell and seconded by Dr. Örmeci that the agenda be approved as presented. The motion carried.

**4. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES AND BUSINESS ARISING**

The minutes of the 146<sup>th</sup> meeting were circulated prior to the meeting. It was moved by Ms. Watson and seconded by Mr. Ullett that the minutes be approved, as presented. The motion carried.

## **5. ITEMS FOR APPROVAL**

### **5.1 Business School Schematic Design**

Mr. Boyce introduced the design architects to the committee: Mr. Hariri, Mr. Pontarini and Mr. Meinhart. The architects presented the design to the committee, stating that it focused on the energy of interaction. The design includes adaptable space, moveable furniture, flexible classrooms, and a green roof. The committee expressed strong support for the beautiful design. Dr. Runte added that the business school also supports this design. The Chair thanked the architect for their design and they departed.

It was moved by Ms. Watson and seconded by Dr. Carruthers to approve the Schematic Design for the new School of Business Building. The motion carried.

The Chair added that the approval is conditional on enrolment increases at the Sprott School of Business and a full business case. The next step is for the design to be presented to the Finance Committee for review and consideration of funding for the development of a tender-ready design and documentation.

### **5.2 ARISE Building Final Design**

Mr. Boyce introduced the ARISE Building Final Design. The project is to repurpose the existing Life Sciences Building. The project has received Strategic Investment Funding (SIF) from the federal government and must meet the requirements of the funding agreement. One of the requirements is substantial completion by April 30, 2018.

Mr. Boyce introduced the design team: Mr. Davies and Mr. Bryden. The architects presented the design that was distributed to committee members with the meeting materials. The committee was disappointed with the design, primarily the building's exterior "skin".

For the project to stay on schedule it must go out for tender in January. The building space is needed for research and classes. The Master Plan includes a functional purpose for this building. The committee discussed the consequences of failing to support this plan. It was suggested that the design team use the feedback from the committee to come back with a new "skin" design.

It was moved by Mr. Durrell and seconded by Mr. Ullett to have the design team return to the committee within three weeks with a new design for the ARISE Building. The motion passed.

### **5.3 Student Commons Addition Concept Design**

Mr. Boyce introduced the Student Commons Addition Concept Design to the committee. The project is a joint project with the Carleton University Students' Association (CUSA), and it is in the concept stage, with no funding commitment yet. The motion is a decision to support the idea of an addition, not the design. If

the Board supports the concept, CUSA can hold a plebiscite to ask students to decide on a motion to fund the project, which will involve a \$40 increase in fees per semester once the building is completed. If the referendum results are in favour of funding the addition, a design team will be hired and the actual design plan will return to this committee.

It was moved by Mr. Durrell and seconded by Mr. Ullett to approve the Design Concept for the Student Commons Building Addition. The motion carried.

## **6. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION**

### **6.1 Review of Committee Work Plan**

The Chair received committee support for the annual work plan.

### **6.2 Report on Deferred Maintenance/Minor Capital Projects**

This was provided to the committee before the meeting. There were no questions.

### **6.3 Update on Renewal Projects (including five-year plan)**

The Chair stated that the Dunton Tower elevator replacement is scheduled for next year.

### **6.4 Federal Infrastructure Update**

Mr. Boyce stated that the ARISE and infrastructure projects were submitted for funding. In the end, Carleton will receive \$22 million plus almost another \$4 million to use towards projects with an estimated cost of \$50 million.

### **6.5 Review Committee Terms of Reference**

The committee terms of reference were distributed prior to the meeting. The oversight of maintenance was brought forward as an issue and the Chair replied that maintenance is a management issue. Mr. Piché stated that his office is designing better indicators to measure and manage performance. He also acknowledged that concerns need to be communicated to the right people, so that appropriate action can be taken. The committee determined that maintenance and repair issues that are identified by staff need to be dealt with by management to determine if contractors are accountable.

### **6.6 Apartment Building Opportunity**

Mr. Piché stated that last year significant work was designated to a new residence project that was put on hold for multiple reasons. His office has received an unsolicited approach by a design team to use their plans for an apartment building. Mr. Piché asked the committee if there is interest in considering this project to use for a more upscale housing option for graduate students, visiting professors, international students and others. The committee discussed a number of options but all agreed a proposal was worth considering. The committee asked Mr. Piché to return to this committee with a presentation.

**7. OTHER BUSINESS**

There was none.

**8. ADJOURNMENT**

It was moved by Mr. Ullett and seconded by Ms. Watson that the meeting adjourn at 6:05 p.m. The motion carried.

**Minutes of the 148<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Building Program Committee  
Friday, November 25, 2016 at 4:00 p.m.  
Robertson Hall Room 617**

**MINUTES**

<b>Present:</b>	Mr. D. Craig, Chair Mr. J. Durrell, Vice-Chair Dr. R. O'Reilly Runte Dr. C. Carruthers	Mr. F. Alhattab Mr. A. Ullett Ms. L. Watson
<b>Guests:</b>	R. Davies	D. Bryden
<b>Regrets:</b>	Ms. G. Courtland Dr. B. Örmeci	Mr. M. Wernick
<b>Staff:</b>	Ms. S. Blanchard Mr. D. Boyce Ms. A. Goth Dr. R. Goubran	Mr. S. Levitt Mr. M. Piché Dr. P. Ricketts

**1. CALL TO ORDER AND CHAIRMAN'S REMARKS**

The meeting was called to order at 4:10 p.m. The Chair thanked the committee members for their attendance.

**2. DECLARATION OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

The Chair asked if anyone on the committee felt the need to declare a conflict of interest regarding any of the items on the agenda. There were no declarations.

**3. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

It was moved by Mr. Craig and seconded by Mr. Durrell that the agenda be approved as presented. The motion carried.

**4. ITEMS FOR APPROVAL**

**4.1 ARISE Building Final Design**

Mr. Boyce introduced the design team: Mr. Davies and Mr. Bryden. The design team focussed on the articulation and materials of the façade of the building. In terms of articulation, the revised design included more visual interest, more glazing, an increase in public space, a more pronounced entry point, a view

straight through the building to the river, and a continuous bench along the front of the building.

The committee was presented with three options for materials:

1. Metal Panel – Muntz Metal (Copper and zinc material). This metal will change colour over time. Views of the colour change were shown from year one to year fifteen.
2. Metal Panel – Zinc. This is similar material to that used in the Richcraft Building
3. Unitized Curtain Wall

The preferred option by the design team of option one – Metal Panel – Muntz Metal was supported by the committee. It was noted that the material is durable and contextually correct for the campus.

The committee was presented with renderings of each side of the building as well as two interior views.

The design was well liked by the committee. There was a question to the design team regarding the upper level and if it could be “popped-out” to help relieve the vertical perception of the building.

Mr. Davies and Mr. Bryden departed from the meeting.

It was moved by Mr. Craig and seconded by Mr. Durrell to approve the final design for the Carleton University Institute for Advanced Research and Innovation in Smart Environments (ARISE) Building. The motion carried.

The utilities box on the top of the building was noted as not visually appealing. The material used on the utilities box is aluminium so that it blends in with the colour of the sky.

Falling ice was raised as a concern. It was stated that there is no place on the building for ice to accumulate and thus there should be no falling ice.

The lay-down areas for the contractor will be between the Life Science building and Loeb and between the Life Sciences Building and Hertzberg. There may also be some room on the north side of the building.

The committee raised the following questions with Mr. Boyce:

1. Will pedestrian and traffic circulation modifications adjacent to the new building be done to ensure a satisfactory experience for the community?

Yes. The sidewalk will be widened to nine feet (from the current 5.5 feet) and traffic circulation will improve as road width will be consistent with the rest of the road.

2. Is the project budget adequate to deliver the revised concept and site redevelopment as presented?

There will be additional costs for the building exterior, we are currently working on a 66% design estimate and will manage the scope of the project accordingly.

3. Are the project timelines included adequate allowance for vacating the existing building and labs, tender document preparation, tendering and award through Merx and construction to meet the Infrastructure Funding deadline?

Yes. Adequate time is included in the project timeline for vacating the existing building and labs by March 1<sup>st</sup>, 2017. Delay in vacating the building will affect our ability to have the building substantially completed by the infrastructure funding deadline. A prequalification has been started for the mechanical and electrical on the building which is a three-week process.

4. Can a complex renovation and addition project such as this be delivered without undue risk through a stipulated price construction contract?

Yes. The design documents will be in good shape when we tender in January and this will help keep the project on schedule and on budget. A tender for a General Contractor should be awarded in February so that they can start March 1. The thirteen-month timeframe may result in a compression premium.

## **5. OTHER BUSINESS**

There was none.

## **6. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 4:51 p.m.



**Carleton**  
UNIVERSITY

Canada's Capital University

**Minutes of the 101<sup>st</sup> Meeting of the Community Relations  
and Advancement Committee**

**Tuesday, November 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2016  
Room 2440R, River Building**

<b>Present:</b>	Ms. L. Daly, Chair	Mr. G. Owens
	Mr. N. Nanos, Vice-Chair	Dr. R. O'Reilly Runte
	Dr. C. Carruthers	Dr. E. Sloan
	Mr. D. Fortin (phone)	Ms. C. Switzer
	Ms. J. Ostrajanskiy	
<b>Staff:</b>	Ms. S. Blanchard	Ms. A. Goth
	Ms. J. Conley	Dr. R. Goubran
	Mr. D. Cumming	Mr. S. Levitt
<b>Regrets:</b>	Mr. J. Nordenstrom	Mr. M. Wernick
	Ms. R. Thompson	
<b>Guest:</b>	Mr. N. Connolly (staff)	Mr. M. Savenkoff (staff)
	Mr. R. Davies (staff)	Ms. J. Sugar (staff)
	Mr. B. Richardson (phone)	Mrs. J. Teron

---

**1. CALL TO ORDER AND CHAIR'S REMARKS**

The meeting was called to order at 1:31 p.m.

**2. DECLARATION OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

There was none.

**3. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

It was moved by Mr. Owens and seconded by Dr. Sloan that the Community Relations and Advancement Committee approve the agenda of the meeting of November 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2016. The motion carried.

#### **4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

It was moved by Dr. Runte and seconded by Mr. Owens that the Community Relations and Advancement Committee approve the minutes of the meeting of October 11th, 2016. The motion carried.

#### **5. BUSINESS ARISING**

There was none, however, it was noted that the donation forms were changed to permit greater flexibility as requested.

#### **6. ITEMS FOR DELIBERATION**

##### **a. Board Award Jury and Criteria**

The proposed 2016/17 Carleton University Board of Governors Award for Outstanding Community Achievement was circulated prior to the meeting.

Last Board year the award criteria were updated to include recognition of the spirit of student volunteerism and substantial community contribution both on- and off-campus while at Carleton University.

The revised criteria circulated added the ability for the Chair of the Board and the Chair of the CR & A to assign designates.

The Board Award Jury will consist of Dr. Sloan (faculty representative), Ms. Switzer (staff representative), Mr. Owens (undergraduate representative), Ms. Ostrajanskiy (graduate representative), and Nik Nanos (CR&A Representative and Chair of the Jury). A designate for the Chair of the Board will be decided prior to the next Board meeting.

The Board Office will oversee the call for applications with the assistance of the Department of University Communications for advertising in January 2017.

There was a discussion about the overall CGPA of 7 (B-) or higher and the possible need to increase the CGPA for the applicants. It was felt at this time there was not a need to change the CGPA since most applicants have quite high CGPAs.

It was moved by Mr. Owens and seconded by Ms. Switzer that the Community Relations and Advancement Committee approve and recommend that the Board of Governors approve the Board Award Criteria and 2016-17 Jury as discussed. The motion carried.

b. Committee Terms of Reference and Work Plan for 2016-2017

It was moved by Ms. Switzer and seconded by Dr. Sloan that the Community Relations and Advancement Committee approve and recommend that the Board of Governors approve the Terms of Reference and Work Plan for 2016-2017 as discussed. The motion carried.

## **7. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION**

a. Department of University Advancement Update (Mr. Fortin, Ms. Conley, Mr. Savenkoff, and Mr. Davies)

A report entitled Collaborate: The Carleton University Campaign Report for the Community Relations and Advancement Committee was circulated prior to the meeting. General comments included: the cover of the report pays tribute to Richcraft Hall; the campaign total has improved since last meeting (increase by approximately \$8.3 million); there have been innovations with the planned giving program and the entire Board of Governors is invited to the Advancement Holiday Reception on December 1, 2016.

i. Campaign Summit

The Campaign Summit was very successful with excellent attendance. All of Senior administration were able to attend, the Deans were well represented. Ms. Conley gave an update on the campaign. Michael Sinkus (consultant from Marts&Lundy) also gave an update, indicating that the campaign is pacing well but there is a high level of intensity required to meet the campaign goal of \$300,000,000. There was also a discussion about the involvement of the Board of Governors acting as champions for the campaign.

It was also mentioned that Mr. Nanos gave a successful lecture at the Leadership Luncheon called "Making Sense of the 2016 US Presidential Election" and made a direct request for support for the G. Stuart Adam Graduate Award in Journalism.

ii. Alumni & Donor Relationships

Mr. Savenkoff was welcomed to give a presentation. Much of the work of Alumni and Donor Relations feeds into the Relationship pillar, specifically in support of the following goals: 25,000 unique donors, and 1,250 volunteers. Engaged alumni are twice as likely to give to the university and, their life timing giving is nearly four times that of a non-engaged graduates.

Records are kept of alumni participation and engagement including: event attendance (12,911 in 2015-2016) and volunteer activity (1,089 cumulative volunteers during the life of the campaign as of November 2016).

An Alumni Mentors program was also created which has had 221 mentors and 401 mentees. The satisfaction rates for 2015-2016 were 89% for mentors and 91% for mentees. 84% of mentees said the program helped them advance in their professional development goals. The program saw a 30% growth in participation between its first and second year.

We are looking for ways to demonstrate the impact of donations and have asked students to help us say "thank you" to our donors. On "Thank You Thursday", December 1, 2016, students will be helping to say "Thank You" to our donors. Recently nearly 900 customized/personalized endowment reports were sent to donors who established endowments including: five dynamic fields, over 200 included personalized message of thanks directly from students, and dozens were either hand-delivered or had personalized notes included from Advancement staff.

In support of Carleton's 75<sup>th</sup> Anniversary, Carleton will be hosting over 150 events, anniversary projects and conferences. Carleton has also signed an MOU with the Ottawa 2017 Bureau which is the group organizing the many events and projects in Ottawa in 2017 to celebrate Canada's 150<sup>th</sup> anniversary. January 18<sup>th</sup>, 2017 will be the official launch event of Carleton Universities 75<sup>th</sup> Anniversary. June 18<sup>th</sup>, 2017 is the founding day of Carleton University and a special event will be held at the Château Laurier where the original, founding papers were signed.

There was a question about the breakdown of number of alumni mentors by faculty for 2016-2017. Subsequent to the meeting Mr. Savenkoff provided the following numbers:

- Sprott School of Business = 24 mentors
- Faculty of Arts and Social Science = 31 mentors
- Faculty of Public Affairs = 54 mentors
- Faculty of Engineering and Design = 37 mentors
- Faculty of Science = 13 mentors

iii. Advancement Communications

Mr. Davies made a presentation on Advancement Communications. Digital innovation in online giving has increased. Graduates prefer to give to specific initiatives, something that resonates personally with them and they like to contribute on line. FutureFunder introduced crowd funding built from a grassroots level and made Carleton the first university to do so..

Since the initial investment into FutureFunder that are four times as many gifts (860 online gifts this year alone).

The goal for Giving Tuesday this year is \$150,000. For each donation up to \$1,000 there is a match of funds.

Mr. Davies was congratulated on his work with online engagement with alumni and donors.

b. Communications Update (Mr. Cumming)

i. Issues being managed

The current issues being managed include:

a) The provincial initiative to introduce sexual violence policies on campuses across Ontario with many schools finalizing their policies within the next month to meet the January 2017 deadline.

b) The Research InfoSource ranking were released in October. As noted at last meeting Carleton's ranking increased from one position from 24<sup>th</sup> to 23<sup>rd</sup> spot.

c) The Maclean's rankings were also issued in October. As the former Vice-President (Research and International) noted in previous presentations to the Board, Carleton's position varies from year to year in this ranking but remains essentially at the same place in the rankings.

A question was raised if the Maclaren's ranking is as important as it was in the past? It is one tool for parents and student to consider when

choosing a school but is usually not the driver. The main driver for parents and students in picking an institution to attend is usually the quality of the programs offered and/or a visit to campus. Any ranking has to be put into perspective.

ii. Issues on the horizon

The current issues on the horizon include:

a) Collective bargaining with Teaching Assistants and Contract Instructors which is ongoing

b) The cost of tuition remains an important issue for universities and students across Ontario.

c) The Province is expected to release a new tuition framework, possibly by the end of 2016.

d) Similarly, a new provincial Funding Formula will be presented to Cabinet, with the sector learning about final recommendations by December 2016 or January 2017.

iii. Shopify Update

An article entitled “Carleton Students Take on Shopify Internships” was circulated prior to the meeting. The article outlines the unique partnership between Carleton and Shopify. The Shopify internships will see students splitting their time between Carleton’s campus and Shopify’s downtown headquarters throughout their four-year Bachelor of Computer Science program. They will learn both in the classroom and by doing hands-on work with Shopify paying a salary to cover their tuition as well. A tremendous effort was put forward by the academic administrators who reached this special agreement with Shopify and the Department of University Communications (DUC) played a role over many months to plan the communications and launch of the program. This is a great news story for Carleton and a terrific example of showcasing our partnerships and what can be achieved with our partners in Ottawa. Committee members were encouraged to share this story with others.

iv. Profile – Chair of the Board of Governors

An article entitled “A Collection of Communities” was also circulated prior to the meeting. The story emphasized the role of volunteer

members on the Board and what motivated the current Chair to volunteer his time on the Board, his experiences at Carleton and the role of the Board in stewarding the university. The article profiles Dr. Chris Carruthers and was written by Carleton's senior writer Dan Rubinstein. It was also agreed that it was important to introduce a summary report of the key decisions from the Board meetings and to share that report internally with groups on campus which began in September 2016. Dr. Carruthers was thanked for his time to meet with the writer to help in the creation of this article. The article will be profiled on the Carleton homepage today.

v. Notable Metrics

*A Digital and Social Media Metrics: October 2016 Highlights* report was circulated to the Committee prior to the meeting. The first item is the Shopify announcement which provided a huge reputational bump for Carleton when Prime Minister Trudeau issued a tweet about the partnership to his 2.17 million followers.

