

**CONSENT AGENDA  
to the Open Agenda of the 601<sup>st</sup> Meeting of the Board of Governors**

**Thursday, March 23<sup>rd</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 600<sup>th</sup> meeting on February 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2017.

**4.1.2 Founders Award Board Members for Jury Committee**

- a) Working paper circulated in advance.

**4.2 ITEM(S) FOR INFORMATION**

**4.2.1 Committee Minutes**

- a) Finance Committee
  - 287<sup>th</sup> Meeting, January 25<sup>th</sup>, 2017
- b) Governance Committee
  - 32<sup>nd</sup> Meeting, October 5<sup>th</sup>, 2016

**4.2.2 Minutes from Senate Meeting**

- Approved Minutes from November 2016 and January 2017 Senate meetings were circulated in advance.

**4.2.3 Cyclical Review Reports**

- a) Undergraduate and Graduate Programs in Film Studies
- b) Undergraduate and Graduate Programs in History
- c) Graduate Programs in Political Economy

**Minutes of the 600<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the  
Board of Governors**

**Thursday, February 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2017 at 4:00 p.m.  
Room 2440R Richcraft Hall, Carleton University**

<b>PRESENT:</b>	Dr. F. Afagh	Mr. K. Evans (phone)	Mr. G. Owens
	Mr. F. Alhattab	Mr. D. Fortin	Dr. R. O'Reilly Runte
	Ms. D. Alves	Mr. O. Javanpour	Dr. E. Sloan
	Ms. D. Armstrong (phone)	Mr. P. Dinsdale	Ms. C. Switzer
	Mr. M. Bueckert	Mr. I. Lee	Mr. A. Tattersfield
	Dr. C. Carruthers (Chair)	Dr. P. Merchant	Ms. R. Thompson
	Mr. D. Craig	Mr. N. Nanos	Mr. A. Ullett
	Ms. L. A. Daly	Mr. J. Nordenstrom	Ms. L. Watson
	Mr. J. Durrell	Dr. B. Örmeci	Mr. B. Wener
		Ms. J. Ostrajanskiy	Mr. M. Wernick (Vice Chair)
<b>REGRETS:</b>	Ms. G. Courtland	Ms. C. Gold	
<b>STAFF:</b>	Ms. S. Blanchard	Ms. A. Goth	Mr. M. Piché
	Mr. D. Boyce	Dr. R. Goubran	Dr. P. Ricketts
	Ms. J. Conley	Mr. D. Levesque	Mr. T. Sullivan
	Mr. D. Cumming	Mr. S. Levitt	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 were none.

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

The Chair noted that he received a motion from a student governor related to item 5.2 and the Chair has suggested that following Mr. Piché's presentation the motion could be considered.

Mr. Owens moved, and it was seconded by Ms. Alves, that the open agenda of the 600<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Board of Governors be approved, as presented. The motion carried.

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

Mr. Tattersfield moved, and it was seconded by Ms. Daly, that the Open Consent agenda with the exception of the item 4.2.1b Building Program Committee be approved, as presented. The motion carried.

It was noted that in the Senate minutes W. Felepchuk was marked as absent but was present at the meeting.

Regarding the 148<sup>th</sup> Building Program Committee Meeting held on November 25<sup>th</sup>, 2016 there was a discussion about the project timelines for the ARISE Building and either there was adequate time allowed for vacating the existing building and labs. The answer was yes, there was adequate time is included in the project timeline. It was asked if included an assessment based on the opinion of the Department of Neuroscience. Conversations with the department have been ongoing and as of now, administration has not heard any concern about the building being vacated by the March 1<sup>st</sup> deadline. Formal approval was not sought on the assessment timeline by the Department of Neuroscience. It was stated by a governor that there is an issue with the March 1<sup>st</sup> deadline.

Mr. Tattersfield moved, and it was seconded by Mr. Wener, that the item 4.2.1b Building Program Committee be approved, as presented. The motion carried.

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

#### **5.1 Board Community-at Large Member for Vacancy on the Board**

A recommendation was brought forward for to elect a new member to the Board of Governors'. A working paper was circulated prior to the meeting. Both the Chair and President have met the candidate. Mr. Dinsdale has experience with academic institutions. He has also worked with volunteer organizations and is the CEO of YMCA Canada which is a large national organization. He has been president of a number of important indigenous groups across the country. He will be a great asset to the Board and it would be an honour to welcome him.

Dr. Runte moved, and it was seconded by Mr. Wernick, as recommended by the Executive Committee, to approve the appointment of Peter Dinsdale as a community-at-large member of the Board for a three-year term effective February 2, 2017 ending June 30, 2019. It was carried.

Mr. Peter Dinsdale joined the Board meeting as a governor and Member of the Corporation. The Chair welcomed and thanked Mr. Dinsdale for joining the Board, noting his excellent CV and that he will be a significant contributor to the Board.

Mr. Ricketts noted given the YMCA involvement with the creation of Carleton, it is fitting that the CEO of YMCA Canada should join the Board during Carleton's 75<sup>th</sup> anniversary.

## 5.2 Approval of Recommendation from Finance Committee

A working paper was circulated prior to the meeting. A presentation entitled "Board of Governors Tuition Fee Framework 2017-2018 & 2018-2019" and an article "*What students really pay: Net Tuition at Ontario Universities*" by the Council of Ontario Universities were circulated.

Tuition makes up a high percentage of the revenues and covers the costs of providing high quality education and services to our students. The Board approves a framework each year so that Financial Services can prepare an annual budget. The Finance and Executive Committees have met to review and discuss the proposed framework.

Mr. Piché presented the Tuition Fee Framework 2017-2018 and 2018-2019. The proposal is being made in the context of major government policy changes on how the university will be funded over the next two years. Two criteria were considered when making this proposal: 1) the university must have sustainable ongoing operations; and 2) must be able to continue supporting student aide.

Tuition fees represent 58% of the operating revenue for Carleton and are the most important source of funding in comparison to 38% from government grants. The majority of operating expenditures are for salary and benefits which represent 70% (\$315M). The second highest expenditure is for student aid and enrolment incentives which represent 10% (\$45M).

Why do we need to increase tuition every year? There are annual cost increases including: salaries (\$9.4M), benefits (\$23M), utilities/new space (\$1.5M), student aid (\$2.0M), and new ongoing initiatives (\$1.5M). There is a continuing focus on cost control to mitigate increasing costs (e.g. energy conservation projects). These costs are non-discretionary and need to be funded by government grants or increasing tuition fees. Although it is predicted that there will be a decrease in enrolment for 2017-2018 there will still be increased number of students due to increased enrolment in previous years.

The preliminary projection of Carleton's operating budget assuming flat enrolment, no additional government grants and average tuition increases of 3% per year shows that by 2021-2022 revenue will barely cover base expenses leaving no money for additional student aid, new academic programs, capital projects or other contingencies. To help offset these costs we continue to look for increased efficiencies to improve our operations through the Office of Quality Initiatives. Increasing enrolment is difficult as universities draw from a decreasing student demographic.

Cutting costs is always an option but has many negative consequences for Carleton's stakeholders. Our budget needs to be considered in conjunction with changes in government policy which include a two-year tuition framework and a movement toward net tuition billing and the implementation of a new funding framework with the key characteristics outlined in slides 7 and 8.

The implementation of net tuition billing is an important part of the government policy and will be implemented in 2018-2019. By integrating all OSAP grants and student aids in one and asking only for payment of the net tuition, students and their parents will clearly see how much they are actually required to pay.

Slide 9 shows what net tuition billing might look like for Carleton students either receiving or not receiving OSAP assistance. This analysis is consistent with the study done by the Council of Ontario Universities entitled "*What students really pay: Net Tuition at Ontario Universities*" conducted in August 2016.

Slide 10 shows what net tuition will look like for a student receiving maximum OSAP assistance.

The supplemental tables provided show a break down of tuition fee increases by program, proposed administration fee increases and the domestic tuition fees for 2016-2017 for domestic and international students as compared to other Ontario universities.

Slide 13 was clarified. When referring to upper year graduate students, what is shown is a 0 % increase to the fee table for certain graduate programs. If a graduate student is paying less than the fee in the table provided they may see an increase in their tuition.

#### Questions:

At a previous meeting, it was indicated that there might be a surplus this year above what we were expecting why was an option not given to use some of the surplus to offset increases in costs? The costs outlined previously are ongoing and recurring. Yes, we could take funds from a given year's surplus to cover increasing costs but then you are not dealing with the underlying problem long-term. Slide 5 was referred to showing that by 2021-22 we will be barely covering basic operating costs. The policy of the university is that, when a surplus or deficit is forecasted with accuracy, the Finance Committee

recommends to the Board how these funds should be allocated, including for additional student aid.

A follow-up question was asked if it would ever be possible to include students in that conversation (concerning allocation of a surplus)? Students are included in the conversation through Town Hall meeting, (one was held on January 16<sup>th</sup>, 2017). When a recommendation on any surplus is made it has and will come to the Board for consideration and there are student and academic representatives around the table and they will have input into the decision.

It should be noted that about 48% of our students will be paying only about \$100 tuition. Of the 48%, 17% will receive about \$2,000. The students that are most in need are receiving assistance.

Do we have an idea of what percentage of the \$2 million is coming from the increase in tuition? If we are increasing tuition of all students to help a few, has it been considered not to increase student aid? Part of the increase in student aid is coming from a mandated government policy that every time tuition fees are raised a portion must be allocated to student aid. \$1.3 million of the \$2 million is government mandated student aid.

Is there any consideration for option B, not just from a short-term perspective but from a long-term perspective as well that perhaps it would be a good idea to decrease expenditures if we are having issues finding other sources of revenue that aren't coming from students, especially graduate students? The administration is continuing to invest in projects focussed on reducing the university's costs. One example is the cogeneration facility project which will see considerable reduction in energy costs. Reducing staffing especially on the faculty side would create significant challenges particularly because Carleton has continued to grow in the past years. With increased enrolment, there is greater demand on the faculty and staff and to think of reducing that staffing would affect the quality of the programs offered. Carleton is one of the most efficiently run universities when compared with key benchmark data and to use reduction as a long-term option would have a significant impact as outlined in slide 6.

One thing that we can do and continue to do is raise money for bursaries and scholarships to increase student aid. Many of the Board members have made significant donations to student aid and continue to do so and it our way of supporting the students forever which is a sustainable long-term commitment to our student body.

It is important to understand how this new structuring will affect our students here on campus. Do we have a break-down of what our students will be paying at the end of the day? The difficulty is the funding and tuition framework are not fully out. We have estimates of the sticker price for students but until we have more information from the government and we can break that down for our various programs it will be difficult to know the exact cost. Net billing is to be fully implemented in 2018-2019 but starting in

the spring of 2017 Carleton is part of a pilot project which will give us some indication of what this will mean for students.

The Net Tuition example on slide 10 notes the total tax credit of \$1,402, does this average include the provincial tax credit (which potentially no longer exist with OGS)? Because we don't know the future, these are 2014-2015 based charts. The new system will transfer the tax credit to lower income students. The government is working toward doing. Additional details are provided in the article distributed including how the tax credit will shift into Ontario grants.

Because this is a response to provincial mandate, will we see this change across the province? Does that put us at a disadvantage when compared with other provinces? As we are aware, all universities in Ontario will be following the same framework set out by the province. Ontario's fees have been higher compared to other provinces and government support for universities has been lower. This framework does not change that. It does mean that students in need will not have to pay the higher tuition amount. Tax credits were provided before to parents. The aid will flow directly to students.

There were concerns expressed that a lot of student struggle to pay their tuition and associated costs and that the numbers provided are based on assumptions that students will be eligible for grants and scholarships that they may or may not receive. If you refer to slide 9 and the article "*What Students Really Pay*" the \$113 projected as net pay for tuition is an average. Some students pay and those who are most in need under the OSAP system get a grant (abstracted from loans which are in addition) which may exceed the tuition fee by \$2,000. Page 3 of the article shows the average OSAP grants by parental income and tuition bands. The OSAP system is not perfect. For example, part-time students are not fully covered and there are certain classes of students that are not supported. For a large number of full-time students, it is not a bad system and will be made much better by the net tuition billing system. The system is redistributive transferring from those students who have higher parental incomes to those who have less. This is a progressive tax change that the government is introducing.

It was also stated that two years ago, when we spent a lot of time investigating tuition in the Tuition Taskforce. The province is trying to bring all the information together so the student receives one net bill as they enter their term.

Aside from the letter that the Board of Governors signed that was sent to the government for student support for university education what are we as a body or institution doing to lobby the government for additional funding for post-secondary education? What are the presidents of Ontario Universities doing on this front? It was noted that the Ontario colleges had an independent accounting firm do a review on their financial situation which they claim is very desperate and the government's response to this was "no new money". Every year the university presidents present to the government how the universities are receiving less funding from the government and the response is that the

province is in a deficit and they cannot provide new funding. It is not just something for the Board or the presidents to lobby the government. Governments make decisions when they believe good of the whole. This provincial government heard the students who indicated that students in low-income families could not pay the fees so the system is being flipped to help the lower-income students. Now we need to join together to persuade the government that helping poor students is not enough. There has to be a public recognition of the problem. The Council of Ontario Universities has hired a public relations firm and they are going out across the province to talk to people to obtain their opinions on higher education and the funding of higher education so that we, as a whole, can show the government that it is the population asking for change, for the social and economic good for our province. It was mentioned that further discussion is needed to see how the student associations across the province can be involved in supporting this initiative. There is an election in Ontario coming next year and there might be an opportunity in that context to present this case.

It was moved by Mr. Bueckert, seconded by Mr. Owens that the tuition framework approval be postponed until the university receives information from the Ministry about the calculations for tuition fees so that further information can be provided. It was defeated with three abstentions.

In the information received there is an indication of increases of zero percent but sometimes when students go to their tuition calculator they find their tuition has gone up. There was concern expressed about there possibly being hidden increases.

