

SENATE QUALITY ASSURANCE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE
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 the provincial Quality Assurance Framework and Carleton's Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The graduate programs in Political Economy reside in the Institute of Political Economy, a unit administered by the Faculty of Public Affairs.

As a consequence of the review, the programs were categorized by Carleton University's Senate Quality Assurance and Planning Committee (SQAPC) as being of good quality. (Carleton's IQAP 7.2.13-7.2.14).

The External Reviewers' report offered a very positive assessment of the programs. 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 of Political Economy and the Dean of the Faculty of Public Affairs in responses to the External Reviewers' report and Implementation on Plan that was submitted to SQAPC on April 11, 2024.

Political Economy
Unit Response to External Reviewers' Report & Implementation Plan
Programs Being Reviewed: MA and Collaborative PhD

Note: This document is forwarded to Senate, the Quality Council and posted on the Vice- Provost's external website.

Introduction & General Comments

Please include any general comments regarding the External Reviewers' Report.

Those at the Institute of Political Economy were delighted to receive the Reviewers' very positive report on November 21,2023. This report has been shared with our faculty and staff. We are committed to continually improving our programs to provide the conditions to support student learning, faculty teaching, research, and service, and staff contributions to administration and support for teaching and engagement. This document contains both a response to the External Reviewers' Report and an Implementation Plan with have been created in consultation with the Dean's Office, Faculty of Public Affairs.

For each recommendation ***one*** of the following responses must be selected:

Agreed to unconditionally: used when the unit agrees to and is able to take action on the recommendation without further consultation with any other parties internal or external to the unit.

Agreed to if additional resources permit: used when the unit agrees with the recommendation, however action can only be taken if additional resources are made available. Units must describe the resources needed to implement the recommendation and provide an explanation demonstrating how they plan to obtain those resources. In these cases, discussions with the Deans will normally be required and therefore identified as an action item.

Agreed to in principle: used when the unit agrees with the recommendation, however action is dependent on something other than resources. Units must describe these dependencies and determine what actions, if any, will be taken.

Not agreed to: used when the unit does not agree with the recommendation and therefore will not be taking further action. A rationale must be provided to indicate why the unit does not agree (no action should be associated with this response).

Calendar Changes

If any of the action items you intend to implement will result in calendar changes, please describe what those changes will be. To submit a formal calendar change, please do so using the Courseleaf system.

Hiring

Where an action item requires additional hiring (faculty or staff) the owner should at minimum include the Dean of the faculty and member of the unit.

UNIT RESPONSE AND IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

Programs Being Reviewed: MA and Collaborative PhD in Political Economy

Prepared by (name/position/unit/date): Susan Braedley, Director, Institute of Political Economy, 23 January 2024

External Reviewer Recommendation & Categorization Note: Recommendations highlighted in yellow were also made as part of a previous review	Unit Response (choose only one for each recommendation): 1- Agreed to unconditionally 2- Agreed to if additional resources permit (describe resources) 3- Agreed to in principle 4- Not agreed to Rationales are required for categories 2, 3 & 4	Action Item	Owner	Timeline	Will the action described require calendar changes? (Y or N)
1. Ensure consistent descriptions of the core courses. (Weakness)	1. Agreed to unconditionally	This work is already underway. The curriculum committee met and has realigned course descriptions on the website. New course descriptions have been developed and approved by the committee, and will be approved at our next Board meeting, in time for changes to be made to the calendar. These descriptions are less prescriptive, to allow for the work involved in addressing Recommendation #2.	Director	Fall 2023-May 2024	Y
2. Review core course content to take into consideration how the field of political economy has evolved since the last program review and how this evolution relates to the programs' goals, the place of the core courses within the programs, and changes in the composition of faculty associated with the programs. The review should involve not just the Director and Curriculum Committee but also the wider PECO Board. (Concern)	1. Agreed to unconditionally	This work has been discussed with the curriculum committee and approved there. The Director will develop and lead a review process during the 2024- 2025 period, not as a one-and-done review, but as a regularly scheduled activity to be completed at an interval determined by and agreed upon by the Institute Board.	Director	Fall 2024-May 2025	N

<p>3. Consider a direct entry option to the Collaborative PhD. (Opportunity)</p>	<p>3. Agreed in principle. This recommendation requires coordination and collaboration across the departments involved – resources and attention not in the control of IPE. Further, students are often confused by the many specialization opportunities and want to assess on admission to PhD.</p>	<p>The Director will make inquiries with Program Supervisors in the doctoral programs involved.</p>	<p>Director</p>	<p>Summer/Fall 2024</p>	<p>Y</p>
<p>4. Develop a clearer outline of standard procedures and job description for the program administrator. (Concern)</p>	<p>1. Agreed unconditionally. The Administrator position includes both Department and Graduate Program duties, and administrative responsibilities for a department without dedicated faculty beyond a Director. Clarifying the position and aligning it appropriately with other administrative positions at the university is overdue.</p>	<p>In collaboration with the Human Resources support at the Dean’s office through the Manager of Administration and Operations, the Director and Administrator will together undertake to produce a job description that entails the work responsibilities assigned to this position.</p>	<p>Director, Administrator, FPA Manager, Administration and Operations</p>	<p>Fall 2024-completed April, 2025</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>5. Place existing resource commitments to the program on a more secure foundation with longer-term commitment, including support for the visiting scholars program and the Work and Labour seminars and associated placements. Consider a more formal agreement between FPA and FASS on the coordination of resources that support the programs.(Concern)</p>	<p>3. Agreed in principle. There was a recent issue with placement course instruction recently that, while very satisfactorily addressed for the longer-term, brought up questions about the informality in the agreement between FASS and FPA.</p> <p>IPE has operated well with the following informal agreement. Directors tend to alternate between Faculties. When FPA does not provide the Director (1.0), it agrees to cross-list 2 courses with FASS units to offset this. These are usually offered by the visiting scholars. FPA also covers the full costs of the visitors (\$60,000 a year).</p> <p>The rest of the courses are generally shared equally across both Faculties. Historically, FASS has provided a bit more teaching. FPA, on the other hand, is covering the full cost of</p>	<p>The Director, in collaboration with the Dean’s Office of Public Affairs, will consider options in formalizing resource commitments between FPA and FASS, to consider stability, flexibility, and contributions to the program.</p>	<p>Director, IPE Dean’s Office, FPA</p>	<p>Fall 2025</p>	<p>N</p>

	<p>visiting scholars. So resource-wise, it has balanced out over time.</p> <p>Given that this understanding is informal and personnel and budgets tend to change, there may be some advantage to making the arrangement more formal. The basis for the agreement should be a principle to work together to ensure the program has necessary, equitable resources, rather than specific contributions.</p>				
6. If financial support for domestic full-time MA students is guaranteed, this should be advertised explicitly by the program to help with recruitment. (Opportunity)	2. Agreed. Currently we are advertising funding for every student.	The Institute will be careful to communicate funding policies to prospective graduate students	Director and Administrator	Ongoing	N
7. The programs should promote the link to the considerable research related activities with the Institute as a resource for students as part of their recruitment. (Opportunity)	1. Agreed to unconditionally. These research related activities are already promoted in recruitment materials as offering opportunities for students	Availability of research opportunities has been added to recruitment activities and information in recruitment materials for 2024-25.	Director and Administrator	Completed	N