There was a milestone moment when our NSERC funding announcement for the Matthew Johnston's research into Cleaner Fossil Fuels was granted. Ministers Catherine McKenna and Kirsty Duncan were both on campus for this announcement along with the President of NSERC. DUC organized an on-site social media campaign in collaboration with the Minister's Office resulting in some impressive numbers including: over 52,000 impressions occurred on Facebook, Twitter and Instagram and both Minister's retweeted the news on their accounts.

Carleton Universities 75<sup>th</sup> (CU75) planning continues. At the last CR&A meeting Mr. Cumming reported that the CU75 reputation campaign would be launching across campus. Through our digital advertising and engagement strategy: we reached over 500,000 people on Facebook and Instagram; There were over 12,000 page views on the CU75 site; and more than 1,200 people took part in our engagement quiz, answering questions related to the content on our CU75 site.

Prime Minister Trudeau visited Carleton campus on November 1, 2016. DUC discovered this the evening before his visit. The Prime Minister was welcomed by our President before addressing the Accessible Canada National Youth Forum and taking students' questions. Carleton tweeted the President's photo with the Prime Minister (photo taken by MaryAnne Pomainville) which was seen by more than 23,000. As a result of one

tweet, Carleton's newsroom account was lead trending account for the Ottawa area that day.

DUC, Human Resources and Computer and Communication Services are launching a brand new "Intranet" service for faculty and staff in the coming weeks to improve our internal communications which has been under development since last year. The President has suggested this might be a topic that we may present to the full Board in the New Year.

c. Student Services and Engagement Update (Ms. Blanchard)  
i. Sexual Violence Policy (Ms. Blanchard and Ms. Sugar)

Ms. Blanchard and Ms. Sugar gave a verbal presentation on the Sexual Violence Policy along with an update on feedback which was circulated to the committee prior to the meeting.

The Feedback Summary is response to all the feedback submitted and heard in October 2016. There were 140 individual submissions of feedback as well as feedback from CUPE 2424, CUASA, GSA and student groups.

Training, education and resources will be examined as of January 2017. The University is committed to offering students the resources needed and to show this commitment a counsellor with experience in trauma and sexual violence counselling has been added to the Health and Counselling Services team.

Ms. Sugar and Ms. Blanchard were congratulated on their work on the feedback summary and the incorporation of the changes to the document.

A committee member about the response to the feedback summary was from the community stakeholders? There were a few emails in response to the feedback summary which included thanks to the OVPSE and pleasure with the robust document created. There are a few questions and outstanding issues with some groups. Ms. Sugar will be meeting with them in the coming weeks.

There was a question about when the revised policy would be released to the Carleton community? The regular process for policy approval will be followed and the policy will be posted to the University Secretariat University Policies website following board approval.

Promotional material about the policy is being created including an infographic with the main points of the policy, and a handout to navigate the policy. It was suggested the a "5 things everyone should know about the Sexual Violence Policy" might be shared with Board members to help them communicate with stakeholders.

It was asked, what would happen if the policy was not approved at the Board meeting on December 1, 2016? Essentially the Board would have to continue to meet during December to come to a decision on the policy as it must be approved by January 1, 2017 in accordance with government legislation.

ii. Mental Health (Mr. Connolly)

Ms. Blanchard and Mr. Connelly gave a presentation on the Student Mental Health Framework 2.0. The current services offered through the OVPSE were outlined including: counsellors and mental health practitioners at Health and Counselling Services, programming in Health and Counselling Services, initiatives with community partners, establishment of the Student-at-Risk Evaluation Team, Creation of Manager of Student Care and Support position, alcohol, drug and sexual violence strategies, Paul Menton Centre, From Intention to Action, and mental health training.

The framework engages students in the conversation about mental health and creates an environment that supports positive mental health and provides a wide range of programs and services.

There were five different elements in the initial mental health framework and, working with the students, version 2.0 was created. There are 39 recommendations for implementation over the next five years. The first phase has six priorities including: an environmental scan (programming and services); person-centered workshops; wellness website; stepped guide for student support; peer support programming and skills for well-being. The environmental scan will help to identify what is already occurring on campus. The person-centered workshops are potentially a new initiative that has not been seen in Canada. The students will be helping each other and developing solutions that can be implemented e.g. walking group. The wellness website will be built from the environmental scan starting in December 2016 to provide information, tools and resources in one place so students can match their concern with a solution. The skills of well-being will be learning about coping strategies for the issues they are facing. The students helped prioritize the initiatives for 2017.

The Mental Health Framework 2.0 started last September and took a full academic year to produce in collaboration with students. The final product is very different from the initial framework. Students were very engaged.

A question was raised concerning the consideration given to how we will track the success of the framework? The student engagement in the creation of the framework has helped with tracking success and the chief evaluation tool is the timeline that is acting like a roadmap for the framework. All initiatives are also being tested by students as they are rolled out.

A question was asked about the number of health care professionals on campus and the wait time? Health and Counselling Services have a mental health triage nurse that will see patients right away and do an assessment. The nurse will assess if a general practitioner (GP) is needed or a psychologist referral and the urgency. A student would be seen by a nurse and/or GP right away and referred to a psychologist.

It was asked if the services available to students are also available to faculty and staff? Faculty and staff do not have access to counselling but can use the Employee and Family Assistance Program (EFAP).

## **8. OTHER BUSINESS**

There was none.

## **9. ADJOURNMENT**

It was moved by Mr. Owens and seconded by Ms. Switzer that the Community Relations and Advancement Committee adjourn until the next meeting.



**Carleton**  
UNIVERSITY

**Canada's Capital University**

**Minutes of the 285<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Finance Committee  
Tuesday, September 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016 at 1:30 p.m.  
Room 2440R, River Building**

**Present:** Mr. B. Wener, Chair  
Ms. D. Armstrong, Vice-Chair  
Dr. R. Runte  
Dr. C. Carruthers  
Mr. N. Nanos  
Ms. C. Gold (phone)  
Mr. J. Nordenstrom  
Ms. C. Switzer  
Dr. F. Afagh

**Staff:** Ms. A. Goth  
Mr. S. Levitt  
Mr. M. Piché  
Ms. S. Blanchard  
Dr. P. Ricketts  
Mr. T. Sullivan  
Mr. T. Lackey  
Ms. A. Marcotte  
Mr. B. Winer

**Guests:** Mr. A. Newman (KPMG)  
Mr. R. Clayton (KPMG)

**Regrets:** Mr. M. Wernick

---

**1. CALL TO ORDER AND CHAIRMAN'S REMARKS**

The meeting was called to order at 1:30 p.m.

**2. DECLARATION OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

The Chair asked if anyone on the Committee felt the need to declare a conflict of interest regarding any of the items on the agenda. No conflicts were declared.

**3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

It was moved by Dr. Afagh and seconded by Dr. Carruthers that the agenda be approved, as presented. The motion carried.

#### **4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

##### **4.1 Minutes of the previous meeting**

Minutes of the 284<sup>th</sup> Finance Committee were circulated. It was moved by Dr. Carruthers and seconded by Ms. Armstrong that the minutes be approved, as presented. The motion carried.

#### **5. ITEM(S) FOR DELIBERATION**

##### **5.1 Review of Committee Terms of Reference**

There were minor changes to the Terms of Reference for the Finance Committee to reflect changes in the Board of Governors Bylaws. The document will be finalized with all changes indicated and distributed to the committee.

##### **5.2 Review of Finance Committee Work Plan**

The Work Plan for 2016/2017 Board Year was distributed to the committee for review. The April 14<sup>th</sup> date should be changed to April 12. The document will be finalized with the date change and distributed to the committee.

#### **6. ITEM(S) FOR INFORMATION**

##### **6.1 Review of the Financial Report for 2015/2016 Fiscal Year**

Mr. Piché made a presentation to the Committee. Of particular note, a special pension contribution of \$30 million was made on March 31, 2016 to reduce the solvency deficit. There has been significant growth in the Faculty of Science and in the Faculty of Engineering and Design. There has been a decline in enrolment in the Faculty of Arts but less than the national average. This may be due to the opportunity for all Arts students to have co-op placements. Ancillary operations finished the year with a surplus, from regular operations, of \$1.3 million.

There was a thoughtful discussion about tuition fees, scholarships, ELBA funding and the pension fund.

##### **6.2 Update on 2016/17 Operating Budget**

Ms. Blanchard gave a brief report to the committee. The 2016-17 budget has a projected decrease of 1% in full-time first year students on November 1 2016. Based on current registrations, we are projecting our new first year full-time November 1 number to increase by 1.9%. It is early in the term and we may still have some fluctuations in that number. There are quite a few initiatives to keep students in full-

time studies. The Bachelor of Arts has seen a slight increase likely due to the Communications and Media Studies program which attracted 50 students. Also the historical Bachelor of Arts enrolment did not decrease this academic year. The Sprott School of Business enrolment decreased last year and they are conducting a competitive analysis for Sprott programs specifically. It was noted that Masters and PhD student domestic enrolment has increased.

Mr. Piché gave a verbal report to the committee. The Major Capital Projects are continuing and include: Health Sciences Building, Business School Building, University Centre Addition, ARISE Building, and Cogeneration Facility. The Health Sciences building has the structure complete, exterior cladding underway and will be substantially completed by the end of July 2017. Mr. Piché will check if there is a penalty clause for late completion. The deferred maintenance projects also continue and include: MacOdrum Library, Steacie Building, Herzberg Building, Loeb Building, CTTC Building, Tunnel System, Glengarry House, Mackenzie Energy/Renewal, and Minto Energy/Renewal.

### 6.3 Review of Insurance Report

Mr. Lackey spoke briefly to the Report which was circulated in advance.

It should be noted that the fiscal year for insurance is different from that of the university. The premiums decreased by 2.5%, liability increased and the liability claims doubled from three to six in the last year. CURIE is the claims-based premium application. There was a medium increase in non-CURIE claims. The FTEs and property insurance increased. The Risk Assessment will come forward to the Finance Committee in April 2017. There will be close work between the Communications and IT departments in regards to IT and cyber security.

## 7. **IN-CAMERA SESSION**

An in-camera session was held.

## 8. **OTHER BUSINESS**

No additional business was raised.

## 9. **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

**Minutes of the 286<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Finance Committee  
Tuesday, November 15<sup>th</sup>, 2016 at 1:30 p.m.  
Room 2440R, River Building**

<b>Present:</b>	Mr. B. Wener, Chair Dr. F. Afagh Dr. C. Carruthers Mr. N. Nanos	Dr. R. Runte Mr. J. Nordenstrom Ms. C. Switzer
<b>Staff:</b>	Ms. S. Blanchard Ms. A. Goth Dr. R. Goubran Mr. D. Leveque Mr. S. Levitt Ms. A. Marcotte	Ms. N. Merriman Mr. M. Piché Dr. J. Tomberlin Mr. T. Sullivan Ms. B. Springer Mr. B. Winer
<b>Regrets:</b>	Ms. D. Armstrong, Vice-Chair Ms. C. Gold	Mr. M. Wernick

---

**1. CALL TO ORDER AND CHAIRMAN'S REMARKS**

The meeting was called to order at 3:59 p.m.

**2. DECLARATION OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

The Chair asked if anyone on the Committee felt the need to declare a conflict of interest regarding any of the items on the agenda. No conflicts were declared.

**3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

It was moved by Dr. Carruthers and seconded by Mr. Nordenstrom that the agenda be approved, as presented. The motion carried.

#### **4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

##### **4.1 Minutes of the previous meeting**

Minutes of the 285<sup>th</sup> Finance Committee were circulated. It was moved by Mr. Nordenstrom and seconded by Ms. Switzer that the minutes be approved, as presented. The motion carried.

##### **4.2 Business Arising from the Minutes of 285<sup>th</sup> Finance Committee**

###### **4.2.1 Business Arising from Agenda Item 6.2 Update on 2016/17 Operating Budget**

Mr. Piché was to check if there is a late penalty clause for the late completion of the Health Sciences Building. Mr. Piché reported back to the committee that there is no late termination penalties on the contract. If a late penalty clause is included in contracts it creates a different form of negotiations and in the end, is usually counter productive. It adds additional costs to the project and creates risks on both sides of the contract. As a matter of usual course there is not a late termination penalty (late delivery) on building projects.

#### **5. ITEM(S) FOR APPROVAL**

##### **5.1 Review of Committee Terms of Reference**

The Terms of Reference for the Finance Committee were circulated. It was moved by Mr. Nanos and seconded by Mr. Nordenstrom that the Terms of Reference for the Finance Committee be approved, as presented. The motion carried.

##### **5.2 Review of Finance Committee Work Plan**

The Work Plan for 2016/2017 Board Year were circulated. The Concert Hall and Residence Building are to be removed from the Work Plan for the November 15<sup>th</sup> meeting. It was moved by Dr. Runte and seconded by Ms. Switzer that the Work Plan for the Finance Committee be approved with above correction. The motion carried.

#### **6. ITEM(S) FOR DELIBERATION**

##### **6.1 Financial Overview 2016/2017**

Mr. Piché made a presentation to the Committee. The presentation included the Audit and Finance Committee schedule for 2016/2017, a financial overview for 2016/2017 (budgeting operating revenues, expenditures, enrolment overview, financial viability, restricted reserve fund, deferred maintenance/capital renewal

projects, pension plan overview, endowment fund investments), performance indicators, and the planning framework for 2017/2018.

#### *Financial Overview*

In March 2017, the Vice-President (Finance and Administration will provide a update on the 2017-2018 operating and ancillary budgets, part of which will be a mid-year review of the expenditures and revenues.

The November 1, 2016 enrolment numbers confirmed a growth in full-time students, contrary to the April 2016 assumption of a 1% decrease in enrolment based on the projected 18-year-old population in Ontario. Currently the budget is enrolment driven and with increased enrolment there is revenue increases. Faculties are given Enrolment-Linked Budget Allocation (ELBA) incentives to reward increased enrolment.

Reserve funds will be used for deferred building maintenance, capital renewal projects and special payments (solvency relief) to the pension plan.

The Deferred Maintenance Projects Plan was outlined from 2015/2016 to 2020/2021 which included updating and renewing various facilities on campus.

The current going-concern deficit for the Pension Plan is \$93 million and the solvency deficit is \$226 million. The Government of Ontario approved the application for stage two solvency relief for the Carleton University Pension Plan in May 2014 with special payments of \$9.7 million annually for three years ending in June 30, 2017. Subsequently the relief was extended on October 31, 2016 and it is estimated that special payments will increased to approximately \$14.7 million for seven years starting July 1, 2017. Without the solvency relief from the government the special payments are estimated to be \$41 million annually. The relief provides stability to the university to manage the budget. The Ontario government in 2016 announced a solvency funding review led by David Marshall. The review is to provide a permanent solution to the solvency deficit and will likely be released in two years. The review is looking at the entire funding framework and one consultation paper has been released so far with another to be released shortly.

The investment return on the endowment funds was outlined. If there are surpluses to the budget a recommendation on how to allocate the funds will come to the Finance Committee for recommendation to the Board.

#### *Performance Indicators*

Updates were given on the short-term targets for teaching excellence, research excellence, student centered and organizational excellence indicators.

It was noted that the first year enrolment (international) is an average of all students and is a better representation of the current level of enrolment. The university has limited funding for graduate students and has room to grow in enrolment in this area which is 2 % below provincial target. With regard to research, Carleton increased to

in ranking the top 5 which is up from the top 7 but would like to reach the top 3. The Student Satisfaction Survey exceeded the target (still on upper 50% percentile) and there was an improvement on the graduate side of the survey. The target is to be in the top third. There is a concerted effort to make services user friendly for graduate students. The capital campaign indicator we are doing well but need to work hard to achieve the ultimate target of \$300 million.

There was a thoughtful discussion regarding the upcoming Strategic Mandate Agreement (SMA) negotiations.

## 6.2 Planning Framework for 2017/2018

Mr. Piché gave a verbal report to the committee. The planning framework is difficult to discuss because there is so much uncertainty in regards to the provincial funding framework which will likely be negotiated with the SMA. It is likely that there will be a funding corridor for each institution, a new tuition fee framework and changes to the rules on the pension liability deficit. All this considered, there will be a significant impact on how the university moves forward into the 2017/2018 budget cycle. A change in provincial government leadership in 2018 may also have an impact on funding at universities. The goal is to maintain a balanced budget that will permit progress towards institutional priorities as outlined in the Strategic Integrated Plan. Carleton has volunteered for the pilot project for net tuition billing with the province.

## 6.3 Investment Report

Ms. Springer spoke briefly to the Report which was circulated in advance.