There was a question asked if a category in the table states a zero percent increase can the Board have assurances that the tuition dollars that are currently existing will not increase over the next two years? No. There will be a zero percent increase to the tuition fee table for PhD and Masters students for next year. First-year students going into second year will not see an increase. If there are students who have been here longer (3<sup>rd</sup> or 4<sup>th</sup> year PhD students) they may see a dollar increase because they are coming from a lower base, then what is included in the table and in that case will see an increase.

It is not the Board's role to evaluate every category of student's tuition fee. If there is still concerns going forward, there is an opportunity to take the questions to the Finance Committee for further detailed analysis.

The consequences of voting to postpone the approval of the tuition framework would be that the operating budget could not be prepared for 2017/2018.

The increase in tuition will not cover the increase in expenditures is there another option to look at? We are just approving the tuition framework and not the operating budget at today's meeting. We will need to find other sources of revenue to cover the short-fall. The operating budget will come to the Board for approval in March 2017.

Mr. Wener moved, and it was seconded by Ms. Thompson, as recommended by the Finance and Executive Committee, to approve an average domestic annual tuition fee increase of 3% for 2017-2018 and 2018-2019, the international tuition fees schedule as per table provided, and an increase of miscellaneous administration fees as per Consumer Price Index (CPI) (1.3%), as presented. It was carried with three opposed (Mr. Owens requested his name be stated as opposed).

### 5.3 Approval of Nominating Policy and Terms of Reference

The Governance Committee met on January 26, 2017 and developed the proposed Nominating Policy and Terms of Reference. It is intended to set out the duties of the Nominating Committee regarding identification and recruitment of potential candidates for the Board. The Committee is also charged vetting the qualifications and ensuring that potential candidates are educated on the role of the governor. The Committee will prepare a slate of recommended candidates for consideration and approval by the members of the corporation and the Board. The policy includes an appeal for candidates that feel there is an irregularity in the process. The decision of the Nominating Committee will be final.

Mr. Evans moved, and it was seconded by Mr. Javanpour, as recommended by the Governance Committee, to approve the Nominating Policy and Terms of Reference, as presented. The motion carried.

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

### 6.1 IT Security

Assistant Vice-President for Information Technology Services (ITS), Denis Levesque gave a presentation on IT Security at Carleton University. ITS is keeping our system up and running and improving bandwidth and speed so that we can keep up with the latest technological improvements. ITS has been excellent in dealing with the cyber-attack we experienced in November, keeping us operating and minimizing disruption.

The presentation highlighted the sense of urgency, the risks for higher education institutions, and the impacts of an attack. Mr. Leveque also gave an overview of the November 28, 2016 Ransom Ware Attack at Carleton and the specific actions taken by ITS in response. The administrative side of the university was affected and ITS worked to get all systems back up and running. Some workstations were infected and had files encrypted that could not be recovered.

The priority is to protect ourselves in the short-term and make long-term improvements to improve RIT Security posture. ITS must prepare, prevent, respond, and improve. A

new enforced password change policy is now in place for all faculty and staff. IT hygiene guidance was provided and recommended for Carleton users.

A report about the attack and the protective measures being taken will be presented to at the next Audit Committee meeting on March 8<sup>th</sup>.

This is an urgent issue and business risk at the national level. There was a nation-wide consultation on national security. There is an opportunity for our students and faculty as there is projected growth in IMIT (Cyber Security) for well-paying jobs in this area. The teaching and research areas of the university should be aware of this and the opportunity it presents for Carleton.

There was a question if Carleton's business continuity insurance includes cyber-attacks? Yes. it does and the insurance company was involved once the attack was known.

What is the relationship between IT and Information Security strategy and priorities in relations to the Business Continuity Plans (BCP)? Specifically, at Carleton we work with our risk management team and the business continuity plan has been updated last year. In ITS, there is a disaster and recovery plan in place. ITS is a key component of disaster and continuity planning for the institution.

It was asked if ITS has enough resources or fund to cover this important issue? The short answer was affirmative.

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

### **7.1 Report from the Chair**

#### *7.1.1 Executive Compensation Framework*

The Colleges have already started work on the framework. Under the legislation which addresses the compensation of the President and the Vice-Presidents, the Board will establish a program which will evolve over the next few months. The university is at the stage of engaging outside help to identify our comparators and then a compensation framework will be developed for those positions outlined and there will be public information and consultation. By September 5, 2017 the framework must be finalized and approved by the Board.

### *7.1.2 Board Survey Results*

The Board Office has been conducting surveys of the board meetings and will continue to do so for one or two more meetings as they have been helpful. Most board members are satisfied with the way the meetings are being conducted. Board members are more satisfied with the material being sent out on a timely basis and available through CUCollab. There were a few comments that the meetings are long and maybe it would be beneficial to shorten the meetings but perhaps hold more meetings. Please add comments to the survey to help us to improve the board meetings.

## *7.2 Report from the President*

### *7.2.1 Strategic Integrated Plan Update*

The SIP Update will be given under closed session by Ms. Blanchard and Dr. Butler.

### *7.2.2 Academic Appointments*

There are quite a few administrative searches going on now including: Chancellor, Vice-President (Research and International), and Director of Equity Services. All search committees have been formed and in progress.

The Dean of Science, Dr. Malcolm Butler has been named Vice-President, Academic and Research at St. Mary's University in Nova Scotia as of July 1, 2017 and leaves Carleton University on June 30, 2017. Dwight Deugo has agreed to take on the role of Interim Dean of Science while a search is conducted for a new Dean. The Provost thanked Dr. Butler for his incredible work as Dean of Science over his term at Carleton and congratulated him on his new appointment. His contributions to Carleton will be celebrated at a later time.

There are four Dean searches underway including: Dean of Faculty of Engineering and Design, Dean of Science, Dean of Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences and Dean of Business.

### *7.2.3 Strategic and Budgetary Planning*

As mentioned previously the framework for funding universities by the Province is changing and Carleton received further information on framework February 1, 2017. Universities will be able to negotiate the corridor for funding with the provincial government and new programs initiated will be considered in this funding formula. There are currently four

new, Carleton programs that are under consideration for approval by the province.

The province has confirmed that there will be five areas that will be part of the Strategic Mandate Agreement including: 1) Student Experience; 2) Innovation in Teaching and Learning; 3) Access and Equity; 4) Research Excellence and Impact; and 5) Innovation in Economic Development and Community Engagement. Each university will negotiate what percentage of their funding will be measured against these five areas based on performance indicators. Carleton University strategically will want to be measured against all five areas as we are a “holistic” university that undertakes initiatives in these areas.

The performance indicators will include (not a comprehensive listing): retention from first year to second year; number of high-impact classes offered; the percentage of the student graduating with at least two high-impact classes in their curriculum; funding for research; number of citations; weight of the papers published; the number of graduate students; the degree completion of graduate students; the number of international students; employment of students following graduation and how many have full-time employment; how many students started their own companies following graduation; all academic programs; the number of students registered in each program; graduation rate for each academic program; indication of financial sustainability; report on all interinstitutional collaboration and cooperation both nationally and internationally. This will be a major report on what we do and how we are doing currently.

It was asked what high-impact teaching is? Each institution will define what high-impact teaching means at their university but examples are given within the document such as: the classes going out the classroom, combinations of computer work and lecture teaching, experiential learning such as co-op, internships, placements, student international exchanges, international research, undergraduate research, independence or team research projects, community projects. These all add to the classroom experiences. Interactive classrooms (flipped classrooms) which included more group and interactive activities within the classroom are also considered high-impact teaching. There is a lot of high-impact teaching activities happening currently at Carleton.

#### *7.2.4 Update on Campus Issues*

##### *a) Neuroscience Department Relocation*

A project manager has been hired to coordinate the move of the Neuroscience Department from Carleton's Life Sciences Building to the University of Ottawa Facility. The Dean, Provost and the Vice-Presidents have been meeting with faculty and students. Each student will be cared for during the relocation and if there are any outstanding issues they should be brought forward so that a solution can be found.

The following questions were raised: What is the current progress of the project managers facilitating the move? Current estimates on the impact of the move on student and faculty research and timely completion rates? And are there any funds to help compensate for loss of research or study?

It is the belief of administration that all students have been cared for and will be able to meet their academic deadlines. There was a full report given at the Senate meeting. The project management team has been working effectively with the department to facilitate the move and working toward the move deadline. The focus has been on students who are intending to graduate including undergraduate students conducting research will not be affected in terms of their graduation dates. Graduate students with the intention of graduating this year have to be identified and administration is working with the Faculty of Graduate and Post-doctoral Affairs and the graduate student's supervisors to identify if there are any graduate students who are impacted in such a way that it might delay their graduation.

Is there is any indication of support for those Neuroscience students who are not intending to graduate in 2017 but are affected by the move of space and equipment? There is no indication that a semester will be lost by any student in Neuroscience. Moving buildings is common on campuses due to renovations and there is always inconvenience. There may be some impacts and administration has committed to addressing any impacts that do arise.

Is there any possible impact on this project, particularly students, due to Dr. Butler leaving the university? There will be no impact. Dr. Butler will be at the university until the end of June 2017 and Dr. Deugo will oversee the project as of July 2017. By the end of June, the relocation will have occurred. In the Fall, there will be the planned move into the new Health Sciences Building.

b) *Quebec City Mosque Shootings*

On Sunday night, there was a terrible shooting in a mosque in Quebec City and the President sent out a message to the community that flags would be lowered to half-mast in memory of those who lost their lives. On Tuesday, January 31<sup>st</sup> five minutes of silence were shared by students, staff and faculty in the Galleria as an expression of our solidarity against this attack. A copy of the email was distributed to the Board.

c) *U.S. Executive Order*

A message was sent out to the Carleton community this afternoon to address what the President and Vice-Presidents are doing to address any issues that might arise as a result of this order. A copy of the email was distributed to the Board. The focus will be to help our students, faculty and staff that need assistance.

It was asked if Carleton has considered creating a task force (with a fund of \$250K) to assist students and staff affected by the travel ban similar to the University of British Columbia? No, this is not being considered at this time. If staff, faculty, or students have made travel arrangements previously and now have to cancel travel plans the university will reimburse those funds.

7.3 Committee Chair Updates

7.3.1 *Building Program Committee (D. Craig)*

The committee met on November 9 and 25, 2016 and January 11, 2017. The Health Sciences Building is due for substantial completion in August 2017. The Business School Building schematic design has been approved and the detailed design is underway and will be tender ready by August 2017 but will not be approved for construction until such time as the financing is in place and the business case is satisfactory. The University Centre Addition preliminary conceptual design was completed at the end of October but the student referendum that was held in November did not succeed so the project is now on hold. The Co-generation facility project continues with funding secured from Hydro Ottawa and the ESO, contracts have been signed and construction is scheduled to start in early 2017 with completion in 2018. The ARISE Building has been of particular focus for the committee over two of the three meetings held this year. The funding was approved by the government which has an extremely ambitious completion date hence the need to get the final design approved and out to

tender. The original tender was scheduled to be submitted by the end of January and it has been delayed at the contractors request until mid-February. It has been approved to move forward directly to contract award and construction approval provided it is within the budget approved by the Finance Committee and there is no change to the completion date as this would affect the funding provided by the province. Other items that were discussed at the committee meetings were facility renewal program (\$14 million per year) to try to regain some of the usefulness of our existing buildings. The five-year program is ambitious and the committee discusses and reviews the progress of the project as it continues.

### *7.3.2 Community Relations and Advancement Committee (L.A. Daly)*

The last meeting of the committee was held on January 25<sup>th</sup>. The committee would like to host an event on March 20<sup>th</sup> in MacOdrum Library to talk with the Carleton community called “The Talk Exchange” and use the motto of “Ours The Task Eternal” as the backdrop. Invitations will be given to our constituents for all stakeholder groups: students, faculty, staff, donors and alumni. The event would be a forward thinking initiative, launching with two questions: 1) What is your ambition for Carleton over the next 75 years? and 2) What kind of Carleton would you like to leave for future generations? The event will embrace our 75<sup>th</sup> anniversary and moving beyond that to envision the future.

The Department of University Communications (DUC) presented the new Intranet launched in December 2016 and was co-sponsored by DUC, Information Technology Services and Human Resources. The platform will enhance communications for faculty and staff highlighting the information that is relevant to everyday life, HR information, employee directory, etc. The information that is currently housed on the public website that is better suited to be on an internal intranet space.

Ms. Blanchard also presented to the committee about recruitment of transfer students and the 195 pathways students can follow to come to Carleton. The resources for transfer students were also highlighted such as a credit coordinator officer, peer support program, etc.

### *7.3.3 Finance Committee (B. Wener)*

The committee continues to monitor all the capital projects and spending that are currently ongoing under the guidance of the university.

### *7.3.4 Governance Committee (K. Evans)*

There are other matters under consideration but nothing to bring forward to the Board at this time.

**8. OPEN-QUESTION PERIOD**

There were no questions.

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

The Chair reminded the Board of the Capitals Hoops Classic at the Canadian Tire Centre on Friday, February 3<sup>rd</sup>. Carleton will be playing against the University of Ottawa. The women's game starting at 6:00 pm.

The Board is seeking student governors for 2017/2018 and the deadline for expressions of interest is February 17<sup>th</sup>.

The Board is also seeking nominations for the Board of Governors Award for Outstanding Community Achievement and the deadline is February 20<sup>th</sup>.

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

**COMMITTEE:** Full Board

**MEETING:** (713<sup>th</sup>) March 13<sup>th</sup>, 2017

**ORIGINATOR:** University Secretary

**ITEM:** 5.2 Founders Award Board  
Members for Jury Committee

**I. MATERIAL ATTACHED**

- No attachments

**II. BACKGROUND**

Carleton University was established in 1942, because of the dedication and commitment of our founders—a small group of Ottawa citizens, led by Dr. Henry Marshall Tory, who dared to imagine a university in the nation’s capital that would serve Canadians whose education was interrupted by World War II. It is our individual founders – past, present and future – whose commitment has helped build one of Canada’s most respected universities and whose leadership will ascertain our future.

