OPEN SESSION

CONSENT AGENDA

to the Open Agenda of the 611th Meeting of the Board of Governors

Thursday, June 28th, 2018
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 610th meeting on May 24th, 2018

4.1.2 Approval of Nik Nanos and Alaine Spiwak to the Chancellor Search Committee

a) Working paper attached.

4.2 ITEM(S) FOR INFORMATION

4.2.1 Report from the Office of the Vice-Provost and Associate Vice-President (Academic)

• Summary report and five cyclical program review documents attached.

4.2.2 Committee Minutes

a) Governance Committee
  ▪ 36th Meeting, February 1, 2018

4.2.3 Minutes from Senate Meeting

▪ Approved Minutes from April Senate meeting were circulated in advance.
The Board of Governors acknowledges and respects the Algonquin First Nation, on whose traditional territory the Carleton University campus is located.

Minutes of the 610th Meeting of the Board of Governors

Thursday, May 24th, 2018 at 4:00 p.m.
Room 2440R Richcraft Hall, Carleton University

OPEN SESSION

1. CALL TO ORDER AND CHAIR’S REMARKS

The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. All attendees, guests and observers were welcomed. The Open Session was live-streamed to Southam Hall 617.

2. DECLARATION OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The Chair asked for any declarations of conflict of interest from the members. There were none declared.
3. **APPROVAL OF OPEN AGENDA**

Mr. Tattersfield moved, and Mr. Javanpour seconded, that the Open Agenda of the 610th meeting of the Board of Governors be approved, as presented. The motion carried.

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

The following items were circulated in the Open Consent Agenda for approval:

Item(s) for Approval:
- Minutes of the previous meeting and business arising from the minutes

Item(s) for Information:
- Minutes from Building Program, and Community Relations and Advancement Committees
- The Environmental Health and Safety Annual Report
- Minutes from March Senate

Ms. Daly moved, and Ms. Alves seconded, that the Open Consent Agenda be approved, as presented. The motion carried.

5. **ITEMS FOR EDUCATION & RESEARCH STRATEGIC INITIATIVES**

5.1 **Employability and Experiential Learning Update (S. Blanchard)**

Ms. Blanchard was introduced to give a presentation on Employability and Experiential Learning funding provided by the Ministry of Advanced Education and Skills Development (MAESD) for new initiatives. In the last couple of months, increased funding has been provided to really differentiate Carleton.

Career Ready Fund – Stream 1 funding (over two years) was received in November 2017. The proposal included the Faculty of Public Affairs, Sprott School of Business, Faculty of Science, Student Experience Office, Career Services and Co-operative Education all working towards a set of initiatives across the university to increase experiential learning opportunities. An area of increase was international internships abroad for students. Carleton started with a small number last year and slowly increased the number of students participating. Problem based learning and partnering with businesses are being explored.

Career Ready Fund – Stream 2 (one-year funding), received in March 2018 was used to refresh branding and build strong relationship with businesses and employers. Carleton is employing a multi-disciplinary approach to co-operative education and extra-curricular activities.
Create Career Ready is seeking to make jobs accessible (placements) for students with disabilities. Carleton differentiated themselves with accessibility opportunities for employment. The project is a multifaceted collaboration between Career Services, Paul Menton Centre and the READ Initiative. The placements are subsidized part-time and partial subsidized during the full-time hours in the summer. This acts as an incentive for employers to support (tools and understanding) students with disabilities. Encouraging students on campus (300) to seek placements in the Ottawa-region.

The David C. Onley Initiative for Employment and Enterprise was launched on May 4, 2018 (just prior to the election), is for $5M over two years. This initiative is for students at all Ottawa institutions (colleges and universities) for employment opportunities in the Ottawa-area. MAESD saw this initiative as being led by Carleton but bringing in other institutions. Awareness, outreach and partnerships are needed to place students.

The Ontario Postsecondary Access and Inclusion Program (OPAIP) funding from MAESD for student initiatives ($1.5M over three-years) through a competitive process. Historically there was a first-generation inclusion program to support different mechanisms and the province decided to work towards more specific initiatives and to assist underrepresented populations to attend university. Carleton decided to build upon the Enriched Support Program to get support and transition students into a full degree program. Peer support, writing tutor and study strategies are being used to help student transition into a program.

The number of co-operative education classes increased every year by about 10%. The increased awareness with employers and trending will to continue the positive relationship with employers and provide opportunities for our students.