The reports on performance of the Endowment Fund are for periods ending on June 30, 2016. Subsequent to this date there have been changes to the fund. The General Endowment represented over 90% of all endowed funds. The remaining 10% are composed of special endowments which include: The Eric Sprott School of Business Endowment, Sprott Bursary, and Jarislowsky Fraser Chair in Water and Global Health. There are five managers that monitor and report on the investments and they also do the same for the pension funds. The managers include: Phillips, Jager and North (PJ&N) are a division of RBC and MFS Intuitional Advisors and Sprott Asset management.

The total endowments had a good quarter shown in Exhibit A of the working paper. The five-year annualized number is 1%. Since the inception of the endowments the growth is 11 % with strong returns. There have been periods of extreme volatility which have been dealt with appropriately.

In June, a recommendation was made to the Board of Governors Executive Committee to rebalance the endowment assets which included termination of the

Sprott Asset Management (SAM) mandate in the General Endowment as well as the SAM hedge fund mandate of the Sprott School Endowment. The process of effecting this change took place over the third quarter of 2016. The funds received were reallocated to PH&N and MFS. Brookfield has been hired to look after the infrastructure mix to increase contributions up to 15%. The General Endowment went from \$192 million to \$200.6 million

ACTION: It was asked how much the university endowment has received in new donations. Betsy Springer to report back to the committee.

#### 6.4 Strategic Investment Fund – ARISE, Energy Retrofit & Modernization of Facilities

The Strategic Investment Fund (SIF) was negotiated last summer and approved in September 2016 for an upgrade to the existing Life Sciences building which will be renamed the Carleton University Institute for Advanced Research and Innovation in Smart Environments (ARISE) Facilities. The building must be substantially completed by April 30, 2018 to be eligible for the federal government. The final design was presented to the Building Program Committee on November 9, 2016 feedback was provided and the design team is producing an alternative design for the façade which will be presented to the Building Program Committee on November 25, 2016. The alternative design may increase the overall cost of the building. In the meantime, the project needs to move forward and a request was made to the Finance Committee for \$1 million for go forward with tender-ready documentation for January 2017. If the approval is not done in this fashion which is unusual, there will be a delay in the tender ready status of the building. The consequences of not getting approvals at the Board of Governors meeting on December 1, 2016 is the potential loss of the SIF funding.

It was moved by Dr. Carruthers and seconded by Mr. Nordenstrom to recommend to approve the expenditure of \$1 million for the creation of tender ready documentation for the ARISE Building on the condition that the Building Program Committee approve the Final Design of the building. The motion carried.

An update was given on the energy retrofit and modernization of facilities at Carleton University including an outline of the total project value and the breakdown of SIF Funding (\$9.1 million), Provincial Funding – FRP (\$3.9 million) and University Funding (\$5.8 million).

#### 6.5 Capital Projects Update

A Capital Projects update including financial estimates from 2015/2016 to 2020/2021 was given to the Committee for information. The report included all major capital projects underway and the deferred maintenance projects currently underway. Some of the projects outlined are also included in the SIF funding as well. The University

Centre Addition's conceptual design was approved at Building Program Committee meeting and the design drawings will be provided to CUSA for consideration in connection with the student referendum to be held on December 6 and 7, 2016.

#### 6.6 Proposed Business Building Project

The conceptual design of the proposed Nicol Business Building were approved at the Building Program Committee meeting. The conceptual design cost \$400,000 and there is a request for additional funding to move forward to the detailed design.

Dr. Tomberlin spoke to the building design and distributed a presentation and supporting documentation. The building design was well liked because it will stand out as a distinctive building on campus but will also fit in with the overall building design on campus. It would be one of the most unique business school buildings national and potentially internationally. The stand-alone building for business will help attract students and increase enrolment. The design drawings were taken to the Ontario University Fair and created a lot of "buzz" with parents and students. Information sessions for the Spratt School of Business have increased by 100% from last year. Facilities that would be available in this building will influence students' decisions on what university to attend. The trends in enrolment since 2005 were outlined with overall growth. There is an increase in enrolment in the business school in comparison to the province. The addition of the new building will also help alleviate some of the space constraints for teaching space on campus. The new building will have classrooms that are designed for the new ways that professors are teaching including interactive and moveable space. A dedicated building for business will send a clear message that the business school is a priority for the university and will lead to greater enrolment and attract new faculty.

It was moved by Dr. Runte and seconded by Mr. Nanos to recommend the approval of the funding for the development of tender-ready design and documentation at a cost not to exceed \$2.2 million for the Spratt School of Business Building, as presented. The motion carried.

### **7. IN-CAMERA SESSION**

An in-camera session was held.

### **8. OTHER BUSINESS**

No additional business was raised.

### **9. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:30 p.m.



*Carleton University acknowledges and respects the Algonquin people, traditional custodian of the land on which the Carleton University campus is situated.*

**Carleton University Senate  
Meeting of October 26, 2016 at 2:00 p.m.  
Senate Room, 608 Robertson Hall  
MINUTES**

**Present:** S. Ajila, F. Alhattab, A. Arya, A. Bellerive, S. Blanchard, A. Bowker, D. Buss, M. Butler, L. Callaghan, C. Carruthers, A. Christianson, W. Clement, J. Debanné, D. Deugo, C. Duff, M. Esponda, K. Evans, C. Feres, A. Forth, R. Goubran, N. Grasse, J. Hayes, R. Hoey, W. Horn, D. Howe, B. Hughes, W. Jones, E. Kwan, E. Lai, A. Loiselle, D. Long, A. Maheshwari, C. Miller (proxy sent), H. Nemiroff, M. Neufang, D. Owusu-Akyeeah, J. Paulson, P. Ricketts, R. Runte, D. Russell, J. Shepherd, E. Sloan, C. Smelser, M. Sucharov, N. Tait, S. Taylor, P. Thompson, J. Tomberlin, P. Watzlawik-Li, F. Webster, J. Wolfart, P. Wolff

**Regrets:** F. Afagh, K. Bashir, A. Chandler, C. Chi, C. Cruickshank, J. Dalphy, A. Diptee, A. Dodge, M. El-Tanany, W. Felepchuk, S. Field, C. Fong, T. Garvey, P. Gentile, R. Gorelick, F. Hosseinian, O. Javanpour, K. Karim, M. Martinov, J. Miller, K. O'Meara, B. Örmeci, C. Parrott, M. Pelletier, M. Piché, A. Plourde, N. Rajapakse, J. Smith, J. Stoner, S. Sur, L. Watson, C. Wong.

**Open Session:**

**1. Welcome**

The President welcomed the new Senators.

**2. Approval of Agenda (open)**

It was **MOVED** (W. Felepchuk, W. Jones) that Senate approve the open agenda of the meeting of October 26, 2016. Item 4 was deferred to the next Senate meeting as this was a topic request by a Senator unable to attend today's meeting. W. Felepchuk requested that the November 2, Day of Action be added to the agenda under 'Other Business'.

The motion **PASSED**.

**3. Minutes:**

a) September 9, 2016

It was **MOVED** (R. Goubran, M. Neufang) that Senate approve the minutes of the meeting of September 9, 2016.

The motion **PASSED**.

#### 4. Member Request: Update on the Global Academy (P. Ricketts)

This item is deferred to the November Senate meeting.

#### 5. Reports:

##### a) SAPC (P. Ricketts)

It was **MOVED** (P. Ricketts, M. Butler) that Senate approve the addition of the Astrophysics stream in the BSC honours program effective fall 2017.

The motion **PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**.

It was **MOVED** (P. Ricketts, W. Clement) that Senate approve the Final Assessment Report and Executive Summary for the MA program in Religion and Public Life.

The motion **PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**.

It was **MOVED** (P. Ricketts, W. Clement) that Senate approve the Final Assessment Report and Executive Summary for the Undergraduate and Graduate Programs in Sociology.

The motion **PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**.

A Senator asked if the issue of over-reliance on contract instructors is mentioned in many program reviews. P. Ricketts stated that it does occur at times and the department is responsible to address the issue.

##### b) SCCASP (H. Nemiroff)

H. Nemiroff introduced the following motions:

It was **MOVED** (H. Nemiroff, A. Arya) that Senate approve revisions to section 2.5, Deferred Final Examinations and the addition of section 2.5.1, Early Departure from Final Examinations as amended, effective the 16-17 calendar.

The motion **PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**.

It was **MOVED** (H. Nemiroff, J. Shepherd) that Senate approve the revised admission requirements for the Bachelor of Information Technology program in Photonics and Laser Technology with a report to be submitted at the conclusion of the 2017-2018 academic year to the Carleton University Committee on Quality Assurance on the degree to which the first cohort of students admitted to the program under the revised admission requirements successfully completed first year.

The motion **PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**.

It was **MOVED** (H. Nemiroff, R. Hoey) that Senate approve inclusion of the WDN notation on official transcripts, for graduate and undergraduate students who withdraw after the full fee adjustment date in each term, for courses commencing the 17-18 academic year.

S. Blanchard stated that this change would bring Carleton in line with the standard practice of most other universities. Senators discussed the benefits and disadvantages of this change for the university, for students who may receive the WDN notation and for students who would not require the notation. H. Neufang stated that the motivation for this change was to provide better transparency and to align with provincial practices. It is not retroactive, nor in the CPGA. L. Ralph stated that students can appeal the WDN notation for health reasons. The motion **PASSED**.

It was **MOVED** (H. Nemiroff, J. Shepherd) that Senate approve changes to regulation 2.3, Standing in Courses/Grading System, as amended, for the 17-18 calendar.

The motion **PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**.

It was **MOVED** (H. Nemiroff, J. Shepherd) that Senate approve the Academic Nomenclature document, as presented, effective the 18-19 calendar.

The motion **PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**.

c) Academic Colleague (J. Smith)

The report was included in the meeting materials.

## **6. Senate Administration**

The Clerk presented updated membership of Senate and Senate Committees (see Appendix A).

It was **MOVED** (D. Russell, J. Paulson) that Senate approve and recommend to the Board of Governors that Jack Coghill be appointed to Senate as a Special Representative for the term of 2016-19.

The motion **PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**.

It was **MOVED** (D. Russell, R. Hoey) that Senate approve the amendments to the Senate Committees' Membership.

The motion **PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**.

## **7. Discussion Period: Sexual Violence Policy (S. Blanchard)**

S. Blanchard asked Jen Sugar, Director of Student Affairs, to provide a PowerPoint presentation. J. Sugar stated that the deadline for feedback is Friday, October 28, 2016. They have received the most feedback regarding:

- The definition of the terms sexual violence, consent and rape culture. J. Sugar stated that the draft policy is using the definitions that are in the statute and mandated by the provincial government;
- The scope of the policy;
- Support services for survivors;
- Issues on confidentiality and the requirements of FIPPA regulations.

S. Blanchard then invited Senators to discuss the draft policy. J. Paulson stated that he has concerns about the scope (applying off-campus), academic freedom, survivor follow-up, and how to make intersectionality more than a term. J. Paulson also stated his appreciation of the committee's consultations with faculty. J. Sugar stated that in regard to sexually explicit material the collective agreement protects faculty. However, this policy would consider if the material is contextually relevant. S. Blanchard stated that our focus is that the policy represents the Carleton community. Senators discussed the implementation process, committees, and committee membership. A student letter led by CASG, with many supporting signatures, will be submitted through the feedback process. The GSA will also be submitting a letter of recommendations. D. O stated that every elected position that students occupy on campus has signed the letter. W. Felepchuk raised concern that the policy includes a clause that allows the President to use veto power. He also questioned why a resource commitment wasn't included. S. Blanchard stated that policies don't include resource allocation commitments but the issue of the veto power will be examined in the feedback assessment. R. Hoey recommended that the consultative aspect of this process should be included in the policy. J. Sugar stated that they have received feedback to include an external member on the review committee. S. Blanchard confirmed that there is flexibility to allow senior management to make exceptions to this policy. J. Wolfart rose concerns about the scope and process. He asked that for contentious issues, consensus should be needed to support the inclusion of it in the document. However, if there is no consensus, the contentious aspects should be

removed from the policy. M. Bueckert drew attention to the policy's commitments and value statements in section 2.1. S. Blanchard thanked everyone for this level of engagement.

## **8. Reports for Information:**

a) Senate Executive Minutes – June 3, July 20, August 23 (electronic), August 30, September 15 (electronic) and September 20, 2016  
There were no questions.

b) Board of Governors Minutes – June 28, 2016  
There were no questions. The Chair stated that the Board is still waiting on the federal infrastructure funding announcement.

c) Appointments Made Contrary to the Advertising Policy (Clerk)  
The Clerk stated that there have been three appointments made under this policy. Confidentiality requirements limit the scope of this report. P. Ricketts stated that all three of these cases involved a person already in a term position when a longer term position became available and the candidates were reviewed and appointed without advertising. This policy is permissible according to our collective agreements.

## **9. Other Business**

a) November 2: Day of Action  
W. Felepchuk stated that next Wednesday is the national day of action by the Canadian Federation of Students. It is a day of protest against high tuition costs and how they impact all students and particularly disadvantaged peoples. The GSA made an appeal to the Provost for academic amnesty on this day to allow students to attend this event. However, P. Ricketts was unable to consider this request due to the August deadline of the 2010 policy that addresses this type of request. W. Felepchuk stated that several universities have granted academic amnesty for this event. The GSA will be seeking to amend this policy in the near future.

J. Paulson reported that since the last Senate meeting he and others have received a lengthy email regarding the Senate Financial Review Committee. The Senate Office was not aware of this email. The Clerk asked J. Paulson to forward it to him and stated that it will be circulated to all Senators.

In response to a question, H. Nemiroff stated that the new WPN notation will become active in 2017-18 and the method of informing students has not yet been determined.

## **10. Adjournment**

It was **MOVED** (M. Neufang, P. Ricketts) to adjourn the meeting at 3:50 p.m.  
The motion **PASSED**.

DATE: December 6, 2016

TO: Board of Governors

FROM: Dr. Peter Ricketts, Provost and Vice-President (Academic)

RE: Final Assessment Report and Executive Summary of the Cyclical Review for the Bachelor of Humanities program

---

Please find attached the final assessment report and executive summary of the cyclical review of the Bachelor of Humanities program offered by Carleton University.

This review has taken place under the auspices of the new academic quality assurance process established by the Council of Ontario Universities that took effect during the summer of 2011.

Under this process, which is governed by the Provincial Quality Assurance Framework, the university is required at the conclusion of each cyclical program review to summarise the outcomes and plans for program enhancement in a final assessment report and executive summary. At Carleton, plans for improvement are contained in an action plan, which constitutes part of the final assessment report.

Once drafted and agreed to by the Carleton University Committee on Quality Assurance, the final assessment report and executive summary are referred to the Provost for approval. With this approval, the document is forwarded to the Senate. Senate approved the final assessment report and executive summary for the Bachelor of Humanities program at its meeting of November 25, 2016.

Once approved by Senate, the executive summary and action plan is posted on Carleton's website at: [www.carleton.ca/ovp/reports](http://www.carleton.ca/ovp/reports).

The final assessment report and executive summary are then forwarded to the Board of Governors and the Ontario Universities' Council on Quality Assurance for information as required by the Provincial Quality Assurance Framework.

The appendices of the final assessment report have not been included, as they are extensive. However, they can be made available to members of the Board on request.

**CARLETON UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON  
QUALITY ASSURANCE**

**Cyclical Review of the Bachelor of Humanities Programs  
Executive Summary and Final Assessment Report**

This Executive Summary and Final Assessment Report of the cyclical review of Carleton's Bachelor of Humanities programs are provided pursuant to articles 4.2.5.b-4.2.6.a-b of the provincial Quality Assurance Framework and articles 7.2.23.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The Bachelor of Humanities programs (B.Hum Honours, B.Hum Combined Honours, Biology and Humanities B.Hum Combined Honours) reside in Carleton University's College of the Humanities, a unit administered by the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences.

As a consequence of the review, the programs were categorised by the Carleton University Committee on Quality Assurance (CUCQA) as being of **GOOD QUALITY** (Carleton's IQAP 7.2.12).

The external reviewers' report, submitted to the College of the Humanities on January 4<sup>th</sup>, 2016, offered a positive assessment of the programs. Particularly noteworthy is the external reviewers' observations that 'the faculty appointed to the B.Hum programs are, by any standard of assessment, exemplary. Each faculty member is an expert, with an impressive scholarly track record, in a field directly related to the B.Hum curriculum. The faculty are accomplished scholars, but more importantly, they are deeply accomplished teachers.' The Reviewers also added that 'the students [they] met were as impressive as any – articulate, thoughtful, intelligent, knowledgeable, and, not to be under-emphasized, polite.'

Within the context of this positive assessment, the report nonetheless made a number of recommendations for the continuing enhancement of the program. These recommendations were productively addressed by the program coordinator, the Director of the College and the Interim Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences in a response to the report of the External Review that was considered by CUCQA on June 14<sup>th</sup>, 2016.

An Action Plan detailing how, when and by whom the recommendations will be implemented was received and approved by CUCQA on October 12<sup>th</sup>, 2016.

## FINAL ASSESSMENT REPORT

### Introduction

The Bachelor of Humanities programs reside in Carleton University's College of the Humanities, a unit administered by the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences. As a consequence of the review, the programs were categorised by the Carleton University Committee on Quality Assurance (CUCQA) as being of **GOOD QUALITY** (Carleton's IQAP 7.2.12).

The site visit, which took place on November 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2015, was conducted by Professors Edvard Lorkovic from MacEwan University and Neil Robertson from the University of King's College. The site visit involved formal meetings with the Vice-Provost and Associate Vice-President (Academic); the Assistant Vice-President (Academic); the interim Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences; the Director of the College of the Humanities; the Program Review Lead; faculty members; and approximately a dozen B.Hum students. The External Reviewers also toured the College facilities.

The external reviewers' report, submitted on December 21<sup>st</sup>, 2015, offered a positive assessment of the program.