The Founders Award, Carleton’s highest non-academic honour, was inaugurated in June 1996 to recognize and pay tribute to those individuals who have made significant contributions to the advancement of Carleton through their dedication, generosity and commitment to the values of the university. It is awarded annually, when merited, at Spring Convocation.

Proposed Committee membership:

<b>President, Carleton University Alumni Association- Chair</b>	Louise Hayes
<b>Chancellor of the University</b>	Charles Chi
<b>Chief Development Officer</b>	Jennifer Conley
<b>Clerk of Senate</b>	Donald Russell
<b>Board of Governors Faculty Member:</b>	Banu Örmeci
<b>Board of Governors Staff Member:</b>	Art Ullett
<b>Board of Governors Student Member:</b>	Joanne Ostrajanskiy
<b>Board of Governors Community-at-Large Member:</b>	Oliver Javanpour
<b>Additional member of the Carleton University Alumni Association Executive Council</b>	

**III. DECISION REQUIRED/RECOMMENDATION**

To approve the Board of Governors members on the 2017 Founders Award Committee.



**Carleton**  
UNIVERSITY

**Canada's Capital University**

**Minutes of the 287<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Finance Committee  
Wednesday, January 25, 2017 at 3:00 p.m.  
Room 2440R, Richcraft Hall**

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

**Staff:** Ms. A. Goth  
Mr. S. Levitt  
Mr. M. Piché  
Ms. S. Blanchard  
Dr. P. Ricketts  
Dr. R. Goubran  
Mr. T. Sullivan  
Ms. B. Steele  
Ms. A. Marcotte  
Mr. B. Winer  
Ms. N. Merriman

**Regrets:** Mr. N. Nanos

---

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

The meeting was called to order at 3:10 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 Mr. Nordenstrom and seconded by Dr. Afagh that the agenda of the 287<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Finance Committee be approved, as presented. The motion carried.

#### 4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

##### 4.1 Minutes of the previous meeting

Minutes of the 286<sup>th</sup> Finance Committee were circulated. It was moved by Mr. Nordenstrom and seconded by Dr. Afagh that the minutes be approved, as presented. The motion carried.

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

##### 5.1 Tuition Framework

On December 15, 2016, the Ministry of Advanced Education and Skills Development (MARSD) announced that the 2013-14 to 2016-17 Tuition Framework would remain in place for an additional two years. Tuition fees could increase within specified limits provided the overall fee increase was less than or equal to the cap prescribed by the framework. For the years 2017-18 and 2018-19 this cap will remain at 3%. Universities are encouraged to set fee increases for the next two years to facilitate the move to 'Net Tuition Billing'. A 3% increase will represent approximately \$9.0 million annually but the operating costs of the university will increase about \$15 million meaning there will be about a \$5-7 million shortfall. In order to meet cost increases and enhance program offerings it is recommended that tuition fees for 2017-2018 and 2018-19 be set at a level that maximizes the available tuition revenue within the Tuition Fee Framework.

The Funding Framework in 2017-2018 is needed to provide stability in times of decreasing demographics. There will be a move to create accountable outcomes per Strategic Mandate Agreements (SMA). The Funding Formula Model Corridor will provide downside protection for decreasing enrolment and provide universities the ability to plan forward under the premise that there will be no guaranteed funds for enrolment growth. Accountability will be handled through the Differentiation Fund which will be linked to the SMA.

The Funding Formula Structure from the province includes an enrolment grant (approximately 91% of the funding), a student success and differentiation grant (approximately 8% of funding) and special purpose grants (1% of funding) while keeping in mind that the province has stated that there will be no new money.

The Ontario Students Assistance Program is restructuring the current grants and loan starting in 2017-18 into one single grant (OSG). OSG will provide a flat grant to students who parental income is below \$160,000 with a progressive model. The new system of Net Tuition will make paying for university more transparent.

There was a question asked about what percentage of students would the 'net' tuition example apply to over the last two years. Bruce Winer is to report back.

There was a thoughtful discussion regarding options for tuition increases and possible outcomes. It was mentioned that it will be very important for the Board to have proper messaging/key messages to students regarding any increases.

Ms. Armstrong moved, and it was seconded by Ms. Switzer, that it be recommended to Executive Committee and the Board, to approve an average domestic annual tuition fee increase of 3% for 2017-2018 and 2018-2019, international tuition fees schedule as per table provided, and an increase of miscellaneous administration fees as per Consumer Price Index (CPI) (1.3%), as presented. It was carried.

**6. IN-CAMERA SESSION**

An in-camera session was not held.

**7. OTHER BUSINESS**

No additional business was raised.

**8. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 4:20 p.m.

**Minutes of the 32<sup>nd</sup> Meeting of the Governance Committee  
Wednesday, October 5<sup>th</sup>, 2016 at 4:00p.m.  
Room 617 Robertson Hall**

<b>Present:</b>	Mr. K. Evans, Chair Mr. O. Javanpour, Vice-chair Dr. C. Carruthers Mr. J. Nordenstrom	Dr. R. O'Reilly Runte Mr. F. Alhattab Mr. M. Bueckert Mr. A. Ullett
<b>Regrets:</b>	Mr. M. Wernick	Mr. I. Lee
<b>Staff:</b>	Ms. A. Goth Dr. P. Ricketts	Mr. S. Levitt

---

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

The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:02 p.m. The chair remarked that the September meeting is usually an introduction to the committee and the work plan for the year.

**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 none.

**3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Mr. Nordenstrom moved, and it was seconded by Dr. Carruthers, to approve the agenda as presented. It was carried.

**4. ITEM(S) FOR APPROVAL**

4.1 Minutes of Previous Meeting

Dr. Runte moved, and it was seconded by Dr. Carruthers, to approve the minutes of the 31<sup>st</sup> meeting of the Governance Committee as presented. It was carried.

4.2 Review and Approval of Annual Work Plan

An updated annual work plan for the Governance Committee was circulated prior to the meeting. The October meeting will be a recap on what has been done and organization for the upcoming year.

Last year the Governance Committee did a thorough review and revision of the Board of Governors Bylaws. Members were encouraged to review the Bylaws as 18 months of discussion and research went into their creation. In the Bylaws, there is reference to a Nominating Policy. A template policy was prepared as starting point for discussion and shared at the last committee meeting. The Chair will review the document and with assistance of General Counsel prepare a draft of the policy for consideration at the next meeting.

A task assigned to the Governance Committee is to investigate the need for a Talent Management Committee which would deal with compensation, and negotiations. Carleton's Board of Governors has had two iterations of this type of committee. The Compensation and Review Committee was the last iteration. The committee was in existence for several years and was disbanded as it did not have enough work. The function of the committee was transferred to the Executive Committee. Some universities have a version of a Human Resources or Talent Committee. A package of all relevant historical and comparable Board Terms of Reference for Executive Committees and HR/Talent Management Committees will be provided prior to the January meeting.

During the May 10<sup>th</sup> meeting a review of the Board Assessment and the President's Assessment for updates and distribution will be done.

An alternative date is needed for the January 16<sup>th</sup> meeting as Mr. Evan's is out of town

**ACTION:** The Acting University Secretary will find an alternative date in January for the Governance Committee meeting.

The nomination process for student governors and potentially moving the process to coincide with the undergraduate student association elections in January were brought forward as an issue for discussion. It was decided that this item would be sent to Nominating Committee for consideration.

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

### **5.1 Update on Not-for-Profit Legislation/Regulations**

The Ontario Not-for-Profit Corporations Act (ONCA) has been passed by the legislature but has yet to be proclaimed. It is not clear when the ONCA will come into effect. The ministry has committed to providing two-year notice prior to the act's coming into force. To the extent possible the Bylaws were amended last year in

anticipation of the ONCA to ensure compliance with current statute and ONCA in the future.

5.2 Creation of a Policy for the Use of the University Seal

The University Seal is a corporate seal used primarily for construction documents, and international agreements when required. Most official documents of the university are signed by the signing officers who are appointed annually by the Board of Governors. A separate ceremonial seal is used on degrees and is housed in the Registrar's Office. It was decided that a policy for the use of the University Seal was not needed.

5.3 Process for President's Performance Review (Outstanding from 2014/2015)

The process has already been completed, adopted and was utilized last year.

5.4 Update of Senate Bylaw Proposals

The Senate Bylaws are being reviewed by Senate and once drafted will be brought to Governance Committee for review and recommendation to the Board of Governors.

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

6.1 Mandatory Review of Terms of Reference for Governance Committee

There were minor changes to the Terms of Reference for the Governance Committee to reflect changes in the Board of Governors Bylaws. It was decided to remove the paragraph stating "Consider the relationships between the Board and other bodies both within and outside the University (including the University administration) and the ways in which the governance of the University has an impact on those relationships, with a view to maintaining productive, supportive and beneficial communication and consultation as appropriate, conferring with all standing committees of the Board as necessary;". The document will be finalized and will be suggested for approval by the Board of Governors.

6.2 Update on Research Related Article 6.05 (3.08) of Bylaws Reference Teleconference/ Electronic Meetings and Discussion of Portal/Document Security

Section 6.05 of the Bylaws states that participation at Board meetings will be in person and by telephone. In the event that a vote by secret ballot is requested, it is recommended that operationally the Governors who participate in the meeting by telephone would email their vote to University Secretary. The University Secretary would keep the identity of the vote confidential and would tabulate the vote for the Board along with ballots submitted in person. It was discussed that if the Board

would like to conduct meetings other than in person and by phone e.g. via video conferencing, the Board would need to pass a resolution addressing and setting out the mechanics for holding such meetings.

The Board will be moving to an electronic portal for receiving Board meeting and committee meeting materials moving forward through CUCollab. A question for consideration is how long will the documentation will be kept in the portal for reference for the Governors.

**6.3**     Consideration of Consent to Act as Governor Document

A revised Consent to Act As A Governor document was circulated to the committee and discussed. The document is simplified from the previous version. The document would be signed at the beginning of each year by the Governors.

It was moved by Mr. Javanpour and seconded by Mr. Ullett that the Consent to Act as a Governor document be recommended for approval by the Board. The motion was carried.

**7.     OTHER BUSINESS**

**7.1**     Code of Conduct

The Chair of the Board wrote a letter in response to a post by Alex Usher in 2016. It was asked that the chair consider making this response a public communication and to have it as part of the orientation to the Board. It was discussed that the letter was copied to every Governor and the responsibilities of governors were covered in depth at orientation. If any Governors have any questions regarding their responsibilities, they may speak to the Chair or the Board Office for guidance.

**8.     ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:24 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 November 25, 2016 at 2:00 pm  
Senate Room, Robertson Hall  
MINUTES**

**Present:** F. Afagh (proxy sent), S. Ajila, A. Bellerive, S. Blanchard, A. Bowker, M. Butler, L. Callaghan, C. Carruthers, A. Chandler, A. Christianson, W. Clement, C. Cruickshank, J. Dalphy, D. Deugo, A. Diptee, A. Dodge, C. Duff, M. Esponda, W. Felepchuk, C. Feres, C. Fong, T. Garvey, P. Gentile, R. Gorelick, R. Goubran, N. Grasse, R. Hoey, W. Horn, B. Hughes, O. Javanpour, W. Jones, E. Kwan, E. Lai, A. Loiselle, D. Long, A. Maheshwari, M. Martinov, C. Miller, J. Miller, H. Nemiroff, M. Neufang, K. O'Meara, C. Parrott, J. Paulson, M. Pelletier, M. Piché, A. Plourde, P. Ricketts, R. Runte, D. Russell, J. Shepherd, E. Sloan, C. Smelser, M. Sucharov, N. Tait, S. Taylor, J. Tomberlin, P. Watzlawik-Li, J. Wolfart, P. Wolff, C. Wong.

**Regrets:** F. Alhattab, A. Arya, K. Bashir, D. Buss, C. Chi, J. Coghill, J. Debanné, M. El-Tanany, K. Evans, S. Field, A. Forth, J. Hayes, F. Hosseinian, D. Howe, K. Karim, B. Örmeci, D. Owusu-Akyeeah, J. Smith, J. Stoner, S. Sur, P. Thompson, L. Watson, F. Webster.

**Open Session:**

**1. Welcome 1:58 pm**

The President welcomed the Senators.

**2. Approval of the Agenda**

It was **MOVED** (R. Hoey, R. Goubran) that Senate approve the open agenda of the meeting of November 25, 2016.

The motion **PASSED**.

It was **MOVED** (W. Felepchuk, A. Christianson) that an emergency motion in relation to the Neuroscience Departments move from the Life Sciences Building.

The motion was **DEFEATED**.

### 3. Approval of Minutes: October 26, 2016 (Open Session)

It was **MOVED** (P. Ricketts O. Javanpour) that Senate approve the minutes of the meeting of October 26, 2016 (Open Session).  
The motion **PASSED**.

### 4. Chairs' Remarks

The President suggested that Senate could discuss the Neuroscience Departments concerns during Other Business.

### 5. Question Period: Update on Global Academy (P. Ricketts)

A presentation on the Global Academy was given by P. Ricketts. The presentation outlined how the Global Academy is related to the Strategic Integrated Plan, the vision, the mission statement, the types of activities, program offerings, and country specific initiatives.

Questions asked by Senators included:

1. What is the background and qualifications of the individuals providing the programming for the Global Academy?

The individuals providing the programming are Carleton faculty or external individuals with a specific expertise to the topic for the program. All programs are non-credit.

2. What is the number of students in the Programs?

The information was not at hand.

3. Does the University own monitoring and evaluation?

Yes. Programs are run through the Academic Units. The Global Academy assists with registration.

4. Are students coming to Ottawa to participate in the Global Academy or are our students going to another country?

Most programs have an online portion and in-class here in Ottawa. There is a potential of offering the courses in another country as well as in Ottawa.

5. There have been concerns in the past with the Canadian Teachers Associations and the Confucius Institute. Are the concerns being addresses?

Yes. Carleton's Confucius Institute is a model for others. It was built-in clearly that the program will be developed by Carleton and hiring will be done under Carleton University conditions. The control and operation of the Confucius Institute is by Carleton University and has been successful. There have been no issues with the Chinese funding agencies.