Employability for Carleton’s students with disabilities is on-par for employability and graduation rates. Carleton’s team has the expertise, dedication and commitment to employability.

6. OPEN – ITEM(S) FOR APPROVAL

6.1 Board of Governors Award for Outstanding Community Achievement

A working paper was circulated in advance. A story featuring the recipient Christian Robillard was circulated at the meeting.

Ms. Daly, Chair of the Community Relations and Advancement Committee introduced the item, noting that the Board Award Jury met on February 26th, 2018 and they reviewed ten applications for the Board of Governors for Outstanding Community Achievement.

The individual chosen by the Jury is involved in philanthropy, Mr. Robillard, is a strong Carleton ambassador. The award will be presented during June convocation.
Ms. Daly moved, Mr. Craig seconded to approve Christian Robillard as the recipient of the 2018 Board of Governors Award for Outstanding Community Achievement, as presented and recommended by the Board Award Jury and the Community Relations and Advancement Committee, as presented. The motion carried.

6.2 Nicol Building – Award of Contract

Documentation providing clarification and explanation of the difference in the cost estimates and proposed tender budget were circulated in advance. Mr. Trevor Stewart also joined the meeting to answer questions on the tender results.

The Board of Governors approved the budget for the Nicol Building at its October 5th, 2017 at a cost not to exceed $48M, based on the cost estimates provided by the firm Turner and Townsend. It was noted that Carleton has a high level of classroom utilization (90%), and this building will provide, much needed space for the Sprott School of Business, additional classroom space to bring the utilization rate closer to 80%. The Nicol Building will be built in P2 across from the Health Sciences Building and once constructed a new quad will be developed to create a welcoming space.

The initial funds for the project will be provided by the $10M donated from Wes Nicol (now worth $11.8M), $8M appropriated from the 2017-18 operating budget, and $28.2M from the accumulated funds in the Capital Reserve Fund.

On November 14, 2017, the Finance Committee was informed that the tender results would include the build-out of the previous shelled-off 5th floor with an increased cost which was not specified.

Using the MERX system six contractors were prequalified to bid on the project. Five bids for the construction were received. One of the contractors did not submit a bid because of overcommitment to construction in Ottawa. Using the low bid $53.5M, the total cost of the project is estimated at $65.1M. Management reviewed the bid with the contractor and the cost-estimator. Additional costs come from the fit-up of the 5th floor, additional soft costs, construction and increased material costs for the whole building. Uncertainty around tariffs and increase has caused steel and material prices to increase dramatically as well. The construction market in Ottawa is also tight due to major projects around the city, including on Parliament Hill.

The Building Program Committee and the Finance Committee held a joint meeting (May 22nd, 2018) to discuss to tender results. The contractors all had an increase in pricing for labour, materials and subtrades. There was a significant discussion concerning numbers provided by the cost estimate and the ability to estimate more accurately complex projects and tight designs on specific sites. There is protection/contingency in the overall
price for cost overrun. Management is exploring ways to find cost savings that will not affect the overall look of the building.

Management recommended proceeding with a revised $65.1M price (representing an increase of $17.1M) on the understanding there will be a continued effort to find cost savings with the contractor. A potential place for savings is in the form work of the building. A bubble form will be used which will put spaces in the concrete. This technique has not been used in the Ottawa area but is routinely used in Toronto. This accounts for a $1.8M difference in cost for a standard building. The spread between bids was $4-5M and indicates valid prices for the construction in the current market, with the specific materials and finishes, etc. We rely on the expertise of our cost estimating company to provide better warning and mitigated the price shock. It is likely that the steel companies are using the uncertainty around tariffs to justify a price increase.

A fixed price contract will be negotiated. Management also recommends that the additional $17.1M comes from the capital reserve fund and it will be replenished over the coming years. As a result the possible University Centre project, which is at very preliminary exploratory stage, may be delayed.

The Nicol Building will provide teaching and learning spaces that are unique to experiential learning, problem-based learning, and entrepreneurship. It will not be just the business school as the needs of the students and faculty will be integrated with the rest of campus which speaks to the nature of the business school that has always been heavily integrated into campus life.

Mr. Wener moved, and Mr. Craig seconded, to approve the construction of the Nicol Building at a cost not to exceed $65.1M, and management proceed to negotiating a stipulated fixed-price contract and the additional funds for the construction to come from the Capital Reserve Fund, as presented. The motion carried.