This Final Assessment Report provides a summary of:

- Strengths of the programs
- Challenges faced by the programs
- Opportunities for program improvement and enhancement
- The Outcome of the Review
- The Action Plan

This report draws on eight documents:

- The Self-study developed by members of the Bachelor of Humanities program (please see Carleton's IQAP 7.2.1-7.2.3) (Appendix A)
- The Report of the External Review Committee (IQAP 7.2.9.16) (Appendix B).
- Communication from CUCQA regarding the outcome of the external review (IQAP 7.2.9.18) (Appendix C)
- The response from the coordinator of the Bachelor of Humanities program and the Dean (interim) of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to the Report of the External Review Committee (IQAP 7.2.9.19) (Appendix D).
- The internal discussant's recommendation report (IQAP 7.2.11) (Appendix E).
- The communication from CUCQA regarding the outcome of the review (IQAP 7.2.15) (Appendix F).
- The program's Action Plan (IQAP 7.2.16) (Appendix G)
- The acceptance by CUCQA of the Action Plan (Appendix H)

Appendix I contains brief biographies of the members of the External Review Committee.

This Final Assessment Report contains the Action Plan (Appendix G) agreed to by the program coordinator, the Director of the College of the Humanities, and the Interim Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences regarding the implementation of recommendations for program enhancement to have been advanced as a consequence of the cyclical program review process.

The Action Plan provides an account of who is responsible for implementing the agreed upon recommendations, as well as of the timelines for implementation and reporting.

### **Strengths of the programs**

#### *General*

The External Review Committee noted that ‘by any reasonable standard of academic assessment, these B.Hum programs are tremendously successful.’ The Reviewers further observed that ‘the B.Hum has succeeded in part by holding in balance, both in its recruitment strategy and in its curriculum, the sense that the content of the program is an end in itself and has an excellence worthy of the deepest attention, with the sense that the program functions for many of its students as a formation toward a profession life, for example medicine or journalism.’

#### *Faculty*

The external report indicates that ‘the faculty appointed to the B.Hum programs are, by any standard of assessment, exemplary. Each faculty member is an expert, with an impressive scholarly track record, in a field directly related to the B.Hum curriculum. The faculty are accomplished scholars, but more importantly, they are deeply accomplished teachers.’ The report states ‘that scholarship and teaching excellence have been so well balanced by B.Hum faculty accounts, to no small degree, for the successes of their programs.’

#### *Students*

The Reviewers reported that the students they met ‘were as impressive as any – articulate, thoughtful, intelligent, knowledgeable, and, not to be under-emphasized, polite.’ They added that ‘the generally superior (relative to other Faculty of Arts and Social Science programs) teaching evaluation results point to student satisfaction in the teaching they are receiving. This finding was further confirmed in conversation with students during the site visit.’ The Reviewers found that ‘these young people are not only talented – after all, they come to the College because they are talented – but actually develop and improve those talents through their studies in the B.Hum in ways that are both productive or functional and human or moral.’

#### *Learning Outcomes*

The Reviewers remarked that ‘the College of Humanities is highly successful in meeting its learning outcomes and fulfilling the degree level expectations of the province. The evidence is provided in the Self-study, but most strikingly in the impressive graduation results for graduates of the B.Hum degrees (55% receiving highest honours, compared to 10% for BAs, p. 21 of the Self-study)’

### **Challenges faced by the programs**

While the Program is generally successful in helping students acquire the learning outcomes, the Reviewers suggested that a few learning outcomes ‘need to be adjusted to match the competencies of the program.’ For instance, the learning outcome phrased as ‘knowledge of the theoretical and methodological underpinnings of the particular academic programmes that make up the Humanities program’ seems too broad a goal as to be reasonably attainable. Moreover, the External Reviewers could find little evidence of instruction in a number of discipline specific methods such as archival

methodologies or statistical analysis that would be basic to disciplines that 'make up the Humanities program.'

Regarding the content of the courses offered, the Reviewers felt that 'there are some questionable inclusions and some questionable exclusions' in terms of canonical books covered. 'For instance, in first year, students read classics from the Western tradition, and from non-Western traditions. After first year, the non-Western traditions appear to be forgotten.' The Reviewers also expressed 'some concerns about cohesion between courses, and even within individual courses.' They argued that this lack of cohesion is challenging for students, who said that they are often unable 'to see how the texts taught by different instructors related to each other.' There was a sense that 'the faculty teaching these courses sacrifice some curricular cohesion to satisfy their own scholarly interests and areas of expertise.' To remedy such lack of cohesion, students should participate in 'the review and assessment of the B.Hum curriculum.'

The Reviewers also indicated that some students 'expressed confusion about their programs, in particular about how they could manage to complete their course credits within four years.' Their 'impression was that both the College and the University as a whole would do well to improve their advising.'

### **Opportunities for program improvement and enhancement**

As a result of the Review, CUCQA identified 10 areas for improvement:

1. Include student representatives, as voting members, on B.Hum curriculum committee;
2. Create an advisory body, comprised of student representatives from all four years of study, to meet annually to discuss the B.Hum curriculum and make recommendations to curriculum committee;
3. As part of the annual review process, the curriculum committee should consider ways to more fully integrate and connect the curriculum, both within and between required classes;
4. Expand writing tutorial service, with the writing consultant (or consultants) available for as many as 40 hours per week;
5. Coordinate, through communication and increased collaboration, advising between the College and University advisors;
6. Advising by the B.Hum be as pro-active as possible, stimulating or requiring students to meet to plan their degrees and that there be made a record of this plan kept by both the B.Hum program and the respective student;
7. Replace the 0.6 LTA position with a tenured or tenure-track position;
8. Preserve the College of the Humanities designated B.Hum space;
9. Stress, in national and international advertisement campaigns, the tremendous work and achievements of the B.Hum faculty and students;
10. Any addition to the B.Hum programs be done cautiously and ensure that any increased demand resulting from new programs translate, not into increased student numbers, but increased excellence of those students accepted.

### **The Outcome of the Review**

As a consequence of the review, the Bachelor of Humanities programs were categorised by the Carleton University Committee on Quality Assurance (CUCQA) as being of **GOOD QUALITY** (Carleton's IQAP 7.2.12).

### **The Action Plan.**

The recommendations that were put forward by CUCQA as a result of the review process were productively addressed by the program coordinator, the Director of the College, and the Interim Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences in a response to the report of the External Review that was considered by CUCQA on June 14<sup>th</sup>, 2016. An Action Plan detailing how, when and by whom the recommendations will be implemented was received and approved by CUCQA on October 12<sup>th</sup>, 2016.

It is to be noted that Carleton's IQAP (7.7.1) provides for the monitoring of action plans: 'A report will be filed with the Office of the Vice-Provost by the Faculty Dean(s) and academic unit(s) when the timeline is reached for the implementation of each element of the Action Plan. This report will be forwarded to CUCQA for its review.'

In the case of the Bachelor of Humanities, the majority of monitoring will be achieved by means of regular updates on the Action Plan, the first of which being expected by June 30<sup>th</sup>, 2017.

### **The Next Cyclical Review**

The next cyclical review of the Bachelor of Humanities programs will be conducted during the 2021-22 academic year.

DATE: 19 September 2016

TO: Dr. John Shepherd, Vice-Provost and Associate Vice-President (Academic); Chair  
Carleton University Committee on Quality Assurance

FROM: Dr. Shane Hawkins, Director, College of the Humanities

CC: Dr. Wallace Clement, Interim Dean, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences  
Dr. Sukeshi Kamra, Associate Dean (Curriculum, Programs, and Planning), Faculty  
of Arts and Social Sciences  
Dr. André Loiselle, Assistant Vice-President (Academic)  
Dr. Matthias Neufang, Dean, Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs

**RE: Action Plan for the BHUM program**

---

As stipulated in the memo of 15 June 2016 from Dr. John Shepherd, the following Action Plan for the BHum program contains 1) details of the steps that the College agrees to take in response the external reviewers' recommendations and suggestions, 2) those responsible for undertaking these steps, and 3) timelines for completing these steps. The Action Plan concludes with this information in tabular form.

The Action Plan addresses the recommendations of the external reviewers as they have been placed in order by CUCQA: 1-3 Curriculum, 4-6 Support and Advising, 7-8 Resources, 9-10 Recruitment and Promotion.

**Recommendation 1:** Include student representatives, as voting members, on the curriculum committee

**Reply from Faculty (26 May 2016):** The faculty respectfully rejected this recommendation, noting that students are already consulted on the curriculum annually. Students are consulted through formal and informal feedback mechanisms including in class consultation with faculty, course evaluation comments and one-on-one contact with faculty. Beyond that, student representatives have representation on the Bachelor of Humanities committee of the whole. The faculty also noted that currently no program or department allows students voting representation on curriculum committees.

**From the memo from John Shepherd of June 15, 2016:** The Committee noted that the College has agreed to take action on the majority of the recommendations made by the external reviewers. The Committee also observed that the College has declined to take action on recommendation #1, regarding the inclusion of student representatives, as voting members, on the B. Hum curriculum committee. The Committee accepts the College's decision. However, given the current context, where the Province of Ontario is stressing the importance of a postsecondary education that is student-centred, the

Committee encourages you to consider other means of engaging students systematically in the development of a cohesive curriculum. We look forward to seeing such considerations reflected in your Action Plan.

**Steps to be taken:** None, but with regard to student-centred postsecondary education, see further Recommendations 2 and 3.

**Personnel responsible:** Not applicable.

**Recommendation 2:** Create an advisory body, comprised of student representatives from all four years of study, to meet annually to review the BHum curriculum and make recommendations to the curriculum committee.

**Steps to be taken:** As noted in the faculty response to the external report (26 May 2016), currently two students are selected each year to sit in on BHUM faculty meetings. Those members attend meetings and may suggest items for the agenda, forward motions and vote. As part of the agenda, the representatives are asked to report on any concern of the student body. Also, these students serve to transmit the concerns of the student body, including but not limited to those concerning curriculum.

In addition to this process, the program faculty would like to implement the recommendation of the external reviewers as follows. A student committee of two members from each of the four years of study will be appointed by the student body. The committee's task will be to make recommendations on curricular matters to the faculty curriculum committee and the Director in the Winter term of every year.

**Personnel responsible:** Director of CoH, Curriculum Committee

**Recommendation 3:** The curriculum committee should consider ways to more fully integrate and connect the curriculum, both within and between required classes, to allow the rationale of curricular choices to be appropriately clear to the students.

**Additional comment from CUCQA:** With respect to these recommendations on the curriculum, it should be noted that the external reviewers made the following observation: 'we do believe that, at times, the faculty teaching these courses sacrifice some curricular cohesion to satisfy their own scholarly interests and areas of expertise.' This observation is telling in a context where the Province of Ontario is stressing the importance of a postsecondary education that is student-centred.

**Steps to be taken:** The faculty take seriously the recommendations regarding curricular cohesion within and between required courses. We note that the external reviewers identified the 3000- and 4000-level courses as particular concerns, and some uneasiness among the students regarding their continuity.

This issue will be put on the agenda for discussion in the first BHUM council meeting on September 30. Subsequently, the program Curriculum Committee will be asked to prepare further recommendations and deliver these to the BHUM council in the Winter 2017 term.

In the past the Bachelor of Humanities has met annually as a group to consider ways to encourage greater integration of the curriculum. In our response to the external review we suggested that the faculty revive this process with an annual dedicated meeting at the end of the fall term to identify areas where such integration might be appropriate. At the recommendation of the Director we have instead decided to make curriculum integration a major agenda item during one council meeting every Winter term, beginning in 2017.

**Personnel responsible:** Director of CoH, BHUM Curriculum Committee

**Recommendation 4:** The writing tutorial service should be expanded, with the writing consultant (or consultants) available for as many as 40 hours per week.

**Comment:** a slight correction to previous reports on this matter should be made. Funding for the writing consultant is provided by the Dean's office (fiscal) and supplemented by the College of Humanities from an unallocated fund (not from a designated BHUM fund). Almost all of the funding for the service is provided by the Dean and that is the most likely source of any expansion in the program.

**Steps to be taken:** CoH will request funding for an expansion of the writing tutorial service.

**Personnel responsible:** Dean of FASS, Director of CoH

**Recommendation 5:** Improved coordination of and communication between College and University advisors.

**Steps to be taken:** Currently the Undergraduate Advisor meets annually with representatives from the Registrar's office and works closely with the various student services provided therein. The Undergraduate advisor will consult with the appropriate staff members (Louise DeCristoforo & Amy Fraser and where appropriate the staff of the Student Academic Success Centre) and provide a report to BHUM faculty at the Winter 2017 term meeting.

**Personnel responsible:** Undergraduate Advisor

**Recommendation 6:** Advising by the BHum should be as pro-active as possible, stimulating or requiring students to meet to plan their degrees and that there be made a record of this plan kept by both the BHum program and the respective student.

**Steps to be taken:** 1) The Undergraduate Advisors will continue to visit all four core courses every fall and strongly recommend that each student meet with them to discuss their progress toward completing the degree; 2) When faculty identify students who are academically “at-risk”, the Undergraduate Advisor will schedule an appointment with the student; 3) All meetings between students and the Undergraduate Advisor will be logged in the student’s file, which students may examine at any time, either independently or in consultation with the Undergraduate Advisor; 4) The Undergraduate Advisor will make a record of the consultation available to the student immediately following the meeting.

**Personnel responsible:** Undergraduate Advisor

**Recommendation 7:** The 0.6 LTA should become a tenured or tenure-track position.

**Steps to be taken:** None. This LTA has been converted into an instructor position.

**Personnel responsible:** NA

**Recommendation 8:** Preserve the College of the Humanities’ designated BHum space.

**Steps to be taken:** We will endeavor to sustain the special status of the administrative and instructional spaces now permanently and exclusively assigned to the program.

**Personnel responsible:** Director of CoH

**Recommendation 9:** Carleton University should stress, in its national and international advertisement campaigns, the tremendous work and achievements of the BHum faculty and students.

**Steps to be taken:** We will continue to lobby the university to promote the program.

**Personnel responsible:** Director of CoH, CoH faculty

**Recommendation 10:** Any addition to the BHum programs should be done cautiously and ensure that any increased demand resulting from new programs translate, not into increased student numbers, but increased excellence of those students accepted.

**Steps to be taken:** None

**Personnel responsible:** NA

**Additional issue:**

**From the memo from John Shepherd of June 15, 2016:** The Committee also noted that the College did not respond to the external reviewers suggestions that the program-level learning outcomes ‘need to be adjusted to match the competencies of the program,’ or to

the observations on the program's learning outcomes contained in my memorandum of January 4th, 2016. Again, we look forward to seeing such considerations reflected in your Action Plan.

**From external review:** In general, the Self-study should be clearer, in its statement of learning outcomes, of the inherent limitations of a primary text, high culture, western civilization focused program. But rather than see this issue as a need to change the instruction methods of the program, it seems that rather the learning objectives/ outcomes need to be adjusted to match the competencies of the program. The need for some modifications in the Learning Outcomes assessment process, does not affect our basic assessment that the programme fully meets the Provincial Degree Level Expectations, modified to reflect the interdisciplinary character of the programs under review.

**From the January 4<sup>th</sup> memo:** Furthermore, the external reviewers also suggest that the learning outcomes "need to be adjusted to match the competencies of the program." They give a number of examples of learning outcomes that should be reviewed. For instance, the learning outcome phrased as "knowledge of the theoretical and methodological underpinnings of the particular academic programmes that make up the Humanities program" seems too broad a goal as to be reasonably attainable. Moreover, the external reviewers could find little evidence of instruction in a number of discipline specific methods such as archival methodologies or statistical analysis that would be basic to disciplines that "make up the Humanities program." While such references to learning outcomes in Section 2. "Learning Outcomes Assessment" of the external report do not appear as formal recommendations, we encourage the College to consider and respond to these concerns.

**Steps to be taken:** The point made by the external reviewers that the program-level learning outcomes 'need to be adjusted to match the competencies of the program' is well taken. The Director and BHUM faculty met to discuss learning outcomes on 19 September 2016 and have agreed to place this issue on the agenda of a Fall 2016 and a Winter 2017 meeting in order to make adjustments to the outcomes. The Director met with the CUCQA Program Assessment Specialist, Dr. Andrea Thompson, on 20 September for discussion and assistance. A revised set of learning outcomes that takes into account all of the external reviewers' concerns has now been drafted and is circulating among the faculty for comment and revision.