6. How is the research aspect in the Global Academy managed?

The Global Academy does not manage any research activities this is done through the Research Office.

#### 6. Discussion Period: Enrollment Report (S. Blanchard)

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

Highlights from the undergraduate statistics included a 1.5 % increase in 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 students at the Masters level by 18%. All international graduate students increased by 4%. 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.

A Senator asked if the increases in enrolment are linked to a change in the faculty to student ratio.

**ACTION:** M. Neufang will report back to Senate with the statistics related to the faculty to student ratio per discipline.

Staff and Faculty were thanked for their involvement in recruitment of students including reaching out to students, answering questions and supporting families.

A Senator asked why the two-year retention rate does not seem to be increasing? S. Blanchard responded that the Strategic Integrated Planning Committee is looking for different ways to address retention. Interested faculty members should contract S. Blanchard.

#### 7. Senate Administration:

##### a) Committee Membership

The Clerk presented updated membership lists of Senate Committees.

It was **MOVED** (D. Russell, P. Ricketts) that Senate approve the committees' memberships as presented.

The motion **PASSED**.

##### b) Financial Review Committee

Senator Paulson brought forward an email from Dr. Corder in regard to the Senate Financial Review Committee which was circulated to many Senators. It was stated that the letter included inaccuracies.

The letter states that the committee was asked to consider a motion to revise its terms of reference. Currently, the Governance Committee is reviewing all the Senate Committee terms of reference. As part of this process the Financial Review Committee will also be reviewed. The Governance Committee will ensure that all committees are in line with the Carleton Act and the Senate Governance documents.

Currently the Financial Review Committee is fully populated with the exception of the Chair. A Chair can be nominated by Senate Executive and then brought to Senate for consideration.

**ACTION:** D. Russell to report back the Senate in January or February on the status of the Financial Review Committee.

**ACTION:** M.Piché (Vice-President, Finance and Administration) to report to Senate regarding the budget.

- c) Vice President (Research and International) Search Committee  
It was **MOVED** (D. Russell , H. Nemiroff) that Senate approve and recommend that the Board of Governor's approve the committee members as presented.  
The motion **PASSED**.

## 8. Committee Reports:

- a) SAPC (P. Ricketts)  
P. Ricketts introduced the following motions:

It was **MOVED** (P. Ricketts, R. Goubran) that Senate approve the commencement of the Joint PhD program in Biomedical Engineering with the University of Ottawa with effect from September 2017, with a report to be submitted to the Ottawa Carleton Committee on Graduate Quality Assurance by June 30, 2019 on a reconsideration of the requirement that students entering the program who have already successfully completed BIOM 5010/BMG 5112 or the equivalent be required to take an additional 3 credit (University of Ottawa) or 0.5 credit (Carleton University) elective.

The motion **PASSED**.

Question from a Senator: Are three credits at U of O same as 0.5 at Carleton? Yes.

It was **MOVED** (P. Ricketts, M. Butler) that Senate approve the proposed MSC and PhD programs in Health Science to commence with effect from Fall 2017.

The motion **PASSED**.

There was a question from a Senator concerning an external reviewer's comment to approach the programs with caution. The external reviewer suggested delaying the graduate programs for a year since Carleton is just rolling out the undergraduate program and still hiring faculty. The Quality Committee responded to the unit to provide a supplementary document addressing this concern. The supplementary document was reviewed by the committee and they were satisfied with the decision to go forward with graduate programs in Health Sciences.

It was **MOVED** (P. Ricketts, W. Clement) that Senate approve the proposed Post-Baccalaureate Diploma in Film Studies to commence with effect from Fall 2017.

The motion **PASSED**.

It was **MOVED** (P. Ricketts, W. Clement) that Senate approve the proposed master's-level graduate diplomas (type 2 and type 3) in Curatorial Studies to commence with effect from Fall 2017.

The motion **PASSED**.

It was **MOVED** (P. Ricketts, W. Clement) that Senate approve the Final Assessment Report and Executive Summary arising from the Cyclical Review of the Bachelor of Humanities program.

The motion **PASSED**.

It was **MOVED** (P. Ricketts, W. Clement) that Senate approve the Final Assessment Report and Implementation Plan arising from the cyclical review of the Joint PhD program in Canadian Studies.

The motion **PASSED**.

It was noted that there were glowing comments in the cyclical report which was a proud moment for Carleton.

A Senator asked why the program is not called a joint program in Canadian and Indigenous Studies?

It was answered that Trent University has a stand-alone program in Indigenous Studies. Indigenous studies can be incorporated into the

PhD program in Canadian Studies. Conversation will continue with Trent University.

It was **MOVED** (P. Ricketts, J. Tomberlin) that Senate:

- i) approve the major modifications to the Master of Computer Science program as presented with effect from fall 2017.
- ii) approve the major modifications to the Bachelor of Health Sciences program as presented with effect from fall 2017.
- iii) approve the major modifications to the Master of Science in Health in Science Technology and Policy program as presented with effect from fall 2017.
- iv) approve the major modifications to the Master of Accounting program as presented with effect from fall 2017.
- v) approve the major modifications to the Bachelor of Science in Neuroscience and Mental Health and minor in Neuroscience and Mental Health programs as presented with effect from fall 2017.
- vi) approve the major modifications to the Bachelor of Information Technology in Photonics and Laser Technology program as presented with effect from fall 2017.
- vii) approve the major modifications to the PhD program in Environmental Engineering as presented with effect from fall 2017.
- viii) approve the Master of Business Administration: Concentration in Arts Managements to commence fall 2017.
- ix) approve the Master of Arts in Music and Culture with a Specialization in African Studies with effect from September 2017.
- x) approve the delivery of the PhD program in Management at Okanagan University College, with effect from May 2017.

The motion **PASSED**.

- b) SCCASP (H. Nemiroff)

It was **MOVED** (H. Nemiroff, P. Gentile) that Senate approve revisions to regulations 2.4 UG and 9.3 GR, Final Examinations, as presented, effective the 17-18 calendar.

The motion **PASSED**.

It was **MOVED** (H. Nemiroff, R. Hoey) that Senate approve revisions to section 2.6 UG and 9.2GR, Deferred Final Term Work, as presented, effective the 17-18 calendar.

The motion **PASSED**.

- c) Academic Colleague (J. Smith)  
There was no report.

#### **9. Reports for Information:**

- a) Senate Executive Minutes: October 18 and November 3, 2016  
There were no questions.

#### **10. Other Business**

##### **a) Discussion regarding the Neuroscience Department Move**

W. Felepchuk stated that he believed there are significant issues being faced by students, faculty and staff in the Department of Neuroscience in relation to the upcoming move from the Life Science Building by the deadline of March 1, 2016. W. Felepchuk introduced Natalie Prowse, a student in Neuroscience, to address Senate. Ms. Prowse expressed her concern about the collaboration in organizing the move, her lack of confidence regarding adequate alternative space being provided, her feeling that research and teaching will be disrupted during the move and that there could also be effects on the research grants.

President Runte stated that administration has responded to the department's concerns. There are many departments involved in the move and a solution will be found for all involved. The renovation of the Life Science Building is needed and the new space for the department will be much improved. President Runte stated that there are alternative arrangements that are currently under negotiation and administration cannot comment until the agreement can be made public. The President has had conversations with students, the Dean of Science has spoken to the Chair and Faculty in Neuroscience about their specific needs. An overall solution for space is being worked out and everyone will be involved in order to make it work.

It was **MOVED** (A. Christianson, W. Felepchuk) that Senate move to a closed session. The motion was **WITHDRAWN** when it became known that the details of the proposed solutions could not be discussed in a closed session.

M. Butler, Dean of Science commented that researchers and faculty are being engaged and are creating a list of their research requirements and concerns for the move. Unfortunately, moving the department only once is not an option as there are time constraints for the funding to renovate the Life Sciences Building. The administration is committed to working with faculty, researchers and student to accommodate them during the moves.

**b) December 16<sup>th</sup> – Senate Meeting**

The Clerk of Senate suggested that if there are no time sensitive issues that need to be considered before the January 27<sup>th</sup> meeting of Senate that the December 16<sup>th</sup> meeting of Senate would be cancelled.

**c) Sexual Violence Policy Follow-up**

A Senator pointed out that some of the feedback provided on the policy at the last meeting of Senate was not reflected in the latest draft of the policy. The OVPSE has produced a feedback document where each of the items raised has been addressed.

**11. Adjournment**

It was **MOVED** (P. Ricketts, A. Christianson) to adjourn the meeting at approximately 4:00 p.m. The motion **PASSED**.



*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 January 27, 2017 at 2:00 pm  
Senate Room, Robertson Hall  
MINUTES**

**Present:** F. Afagh, S. Ajila, , A. Arya, A. Bellerive, S. Blanchard, A. Bowker, M. Butler, , C. Carruthers, A. Chandler, W. Clement, J. Coghill, J. Dalphy, J. Debanné, D. Deugo, A. Dodge, C. Duff, M. Esponda, K. Evans, C. Fong, A. Forth, P. Gentile, R. Gorelick, R. Goubran, N. Grasse, R. Hoey, D. Howe, B. Hughes, O. Javanpour, W. Jones, K. Karim, E. Kwan, E. Lai, A. Loiselle, D. Long, A. Maheshwari, M. Martinov, J. Miller, H. Nemiroff, M. Neufang, B. Örmeci, D. Owusu-Akyeeah, C. Parrott, J. Paulson, M. Pelletier, M. Piché, A. Plourde, P. Ricketts, R. Runte, D. Russell, J. Shepherd, E. Sloan, C. Smelser, M. Sucharov, S. Sur, N. Tait, S. Taylor, P. Thompson, P. Watzlawik-Li, F. Webster, J. Wolfart, P. Wolff, C. Wong.

**Regrets:** F. Alhattab, K. Bashir, D. Buss, L. Callaghan, C. Chi, A. Christianson, C. Cruickshank, A. Diptee, M. El-Tanany, W. Felepchuk, C. Feres, S. Field, T. Garvey, J. Hayes, W. Horn, F. Hosseinian, C. Miller, K. O'Meara, J. Smith, J. Stoner, J. Tomberlin, L. Watson.

**Open Session:**

**1. Welcome**

The President welcomed Senators and called the meeting to order.

**2. Approval of the Agenda**

It was **MOVED** (E. Sloan, M. Neufang) that Senate approve the agenda of the meeting of January 27, 2017.

The motion **PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**.

**3. Approval of Minutes: November 25, 2016 (Open Session)**

It was **MOVED** (H. Nemiroff, W. Clement) that Senate approve the minutes of the meeting of November 25, 2016.

The motion **PASSED**.

**4. Chairs' Remarks**

a) Strategic Mandate Agreement

Carleton University has not received the instructions for the Strategic Mandate Agreement (S.M.A) from the Province of Ontario. It is premature at this point to start planning a SMA response as we are not sure of the exact points that will need to be considered. The Financial Framework for Tuition has been received

from the Province and requires the university to have a two year plan. Each university will negotiate a corridor midpoint for funding and it is unclear at this point how this is determined.

b) Neuroscience Relocation Update

Dr. Ricketts was called to report on the Neuroscience Department's temporary relocation to the University of Ottawa. Since the last Senate meeting, Senior Administration and the Dean of Science have been working in collaboration with Neuroscience researchers and professional services staff to accommodate the relocation of the department to the University of Ottawa's Animal Care Facility. A project manager, ZW Project Management Inc., have been hired to manage the move and they have been in contact with researchers to identify specific requirements. ZW Project Management Inc. will also be managing the final move to the Health Sciences Building in 2017.

The contract with the University of Ottawa for the animal care facility is now concluded and Carleton University has access to the facility. Carleton researchers also have access to wet lab and workspace at the University of Ottawa so that work that is required near the Animal Care Facility can be conducted. Some researchers with specific needs have identified other sites willing to host these activities. Plans for moving freezers are being finalized.

Carleton Environmental Health and Safety are in touch with counterparts at the University of Ottawa to understand/facilitate any training issues unique to the site.

The impact on students who are undertaking research with animals and wet labs are expected to be short-term. The university is doing all that is possible to accommodate the needs of students and will continue to work with individual student's needs. If individual students experience delay in graduation as a result of the move the university will consider additional support for those students.

Construction will begin on the ARISE Building on March 1, 2017.

**5. Senate Administration:**

a) Committee Membership

It was proposed to add the following individuals to the membership of the Senate Library Committee: Heather MacDonald (2016), Martha Attridge Bufton (2016), Toby Zeng (2016) and Claire Samson (2016).

It was proposed to add Frances Woolley (2016) as a member of the Ombuds Coordinating Committee.

It was **MOVED** (D. Russell, R. Hoey) that Senate approve the committees' membership as presented.

The motion **PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**.

It was asked how Senate committee membership is determined. The Senate Office and Clerk of Senate consult with the Dean's offices to find recommendations for Senate committee membership.

## 6. Discussion Period

### a) IT Security (D. Levesque)

Chief Information Officer, Denis Levesque joined Senate to give a presentation on Cyber Security at Carleton University highlighting the sense of urgency, the risks for higher education institutions, and the impacts of an attack. Mr. Levesque also gave an overview of the November 28, 2016 Random Wear Attack at Carleton and the specific actions taken by the Information Technology Services team in response. There was discussion about the merits of forced password changes and possible ideas to make out system stronger.

## 7. Committee Reports:

### a) SAPC (P. Ricketts)

Dr. Ricketts reported that two programs that were approved at the November, 2016 Senate meeting have now been approved by the Province and Quality Council.

The Cyclical Review Reports provided were deemed to be of good quality. All calendar changes were reviewed by the appropriate administrative and Senate committees before coming to Senate.

Dr. Ricketts introduced the following motions:

It was **MOVED** (P. Ricketts, W. Clement) that Senate approve the Final Assessment Report and Executive Summary arising from the Cyclical Review of the undergraduate and graduate programs in Film Studies as presented.