**Personnel responsible:** Director CoH, CoH faculty

**TABLE**

Recommendations	Steps to be taken and timeline	Personnel responsible
1. Include student representatives, as voting members, on the curriculum committee.	No steps to be taken.	NA
2. Create an advisory body, comprised of student representatives from all four years of study, to meet annually to review the BHum curriculum and make recommendations to curriculum committee.	Beginning <b>Winter 2017</b>	Director of CoH, Curriculum Committee
3. The curriculum committee should consider ways to more fully integrate and connect the curriculum, both within and between required classes, to allow the rationale of curricular choices to be appropriately clear to the students.	Agenda item for BHUM council meeting on 30 <b>September 30 2016</b> . Curriculum Committee report to BHUM council in the <b>Winter 2017</b> term.	Director of CoH, BHUM Curriculum Committee
4. The writing tutorial service should be expanded, with the writing consultant (or consultants) available for as many as 40 hours per week.	<b>Academic year 2016-17:</b> CoH will request funding for an expansion of the writing tutorial service.	Dean of FASS, Director of CoH
5. Improved coordination of and communication between College and University advisors.	The Undergraduate advisor will schedule consultations with the appropriate staff report to BHUM faculty in the <b>Winter 2017</b> term.	Undergraduate Advisor
6. Advising by the BHum should be as pro-active as possible, stimulating or requiring students to meet to plan their degrees and that there be made a record of this plan kept by both the BHum program and the respective student.	<b>Immediate implementation, Fall 2016:</b> 1) The Undergraduate Advisor will visit all four core courses every fall and strongly recommend advising appointments to students; 2) When faculty identify students “at-risk” the UA will schedule an advising appointment; 3) All meetings	Undergraduate Advisor

	will be logged in the student's file, which students may examine at any time, independently or in consultation with the UA; 4) The UA will make a record of the consultation available to the student immediately following the meeting.	
7. The 0.6 LTA should become a tenured or tenure-track position.	None, the LTA has been converted into an instructor position.	NA
8. Preserve the College of the Humanities designated BHum space.	<b>Ongoing:</b> We will endeavor to sustain the special status of the administrative and instructional spaces now permanently and exclusively assigned to the program.	Director of CoH
9. Carleton University should stress, in its national and international advertisement campaigns, the tremendous work and achievements of the B.Hum faculty and students.	<b>Ongoing:</b> We will continue to lobby the university to promote the program.	Director of CoH, CoH faculty
10. Any addition to the BHum programs should be done cautiously and ensure that any increased demand resulting from new programs translate, not into increased student numbers, but increased excellence of those students accepted.	None	NA
Additional matter: adjustment of Learning Outcomes	Recommendations for changes in <b>Fall 2016</b> and <b>Winter 2017</b> meetings.	Director CoH, CoH faculty



**Carleton**  
UNIVERSITY

Canada's Capital University

Office of the Provost and  
Vice-President (Academic)

*memorandum*

DATE: December 6, 2016

TO: Board of Governors

FROM: Dr. Peter Ricketts, Provost and Vice-President (Academic)

RE: Final Assessment Report and Executive Summary of the Cyclical Review for the MA in Religion and Public Life program

---

Please find attached the final assessment report and executive summary of the cyclical review of the MA in Religion and Public Life program offered by Carleton University.

This review has taken place under the auspices of the new academic quality assurance process established by the Council of Ontario Universities that took effect during the summer of 2011.

Under this process, which is governed by the Provincial Quality Assurance Framework, the university is required at the conclusion of each cyclical program review to summarise the outcomes and plans for program enhancement in a final assessment report and executive summary. At Carleton, plans for improvement are contained in an action plan, which constitutes part of the final assessment report.

Once drafted and agreed to by the Carleton University Committee on Quality Assurance, the final assessment report and executive summary are referred to the Provost for approval. With this approval, the document is forwarded to the Senate. Senate approved the final assessment report and executive summary for the MA in Religion and Public Life program at its meeting of October 26, 2016.

Once approved by Senate, the executive summary and action plan is posted on Carleton's website at: [www.carleton.ca/ovp/reports](http://www.carleton.ca/ovp/reports).

The final assessment report and executive summary are then forwarded to the Board of Governors and the Ontario Universities' Council on Quality Assurance for information as required by the Provincial Quality Assurance Framework.

The appendices of the final assessment report have not been included, as they are extensive. However, they can be made available to members of the Board on request.

## **CARLETON UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON QUALITY ASSURANCE**

### **Cyclical Review of the MA Program in Religion and Public Life Executive Summary and Final Assessment Report**

This Executive Summary and Final Assessment Report of the cyclical review of Carleton's MA program in Religion and Public Life are provided pursuant to articles 4.2.5.b-4.2.6.a-b of the provincial Quality Assurance Framework and articles 5.1.9.23-24 and 5.1.9.26-27 of Carleton's Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP).

#### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The MA program in Religion and Public Life resides in Carleton University's College of the Humanities, a unit administered by the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences.

As a consequence of the review, the program was categorised by the Carleton University Committee on Quality Assurance (CUCQA) as being of **GOOD QUALITY** (Carleton's IQAP 7.2.12).

The external reviewers' report, submitted on January 4<sup>th</sup>, 2016, offered a positive assessment of the program. The Reviewers stated that, 'the current faculty complement are working hard to ensure the delivery of a high quality MA program and as a whole are themselves actively involved in research, including publication and conference presentation and participation.' Furthermore, the Reviewers 'found the students to be engaged with the graduate program and excited to be studying at Carleton.'

Within the context of this positive assessment, the report nonetheless made a number of recommendations for the continuing enhancement of the program. These recommendations were productively addressed by the program coordinator, the Director of the College, the Interim Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences and the Dean of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs in a response to the report of the External Review that was communicated to CUCQA on April 27<sup>th</sup>, 2016.

An Action Plan detailing how, when and by whom the recommendations will be implemented was received and approved by CUCQA on September 14<sup>th</sup>, 2016.

# FINAL ASSESSMENT REPORT

## Introduction

The MA program in Religion and Public Life resides in Carleton University's College of the Humanities, a unit administered by the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences. As a consequence of the review, the program was categorised by the Carleton University Committee on Quality Assurance (CUCQA) as being of **good quality** (Carleton's IQAP 7.2.12).

The site visit, which took place on November 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup>, 2015, was conducted by Professors Richard S. Ascough, from Queen's University, and Arthur McCalla, from Mount Saint Vincent University. The site visit involved formal meetings with: (1) the Assistant Vice-President (Academic), the Interim Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences and the Dean of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs; (2) faculty members; (3) the Director of the College; (4) a group of current and former graduate students; (5) and the coordinator of the program. The External Reviewers also toured the College facilities.

The external reviewers' report, submitted on December 7<sup>th</sup>, 2015, offered a positive assessment of the program.

This Final Assessment Report provides a summary of:

- Strengths of the programs
- Challenges faced by the programs
- Opportunities for program improvement and enhancement
- The Outcome of the Review
- The Action Plan

This report draws on eight documents:

- The Self-study developed by the Program (please see Carleton's IQAP 5.1.1-5.1.5) (Appendix A)
- The internal discussant's initial report to the Carleton University Committee on Quality Assurance (CUCQA) on the self-study submitted by the Program (IQAP 5.1.9.1-5.1.9.3) (Appendix B).
- The Report of the External Review Committee (IQAP 5.1.9.9) (Appendix C).
- The response from the Program to the Report of the External Review Committee (IQAP 5.1.9.10) (Appendix D).
- The internal discussant's final recommendation report (IQAP 5.1.9.11) (Appendix E).
- Communication from CUCQA regarding the outcome of the external review (IQAP 5.1.9.13) (Appendix F).
- The Program's Action Plan (IQAP 5.1.9.13 & 5.1.9.14) (Appendix G)
- The acceptance by CUCQA of the Action Plan (Appendix H)

Appendix I contains brief biographies of the members of the External Review Committee.

This Final Assessment Report contains the Action Plan (Appendix G) agreed to by the program coordinator, the Director of the College of the Humanities, the Interim Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences and the Dean of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs regarding the implementation of recommendations for program enhancement to have been advanced as a consequence of the cyclical program review process.

The Action Plan provides an account of who is responsible for implementing the agreed upon recommendations, as well as of the timelines for implementation and reporting.

### **Strengths of the programs**

#### *General*

The review committee observed that, as the only graduate program on religion and public life in Canada, the MA ‘serves well Carleton University's Strategic Integrated Plan’s focus on “Sustainable Communities -Global Prosperity.” Teaching and researching religious traditions is an important aspect of engaging the presence and role of religion in various cultures around the world. Moreover, courses that focus on cultural manifestations of religion likewise bring to the fore aspects too often overlooked in understanding historical and contemporary contexts. The unit's commitment to doing so from a secular (non-confessional) stance ensures that a broad range of religious viewpoints is critically studied.’

#### *Faculty*

The Reviewers noted that ‘the current faculty complement are working hard to ensure the delivery of a high quality MA program and as a whole are themselves actively involved in research, including publication and conference presentation and participation.’

#### *Student Experience*

The Reviewers reported that ‘during the external review team's meeting with a group comprised of current and former graduate students, there was a general appreciation for their experience of their program... students noted that they were attracted to the program by their knowledge of and experience with individual professors’ Overall, the Reviewers ‘found the students to be engaged with the graduate program and excited to be studying at Carleton.’

#### *Completion Rate and Course Delivery*

The Reviewers were impressed with the ‘very good completion rate [which] suggests that each student’s time to completion is monitored and managed well.’ They also praised ‘the programmatic blend of small, dedicated graduate student-only seminar courses with other courses in which graduate students share classroom time with undergraduates [... which] works well here to best utilize the scarce resources in the unit.’

### **Challenges faced by the programs**

The Reviewers were concerned that the term “Religion and Public Life” might not accurately reflect the program’s profile. They wrote: “the rather broad understanding of public life that

includes historical aspects means that the actual program itself is still rather similar to programs elsewhere that take a comprehensive approach to studying religion at the graduate level whereby students from any subdiscipline or area can find a home. That is, although public life is an important way of framing the program, in practice it seems that students interested in studying historical religions can undertake their studies at Carleton, thus somewhat mooting the distinction.”

In terms of faculty complement, the Reviewers indicated that ‘there seems to be insufficient full-time faculty members to address the various research interests that does or could comprise the MA student body. A number of religious traditions receive no attention without drawing upon courses offered by Contract Instructors. More troubling is the use of CIs to provide supervision for Major Research Essays, for which these CIs receive no compensation.’

Regarding the student experience, the Reviewers reported a high level of frustration among participants with the assignment of TA positions, which results in ‘students TAing courses for which they had no demonstrable training or expertise’. Students were also frustrated with the challenge of finding a supervisor for their Research Essays. ‘They do not seem to feel supported in this aspect of the program.’ Students also expressed ‘a desire for more bridge-building with non-academic partners in the “public life” side of the program.’

As for admissions, the reviewers noted ‘a tension between an MA that is framed around a very specific focus - Religion and Public Life - and an admissions policy that allows for students that do not have a clear undergraduate preparation in the study of Religion itself.’ This might lead to poor performance on the part of students with non-religion backgrounds.

Learning outcomes were also an issue for the Reviewers. They expressed concern that ‘the overarching learning outcome(s) remain rather vague’ and do not ‘designate what students will achieve generally through the more specific, measurable skills, knowledge, competencies and/or behaviours students gain in successfully completing the program.’

Regarding course selection, the reviewers were surprised that ‘the MA program allows for students who have taken an undergraduate cross-listed course in Religion at Carleton to re-take that same course at the graduate level so long as different assignments are produced... retaking a course already completed at the undergraduate level seems to be “double-dipping,” even with different assignments.’

About resources, the Reviewers stated that ‘the library resources are not sufficient for graduate level work or faculty research in general.’

### **Opportunities for program improvement and enhancement**

As a result of the Review, CUCQA identified 8 areas for improvement:

1. Religion faculty members should determine three or four specific learning objectives that clearly articulate the core competencies that the MA program's students will demonstrate as having achieved or be progressing towards by the time they have completed the program;

2. Religion Faculty should move towards including clearly stated Learning Objectives and linked Outcomes on all graduate syllabi as the mechanism through which student learning is assessed and monitored;
3. Students should no longer be permitted to take for graduate credit courses they have already undertaken at the undergraduate level;
4. The current admissions strategy should be maintained until the next Cyclical Program Review, but a formal mechanism should be put in place for tracking the participation and performance of students from “non-traditional backgrounds” when compared with those who have an honours BA in Religion in terms of key factors such as grade level attained, quality of MRE, and time to completion;
5. The unit should strategize to better to build bridges with government agencies and NGOs in the Ottawa area and build such connections into the graduate student experience either through course offerings, research internships, focused MREs, or cross-faculty connections;
6. The assigning of TA positions to students registered in the MA program in Religion should be made directly by the MA Coordinator;
7. The unit should develop and web-publish clear guidelines around the finding of a MRE supervisor and the process of the assigning of second readers;
8. In strategic planning/or faculty renewal the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences should consider an appointment or cross-appointment in Chinese Religion that would address a key lacuna in the Religion program. A second position in Hebrew Bible should also be considered in order to make sustainable a clear draw to the MA program.

### **The Outcome of the Review**

As a consequence of the review, the MA in Religion and Public Life program was categorised by the Carleton University Committee on Quality Assurance (CUCQA) as being of **GOOD QUALITY** (Carleton's IQAP 7.2.12).

### **The Action Plan.**

The recommendations that were put forward by CUCQA as a result of the review process were productively addressed by the program coordinator, the Director of the College, the Interim Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences and the Dean of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs in a response to the report of the External Review that was communicated to CUCQA on April 27<sup>th</sup>, 2016. An Action Plan detailing how, when and by whom the recommendations will be implemented was received and approved by CUCQA on September 14<sup>th</sup>, 2016.

It is to be noted that Carleton's IQAP (7.7.1) provides for the monitoring of action plans: 'A report will be filed with the Office of the Vice-Provost by the Faculty Dean(s) and academic unit(s) when the timeline is reached for the implementation of each element of the Action Plan. This report will be forwarded to CUCQA for its review.'

In the case of Religion, the majority of monitoring will be achieved by means of regular updates on the Action Plan, the first of which being expected by June 30<sup>th</sup>, 2017.

**The Next Cyclical Review**

The next cyclical review of the Master program in Religion and Public Life will be conducted during the 2021-22 academic year.

DATE: 8 August 2016

TO: Dr. John Shepherd, Vice-Provost and Associate Vice-President (Academic); Chair  
Carleton University Committee on Quality Assurance

FROM: Dr. Shane Hawkins, Director, College of the Humanities

CC: Dr. Wallace Clement, Interim Dean, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences  
Dr. Sukeshi Kamra, Associate Dean (Curriculum, Programs, and Planning), Faculty  
of Arts and Social Sciences  
Dr. Matthias Neufang, Dean, Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs

RE: **Action Plan for the MA Program in Religion and Public Life**

---

As per the memo received from Dr. John Shepherd on 16 May 2016, the Religion program presents here its action plan for the MA Program in Religion and Public Life. Two important issues that were raised in this memo are taken up below; the first under recommendation #3 and the second after recommendation #8 (“Further to the memo…”).

The reviewers made the following recommendations with respect to the graduate program:

**Recommendation 1:** That the Religion faculty members determine three or four specific learning objectives that clearly articulate the core competencies that the program’s students will demonstrate as having achieved or be progressing towards by the time they have completed the program.

**Steps to be taken:** Recommendations for learning objectives will be taken in a Religion council meeting in the **Fall 2016** term, subsequent to which the Curriculum Committee will be asked to draft language with respect to three or four specific learning objectives for final presentation to the council in the **Winter 2017** term. The learning objectives will be posted on the website as part of the information available to prospective and current MA students by **May 2017**.

**Personnel responsible:** Director COH, Religion faculty, Curriculum Committee, Graduate Advisor

**Recommendation 2:** That the Religion Faculty move towards including clearly stated Learning Objectives and linked Outcomes on all graduate syllabi as the mechanism through which student learning is assessed and monitored.

**Steps to be taken:** Recommendations for Learning Objectives and linked Outcomes on all graduate syllabi will be taken in a Religion council meeting in the **Fall 2016** term,

subsequent to which the Curriculum Committee will be asked to prepare a language for final presentation to the council in the **Winter 2017** term. The Undergraduate Coordinator is currently preparing a guide for CIs and full-time faculty alike to ensure all courses work together, which will be complete by the end of **Winter term 2017**. Learning Objectives and linked Outcomes will be included on all graduate syllabi in the **2017-18 academic year**.

**Personnel responsible:** Director COH, Religion faculty, Curriculum Committee, Graduate Coordinator, Undergraduate Coordinator

**Recommendation 3:** That students no longer be permitted to take for graduate credit courses they have already undertaken at the undergraduate level. Instead, students should take other graduate courses or cross-listed courses in the unit, or take other graduate level courses in ancillary disciplines.

**Program response:** We would like to reassure the CUCQA committee that the Religion program does not allow—and in the past has not allowed—students to take for graduate credit any courses they have already undertaken at the undergraduate level. As advised by your committee, we have conducted a review of graduate registration patterns and past student audits, and we are unaware of any case where such a thing happened since the inception of the MA in 2011.

We do not know why the external reviewers concluded that it was possible for our students to do this. They may have mistakenly come to this conclusion from the fact that some students who took fourth-year seminars as undergraduates have as graduates subsequently taken a combined or ‘piggy-backed’ course which fourth-year undergraduates and graduate students take together (graduate student assignments and assessment for these courses are more rigorous than those for undergraduates; piggy-backing is a fairly common practice across the University). It is crucial to note, however, that graduate students are **never** allowed to take a piggy-backed course that is the same as or covers the same content as the fourth-year course they took as undergraduates.

In the past we have made certain that such double-dipping does not occur through careful review of our MA student progress by the Graduate Advisor, Program Coordinator, and Curriculum Committee. Our keen-eyed program administrator, who is designated for both the BA and MA programs, is also alert to any potential conflict of this sort. It should also be noted that as of 2013 all course titles also appear on audits and transcripts, which allows one to distinguish between cases in which course numbers are identical or similar.

**Steps to be taken:** We will include language in the graduate calendar and on the program website that explicitly conveys the fact that MA students from our own undergraduate program are not allowed to use undergraduate course work for graduate course credit.

The statement will be posted on our website by **May 2017** and included in the **next round of Calendar changes**.

**Personnel responsible:** Director COH, Graduate and Undergraduate Coordinators

**Recommendation 4:** That the current admissions strategy be maintained until the next Cyclical Program Review, but a formal mechanism should be put in place for tracking the participation and performance of students from “non-traditional backgrounds” when compared with those who have an honours BA in Religion in terms of key factors such as grade level attained, quality of MRE, and time to completion.

**Steps to be taken:** The Graduate Coordinator will compile a comparative chart showing the performance of students with a Religion BA versus those who do not, in order to see what patterns in their performance, if any, can be detected. These findings will be presented to the Religion program council **by the end of academic year 2016-7**, where we will discuss implementing possible remedies, if needed, for such students.

**Personnel responsible:** Director COH, Graduate Coordinator. A former Graduate Coordinator has also agreed to assist the current Coordinator in preparing data.

**Recommendation 5:** That the unit strategize how better to build bridges with government agencies and NGOs in the Ottawa area and build such connections into the graduate student experience either through course offerings, research internships, focused MREs, or cross-faculty connections.

**Steps to be taken:** Recommendations for strategies will be taken in a Religion council meeting in the **Fall 2016** term, subsequent to which the Curriculum Committee will be asked to draft recommendations for presentation and approval to the council in the **Winter 2017** term.

**Personnel responsible:** Director COH, Religion faculty, Curriculum Committee, Graduate Coordinator

**Recommendation 6:** That the assigning of TA positions to students registered in the MA program in Religion be made directly by the MA Coordinator. Any remaining open positions in the unit should be filled by non-Religion students assigned by the MA Coordinator and Director working together.

**Response from the Director:** The current Director’s position is that TA appointments will be arranged by the Director in consultation with the Coordinators, but not made directly by the Coordinators.

There are two important issues for the MA with regard to TA allocations. One is that faculty members receive the TA allocations they need (and promptly); another is that our

graduate students receive TA assignments that are suitable and useful as part of their pedagogical training. Both of these issues have been problematic in the past.

TA allocation in FASS is complex and follows a four-step process:

- 1) An estimation of TA needs for the entire COH is prepared by the Director and presented to ODFASS.
- 2) Priority TAs (PTAs) are released to the unit and assigned to specific courses by the Director.
- 3) When and only after all PTAs have been placed, Outside Priority TAs (OPTAs) may be released to the unit. PTAs are typically funded graduate students who must be given a TA assignment. OPTAs are often unfunded graduate students or, in our experience, fourth-year undergraduates. The rationale given by the external reviewers for their recommendation was that “some students were TAing courses for which they had no demonstrable training or expertise”. This has also been the unfortunate experience of other programs in the college on occasion, but it is sometimes due to the nature of the allocation process as directed by ODFASS. For example, some of the available PTAs may not have an appropriate background for the courses to which they are assigned. On the other hand, sometimes OPTAs do have the appropriate background, but they cannot be given priority over PTAs.
- 4) Revisions – ODFASS will at this point consider requests for additional and/or replacement TAs on a case-by-case basis. At this point the College could request, for example, that an unqualified PTA be moved and replaced by another qualified PTA or OPTA.

The Director shares a deep sense of frustration with members of the Religion faculty regarding the way in which TA allocation has been handled within the College in the past, and assures all parties that he will work very closely with the Coordinators to see that the program receives the allocations it needs and that its students receive suitable TA assignments. He notes, however, that the process is largely controlled by ODFASS.

**Steps to be taken:** The Director will raise these issues with the Dean of FASS and report to the Religion council in the **Fall of 2016** term.

**Personnel responsible:** Director COH

**Recommendation 7:** That the unit develop and web-publish clear guidelines around the finding of a MRE supervisor and the process of the assigning of second readers.

**Steps to be taken:** A set of explicit and detailed guidelines, which are included as an appendix to this document, do exist already on our web site and can be found at the URL listed below. The Graduate Coordinator will review these guidelines to see if they need updating or any improvements. Any changes will be presented to the Religion council in the **2017 Winter term** and implemented thereafter.

<http://carleton.ca/chum/religionpubliclife/major-research-essay-faq/>

**Personnel responsible:** Graduate Coordinator

**Recommendation 8:** That in strategic planning/or faculty renewal the Dean of FASS consider an appointment or cross-appointment in Chinese Religion that would address a key lacuna in the Religion program. A second position in Hebrew Bible should also be considered in order to make sustainable a clear draw to the MA program.

**Steps to be taken:** We will make the case for these recommendations to the Dean of FASS.

**Personnel responsible:** Dean of FASS, Director of COH

**Further to the memo of May 16 from Dr. John Shepherd**

Although it was not part of any recommendation from the external reviewers, CUCQUA requested that we also consider a second issue:

“...CUCQA also observed that the external reviewers commented on the potentially misleading use of the term “Public Life” in the title of the program. The committee acknowledges your response to this comment, but strongly urges the program to further reflect on this concern. The external reviewers arrived on campus believing that Carleton’s MA in Religion and Public Life was unique in the province. Yet what they saw on the ground appeared much more generic than they expected. It would be very important to closely examine the causes for the reviewers’ assessment, however mistaken it might be, and consider ways to alter this perception. CUCQA would appreciate an indication in the Action Plan that the program will undertake such a task.”

It may be helpful to include here some language from the external review:

“While there are a number of MA programs in Religion or Religious Studies in Ontario and more widely in Canada, none have the particular emphasis on “public life” found in the Carleton program. Thus, the program is well-positioned to draw students that are concerned to engage this aspect. Nevertheless, the rather broad understanding of public life that includes historical aspects means that the actual program itself is still rather similar to programs elsewhere that take a comprehensive approach to studying religion at the graduate level whereby students from any sub-discipline or area can find a home. That is, although public life is an important way of framing the program, in practice it seems that students interested in studying historical religions can undertake their studies at Carleton, thus somewhat mooting the distinction.”

Again, we strongly disagree with this assessment of the MA. The external reviewers appear to have failed to appreciate at least two facts about the program: that students may study religion and public life in several historical periods, from ancient to modern, and that “students interested in studying historical religions” in our program do so in the specific context of the public life of the historical period they investigate (i.e., they are not limited to contemporary contexts).

As to the causes of the reviewers' assessment, we suggest that the external reviewers have been unfortunately hasty in their judgment, as in their mistaken belief about graduates double-dipping undergraduate course work or their recommendation to web-publish clear guidelines for the MRE when they already exist.

The fact that students can study religion in both modern and ancient public life is an aspect of our program that makes it doubly unique in Canada, and it is perhaps the unexpected breadth of our ability to incorporate aspects of antiquity in the MA that made it inconceivable to the reviewers. We are confident, however, that far from generic our MA program is singular, and that such unique aspects of our program should be heralded in our promotional material and its parameters explicitly defined for prospective and current students. These steps should help to alter any misperceptions of the program.

**Steps to be taken:** The Curriculum Committee, in consultation with the Graduate Coordinator and Religion faculty, will draft a statement explicitly defining and promoting the study of Religion in Public Life in the MA. This statement will be made part of the program's promotional material and posted on its website by the end of the **Winter 2017 term**.

**Personnel responsible:** Curriculum Committee, Graduate Coordinator, Religion faculty

## TABLE

Recommendation	Steps to be taken and timeline	Personnel Responsible
<p><b>1</b> Determine specific learning objectives</p>	<p><b>Fall 2016:</b> recommendations for learning objectives in a Religion council meeting  <b>Winter 2017:</b> Curriculum Committee presents language to the council  <b>May 2017:</b> learning objectives posted on the website</p>	<p>Director COH            Religion faculty            Curriculum Committee            Graduate Coordinator</p>
<p><b>2</b> Learning Objectives and linked Outcomes on all graduate syllabi</p>	<p><b>Fall 2016:</b> recommendations taken in a Religion council meeting  <b>Winter 2017:</b> Curriculum Committee presents language to the council  <b>Winter term 2017:</b> Program Coordinator creates a guide  <b>2017-18 academic year:</b> Objectives and linked Outcomes included on all graduate syllabi</p>	<p>Director COH            Religion faculty            Curriculum Committee            Graduate Coordinator            Undergraduate Coordinator</p>
<p><b>3</b> Students no longer be permitted to take for graduate credit courses they have already undertaken at the undergraduate level</p>	<p><b>May 2017 and next round of Calendar changes:</b> language on website and in calendar that explicitly conveys the fact that MA students from our own undergraduate program are not allowed to use undergraduate course work for graduate course credit</p>	<p>Director COH            Graduate Coordinator            Undergraduate Coordinator</p>
<p><b>4</b> A formal mechanism should be put in place for tracking the participation and performance of students from “non-traditional backgrounds”</p>	<p><b>End of academic year 2016-17:</b> Graduate Advisor will present findings to the Religion program council; remedies, if needed, implemented</p>	<p>Director COH            Graduate Coordinator            Former Grad. Coordinator            Religion faculty</p>

<p><b>5</b> Strategize how better to build bridges with government agencies and NGOs in the Ottawa area and build such connections into the graduate student experience</p>	<p><b>Fall 2016:</b> recommendations taken in a Religion council meeting  <b>Winter 2017:</b> Curriculum Committee presents recommendations for approval to the council</p>	<p>Director COH  Religion faculty  Curriculum Committee  Graduate Coordinator</p>
<p><b>6</b> That the assigning of TA positions to students registered in the MA program in Religion be made directly by the MA Coordinator</p>	<p><b>Fall of 2016:</b> The Director will raise these issues of TA allocation with the Dean of FASS and report to the Religion council</p>	<p>Director COH</p>
<p><b>7</b> That the unit develop and web-publish clear guidelines around the finding of a MRE supervisor and the process of the assigning of second readers</p>	<p><b>2017 Winter term:</b> Graduate Advisor will review these guidelines; changes presented to the Religion council</p>	<p>Graduate Coordinator</p>
<p><b>8</b> Dean of FASS consider an appointment or cross-appointment in Chinese Religion, a second position in Hebrew Bible</p>	<p><b>Academic year 2016-17:</b> We will make the case for these recommendations to the Dean of FASS</p>	<p>Dean of FASS  Director of COH</p>
<p>Use of the term “Public Life” in the title of the program</p>	<p><b>Winter 2017 term:</b> a statement explicitly defining and promoting the study of Religion in Public Life in the MA will be made part of the programs promotional material and posted on its website</p>	<p>Curriculum Committee  Graduate Coordinator  Religion faculty</p>

# Appendix

## Overview:

Deadlines are outlined at the bottom of this document. See below.

The Major Research Essay (MRE) is a 65-80 page academic essay that may engage in empirical, theoretical or archival research. The MRE should engage in original research and/or analysis.

The subject matter for the MRE is open to any historical or contemporary subject, but it must be focused on the theme of religion and public life, and must demonstrate an appropriate and sophisticated use of theoretical and methodological approaches to the discipline. All MREs will employ the Chicago Manual of Style (Humanities) for citation and all MREs must include a 100 to 150 word abstract.

Students are encouraged to build on and develop aspects of their completed course work for the MRE, **but the MRE will differ demonstrably from course work already submitted for credit.**

The MRE will be examined by the supervisor and a second reader, normally a Religion faculty member. A second reader is to be named by no later than the end of May in order for MREs to be submitted during the first week of August. The Second Reader Approval form is to be filled out once a second reader has been selected. The selection of a second reader is done by the supervisor and graduate coordinator in consultation with the student.

Individual faculty members are available to consult with students on their MRE even if that faculty member is not the student's primary supervisor or second reader. Students and supervisors are encouraged to work closely together to produce a strong final document. The expectations of an exceptional MRE are that it, or parts of it, will be of publishable quality in an academic peer-reviewed journal.

## Evaluation of the MRE:

The MRE will be assigned a letter grade once both readers have read the document and assigned a grade independently. In the event that the supervisor and second reader's grades are in disagreement, the coordinator will ask them to consult and see if an agreement can be reached. If agreement cannot be reached the Graduate Coordinator becomes a third reader and determines the final grade. If the Graduate Coordinator feels unable to adequately assess the quality of the MRE due to a lack of expertise in the topic he/she may seek out a qualified third reader who will advise the Coordinator on the final grade. Once a final grade has been agreed upon, the student will make any required changes to the document and submit one clean electronic copy to the Graduate Administrator.

## Choosing a Supervisor:

- You will have a chance to meet potential supervisors in RELI 5801, Seminar in the Discipline, where Religion faculty will present their research.

- Supervisors must be Religion faculty or have rights to supervise in Religion according to University regulations.
- Supervisor and MRE topic are submitted to the Program Coordinator for approval through the MRE Approval Form (In the second week of November, due on the day that RELI 5801 meets, to be handed in in class.)
- Students may approach any Religion faculty member to request that they serve as Supervisor.
- Faculty may accept or decline at their discretion and are discouraged from accepting too many students in any given year.

**Choosing a Second Reader:**

- The second reader must be chosen with the approval of the MRE Supervisor and the Program Coordinator. Second Reader form to be submitted by the last week of May.
- S/he should be a Carleton faculty member, preferably in the Religion program or, if a Religion faculty member is not available, from a cognate discipline at Carleton University with expertise in the MRE topic.
- 2nd Readers may, exceptionally, be chosen from outside of Carleton.
- While students are responsible for requesting that a faculty member serve as Second Reader, this request should only be extended with the prior approval of the Supervisor and Program Coordinator.

**The role of the Supervisor:**

- Supervisors actively facilitate the student's task of producing a well conceived, rigorously researched, thoughtfully argued, clearly articulated Major Research Essay.
- Faculty of the Religion program recognize that different supervisors and students may find different modes of working well together to assist the student in developing the MRE.
- Students and supervisors are encouraged to speak frankly about what degree of structure a student would benefit from during the supervision process (weekly or monthly meetings, frequency and level of detail for feedback, assistance with writing or research methods, etc.)
- All students and supervisors are encouraged to set up clear timelines with explicit expectations about how a student should meet those expectations. It is suggested that this minimally includes deadlines for an outline, preliminary bibliography, first drafts of key sections, complete draft, final submission.

**The role of the Second Reader:**

- There is some flexibility in the role of the second reader and expectations should be discussed early on between the Supervisor, potential Second Reader, and the student.
- Minimally, the Second Reader assures the quality of the MRE meets University and disciplinary standards for a major research project at the graduate level by participating in the evaluation of that project.
- Supervisors and Second Reader may agree that the Second Reader should participate in a more formative and collaborative fashion, including early consultations on bibliographies,

theoretical approaches, methodological questions, project outlines, reading sections or an early draft and making recommendations on how to improve the project.

**Choosing (and Changing) a Topic:**

- The topic of the MRE must primarily and significantly engage the theoretical questions that frame the academic study of the theme of Religion and Public life.
- Students propose a topic through the Letter of Intent submitted through their application to the program. This choice is not binding but allows the admission committee insight as to whether the student understands the program and whether the program is well suited to the student's interests.
- It is expected that students will (especially in the course of their studies during their first semester) study with new faculty who introduce them to diverse topics and a wide array of theoretical and methodological questions. Students are therefore encouraged to modify, revise or even dramatically change their MRE topic from their original proposed topic.

**Formatting the MRE:**

Please note: The University is moving to the electronic deposit of theses and Major Research Essays will soon follow. It is recommended that students observe the formatting requirements outlined for theses.

**Deadlines:**

NOVEMBER:

**MAJOR RESEARCH ESSAY APPROVAL FORM:** The MRE form must be submitted by the **second week of November of each year** and requires the signatures of the Supervisor and Student. It will then be approved by the Coordinator and signed.

MAY:

**SECOND READER FORM:** The Second Reader form must be submitted by the **last week of May** and requires the signatures of the Supervisor, Second Reader and student. It will then be approved by the Coordinator and signed.

AUGUST:

**SUBMISSION: By the end of the first week of August in each year (August 5, 2016) –** submission of the final draft to the supervisor and second reader. This is provided by the student and may be electronic or printed as requested by the supervisor and second reader. Do not submit a copy at this time to the department.  
The final draft of your MRE is the version that will be graded by your supervisor and your second reader.

**GRADE BY SUPERVISOR AND SECOND READER: By the end of the third week of August in each year (August 19, 2016)** – independent submission of final grade by the supervisor and second reader to the graduate coordinator and the return of the final drafts to the student for minor corrections

*The supervisor and second reader submit the grade independently to the program Coordinator.*

**SUBMIT CLEAN ELECTRONIC COPY: By the end of August in each year (August 31 2016)** – submission by the student of one final electronic copy to the Religion Graduate Administrator. A student's supervisor and second reader may request minor changes to the final draft such as the correction of typos, minor syntax errors and so on. These corrections should be made by the student so that the final electronic copy of the MRE kept by the Religion Program represents a 'clean' version of it.

**GRADE ENTERED BY COORDINATOR: According to Carleton calendar** – submission of grades for the summer term by the Graduate Coordinator **(Sept 1, 2016)**

DATE: December 6, 2016

TO: Board of Governors

FROM: Dr. Peter Ricketts, Provost and Vice-President (Academic)

RE: Final Assessment Report and Executive Summary of the Cyclical Review for the undergraduate and graduate programs in Sociology

---

Please find attached the final assessment report and executive summary of the cyclical review of the undergraduate and graduate programs in Sociology offered by Carleton University.

This review has taken place under the auspices of the new academic quality assurance process established by the Council of Ontario Universities that took effect during the summer of 2011.

Under this process, which is governed by the Provincial Quality Assurance Framework, the university is required at the conclusion of each cyclical program review to summarise the outcomes and plans for program enhancement in a final assessment report and executive summary. At Carleton, plans for improvement are contained in an action plan, which constitutes part of the final assessment report.

Once drafted and agreed to by the Carleton University Committee on Quality Assurance, the final assessment report and executive summary are referred to the Provost for approval. With this approval, the document is forwarded to the Senate. Senate approved the final assessment report and executive summary for the undergraduate and graduate programs in Sociology at its meeting of October 26, 2016.

Once approved by Senate, the executive summary and action plan is posted on Carleton's website at: [www.carleton.ca/ovp/reports](http://www.carleton.ca/ovp/reports).

The final assessment report and executive summary are then forwarded to the Board of Governors and the Ontario Universities' Council on Quality Assurance for information as required by the Provincial Quality Assurance Framework.

The appendices of the final assessment report have not been included, as they are extensive. However, they can be made available to members of the Board on request.