The motion **PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**.

It was **MOVED** (P. Ricketts, W. Clement) that Senate approve the Final Assessment Report and Executive Summary arising from the Cyclical Review of the undergraduate and graduate programs in History.

The motion **PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**.

It was **MOVED** (P. Ricketts, J. Paulson) that Senate approve the Final Assessment Report and Executive Summary arising from the Cyclical Review of the graduate programs in Political Economy.

The motion **PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**.

It was **MOVED** (P. Ricketts, J. Shepherd) that Senate approve the major modifications as presented in Appendix A with effect from fall 2017.

The motion **PASSED**.

It was noted that the major modifications to the MIPIS & Master of Engineering in Infrastructure Protection and International Security program (#15 in Appendix A) included the introduction of an accelerated pathway to encourage enrolment in the program.

b) SCCASP (H. Nemiroff)

It was **MOVED** (H. Nemiroff, R. Hoey) that Senate approve revisions to the Guidelines for Determining the Academic Year, as presented.

The motion **PASSED**.

The Academic Schedule for 2017-18 was presented to Senate for information.

It was **MOVED** (H. Nemiroff, A. Plourde) that Senate approve revisions to the Journalism graduation requirements, as presented, effective the 17-18 calendar.

The motion **PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**.

It was **MOVED** (H. Nemiroff, K. Evans) that Senate approve revisions to the Bachelor of Industrial Design Academic Performance Evaluation regulations, as presented, effective the 17-18 calendar.

The motion **PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**.

It was **MOVED** (H. Nemiroff, M. Butler) that Senate approve revisions to the Cooperative Calendar, as presented, effective the 17-18 calendar.

**8. Reports for Information:**

a) Senate Executive

The minutes of November 15, 2016 and December 6, 2016 were circulated. There were no questions.

b) Report from the Board

The minutes of September 27, 2016 were circulated. There were no questions.

c) Academic Colleague (J. Smith)

The Report of the Academic Colleague was circulated. There were no questions.

**9. Other Business**

The Clerk informed Senate that there was an appointment made that was contrary to the Advertising Policy under the CUASA collective agreement.

Any questions regarding Collective bargaining should be directed to Rob Thomas, Associate Vice-President Human Resources.

## **Appendix A: Major Modification with Effect from Fall 2017**

1. That Senate approve the introduction of the BA Honours in Sociology: Stream in Social Justice program as presented with effect from fall 2017.
2. That Senate approve the major modifications to the Bachelor of Global and International Studies (Course Abroad and practicum Course) as presented with effect from fall 2017.
3. That Senate approve the major modifications to the bachelor of Global and International Studies, Stream and Specialization in Global Law and Social Justice program as presented with effect from fall 2017.
4. That Senate approve the major modifications to the Bachelor of Global and International Studies, Stream and Specialization in Globalization, Culture and power program as presented with effect from fall 2017.
5. That Senate approve the major modification to the Bachelor of Global and International Studies, Stream and Specialization in Global Development program as presented with effect from fall 2017.
6. That Senate approve the introduction of the BA Combined Honours in History and Theory of Architecture program as presented with effect from fall 2017.
7. That Senate approve the introduction of the Minor in Human Rights and Social Justice program as presented with effect from fall 2017.
8. The Senate approve the major modification to the Bachelor of Social Work program as presented with effect from fall 2017.
9. That Senate approve the major modification to the Bachelor of Science: Additional Regulations as presented with effect from fall 2017.
10. That Senate approve the major modification to the Bachelor of Health Sciences courses as presented with effect from fall 2017.
11. That Senate approve the major modifications to the Graduate Diploma in European Integration Studies as presented with effect from fall 2017.
12. That Senate approve the major modifications to the master of Business Administration program as presented with effect from fall 2017.
13. That Senate approve the major modifications to the Bachelor of Science: Food science and Nutrition program as presented with effect from fall 2017.
14. That Senate approve the major modifications to the Graduate Diploma in Infrastructure Protection and International Security program as presented with effect from fall 2017.

15. That Senate approve the major modifications to the MIPIS and master of Engineering in Infrastructure Protection and International Security program as presented with effect from fall 2017.
16. That Senate approve the major modifications to the Master of Arts: Sociology course as presented with effect from fall 2017.
17. That Senate approve the introduction of the Master of Cognitive Science with a Specialization in data Science program as presented with effect from fall 2017.
18. That Senate approve the introduction to the Minor in South Asian Studies program as presented with effect from fall 2017.
19. That Senate approve the major modifications to the Bachelor of Computer Science programs as presented with effect from fall 2017.

DATE: March 6, 2017

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 Film Studies

---

Please find attached the final assessment report and executive summary of the cyclical review of the undergraduate and graduate programs in Film Studies 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 Film Studies at its meeting of January 27, 2017.

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 undergraduate and graduate programs in Film Studies  
Executive Summary and Final Assessment Report**

This Executive Summary and Final Assessment Report of the cyclical review of Carleton's undergraduate and graduate programs in Film Studies are provided pursuant to articles 4.2.5.b-4.2.6.a-b of the provincial Quality Assurance Framework and article 7.2.23 of Carleton's Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP).

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The undergraduate and graduate programs in Film Studies (MA in Film Studies; MA in Film Studies with specialization in African Studies; MA in Film Studies with specialization in Digital Humanities; Honours BA in Film Studies; General BA in Film Studies) reside in Carleton University's School for Studies in Art and Culture, an academic 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 School for Studies in Art and Culture on February 9<sup>th</sup>, 2016, offered a positive assessment of the programs. The reviewers report that they 'found the programs at Carleton in a good state of health, with a highly collegial faculty who are active in their research and professional engagements . . . As a group, they have produced a substantial number of publications (books, book chapters, and journal articles), been frequent conference presenters, and regularly host conferences and colloquia.' The reviewers added that, 'as uniformly reported by the students we met, [the faculty] are dedicated and passionate teachers who inspire both their undergraduate and graduate students.' The reviewers remarked 'on the enviable breadth of world cinema expertise the currently faculty hold—African, East and South Asian, European and North American,' as well as on the practica available to undergraduate students: 'The undergraduate students praised the practica that they had been able to secure, such as volunteering as an assistant at a film festival . . . the program is to be congratulated for having this ongoing option for students.'

Within the context of this positive assessment, the report nonetheless made a number of recommendations for the continuing enhancement of the programs. These recommendations were productively addressed by the Film Studies faculty, the Director of the School for Studies in Art and Culture and the Deans of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences and the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs in a response to the report of the external reviewers that was submitted to CUCQA on June 28<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 January 11<sup>th</sup>, 2017.

## FINAL ASSESSMENT REPORT

### Introduction

The undergraduate and graduate programs in Film Studies (MA in Film Studies; MA in Film Studies with specialization in African Studies; MA in Film Studies with specialization in Digital Humanities; Honours BA in Film Studies; General BA in Film Studies) reside in Carleton University's School for Studies in Art and Culture, an academic 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 January 21<sup>st</sup> and 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2016, was conducted by Dr. Philippa Gates, from Wilfrid Laurier University, and Dr. Brian McIlroy, from the University of British Columbia. The site visit involved formal meetings with the Vice-Provost and Associate Vice-President (Academic), the Deans of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences and the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs, and the Director of the School for Studies in Art and Culture. The review committee also met with faculty members, contract instructors, staff, BA and MA students.

The external reviewers' report, submitted on February 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2016, 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 Film Studies programs (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 Film Studies faculty, Director of the School for Studies in Art and Culture, and the Deans of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences and the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs 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 programs' 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 Director of the School for Studies in Art and Culture and the Deans of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences and 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 external reviewers' report states that 'Carleton University's Film Studies Program is one of good quality. Its nearly forty-year history has allowed for growth and a generally well-thought through complexity of course offerings for students.' The report concludes that, 'overall, we found the program at Carleton in a good state of health.'

#### *Faculty*

The report notes that the Film Studies programs are delivered by 'a highly collegial faculty who are active in their research and professional engagements.' The report continues: 'as a group, they have produced a substantial number of publications (books, book chapters, and journal articles), been frequent conference presenters, and regularly hosts conferences and colloquia.' The report in addition concludes that the faculty 'are dedicated and passionate teachers who inspire both their undergraduate and graduate students.'

#### *Students*

The external reviewers observed that 'In our meeting with undergraduate students, it was clear that they were, on the whole, extremely satisfied with the teaching quality and course offerings.' The report continues: 'The undergraduate students praised the practica that they had been able to secure, such as volunteering as an assistant at a film festival . . . the program is to be congratulated for having this ongoing option for students.' The undergraduate students were also 'very excited about the addition of "film practice" courses.'

#### *Curriculum*

The report observes that the undergraduate program regularly offers 'around 30 (0.5 credit) undergraduate courses a year, covering traditional core courses in film history and theory with a broad range of topics courses including a significant focus on national and global cinemas.' The external reviewers felt compelled to remark 'on the enviable breadth of world cinema expertise the current faculty hold—African, East and South Asian, European and North American.'

## *Learning Outcomes*

The external reviewers were impressed by the quality and appropriateness of the programs' learning outcomes as well as by the considerable thought that had gone into their development: 'Much work has clearly been done to establish learning outcomes for the undergraduate program as a whole . . . the learning outcomes are appropriate, ranging from discipline-specific goals (e.g., "critically assess and reflectively apply different theoretical, philosophical and historiographic methodologies") to more general key and transferable skills (e.g., "construct cogent academic arguments in writing and orally"). In the self-study it is apparent that the learning outcomes have been considered in terms of broader degree-level expectations (i.e., what students will learn by the time they have completed the program), as well as course-level expectations and in relation to specific modes of assessment (i.e., what students will learn by the end of a specific course and by the end of a specific year in the program).' The reviewers also noted a clear articulation of 'the different level of expectations for students in the general, honours, and master's programs.' They conclude: 'It seems to us that these outcomes are realistic and achievable and speak to the value of a general humanities education with a focus on critical thinking, research and essay-writing skills.'

## **Challenges faced by the programs**

The external reviewers noted that the biggest challenge facing the undergraduate program is 'the decline of first and second year enrolment by up to 50% over the last five or six years.' This decline is mirrored in the take-up of the practicum option, a phenomenon also apparent at the graduate level.

The external reviewers also noted that challenges existed with mentoring graduate students and with the effectiveness of communications with them. A significant issue for graduate students 'was a lack of coherence with the core two-term FILM 5000: Directions in Film Theory and Film History course.'

A significant imbalance in graduate supervisions on the part of faculty was also noted.

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

The External Reviewers' Report made 18 recommendations for program improvement. The reviewers noted that 'these recommendations are not required but offered as possibilities for program improvement and expansion.'

### *Undergraduate Program*

1. Assessment of Learning Outcomes: we recommend that this assessment be carried out every two or three years rather than annually and be conducted on two core courses at the second- and fourth-year levels rather than four courses.
2. First-Year Courses: we recommend dividing the first-year introductory course into two 0.5 credits courses rather than 1.0 credit and, relatedly, reducing the first-year requirement for the general and/or combined honours to 0.5 first-year film credits.
3. Second-Year Courses: we recommend removing pre-requisites from second-year courses (but retaining them for third- and fourth-year courses).

4. Renaming/Renumbering Courses: We recommend giving separate titles and/or course numbers to all the different versions of each course taught by full-time faculty members.
5. Practicum: we recommend to review the actual experiences the students have with the practicum.
6. Production Courses: we recommend that the faculty consider the addition of a few production courses—for example, on screenwriting, digital editing, and production—since there is a great deal of student interest and would require few additional resources.

#### *Graduate Program*

7. Faculty Grants/RAs: We would encourage the faculty to apply for internal and external grants with a view to supporting professional training for graduate students.
8. Internships: we recommend reviewing the internship option to make it more attractive or available to students.
9. Graduate Handbook: we recommend providing students with a graduate handbook (perhaps online) with clear information about deadlines, contacts, and expectations.
10. Divide FILM 5000: we recommend dividing the course into two separate 0.5 courses—the first, to focus on research methods and, the second, to focus on thesis preparation.
11. Supervision Equity: we encourage the unit to seek a more equitable way to even out the supervisory load.
12. International Students: we recommend discussing with the Dean of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs how better to support and assist international students.

#### *Governance*

13. Curriculum Submission: we would recommend that all curriculum submissions be sent directly to the SSAC's curriculum committee rather than be pre-vetted by the Director of the SSAC.

#### *Facilities*

14. Designated Classrooms: we recommend that it would improve morale if the university could designate specific rooms for film studies courses.
15. Improved Facilities: we recommend that if renovation monies become available, the university should at the very least select one film studies classroom for (a) sound-proofing and (b) installation of raked seating.

#### *Other Suggestions/Issues*

16. Faculty Mentoring: we encourage the senior professors to think about a mentoring or coaching process for their colleagues on the subject of grants.

17. Future Hirings: if monies for one or two more faculty positions do become available, and the world cinema emphasis remains, we would recommend hiring a specialist in Central and South American Cinema and, if the faculty decide to move forward with production courses, we would recommend hiring a lecturer (teaching stream) in film production.

### *Supplementary Questions*

18. BGINs Involvement: since some faculty members expressed a strong desire to be involved with, and develop specific courses for, the BGINs program, we recommend that the program consider a formal relationship with the new program.

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

As a consequence of the review, the Film Studies 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 as a result of the review process were productively addressed by the Film Studies faculty, the Director of the School for Studies in Art and Culture, and the Deans of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences and the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs in a response to the report of the external review that was considered by CUCQA on September 14<sup>th</sup>, 2016. The Film Studies faculty and the Director of the School were generally pleased with the report of the external reviewers and agreed to respond positively to all recommendations except recommendation 13. CUCQA was satisfied with the reasons given in the response for not acting on this recommendation.

An Action Plan detailing how, when and by whom the recommendations will be implemented was received and approved by CUCQA on January 11<sup>th</sup>, 2017.

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 Film Studies' programs, the majority of monitoring will be achieved by means of an update on the Action Plan to be submitted by December 31<sup>st</sup>, 2017.

### **The Next Cyclical Review**

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

## **Film Studies. BA and MA Cyclical Program Review – ACTION PLAN.**

On April 6<sup>th</sup>, 2016, the Film Studies Program submitted to the Deans of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences and the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs, as well as to the Office of the Vice-Provost and Associate Vice-President (Academic), a Response to the recommendations offered by the External Reviewers in their Report dated February 2, 2016. The Response was slightly revised following suggestions from the Deans of FGPA (June 15<sup>th</sup>, 2016) and FASS (June 25<sup>th</sup>, 2016) and resubmitted to the Office of the Vice-Provost on June 27<sup>th</sup>, 2016. The Response was approved by the Carleton University Committee on Quality Assurance at its meeting of September 14<sup>th</sup>, 2016. In the Response, Film Studies agreed with the large majority of the External Reviewers' recommendations, and in the rare cases where we did not agree, we provided a rationale for our decisions.

What follows is an Action Plan based on that Response, which indicates the progress we have already made on a number of items, as well as the steps that remain to be taken in response to the External Reviewers' recommendations. The Action Plan also reflects a more mature consideration of certain issues that had not been fully thought-through at the time of producing the Response in the spring of 2016.

This Action Plan was developed by all Film Studies faculty members (excluding those on sabbatical leave in 2016-17) and the Director of the School for Studies in Art and Culture.

### **Undergraduate Program**

1. **Assessment of Learning Outcomes: we recommend that this assessment be carried out every two or three years rather than annually and be conducted on two core courses at the second- and fourth-year levels rather than four courses.**

In our Response, we presented a schedule for the “Learning Outcomes Assessment” which proposed that the first three LOs would be considered in 2016-17. Since the Response, we have had several robust conversations about the process and it has now become clear that we will not be in a position to undertake the assessment this year. There is consensus among faculty members that we first need 1) to revisit our program-level teaching objectives so as to ensure the coherence of our degrees and 2) develop a framework to enable the evaluation of learning acquisition as students progress through our curriculum. We have agreed to set aside a significant portion of our annual retreat (April 2017) to thoroughly discuss these issues and determine a set of procedures acceptable to all members of the program.

2. **First-Year Courses: we recommend dividing the first-year introductory course into two 0.5 credits courses rather than 1.0 credit and, relatedly, reducing the first-year requirement for the general and/or combined honours to 0.5 first-year film credits.**

As indicated in our response we agree with this recommendation, and decided to go further than recommended and create a new 0.5-credit 1000-level “Introduction to Film Studies” course, FILM

1101, which will fully replace our FILM 1000 course. Faculty members who have taught FILM 1000 in the past agree that it will be possible to cover the essential material from the 1.0-credit FILM 1000 within the new 0.5-credit format, although it will require some re-thinking of the course structure. This will make the course more attractive as an elective for non-Film students, while still providing Film majors with the necessary pre-requisite.

We have also decided to do the same with our First Year Seminar (FYSM 1510), which currently serves as an equivalent to FILM 1000 for Film Studies majors. We have decided to replace FYSM 1510 with a seminar-size version of the new FILM 1101, to be identified as FILM 1201, which will be offered each fall in addition to the large lecture-hall sections. We will thus no longer offer FILM 1000 and FYSM 1510, and offer instead two (or perhaps four) large sections of FILM 1101 [0.5 cr] open to all Carleton students and one seminar-sized section of FILM 1201 [0.5 cr] for our first-year film majors. We have already submitted the changes, and expect to offer the new courses in the fall of 2017.

3. **Second-Year Courses: we recommend removing pre-requisites from second-year courses (but retaining them for third- and fourth-year courses).**

As indicated in our response, we agree to remove the first-year core-course requirement for *all non-core 2000-level courses*, using instead “second year standing or completion of FILM 1101 or 1201” requirement. This change will facilitate entry in our 2000-level courses for any student in their second year, as well as first-year students who have completed the introductory course in the fall and wish to take 2000-level film courses in the winter term of their first year. For our second-year core courses, FILM 2000, FILM 2606 and FILM 2607, we will maintain the first-year core course as a pre-requisite. We have already submitted the changes.

4. **Renaming/Renumbering Courses: We recommend giving separate titles and/or course numbers to all the different versions of each course taught by full-time faculty members.**

As indicated in our response, while we appreciate the recommendation, we are concerned that replacing our current generic titles with specific titles might limit the program’s ability to respond to the vicissitudes of scheduling and instructor availability. A further problem concerns the likelihood that a radical increase in the number of courses on specific topics will result in the creation of courses that can be offered only infrequently. Therefore, for the time being, we have decided to keep our flexible generic titles and undertake, in the winter and summer of 2017, a review of our offerings over the past several years to identify the most common topics taught under the rubric of generic courses. Partly as a result of this review, we will determine which topics should be given their own title.

On a related note, we will also consider creating new courses with specific titles to reflect the evolving profile of the program. First on the list, will be the creation of a course on “Cinema and Gaming”, probably at the 3000 level, to signal this important new topic in our curriculum. We expect that this new course would be created in time for the 2018-19 academic year.

5. **Practicum: we recommend to review the actual experiences the students have with the practicum.**

We created a Practicum & Internship Committee consisting of the former and incoming Undergraduate Supervisors, the Undergraduate Student Representative, the Graduate Student Representative, and an

experienced Practicum Supervisor to adapt the program to best meet the educational needs of the participants. Based on the Committee's assessment, we have made the following changes:

- The number of hours was raised from "maximum 60 hours" to "96 required hours" (the equivalent of 8 hours a week for 12 weeks), to put our program in line with Art History's and Music's practica.
- Instead of writing an extended research paper, undergraduates in the practicum program will write four short papers.
- Graduate students in the internship program will be required to keep a journal of their experiences, including a list of the dates and hours they have worked.
- All participants will turn in the first round of journals and the first paper (in the case of undergrads) or research paper proposal (in the case of grads) halfway through the semester,
- All practicum and internship students will meet as a group at the beginning and end of the semester to share their experiences.
- Students will be required to submit a polished CV with their application.
- We will clarify that the students' final grades will be determined as follows: 75% supervisor evaluation, 25% written work (this is also in line with Art History's and Music's program).

In addition to enacting these changes, the Undergraduate Supervisor has reached out to several local production companies, a government film office, and additional museums and film festivals to expand the options available to students. We hope that these changes will encourage additional students to enroll in the practicum and make the experience even more productive for them.

**6. Production Courses: we recommend that the faculty consider the addition of a few production courses—for example, on screenwriting, digital editing, and production— since there is a great deal of student interest and would require few additional resources.**

As explained at length in our response, we draw a distinction between “production courses” and “practice courses”. While it is unlikely we can create full-fledged “production” courses in the foreseeable future, there is general agreement that “practice” courses are a valuable addition to our program. We have already created a few such courses: FILM 2801 Moving Image Practice I and FILM3801 Moving Image Practice II. These courses could not be offered in 2016-17 because of a faculty shortage, but we intend to offer at least one of them in 2017-18.

Furthermore, we have recently developed a proposal for the creation of a “Concentration in Film Practice” and purchased video equipment that students can use for their practice-related projects. If everything goes as planned, we will proceed with the submission of the concentration proposal in the summer/fall 2017, to take effect in 2018-19.

We have also been proactive in advertising screenwriting courses offered by the English Department, which we recognize as Film Studies equivalents for our majors. We hope to formally cross-list these courses in the very near future and, in the medium term, we hope to further collaborate with the Creative Writing Concentration to establish a stream in screenwriting. We will also explore the possibility of finding other partners both within and outside the university to develop further “practice” courses.

A long-term goal is to create an artist-in-residence program, through which a scholar-practitioner would be invited to provide leadership for our practice stream.

### **Graduate Program**

7. **Faculty Grants/RAships**: We would encourage the faculty to apply for internal and external grants with a view to supporting professional training for graduate students.

We agree and will be more proactive in applying for grants through which we can employ Carleton students. See response to recommendation #16.

8. **Internships**: we recommend reviewing the internship option to make it more attractive or available to students.

See our answer to point #5.

Also, one reason that more graduate students haven't been doing the Internship program is because it does not count toward credit in the thesis stream. Now that more students are pursuing the newly-available coursework stream and major research paper stream, we anticipate that more graduate students will undertake an internship.

9. **Graduate Handbook**: we recommend providing students with a graduate handbook (perhaps online) with clear information about deadlines, contacts, and expectations.

The handbook has been created and put online.

10. **Divide FILM 5000**: we recommend dividing the course into two separate 0.5 courses—the first, to focus on research methods and, the second, to focus on thesis preparation.

We have submitted a formal request to split the full-credit course into two 0.5 credit seminars to increase flexibility for students, who will be able to take the course “out of sequence”. Both halves will be mandatory for all graduate students. The content of the two new seminars will focus on research methods and current debates in Film Studies, but will not emphasize thesis preparation. The new, two-course configuration is expected to be in effect in 2017-2018.

11. **Supervision Equity**: we encourage the unit to seek a more equitable way to even out the supervisory load.

Under the new regime, whereby all students will enter the program in the coursework stream and will have to apply by November 1<sup>st</sup> to be admitted in the Research Essay or Thesis streams, proposals will be reviewed by a committee of the whole in November and early December. At this point, we will distribute supervisory responsibilities as equitably as possible. We anticipate that there will be fewer thesis and research essay supervisions, which should facilitate equitable distribution of supervisees.

12. **International Students**: we recommend discussing with the Dean of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs how better to support and assist international students.

The issue of international students is crucial and we will meet with the Dean of FGPA to discuss possibilities for providing more financial support to international students.

We have also decided to propose a Post Bacc Diploma to help some international students transition into graduate work. The proposal for the PBD was submitted in the fall of 2016 and is likely to commence in the fall of 2017.

### Governance

13. **Curriculum Submission**: we would recommend that all curriculum submissions be sent directly to the SSAC's curriculum committee rather than be pre-vetted by the Director of the SSAC.

As explained in our response, the current model seems to work well. We will not act on this recommendation.

### Facilities

14. **Designated Classrooms**: we recommend that it would improve morale if the university could designate specific rooms for film studies courses.

As indicated in the response we agree. The inadequacy of some of the rooms in which we have to teach our courses affects our ability to deliver a quality program. We will meet with Jamie Carmichael, Manager, Scheduling & Exam Services, to determine next steps.

15. **Improved Facilities**: we recommend that if renovation monies become available, the university should at the very least select one film studies classroom for (a) sound-proofing and (b) installation of raked seating.

We agree, and will continue to lobby the authorities to receive the necessary funds.

### Other Suggestions/Issues

16. **Faculty Mentoring**: we encourage the senior faculty members to think about a mentoring or coaching process for their colleagues on the subject of grants.

We will hold a collective grant-writing workshop, where all members will provide feedback. For instance, we will meet in January 2017 to work with our junior colleague Laura Horak, who won a FASS Junior Faculty Research Award 2015-16, and plans to apply for a SSHRC IDG in February 2017. We will also explore the new faculty-to-faculty mentoring program offered by CURO.

17. **Future Hirings**: if monies for one or two more faculty positions do become available, and the world cinema emphasis remains, we would recommend hiring a specialist in Central and South American Cinema and, if the faculty decide to move forward with production courses, we would recommend hiring a lecturer (teaching stream) in film production.

We will consider this recommendation, but we are not able at this point to commit to a specific area of specialization for our next hires.

**Supplementary Questions**

- 18. BGInS Involvement: since some faculty members expressed a strong desire to be involved with, and develop specific courses for, the BGInS program, we recommend that the program consider a formal relationship with the new program.**

We are moving forward with discussions to create an “Art and Culture” specialization within the BGInS program, which would involve Art History, Music and Film Studies.

## ACTION PLAN – TABULAR FORM

Recommendation	Comments	Responsible Individuals	Timeline
Recommendation #1 Assessment of Learning Outcomes	Establishment of a framework to develop teaching objectives and evaluate the level of student learning acquisition.	Every available faculty member.	Retreat in the Spring of 2017
Recommendation #2 Reduce credit value of First-Year Courses	Eliminate FILM 1000 [1.0] and create FILM 1101 [0.5]. Cease offering FYSM 1510 [1.0] and create FILM 1201 [0.5]	Coordinator of undergraduate program.	Modifications have already been submitted and will be effective September 2017
Recommendation #3 Removing pre-requisites for second- year courses.	Remove the first-year core-course requirement for all non-core 2000-level courses. Keep first-year pre-requisite for second-year core courses.	Coordinator of undergraduate program.	Modifications have already been submitted and will be effective September 2017
Recommendation #4 Renaming/Renumbering Courses	We partially agree. We will keep our flexible generic titles and undertake a review of our offerings over the past several years to identify the most common topics taught under the rubric of generic courses. Subsequently, we will determine whether specific titles should be used in certain cases. Creation of a new course on “Cinema and Gaming” probably at the 3000 level	Coordinator of undergraduate program	Winter and summer 2017, for changes to take effect in 2018-2019, especially for the new course in “Cinema and Gaming”
Recommendation #5 Review “student experience” with the practicum	Practicum committee reviewed the practicum/internship and developed strategies to enhance student experience.	Practicum Committee	Completed
Recommendation #6 Production Courses	a) already created practice courses will be offered in 2017-18. b) proposal for the creation of a “Concentration in Film Practice” c) artist-in-residence program, d) working with the English Department to establish a stream in screenwriting.	a) Assistant director (Film) b) all faculty members in Film Studies c) all faculty members in Film d) Assistant Director (Film) and counterpart in English	a) winter 2017 as CI budget for 2017-18 is established b) summer/fall 2017 c) on-going c) development o proposal in 2017-2018
Recommendation #7	See #16	See #16	See #16

Applying for grants to provide RA funds for grad students			
Recommendation #8 Review internship options at the grad level	See #5	See #5	See #5
Recommendation #9 Handbook for graduate students	Provide graduate students with an online handbook with clear information about deadlines, contacts, and expectations.	Graduate supervisor	DONE!!!
Recommendation #10 Divide FILM 5000	Split the current full-credit core course into two 0.5 core courses.	Graduate Supervisor	Modifications has been submitted and will be effective Sept. 2017
Recommendation #11 Supervision Equity	Supervisory responsibilities will be determined at the time of approval of thesis/MRP proposals. Under the new regime there will be fewer supervisions	All faculty members	November/December of each year.
Recommendation #12 International Student	a) We will seek additional funding for graduate students  b) creation of a PBD to facilitate transition	a) graduate supervisor and dean of FGPA  b) all faculty members	a) on going  b) proposal submitted in 2017
Recommendation #13 Curriculum submission	No action will be taken on this recommendation	N/A	N/A
Recommendation #14 Designated classroom	We will meet with Jamie Carmichael, Manager, Scheduling & Exam Services, to determine next steps	Director of SSAC, Assistant Director (Film) and Jamie Carmichael	Winter 2017
Recommendation #15 Improved Facilities	We will continue to lobby in vain	Director of SSAC, Assistant Director (Film) and the Powers-that-Be	On going
Recommendation #16 Faculty mentoring	a) collective grant writing workshop  b) connect with CURO	a) all faculty members  b) assistant director (film)	Late summer 2017 in preparation for next grant-application season
Recommendation #17 Future Hire	Consideration of best profile for next hire	all faculty members	On-going
Recommendation #18 Involvement in BGIInS	Development of a SSAC specialty in BGIInS	All SSAC faculty members	On-going

DATE: March 6, 2017

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 History

---

Please find attached the final assessment report and executive summary of the cyclical review of the undergraduate and graduate programs in History 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 History at its meeting of January 27, 2017.