## CARLETON UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON QUALITY ASSURANCE

### Cyclical Review for the B.A. Honours, B.A. Combined Honours, B.A. General, MA and PhD programs in Sociology Executive Summary and Final Assessment

This Executive Summary and Final Assessment Report of the cyclical review of Carleton's graduate and undergraduate programs in Sociology are provided pursuant to articles 4.2.5-4.2.6 of the provincial Quality Assurance Framework and articles 5.1.9.23-24 and 5.1.9.26-27 of Carleton's Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP).

#### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The B.A. Honours, B.A. Combined Honours, B.A. General, MA and PhD in Sociology reside in Carleton University's Department of Sociology and Anthropology, a unit administered by the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences.

As a consequence of the review, the programs were categorised by the Carleton University Committee on Quality Assurance (CUCQA) as being of **good quality** (Carleton's IQAP 5.1.9.12).

The external reviewers' report, submitted to the Department on January 4<sup>th</sup>, 2016, offered a very positive assessment of the programs. Particularly noteworthy is the external reviewers' observation that the PhD program in Sociology 'is a *national treasure* not only because it is large and has produced a number of highly regarded sociologists over the years, but also because it is the preeminent training ground for sociologists in the distinctive Canadian sociological tradition epitomized by John Porter.' More generally, the reviewers indicated that their 'overarching conclusion is that the sociology programs at Carleton University are in excellent shape and faculty are committed to an ongoing process of self-examination and improvement.'

Within the context of this very positive assessment, the external report nonetheless makes a number of recommendations for the continuing enhancement of the programs. The large majority of the recommendations were accepted by the Department, as well as the Interim Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences and the Dean of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs in a response to the report of the external reviewers that was received by CUCQA on April 13<sup>th</sup>, 2016.

On September 14<sup>th</sup>, 2016, CUCQA received and approved the Department's Action Plan detailing how the recommendations will be addressed. The Action Plan was endorsed by the Interim Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences and the Dean of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs.

# FINAL ASSESSMENT REPORT

## Introduction

The B.A. Honours, B.A. Combined Honours, B.A. General, MA and PhD in Sociology reside in Carleton University's Department of Sociology and Anthropology, a unit administered by the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences.

As a consequence of the review, the programs were categorised by the Carleton University Committee on Quality Assurance (CUCQA) as being of **good quality** (Carleton's IQAP 5.1.9.12).

The site visit, which took place on November 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup>, 2015, was conducted by Professors Harley Dickinson, from the University of Saskatchewan, and Tom Langford, from the University of Calgary. The site visit involved formal meetings with: (1) the Assistant Vice-President (Academic), the Interim Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences and the Dean of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs; (2) a large group of sociology faculty (along with two adjunct professors and a contract instructor); (3) the chair and associate chair of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology; (4) a small group of undergraduate students; (5) a large group of MA and PhD students; (6) the staff who administer the sociology undergraduate and graduate programs; and (7) faculty members from Political Economy, Criminology, and Geography & Environmental Studies who described the collaborative relations between sociology and each of their units. The External Reviewers also toured the departmental facilities.

The external reviewers' report, submitted to the Department on January 4<sup>th</sup>, 2016, offered a very positive assessment of the programs.

This Final Assessment Report provides a summary of:

- Strengths of the programs
- Challenges faced by the programs
- Opportunities for program improvement and enhancement
- The Outcome of the Review
- The Action Plan

This report draws on eight documents

- The Self-study developed by the Department of Sociology and Anthropology (please see Carleton's IQAP 5.1.1-5.1.5) (Appendix A)
- The internal discussant's initial report to the Carleton University Committee on Quality Assurance (CUCQA) on the self-study submitted by the Department of Sociology and Anthropology (IQAP 5.1.9.1-5.1.9.3) (Appendix B).
- The Report of the External Review Committee (IQAP 5.1.9.9) (Appendix C).
- The response from the Department to the Report of the External Review Committee (IQAP 5.1.9.10) (Appendix D).
- The internal discussant's final recommendation report (IQAP 5.1.9.11) (Appendix E).

- Communication from CUCQA regarding the outcome of the external review (IQAP 5.1.9.13) (Appendix F).
- The Department's Action Plan (IQAP 5.1.9.13 & 5.1.9.14) (Appendix G)
- The acceptance by CUCQA of the Action Plan (Appendix H)

Appendix I contains brief biographies of the members of the Review Committee.

This Final Assessment Report contains the Action Plan (Appendix G) agreed to by the Department, the Interim Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences and the Dean of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs regarding the implementation of recommendations for program improvement and enhancement to have been advanced as a consequence of the cyclical program review process.

The Action Plan provides an account of who will be responsible for implementing the selected recommendations, as well as of the timelines for implementation and reporting.

## **Strengths of the programs**

### *General*

The External Reviewers' 'overarching conclusion is that sociology programs at Carleton University are in excellent shape and faculty are committed to an ongoing process of self-examination and improvement.'

### *Faculty*

The Reviewers observed that 'the sociology faculty is highly committed to the quality of their programs and to the academic knowledge, values, skills and competencies acquired by their students.' They added that 'the sociology faculty at Carleton go to great lengths to make sure PhD students do not 'get lost in the shuffle' after they complete their required courses and start working on the less-structured elements of the program.' They were also 'impressed by many of Sociology's recent initiatives to support PhD students' timely progress through the program.'

### *Programs*

The Reviewers were especially impressed with the graduate programs, in particular the PhD, which they consider 'a national treasure'. In their view, 'the excellence of Carleton University's PhD program in sociology is grounded on two primary factors: (1) the distinctive orientation of the program towards the Canadian sociological tradition that stresses interdisciplinarity, intersectional analyses of power and inequalities, and places sociological analyses in a political economy framework; and (2) the academic excellence of faculty members who serve as a recruiting draw for strong students.' The reviewers also expressed great enthusiasm for the new undergraduate concentration in Social Justice, to begin in 2017-18, and which is poised to 'become a hallmark of the department and ... contribute to the development of future academics and citizens who are engaged in progressive social change.'

## **Challenges faced by the programs**

One of the main challenges for the Department as a whole and especially the PhD program, according to the Reviewers, 'is that a number of the senior scholars whose work has been synonymous with sociology at Carleton University over the past number of years will soon be retiring.' Therefore, from the Reviewers' perspective, 'it is imperative that, as faculty retirements roll out over the coming few years, Carleton University approves the hiring of a full complement of replacement junior professors.' More specifically, the Reviewers indicated 'that sociology should prioritize strengthening its unique PhD program in all of the hiring competitions in the coming years.'

In spite of their high praise for the PhD, the Reviewers also identified the need for action in five areas of the program: '(1) shortening the PhD time to completion; (2) ensuring theoretical breadth among PhD students; (3) ensuring fairness in the distribution of PhD supervisory loads; (4) improving the funding for PhD students; and (5) increasing teaching opportunities for PhD students.'

Regarding the BA programs, the Reviewers expressed some concerns about recent curricular changes. In particular, they noted that 'sociology majors will have the choice of taking either qualitative or quantitative methods courses and therefore are no longer required to take a social statistics course as part of their undergraduate education.' Thus they recommend that 'sociology closely monitor the impact of the planned curriculum changes to the methods course requirements.' They also warned that the creation of the new Social Justice concentration, albeit an exciting initiative, 'might put strains on other teaching and supervisory commitments of the faculty.' For this reason they recommend that, for the time being, 'the concentration in Social Justice be introduced with a cap on enrollment.' The Reviewers also noted some inconsistencies in the delivery of junior-level courses, many of which are taught by contract instructors.

In terms of broad curricular design, the Reviewers also pointed out that they 'encountered some skepticism about whether Learning Outcomes are the most appropriate means to assure the quality of academic programs such as sociology.' Consequently, they suggested various ways to develop Learning Outcomes that would be more appropriate for the discipline. They also recommended generating interdisciplinary Learning Outcomes.

## **Opportunities for program improvement and enhancement**

As a result of the Review, CUCQA identified several areas for improvement. The number of these items should not detract from the very positive character of the External Reviewers' report.

## **General**

1. The Department of Sociology and Anthropology should consider expanding the number of graduate student representatives who participate in and have voting rights at Department Board meetings;
2. The Department should consider incorporating additional Learning Outcomes (related to information literacy, media literacy, intercultural competence and social justice, and internationalization etc.) as part of the course offerings.

### **PhD Program**

1. The Department should develop a multi-year hiring plan to help sustain the nationally recognized excellence of the PhD program in sociology;
2. The Department should implement strategies to shorten the median time-to-completion in the PhD program, enhance the experiences of PhD students, and promote equity in graduate supervision.

### **MA Programs**

1. In order to improve MA recruitment, the Dean of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs should work with the Department to find ways to significantly improve funding offers to MA recruits;
2. The Department should clarify the implications of all funding offers made to graduate students, especially in relation to the payment of fees in the summer in relation to the size of any scholarship that might be paid in that term;
3. The Department should require all MA students to take SOCI 5809 (Logic of the Research Process) and SOCI 5005 (Recurring Debates in Social Thought), or indicate 'normally required' rather than 'strongly recommended.'

### **BA Programs**

1. The Department should closely monitor the impact of the planned curriculum changes to the methods course requirements, which will allow Honours and General BA students to obtain their degrees without completing any courses in quantitative methods or social statistics;
2. The concentration in Social Justice should be introduced with a cap on enrollment until such time that (1) a full-time instructor can be hired to coordinate the experiential learning component of the concentration; and (2) additional units of TA funding are allocated to the Social Justice;
3. To improve the quality of the instruction and standardize the content of the two introductory sociology courses, the Department should hire two full-time, tenure-track instructors, one of which should be immediate.

### **The Outcome of the Review**

As a consequence of this review, CUCQA categorized the undergraduate and graduate programs in Sociology as being of **good quality** (Carleton's IQAP 5.1.9.12).

### **The Action Plan**

On April 4<sup>th</sup>, 2016, the Department provided CUCQA with a thorough response to the External Report, which addressed issues identified by the Committee. CUCQA noted that the Department agreed to take action on the vast majority of the recommendations and suggestions made by the External Reviewers. On September 14<sup>th</sup>, 2016, CUCQA received and approved the Department's Action Plan, which contains 1) details of the steps that the Department agreed to take in response to the external reviewers' concerns, 2) those responsible for undertaking these steps, 3) and timelines for completing these steps. The Action Plan was endorsed by the Interim Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences and the Dean of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs.

It is to be noted that Carleton's IQAP (5.4) provides for the monitoring of action plans: 'A report will be filed with Carleton's Office of Quality Assurance by the faculty dean and academic unit when the timeline is reached for the implementation of each element of the action plan. This report will be forwarded to CUCQA for its review. In consultation with the Provost, CUCQA may request additional action or reports from the faculty dean and/or the academic unit.'

In the case of Sociology's Action Plan, the majority of monitoring will be achieved by means of regular reports on the implementation of the plan, the first of which being expected on June 30<sup>th</sup>, 2017.

### **The Next Cyclical Review**

The next cyclical review of the undergraduate and graduate programs in the Sociology will be conducted during the 2021-22 academic year.

Date: 1 September 2016

TO: Dr. John Shepherd, Vice-Provost and Associate Vice-President (Academic); Chair, Carleton University Committee on Quality Assurance

From: Dr. Augustine Park, Associate Chair, Department of Sociology and Anthropology

RE: Action Plan for the Cyclical Program Review of the Undergraduate and Graduate Programs in Sociology: BA Honours; BA Combined Honours; BA General; MA; PhD

---

We are delighted that the undergraduate and graduate programs in Sociology have been categorized as “good quality” and are pleased to provide this Action Plan addressing the issues identified by CUCQA as a result of the External Review.

We are grateful for the additional time granted to craft our Action Plan as the deadline extension (from 1 June to 1 September) allowed us (1) to hold a day-long retreat of the Sociology caucus to discuss issues emerging from the CPR, and (2) to receive some work back from a research assistant (RA) who was hired for the sole purpose of studying issues that emerged from the CPR.

## **General**

*Recommendation 1:* The Department of Sociology and Anthropology should consider expanding the number of graduate student representatives who participate in and have voting rights at Department Board meetings.

*Note:* Upon consultation, graduate students indicated satisfaction with their level of numerical representation at the Board, but are interested in representation on the SOCI caucus.

### *Steps:*

- (1) Beginning in March 2016, we implemented a new policy of including a standing agenda item at every departmental board meeting for graduate student representatives.
- (2) An interim graduate student representative was appointed by the Chair to SOCI caucus for 2015-2016.
- (3) The graduate student caucus will elect a student representative to SOCI caucus during their September 2016 elections, and will do so annually.

*Participants:* N/A

*Timeline:* Completed.

## **PhD Program**

*PhD Recommendation 1:* Hiring recommendations to help sustain the nationally recognized excellence of the PhD program in sociology. (Omitted: The ERs included six sub-recommendations itemized (a) through (f), which, in summary, stress the need to hire junior faculty to shore up the PhD program, especially with strengths in political economy).

*Steps:* The Chair will pursue negotiations with the Dean of FASS to seek sustained hiring over the next three years.

*Participants:* Chair

*Timeline:* Beginning 2016-2017.

*PhD Recommendation 2:* Shortening the median time-to-completion in the PhD program, enhancing the experiences of PhD students, and promoting equity in graduate supervision: (six recommendations, items (a) through (f))

- a. Sociology should monitor the success of its current initiatives to improve the median time-to-completion of PhD students and introduce new measures where warranted if time-to-completion remains a concern;

*Note:* The move to the University-level Constituent Relationship Management (CRM) system will likely help track student progression.

*Steps:*

- (1) The Graduate Program Coordinator and Graduate Administrator have developed a monitoring tool to measure the impact of the changes to the doctoral seminar on median time-to-completion, specifically a database comprised of: (a) a baseline for comparison of meeting milestones and times-to-completion (i.e., baseline = two cohorts that preceded the changes to the doc sem: 2011-2012 and 2012-2013) and (b) ongoing monitoring of each new cohort to track the meeting of milestones and times-to-completion.
- (2) A new “PhD Program Committee” will be struck to examine additional measures to improve median time-to-completion (beyond the already implemented changes to the doc sem) and to study and propose changes to the PhD program. The Graduate Program Coordinator will chair this committee. The unit Chair will assign faculty members to this committee during the annual assignment of administrative duties.

*Participants:* Graduate Program Coordinator, Graduate Program Administrator, and the PhD Program Committee (members TBD).

*Timeline:*

- (1) Monitoring of milestones and time-to-completion will take place on a yearly basis by the Graduate Program Coordinator and Graduate Program Administrator (commenced in 2015-2016) using the new monitoring tool. However, the ERs recommended monitoring impacts over the course of 5 years. This, we believe, will give us enough data from which to draw some conclusions about the impact of the changes to the doc sem.
- (2) The PhD Program Committee will begin work in September 2016 and will present: (a) additional recommendations on how to improve median time-to-completion (in addition to the initiative being captured in the 5-year monitoring plan), and (2) recommendations on the structure of the PhD program at the 2017 summer retreat of Sociology caucus for debate. Next steps will be determined after debate and discussion at the 2017 retreat.

- b. Sociology should track the employment status of all full-time PhD registrants so that the median time-to-completion can be broken down by employment status;

*Note:* This ER recommendation was made with the goal of determining “whether a relatively lengthy time-to-completion is a general characteristic of the Sociology PhD program or just a characteristic of the subset of students who attempt to combine full time employment with full time PhD registration” (p. 10, External Report). Although we had initially agreed to implement this recommendation, we have concluded that it is not feasible. Students do not typically inform the program of employment outside of the University. There is no way of monitoring employment beyond self-reporting, which is unreliable. After serious consideration, we have determined that we are unable to implement this recommendation. No action will be taken.

- c. Sociology should undertake a full investigation of the idea of adding a required seminar in sociological theory to the PhD program;

*Steps:* The departmental RA completed a study of comparable and competing sociology PhD programs in May 2016. Her findings will be referred to the new PhD Program Committee (as a resource), which will bring a recommendation to caucus.

*Participants:* PhD Program Committee.

*Timeline:* The PhD Program Committee will make a recommendation at the summer 2017 retreat on whether or not to implement a new doctoral core theory course.

- d. In order to promote equity in workloads, and to compensate faculty members for supervisory responsibilities, the Department should consider providing faculty members with a course release each time they achieve a threshold of completed graduate supervisions;

*Note:* This recommendation prompted wide-ranging discussion at the retreat, resulting in three areas for action: (a) distribution of workload, (b) compensation for supervision and (c) supervisory best practices.

### Distribution of Workload

*Steps:*

- (1) The Graduate Program Coordinator will continue the practice of pairing incoming students with temporary advisors who would be suitable supervisors with an emphasis on pairing new students with faculty members who supervise fewer students.
- (2) The Graduate Program Coordinator will circulate a listing of ongoing supervisory distribution, specifically the names of faculty members, numbers of students and the types of projects each faculty member supervises. The goals of doing so are: (a) for faculty to better identify one another’s areas for supervision to aid in referring students to appropriate supervisors, and (b) to keep track of levels of supervision so the Graduate Program Coordinator can more effectively pair incoming students with prospective supervisors.

*Participants:* Graduate Program Coordinator.

*Timeline:* Pairing incoming students with temporary advisors is a long-standing practice that will continue. The circulation of a listing of supervisory distribution was implemented in 2015-2016 and will continually annually. (At a later date, committee membership may be added to this listing because of the labour-intensive norms around committee membership in our program).

### Compensation

*Note:* The Graduate Program Coordinator and Chair have developed a database for monitoring completed MA and PhD supervisions by faculty and a formula for calculating credits for completing different supervisory responsibilities based on the ERs' recommendation. The caucus agrees that some form of compensation should be given to faculty who have accumulated a certain level of supervision credits.