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 undergraduate and graduate programs in History  
Executive Summary and Final Assessment Report**

This Executive Summary and Final Assessment Report of the cyclical review of Carleton's undergraduate and graduate programs in History are provided pursuant to articles 4.2.5.b-4.2.6.a-b of the provincial Quality Assurance Framework and article 7.2.23 of Carleton's Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP).

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The undergraduate and graduate programs in History (B.A. Honours, B.A. Combined Honours, B.A. General, MA History, MA Public History and PhD) reside in Carleton University's Department of History, 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 Department of History on March 1<sup>st</sup>, 2016, offered a very positive assessment of the programs. According to the reviewers 'the faculty's excellent research, its focus on student engagement, and its effort to ensure that students graduate with an array of skills demonstrate that the department supports the university's strategic goals.' The reviewers were impressed with the level of engagement and enthusiasm of the students they met, writing that 'Undergraduates expressed gratitude to the department for the quality of advising and the care with which faculty members interacted with students. The graduate students were also very enthusiastic and spoke about the "positive" community in the department and praised the "collaborative" environment.' Speaking more specifically about the master's program in Public History, the reviewers stated that 'it provides important, career-focused training for graduate students and takes advantage of the rich resources of Ottawa for public history projects and internships.'

Within the context of this positive assessment, the report nonetheless made a number of recommendations for the continuing enhancement of the programs. These recommendations were productively addressed by members of the Department as well as the Deans of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences and the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs in a response to the report of the External Review that was submitted to CUCQA on June 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2016.

An Action Plan detailing how, when and by whom the recommendations will be implemented was received and approved by CUCQA on January 11<sup>th</sup>, 2017.

## FINAL ASSESSMENT REPORT

### Introduction

The undergraduate and graduate programs in History (B.A. Honours, B.A. Combined Honours, B.A. General, MA History, MA Public History and PhD) reside in Carleton University's Department of History, 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 January 8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup>, 2016, was conducted by Dr. Juanita De Barros from McMaster University and Dr. Elizabeth Elbourne from McGill University. The site visit involved formal meetings with the Assistant Vice-President (Academic), the Deans of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences and the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs, and the Chair of the Department of History. The review committee also met with faculty members, contract instructors, staff, as well as large groups of graduate and undergraduate students. The Reviewers also toured the Department's facilities, the Carleton Centre for Public History, and the library archives.

The External Reviewers' report, submitted to the Department on March 1<sup>st</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 members of the Department of History (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 Department of History and the Deans of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences and the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs 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 Department'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 Department of History and the Deans of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences and 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 External Reviewers' Report states that 'the faculty's excellent research, its focus on student engagement, and its effort to ensure that students graduate with an array of skills demonstrate that the department supports the university's strategic goals.' The Reviewers commented that History has 'a healthy departmental culture, [which] seems to be linked to an appropriate governance structure that enables diverse voices to be heard.' The Reviewers also emphasized the Department's 'long tradition of encouraging and supporting experiential learning at the undergraduate level,' and praised the Co-operative Education Option for providing 'valuable training for history students and opportunities for future employment.'

#### *Faculty*

The Reviewers observed that 'the department boasts some remarkable senior scholars.' They commended especially faculty members who specialize in Public History. They 'were impressed at the hard work and creativity of the faculty members teaching in the exciting and demanding area.' The Reviewers added that 'Carleton has several faculty members with interest in public history and/or digital history. The department does an excellent job of bringing these faculty members together to maintain a flourishing Public History program at the MA level and pertinent courses at the BA level.'

#### *Students*

The Reviewers noted 'the enthusiasm of undergraduates, both in conversation... and in their responses to survey questions. Undergraduates expressed gratitude to the department for the quality of advising and the care with which faculty members interacted with students. The graduate students were also very enthusiastic and spoke about the "positive" community in the department and praised the "collaborative" environment.' The Reviewers also mentioned that students 'really enjoy [their] courses and learn a great deal from them.'

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

While the Reviewers praised the devotion of faculty and staff, they expressed concerns that the amount of work required to run the Public History program 'may place an undue burden on some faculty members and may not be adequately recognized and compensated.'

In terms of undergraduate courses, the Reviewers reported that 'students expressed a desire for better communication in a centralized venue about what courses were on offer, including better advertising for new courses.' Similarly, graduate students 'said that better internal communication would make them more aware in a timely fashion of courses outside the department and of the possibility of directed reading classes.' The Reviewers noted as well that both graduate and

undergraduate students ‘expressed the desire for a wider range of courses.’ Furthermore, the Reviewers noticed ‘that some courses are only offered every two years, and [...] that some students had to return for an extra year to finish the program as a result.’ While undergraduate students seemed satisfied with the program generally, the Reviewers commented that they ‘expressed greater dissatisfaction with TAs than with any other aspects of the program.’

The Reviewers stated that in response to previous program reviews, the Department has undertaken to reduce the number of required courses for the MA program and eliminate all combined (or piggy-backed) BA/MA courses. While the Reviewers supported this initiative, they were ‘concerned that one inadvertent consequence of reducing combined MA/BA classes may be a shortage of graduate course offerings and that this may discourage prospective students from enrolling in the program.’

In terms of human resources, the Reviewers commented that ‘administration takes up a great deal of time for some faculty members, including teaching-related administration (such as identifying and developing internships) and communications work, such as maintaining the website.’ They also observed that contract instructors ‘feel excluded from the department, and are not in touch with colleagues or aware of debates as they unfold.’ The Reviewers also reported that the administrative staff is overworked: ‘Both the Departmental Administrator and the Graduate Administrator said they worked well in excess of 40 hours a week – the head administrator said she routinely worked over 60 hours a week and sometimes 80.’ It was clear to the reviewers that ‘the office needs at least another half position.’

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

The External Reviewers’ Report made 16 recommendations grouped under seven general rubrics:

#### **Review Process:**

1. Given the delay between the completion of the Self-Study in August, 2014 and the site visit in January 2016, the Reviewers recommended that future reviews have access to more recent information.
2. Given the usefulness of the meeting with contract instructors, the Reviewers recommended that future reviews include meetings with the contract faculty members.

#### **Tenured and tenure-track Faculty:**

1. The Reviewers recommended that the university enhance its support of research by creating a small-grant program to support early-stage faculty research.
2. The Reviewers supported the request of the department to make a senior hire of a Canadianist to replace forthcoming retirements.
3. The Reviewers recommended that some mechanism be found to compensate faculty members for teaching extra reading courses

#### **Public History:**

1. The Reviewers recommended that the university and the department consider implementing supportive measures, possibly in terms of providing a course release for the faculty members involved in this area.

**Contract Faculty:**

1. The Reviewers recommended that the university investigate ways to improve the compensation offered to these important instructors and that the History Department consider opening department meetings to contract academic staff for optional attendance in a non-voting capacity.
2. The Reviewers recommended that contract faculty who teach more than a certain number of courses be provided with a financial supplement to reimburse them for time to attend meetings and to write letters for students and provide mentorship.

**Graduate Students:**

1. The Reviewers recommended allocating more hours to training for students who work as TAs in a particular area of expertise for the first time and occasionally raising the ceiling of 130 hours per course to better prepare students. They also recommended that the department attempt to allocate TA's according to areas of expertise.
2. The Reviewers recommended that more financial and other resources be made available to part-time graduate students.
3. The Reviewers recommended that the History Department clearly indicate in advance when courses will be offered, offer alternatives (such as courses outside the department and reading courses), and work with students to ensure that they can complete their degrees in one year. They also recommended that the Department schedule courses in such a way as to ensure that it is structurally possible to finish the MA in a timely fashion.
4. The Reviewers recommended that reimbursements for student travel costs should be done in a timely fashion and that the students should be informed in advance of the reimbursement schedule.

**Undergraduate students**

1. The Reviewers recommend that the Department and upper administration should consider how to implement a better communication strategy to ensure that students are aware of course offerings well in advance, know where to go to find out about new courses (including new on-line courses), and are generally given full information in a centralized location to plan their degrees.
2. The Reviewers recommended that students should have the possibility of access to private advising with the Undergraduate Administrator, if desired (rather than in an open office).

**Additional Resources**

1. The Reviewers recommended that at a minimum an additional half-time position be added to the departmental administration; if resources permit, a full-time position would be valuable.
2. The Reviewers recommended that the space available to the Centre for Public History be enlarged and upgraded.

CUCQA recognized that some recommendations related to issues that are beyond the purview of the Department, such as the cyclical program review process and financial compensation for contract

instructors. Nevertheless, CUCQA encouraged the Department to provide its perspective on those issues with a view to improving the quality of Carleton's programs in general.

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

As a consequence of the review, the undergraduate and graduate programs in History 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.**

All the recommendations that were put forward as a result of the review process were productively addressed by the Department and the Deans of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences and the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs in a response to the report of the External Review that was considered by CUCQA on June 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2016. An Action Plan detailing how, when and by whom the recommendations will be implemented was received and approved by CUCQA on January 11<sup>th</sup>, 2017.

The Department was generally pleased with the report and agreed to implement all the recommendations that fall within its purview. It also provided useful comments on the recommendations that related to issues beyond its jurisdiction.

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 History, the monitoring will be achieved by means of an update on the Action Plan, which will be due on November 1<sup>st</sup>, 2017.

### **The Next Cyclical Review**

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

**DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY, CARLETON UNIVERSITY**  
**PLAN OF ACTION**  
**21 OCTOBER 2012**

**I. Recommendations concerning the review process**

*1. Given the delay between the completion of the Self-Study in August, 2014 and the site visit in January 2016, the reviewers recommend that future reviews have access to more recent information.*

**Action** This recommendation lies beyond our authority.

*2. Given the usefulness of the meeting with contract instructors, the reviewers recommend that future reviews include meetings with the contract faculty members.*

**Action** This recommendation lies beyond our authority.

**II. Recommendations concerning tenured and tenure-track faculty**

*1. The reviewers recommend that the University enhance its support of research by creating a small-grant program to support early-stage faculty research.*

**Action** This recommendation lies beyond our authority.

*2. The reviewers support the request of the Department to make a senior hire of a Canadianist to replace forthcoming retirements.*

**Action** The Department is now drawing up plans for new appointments over the next five years. The possibilities include a senior Canadianist, a Russianist, and a Public Historian. The Planning Committee has requested from members suggestions for the fields of new appointments, and will present their proposals at a special departmental planning meeting on 15 December 2016 for discussion and approval. Once these proposals are approved, the Chair will present them to the Dean by early 2017, in time for the next cycle of appointments. They will take into account replacements and new programs.

*3. The reviewers recommend that some mechanism be found to compensate faculty members for teaching extra reading courses.*

**Action** The Graduate Committee is now exploring ways to compensate faculty for graduate supervisions, unscheduled reading courses, and supervisions of honours research essays. The solution will depend in part on any new appointments the Department receives. It will also depend on the results of a FASS initiative on the same question. One of the solutions being considered by the Graduate Committee is that practised by the Department of Sociology and Anthropology. The Graduate Committee will present a proposal to the Department for approval when all of these variables are settled, which will probably be in the Spring of 2017.

**III. Recommendations concerning Public History**

*1. The reviewers recommend that the University and the Department consider implementing supportive measures, possibly in terms of providing a course release for the faculty members involved in this area.*

**Action** The Department has already instituted a half-course release for the supervisor of the Public History program when the combined number of students in the undergraduate practicum and the public history internships warrants it. The Department already supports the management of the internships with a half-course release, a reform that was instituted with the changes in the MA program after the publication of the self-study. A new appointment in Public History will also be considered by the Planning Committee in its proposal to be presented to the Department for approval in December 2016 (see II.2 above).

#### **IV. Recommendations concerning contract faculty**

*1. The reviewers recommend that the university investigate ways to improve the compensation offered to these important instructors and that the History Department consider opening department meetings to contract academic staff for optional attendance in a non-voting capacity.*

**Action** Compensation for contract instructors is subject to a collective agreement and lies beyond the authority of the Department. As for attendance at departmental meetings, the Chair has already begun sending the minutes of meetings to all contract instructors and inviting them to attend departmental meetings as observers.

*2. The reviewers recommend that contract faculty who teach more than a certain number of courses be provided with a financial supplement to reimburse them for time to attend meetings and to write letters for students and provide mentorship.*

**Action** Compensation for contract instructors is subject to a collective agreement and lies beyond our authority. The Departmental Administrator will maintain updated contact information for contract instructors after their teaching term ends to assist students seeking reference letters from these faculty. More generally, the information package provided to contract instructors each term will be revised to include more information on teaching resources, departmental contacts, and funds available from the Department and from the University to defray the costs of teaching materials. The Department has recently cross-appointed a long-time contract instructor, Dr. Hal Goldman, whose teaching record and concern with pedagogy is outstanding, with the understanding that he will help coordinate communication with contract instructors.

#### **V. Recommendations concerning graduate students**

*1. The reviewers recommend allocating more hours to training for students TA'ing in a particular area of expertise for the first time and occasionally raising the ceiling of 130 hours per course to better prepare students. They also recommend that the Department attempt to allocate TA's according to areas of expertise.*

**Action** TA training and working hours are subject to a collective agreement and thus lie beyond our authority. One TAship in the Department is assigned to an experienced graduate student to work as TA Mentor with the EDC on TA training, as well as with the TAs, although, as of two years ago, the Department must now apply for this position each year. The Department will continue to apply for this position each year and will recommend that it is made part of our permanent roster of TA appointments. The

Graduate Supervisor undertakes whenever possible to assign graduate students as TAs in courses that correspond to their areas of expertise.

*2. The reviewers recommend that more financial and other resources be made available to part-time graduate students.*

**Action** This recommendation lies outside of our authority.

*3. The reviewers recommend that the History Department clearly indicate in advance when courses will be offered, offer alternatives (such as courses outside the department and reading courses), and work with students to ensure that they can complete their degrees in one year. They also recommend that the Department schedule courses in such a way to ensure that it is structurally possible to finish the MA in a timely fashion.*

**Action** The Graduate Committee will review in consultation with students the reformed MA program and its course offerings at end of its first year (2016-17) and report to the Department with their recommendations. Graduate students can already take courses at Carleton outside the History Department and at the University of Ottawa, and reading courses from faculty within the Department. The only required course in the MA program is offered every year.

*4. The reviewers recommend that reimbursements for student travel costs should be done in a timely fashion and that the students should be informed in advance of the reimbursement schedule.*

**Action** The Graduate Supervisor from now on will call twice annually for requests for reimbursement of travel costs. This has been implemented in the last month.

## **VI. Recommendations concerning undergraduate students**

*1. The Department and upper administration should consider how to implement a better communication strategy to ensure that students are aware of course offerings well in advance, know where to go to find out about new courses (including new on-line courses), and are generally given full information in a centralized location to plan their degrees.*

**Action** The Communications Committee and the Planning Committee, with the assistance of the Departmental Secretariat, will consider ways to identify new courses on our website beginning 2017-18. The Communications Committee will see that greater prominence is given to the Student Academic Success Centre on the departmental website, and will remind students on our website about the assistance also offered in the Department. Some of these changes have already been implemented: for instance, the website does list courses very early and does have details about advising.

*2. Students should have the possibility of access to private advising with the Undergraduate Administrator, if desired (rather than in an open office).*

**Action** on this recommendation has already been taken and was reported in our replies to the reviewers' recommendations of 13 April 2016.

## VII. Recommendations concerning additional resources

1. *The reviewers recommend that at a minimum an additional half-time position be added to the departmental administration; if resources permit, a full-time position would be valuable.*

**Action** After July 2017, when the new Departmental Administrator has completed a full annual cycle in the Department, she and the Chair will write a job description for a new administrative position and submit the request at the budget meeting with the Dean early in 2018.

2. *The reviewers recommend that the space available to the Centre for Public History be enlarged and upgraded, if possible.*

**Action** Since the reviewers' visit, the Carleton Centre for Public History was renewed for the next five years. The Program in Public History also received the CURO "Building Connections Award". The Chair will ask that more space be made available for the Centre, starting with Paterson Hall.

**Table of Recommendations, Actions, Actors, and Dates**

	<b>Action</b>	<b>Actors</b>	<b>Date by</b>
I.1	None	No-one	n/a
I.2	None	No-one	n/a
II.1	None	No-one	n/a
II.2	Proposals for appointments	Planning Committee	15xii16
II.3	Graduate teaching compensation	Graduate Committee	Spring 2017
III.1	Public History support	Planning Committee	15xii16
IV.1	Contract instructors at meetings	Chair	Done
IV.2	Contract instructors--support	Departmental Administrator	Done
V.1	Allocation of TAs	Graduate Supervisor	Done
V.2	None	No-one	n/a
V.3	Course offerings, MA	Graduate Committee	June 2016
V.4	Travel reimbursements	Graduate Supervisor	Done
VI.1	Course offerings, advising	Communications Committee, Planning Committee, Departmental Secretariat	Fall 2017
VI.2	Private advising	Chair	Done
VII.1	New administrative position	Chair, Departmental Administrator	July 2017
VII.2	Space for CCPH	Chair	Next cycle

DATE: March 6, 2017

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 graduate programs in Political Economy

---

Please find attached the final assessment report and executive summary of the cyclical review of the graduate programs in Political Economy 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 History at its meeting of January 27, 2017.

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 graduate programs in Political Economy  
Executive Summary and Final Assessment Report**

This Executive Summary and Final Assessment Report of the cyclical review of Carleton's graduate programs in Political Economy are provided pursuant to articles 4.2.5.b-4.2.6.a-b of the provincial Quality Assurance Framework and article 7.2.23 of Carleton's Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP).

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The graduate programs in Political Economy (MA in Political Economy; MA in Political Economy with specialization in African Studies; PhD with specialization in Political Economy (collaborative program)) reside in Carleton University's Institute of Political Economy, a unit administered by the Faculty of Public Affairs.

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 Institute of Political Economy on December 14<sup>th</sup>, 2015, offered a very positive assessment of the programs. According to the reviewers, the Institute "has a national reputation that is unequalled" and "is widely recognized for its deep commitment to the field [of Political Economy] as a discipline in its own right." The report goes on to say that "both the MA and Ph.D. programs give students a very good grounding in both theory and methodology," and that the Learning Outcomes are met "through the strong intellectual profile of those associated with the program, through the core courses, through strong connections with the wider community, through its strong support of students, and through the research-intensive degrees." The Reviewers also noted that "the students are highly complimentary of the attention they receive from both the Director and the Administrator." The reviewers observed as well that all faculty members associated with the programs "have exceptional research profiles, publish frequently in the appropriate academic journals, and are active participants in issues related to political economy in the wider community."

Within the context of this positive assessment, the report nonetheless made a number of recommendations for the continuing enhancement of the programs. These recommendations were productively addressed by the Director of the Institute and the Deans of the Faculty of Public Affairs and the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs in a response to the report of the External Review that was submitted to CUCQA on May 25<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 December 14<sup>th</sup>, 2016.

## FINAL ASSESSMENT REPORT

### Introduction

The graduate programs in Political Economy (MA in Political Economy; MA in Political Economy with specialization in African Studies; PhD with specialization in Political Economy (collaborative program)) reside in Carleton University's Institute of Political Economy, a unit administered by the Faculty of Public Affairs. 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 October 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup>, 2015, was conducted by Dr. Marjorie Griffin Cohen, from Simon Fraser University, and Dr. Daniel Salée, from Concordia University. The site visit involved formal meetings with the Assistant Vice-President (Academic), the Deans of the Faculty of Public Affairs and the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs, and the Director of the Institute of Political Economy. The review committee also met with faculty members, contract instructors, staff, MA and PhD students, as well as with Chairs of units affiliated with the Political Economy programs. The Reviewers also toured the Institute's facilities.

The External Reviewers' report, submitted on December 14<sup>th</sup>, 2015, offered a very 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 Political Economy programs (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 Director of the Institute of Political Economy and the Deans of the Faculty of Public Affairs and the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs 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 Director of the Institute of Political Economy and the Deans of the Faculty of Public Affairs and 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 External Reviewers' Report states that the Institute of Political Economy (IPE) "has a national reputation that is unequaled. [... It] is unique and has an excellent reputation, both within Canada and in other parts of the world. There is no other stand-alone Political Economy graduate program in Canada." The report adds that "its outcomes, in both the number, and quality of its graduate students, are outstanding. Because of the strong intellectual community it has fostered, it also is the catalyst within the University for those dealing with political economy in their research and teaching, something that adds significantly to the experience of students."

#### *Faculty*

The External Report indicates that all faculty members "have exceptional research profiles, publish frequently in the appropriate academic journals, and are active participants in issues related to political economy in the wider community. The faculty members attracted to this program are exceptional and most are known throughout Canada. Two are Chancellor's Professors and all are involved in research projects."

#### *Students*

The Reviewers commented that the quality of education in the programs is reflected in "the reception IPE's students receive in the wider world when their degree is finished. The Ph.D. students have an impressive publications record and even some MA students have been published in refereed academic journals." The theses that the Reviewers read "were exceptional in their quality and in their interdisciplinary nature." The reviewers also noted that PhD students consider the Institute "to be their 'consistent intellectual hub,' for many feel 'more at home in the Institute' than in their home department. MA students particularly liked its 'social active nature,' and the way that they were 'connected to various social issues'." The Reviewers also stressed that "all the students [they] met agreed that their life as graduate students was made considerably easier and nearly trouble-free thanks to the Director and Administrator who literally go out of their way to ensure that they be aware of every important detail related to their passage through the programs and ensure that their time at IPE is a pleasant one."

#### *Curriculum*

The Reviewers remarked that "the core courses have been designed to give students a broad understanding of the major theories and approaches to political economy [... and they] give the

breadth of knowledge that is crucial for developing critical abilities, and familiarity with various methodological approaches to research.”

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

While the Institute is generally successful, the Reviewers stated that “the major drawback to the current programs is that IPE does not exist as a department with its own faculty. It is therefore totally reliant on other academic units’ good will to provide all of its faculty needs.” According to the Reviewers, “the programs would stand on firmer grounds if they could count both on a stable offering of courses conceived specifically for them and a core group of professors for whom a part of their teaching duties and workload would be formally earmarked for IPE.”

Since “there is no dedicated faculty, [...] designing the required courses is difficult because they are taught by different faculty with different approaches to political economy.” This results in some dissatisfaction on the part of students. Based on comments from doctoral students, the Reviewers reported that “there was some concern that the Ph.D. theory course becomes more like a ‘topics in PE’ course [...] Students would like a content that gives more attention to the shifts in theoretical approaches [to Political Economy]. This, they felt, would make the ‘discipline’ less ‘fuzzy’ and be more provocative in thinking about political economy.” At the Master’s level, the Reviewers observed a desire “to have the theory course extend to one year, or to combine the theory and methods course into a single one-year course. Whether or how to revise the core courses should be examined by a committee that focuses on curriculum.”

The Reviewers also indicated that “the other major issues raised that affects the governance of IPE related to the 0.4 academic position that IPE lost in recent years.” This loss has caused “real hardship in a very small unit [...] The removal of the 0.4 faculty appointment through attrition has created pressures on the Director and part of this deals with supervisory duties.” Therefore, the Reviewers commented that “reinstating this position could have a positive impact on the governance structure of IPE [...] The position could be assigned a specific role in the governance structure, including taking a role in mentoring MA students until their senior supervisor is in place.”

Finally, the Reviewers praised the current unit administrator. However, they cautioned that there is a risk that the administrator might “be overextended, which, over time, may have a negative impact on her effectiveness.” There is also the risk of an “operational breakdown that may ensue in the event that [the administrator] is kept away from work for a prolonged period. From the standpoint of administrative continuity, IPE is in a vulnerable position.” The Reviewers thus “strongly encourage the university to consider bringing in a junior support staff member at least on a part-time basis, who would assist” the current administrator.

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

The External Reviewers’ Report made 14 recommendations for improvement:

1. *Conduct regular exit surveys of graduates.*
2. *Include ‘quality assurance’ identification among the tasks for the development of a committee structure in IPE*

3. *If the 0.4 permanent faculty is restored that teaching at least one core course be part of the duties in order to ensure consistency in how the theory course is taught.*
4. *IPE needs to conduct a review of its core courses to both ensure that the content has consistency over time, but also to see if the content generates the outcomes desired. Ideally a committee focusing on curriculum would do this.*
5. *Consider offering more interdisciplinary courses in IPE*
6. *That IPE institute a small curriculum committee and/or steering committee*
7. *That IPE considers establishing an advisory committee that might include those within Carleton and from the wider community. This committee might function as a program committee that could plan and publicize IPE events*
8. *Create an Associate Director to assist with the governance of IPE.*
9. *Re-instate 0.4 faculty position with definite governance duties assigned to this position.*
10. *Students should be assigned a formal temporary faculty advisor when they enter the program*
11. *Increase support staff by the addition of part-time support.*
12. *Consider increasing the former 0.4 faculty position to full-time.*
13. *IPE should work on a definition of political economy to include in its brochure.*
14. *Provide a study or common room for Ph.D. students in IPE.*

CUCQA considered all recommendations to be pertinent and invited the Institute to address each of them in their response and subsequent Action Plan.

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

As a consequence of the review, the Political Economy 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 as a result of the review process were productively addressed by the Director of the Institute and the Deans of the Faculty of Public Affairs and the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs in a response to the report of the External Review that was considered by CUCQA on May 25th, 2016. An Action Plan detailing how, when and by whom the recommendations will be implemented was received and approved by CUCQA on December 14th, 2016.

The institute was generally pleased with the report and agreed to implement a number of recommendations. The Institute unconditionally agreed to take action on recommendations #2, #4,

#6, #7, and #13. The Institute also agreed to implement recommendation #1 contingent on support from the University to conduct the exit survey.

The response to the remaining recommendations provided justifications for the Institute's decision to decline taking action. The reasons for such decisions were related either to issues of resources that are beyond the Institute's control (recommendations #3, #8, #9, #11 and #12), or to the Institute's opinion that the status quo is satisfactory and that no action need be taken (recommendations #5, #10, and #14). CUCQA accepted the Institute's rationale regarding recommendations that were declined.

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 Political Economy, 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 Political Economy graduate programs will be conducted during the 2021-22 academic year.