*Steps:* The Chair will explore options to provide teaching release within budgetary constraints or provide alternative forms of compensation such as preferential course assignments or Research Assistant hours.

*Participants:* Chair.

*Timeline:* To be implemented annually during the assignment of teaching duties beginning in 2016-2017 (to take effect in 2017-2018).

### Supervisory best practices

*Steps:* The Graduate Program Coordinator will institute regular meetings of faculty to share and workshop supervisory practices that work well, and to discuss common issues faced by supervisors. The purpose of this meeting will be to pool knowledge and experience and to provide support for fellow supervisors.

*Participants:* Graduate Program Coordinator.

*Timeline:* First meeting to take place in 2016-2017.

- e. Carleton University should routinely offer generous "completion scholarships" to 5th year sociology PhD students whose supervisors report that they are well on the way to completing their dissertation.

*Note:* While we endorse this recommendation, it is outside of the scope of a program level response. Moreover, Teaching Assistantships offered by FGPA to PhD students already extend to the fifth year.

*Steps:* The Graduate Program Coordinator, nonetheless, will discuss this recommendation and our endorsement thereof with the Dean of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs (FGPA).

*Participants:* Graduate Program Coordinator

*Timeline:* 2016-2017.

- f. Carleton University's senior administration should bargain for exemptions to the seniority-based hiring rules for contract instructors so that all sociology PhD students will be guaranteed the opportunity to teach.

*Note:* Per our response to the External Report, this recommendation is covered by Article 17. CUCQA accepts that no action will be taken on this item (see memorandum dated 20 April 2016 from the VPAVPA).

## **MA Programs**

*MA Recommendation 1:* In order to improve MA recruitment, the Dean of Graduate Studies should work with sociology to find ways to significantly improve funding offers to MA recruits.

*Note:* While we endorse this recommendation, it is outside of the scope of a program level response. Moreover, funding levels are discussed at the beginning of every recruitment cycle to ensure their competitiveness.

*Steps:* The Graduate Program Coordinator, nonetheless, will discuss this recommendation and our endorsement thereof with the Dean of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs (FGPA).

*Participants:* Graduate Program Coordinator

*Timeline:* 2016-2017.

*MA Recommendation 2:* Sociology should clarify the implications of all funding offers made to graduate students, especially in relation to the payment of fees in the summer in relation to the size of any scholarship that might be paid in that term.

*Steps:*

- (1) The Graduate Program Coordinator has added the following sentence in the informal admission letter from the department, effective from the most recent cycle of offers: "Once you have received the official offer, please review the important details posted to Carleton Central regarding amounts of funding, as well as how funding is distributed over the three terms."
- (2) Effective September 2016, we will place additional emphasis on information regarding the distribution of funding over the terms at orientation and encourage students to talk to us about their funding.

*Participants:* Graduate Program Coordinator.

*Timeline:* To be implemented annually.

*MA Recommendation 3:* Sociology should require all MA students to take SOCI 5809 (Logic of the Research Process) and SOCI 5005 (Recurring Debates in Social Thought), or indicate "normally required" rather than "strongly recommended."

*Steps:* SOCI 5809 and 5005 will now be “normally required”. The change has been entered into CourseLeaf, with the expectation that the calendar language will be updated for 2017-2018. The change has also been implemented into the audit.

*Participants:* Departmental Administrator.

*Timeline:* Completed.

## **BA Programs**

*BA Recommendation 1:* Sociology should closely monitor the impact of the planned curriculum changes to the methods course requirements (described on pp. 38-39 of the self-study), which will allow Honours and General BA students to obtain their degrees without completing any courses in quantitative methods or social statistics.

*Note:* In our response to the ER, we identified five areas for monitoring.

(a) Monitor the proportion of majors/honours opting for qualitative as compared to quantitative methods, (b) carry out a survey of employers, in particular on the impact of having (or not) quantitative training, (c) carry out a survey of MA programs in sociology to determine the extent to which undergraduate social statistics courses are admissions requirements and/or whether graduate level social statistics are degree requirements, and (d) monitor whether eliminating the statistics requirements has achieved the goal of improving retention and recruitment into the program. And, (e) monitor whether the methods changes have resulted in completing methods requirements in the intended year of study.

*Steps:*

- (1) Item (b): The departmental RA is in the process of carrying out a study of prospective employers of our BA graduates.
- (2) Item (c): The departmental RA completed a study of 20 MA programs in Canada and submitted the results in July 2016. In summary, she found:

*In eight (8/20) of the MA programs surveyed, self-select research methods [i.e., either qualitative or quantitative] training at the undergraduate level would or could make students either ineligible for admission or require them to do remedial methods coursework before or during the MA program in order to gain admission. In 9 other MA programs, self-select training would not make students ineligible for admission, and; in 3 MA programs, it is unclear whether it would.*

- (3) Items (a), (d) and (e): The departmental RA has carried out an initial exploration of possible monitoring strategies in consultation with the Undergraduate Administrator and OIRP. The results of this exploration are captured in a report and set of recommendations that will be referred to the Undergraduate Program Coordinator who will study each of the recommended strategies and implement a monitoring framework.

*Participants:* Undergraduate Administrator, Undergraduate Program Coordinator, and Curriculum Renewal and Learning Outcomes Committee (members TBD).

*Timeline:*

- (1) The departmental RA will deliver the results of the study of employers in August 2016.

- (2) The Undergraduate Program Coordinator will study the departmental RA's report and recommendations and implement a monitoring framework in 2016-2017.
- (3) The departmental RA's study of employers and study of MA programs will be referred to the new "Curriculum Renewal and Learning Outcomes Committee" (see "Quality of Instruction" below), which will commence work in September 2016. The committee will present preliminary recommendations to the caucus by January 2017 (which could potentially include further methods curriculum renewal).

*BA Recommendation 2:* The concentration in Social Justice should be introduced with a cap on enrollment until such time that (1) a full-time instructor can be hired to coordinate the experiential learning component of the concentration; and (2) additional units of TA funding are allocated to the Social Justice.

*Steps:*

- (1) The Chair will seek an appointment for a tenure-track position in the area of Social Justice.
- (2) Allocation of TAs will be addressed in-house.

*Participants:* Chair.

*Timeline:* The Chair will seek the tenure-track appointment in 2016-2017 to commence 1 July 2017. The issue of TAs will be dealt with on a continuing basis during the regular allocation TAs.

*BA Recommendation 3:* To improve the quality of the instruction and standardize the content of the two introductory sociology courses, the Department should hire two full-time, tenure-track instructors, one of which should be immediate (to start by September 2016).

*Note:* We have made two Instructor rank appointments that commenced 1 July 2016 to coordinate 1000-level SOCI courses. No further action to be taken.

## **Additional Actions**

### ***For-Credit Professional Workshops***

*Reviewer comment:* Sociology should consider whether the eight not-for-credit professional development workshops "could be integrated into, for credit course offerings" (p. 3).

*Note:* CUCQA accepts that no action will be taken on this item (see memorandum dated 20 April 2016 from the VPAVPA).

### ***MA Diploma in Quantitative Methods***

*Reviewer comment:* The reviewers were "impressed by the plan to begin offering diploma and certificate programs in quantitative research methods" (p. 12).

*Steps:*

- (1) The Chair will strike a new "Quantitative Methods Diploma Committee" to develop the diploma program in quantitative methods. The committee will initiate discussions with other social science units in FASS and FPA (and possibly Sprott School of Business) to inform them of

our plans for type 2 and/or type 3 diploma programs in quantitative methods, and to engage in consultation for possible collaboration.

- (2) The committee will develop the curriculum structure and new program proposal.

*Participants:* Quantitative Methods Diploma committee (members TBD).

*Timeline:*

- (1) The Quantitative Methods Diploma Committee will commence work in September 2016. Faculty will be assigned to this committee during the annual assignment of administrative duties.
- (2) The committee will develop the curriculum and enter a proposal for a new program in 2017-2018, to commence in 2018-2019.

### ***Internationalization***

*Reviewer comment:* The reviewers recommend greater internationalization in two key forms: (1) Recruiting international students, and (2) the “internationalization of teaching and learning” (p. 6).

*Steps:*

- (1) The departmental RA is investigating existing opportunities with Carleton International.
- (2) The Chair will strike a new “Committee on Internationalization” to be chaired by the unit Associate Chair to develop new opportunities with Carleton International, and explore strategies for internationalization with FGPA. Faculty members will be assigned to this committee during the annual assignment of administrative duties.

*Participants:* Departmental RA, Committee on Internationalization (members TBD).

*Timeline:*

- (1) The departmental RA will provide a summary of existing opportunities by August 2016.
- (2) The Committee on Internationalization will commence work in September 2016 with a mandate to operate till 2018-2019 (3 years) to develop a plan to internationalize our programs.

### ***BGInS***

*Reviewer comment:* The reviewers noted our proposed specialization in BGInS as a positive development for our program (p. 15).

*Note:* Our new BGInS specialization and stream have been approved to commence in 2017-2018. The Associate Chair will, provisionally, serve as the coordinator for the specialization/stream.

### ***Quality of Instruction***

*Reviewer comment:* The reviewers express concerns relating to “the quality and consistency of instruction in junior-level courses” (p. 15). There are two concerns specifically raised: (1) “that the same material gets repeated in multiple courses taught by different contract instructors” (p. 15) and (2) that “junior courses are taught at too elementary a theoretical level and thus leave students unprepared for the more demanding theoretical work in courses at the 3000 and 4000 levels” (p. 15). The reviewers conclude that these problems stem from the loss of a full-time Instructor III who taught the bulk of the 1000-level courses in the past, which resulted in reliance on contract instructors for all 1000-level instruction. They recommend that we address these problems through the appointment of two full-time instructors.

*Steps:*

- (1) We have made two Instructor rank appointments to coordinate the 1000-level curriculum, both of which commenced on 1 July 2016. The Instructors will consult closely with the Chair on curriculum coordination and delivery.
- (2) In response to the CPR process, the SOCI caucus has elected to undertake program-wide curriculum renewal to be articulated with the LOs of the BA programs. The Chair will strike a new committee on “Curriculum Renewal and Learning Outcomes” with a mandate to study and recommend improvements to the undergraduate curriculum. The committee will be chaired by the Associate Chair. Members will be assigned to the committee during the annual assignment of administrative duties.

*Participants:* 1000-level instructors, Curriculum Renewal and Learning Outcomes Committee (members TBD).

*Timeline:* The Curriculum Renewal and Learning Outcomes committee will commence work in September 2016 and operate with, initially, a two-year mandate, including annual reporting at the caucus summer retreat.

### **Learning Outcomes**

While CUCQA accepts that the program has decided not to take action on the ERs’ suggestions relating to LOs, the decision to undertake curriculum renewal was inspired by the CPR process. We may revisit our LOs through the curriculum renewal exercise.

**Action Plan for the Cyclical Program Review of the Undergraduate and Graduate Programs in Sociology**  
**Table of Actions and Timelines**

<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Participants</b>	<b>Timeline</b>
<i>General</i>			
<i>Recommendation 1:</i> Expand graduate student representation at Department Board meetings	(1) Grad student report at every departmental board meeting (2) Interim grad rep to SOCI caucus (3) Permanent, elected rep to SOCI caucus	N/A	N/A
<i>PhD Program</i>			
<i>PhD Recommendation 1:</i> Hiring recommendations to sustain nationally recognized PhD program	Pursue negotiations with the Dean of FASS	Chair	Beginning 2016-2017
<i>PhD Recommendation 2:</i> g. Monitor initiatives to improve the median time-to-completion of PhD students and introduce new measures where warranted	(3) Monitoring tool to track meeting of milestones and times-to-completion (4) New PhD Program Committee to examine median time-to-completion and propose changes to the PhD program	Graduate Program Coordinator, Graduate Program Administrator, and PhD Program Committee (to be chaired by Graduate Program Coordinator)	(3) Yearly monitoring of milestones and time-to-completion, over 5 years (4) PhD Program Committee to present recommendations at 2017 summer caucus retreat
<i>PhD Recommendation 2:</i> h. Track employment status of all full-time PhD registrants	<i>Note:</i> Although we had initially agreed to implement this recommendation, we have concluded that it is not feasible. Students do not typically inform the program of employment outside of the University. There is no way of monitoring employment beyond self-reporting, which is unreliable. After serious consideration, we have determined that we are unable to implement this recommendation.		
<i>PhD Recommendation 2:</i> i. Investigate adding a required seminar in	New PhD Program Committee to examine departmental RA's study of other programs and	PhD Program Committee (to be chaired by Graduate Program Coordinator)	PhD Program Committee to present a motion at the summer 2017 retreat

sociological theory	make recommendation to caucus		
<b>PhD Recommendation 2:</b> j. Consider providing course release for completed graduate supervisions	<i>Note:</i> Caucus developed three, interlocking responses to this recommendation: Distribution of workload, compensation and supervisory best practices.		
• <i>Distribution of workload</i>	(3) Continue pairing incoming students with faculty who supervise fewer students (4) Circulate listing of ongoing supervisory distribution	Graduate Program Coordinator	Implementation to continue annually/ongoing
• <i>Compensation</i>	Explore compensation options	Chair	Annually, during the assignment of teaching duties, beginning in 2016-2017 (to take effect in 2017-2018)
• <i>Supervisory best practices</i>	Regular meetings of faculty to share and workshop supervisory best practices	Graduate Program Coordinator	First meeting in 2016-2017
<b>PhD Recommendation 2:</b> k. Carleton should offer “completion scholarships”	Discuss program’s support for this recommendation with Dean of FGPA	Graduate Program Coordinator	2016-2017
<b>PhD Recommendation 2:</b> 1. Senior administration should bargain for exemptions to CA to give sociology PhD students opportunity to teach	No action to be taken.		

<b>MA Program</b>			
<b>MA Recommendation 1:</b> Dean of FGPA should find ways to significantly improve funding offers	Discuss program's support for this recommendation with Dean of FGPA	Graduate Program Coordinator	2016-2017
<b>MA Recommendation 2:</b> Clarify implications of funding offers by term	(3) New wording in informal admission letter (4) Greater emphasis on relevant information at orientation	Graduate Program Coordinator	Implemented in 2015-2016, continuing annually
<b>MA Recommendation 3:</b> Require all MA students to take SOCI 5809 and SOCI 5005	Minor modification entered into CourseLeaf to make courses "normally required"	Departmental Administrator	Completed
<b>BA Programs</b>			
<b>BA Recommendation 1:</b> Monitor impact of methods curriculum changes, specifically:  (a) Monitor proportion of majors/honours opting for qualitative versus quantitative methods, (b) carry out survey of employers on impact of reduced methods training, (c) carry out survey of MA programs, (d) monitor impact on retention and recruitment and (e) monitor impact on completing methods requirements in the intended	(4) Item (b): Departmental RA carrying out study of prospective employers to be referred to new Curriculum Renewal and Learning Outcomes Committee (5) Item (c): Departmental RA completed study of MA programs to be referred to new Curriculum Renewal and Learning Outcomes Committee (6) Items (a), (d) and (e): Departmental RA generated report and	Undergraduate Administrator, Undergraduate Program Coordinator, and Curriculum Renewal and Learning Outcomes Committee (to be chaired by unit Associate Chair)	(4) Departmental RA to deliver results of study of employers and proposed monitoring framework by August 2016 (5) Monitoring framework to be implemented in 2016-2017 (6) Curriculum Renewal and Learning Outcomes Committee to develop response to results of the studies of employers and MA programs and present recommendations to the caucus by January 2017

year of study	recommendations to be referred to Undergraduate Program Coordinator to study and implement monitoring framework.		
<b>BA Recommendation 2:</b> Concentration in Social Justice should be capped until (1) full-time instructor can be hired and (2) additional units of TA funding are allocated	(3) Seek tenure-track position in Social Justice to commence 1 July 2017 (4) Allocation of TAs will be addressed in-house	Chair	(1) Seek appointment in 2016-2017 (2) TA allocation, ongoing
<b>BA Recommendation 3:</b> Hire two instructors	Two Instructors have been hired, commencing 1 July 2016. No further action.	N/A	N/A
<b>For-Credit Professional Workshops:</b> Course credit for professional development workshops	No action to be taken.		
<b>MA Diploma in Quantitative Methods:</b> Plan to mount diploma and certificate programs in quantitative research methods	(3) Chair to strike a “Quantitative Methods Diploma Committee” (4) Committee to develop new program proposal	Quantitative Methods Diploma Committee (to be chaired by a quantitative methodologist in unit)	(3) Chair to strike committee in September 2017 (4) New program proposal in 2017-2018, to commence in 2018-2019
<b>Internationalization:</b> Greater internationalization in recruitment and teaching and learning	(3) Departmental RA investigating existing opportunities (4) Chair to strike “Committee on Internationalization”	Departmental RA, Committee on Internationalization (to be chaired by unit Associate Chair)	(3) RA to provide a summary of existing opportunities by August 2016 (4) Committee to commence work in 2016-2017 with a mandate to operate till

			2018-2019 (3 years) to develop internationalization plan
<b>BGInS</b>	<i>Note:</i> Our new BGInS specialization and stream have been approved to commence in 2017-2018.		
<b>Quality of Instruction:</b> Hire instructors to address overlap across lower-level courses. Lower-level courses not preparing students for upper-level courses.	(3) Two Instructors have been hired, commenced 1 July 2016 (4) Chair to strike new Curriculum Renewal and Learning Outcomes Committee to undertake program-wide curriculum renewal	1000-level instructors, Curriculum Renewal and Learning Outcomes Committee (to be chaired by unit Associate Chair)	Committee to commence work in September 2016 and operate with two-year mandate, including annually reporting at the caucus summer retreat