7. OPEN-ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

7.1 Report from the Chair (C. Carruthers)

A verbal report was provided by Dr. Carruthers. The governors were reminded to complete the 2018 Board Assessment. The assessment is critical for the Board’s governance. Thank you to those members that completed the assessment.

The members were reminded of the end-of-year board dinner and the members first opportunity to meet new president Benoit-Antoine Bacon. Interim President Summerlee will also be recognized at the dinner.
7.2 Report from the President (A. Summerlee)

A written report, a report from the Office of the Vice-President (Students and Enrolment) and the Carleton Energy Master Plan was circulated in advance. The senior administration and the board members were thanked for their support on the Dominion Chalmers United Church purchase.

Interim President Summerlee alerted the Board that due to the labour disruption, Carleton might have up to 5% fall in enrolment in 2018/19. Carleton’s offers out to the 105’s (non-traditional Ontario high school students) were delayed and are subject to a more complicated process that takes a lot of one-on-one support and staff time to get the offers out.

Spring convocations are coming up June 12 – 15 and all are very welcome to attend. The honorary degrees being awarded at Convocation are: Helen Clark, Gilles Patry, Jayne Stoyles, Catherine Frazee, Peter Buckley, Gordon Hicks, Steven Davis, and Gerison Lansdown.

A primer on bargaining process was provided for the board to take them through the normal steps in the process. Interim President Summerlee advised that a considerable amount of the president’s time has been set-aside to assist with transition of Dr. Bacon.

The Director of Equity is retiring mid-year but this has been part of the transition plan for the office.

The commitment to action on self-identification for Indigenous faculty, staff and students was recognized. Assistance was offered by Mr. Dinsdale as he has experience in this area from various institutions.

7.3 Update on Comprehensive Campaign (D. Fortin)

A brochure was circulated in advance.

Dr. Summerlee gave an update as of April 30, 2018 (fiscal year-end). Credit was given to the Advancement team, Ms. Conley, Ms. Chea and Mr. Fortin for raising $41.5M for 2017/2018 which is double previous years and a considerable achievement. It also reflects the considerable support provided by members of the Board with peer-to-peer and collaborative approaches. There are also considerable ongoing efforts to get to the campaign goal/target of $300M. The type of campaign is agile and does not follow the norm of campaigns and depends on engagement of peers. 23,000 new donors and 16,000 have attended events. Sustainment is needed to continue to gain support funds from generous donors.
Mr. Nordenstrom’s leadership for the Clean Economy Fund was noted as a significant achievement of $870,000. Mr. Javanpour was recognized for his tireless support, and outreach for the Zelikovitz Centre.

The leadership of the President in championing the campaign was noted.

7.4 Committee Chair Updates

a) Building Program (D. Craig)

The Building Committee met on March 5th and will be meeting on May 3rd, and in a joint meeting with Finance later in May. The May agenda items include the Health and Safety Report, an update on Dominion Chalmers United Church purchase (a final agreement is being completed), project management improvements, transportation and parking, Health Sciences Building update (building and fit-up), ARISE Building (building and fit-up), and Nicol Building (tender results).

b) Community Relations & Advancement (L.A. Daly)

The Committee met on May 14th and were scheduled to meet for a Talk Exchange in March which was cancelled due to the strike. The Committee was updated on reputation enhancement, student experience and engagement and campaign advancement. Ms. Blanchard reported on increased provincial funding. Advancement reported on the fundraising campaign. In December, the School of Journalism and the department of communication paired to create a digital only publication that is distributed to 17,000 homes and business called Community Connections (Centre Town News). Linda Ann was thanked for her excellent chairmanship of the committee over the last year.

c) Finance Committee (B. Wener)

The Finance Committee has reviewed the operating and ancillary budgets for 2018/19, student fees, and is maintaining a watch on the budgets of ongoing capital projects.

c) Governance Committee (K. Evans)

The Governance Committee will be meeting in May to discuss update and amendment to the academic governance of the university (joint policy of senate and the board). Review of this document will clear the way to complete the amendment of the portion of the bylaws that relate to senate. The board self-assessment results were discussed, and the best practices review with a focus on
frequency and format of meetings, training and orientation of members, and board recruitment. The committee is currently seeking out a consultant for the best practices review and the president designate is interested in getting involved in the review. The report is expected to be prepared for the retreat in the fall.

d) Nominating Committee (C. Carruthers)
The next meeting is in June and transition and the new board members will be approved as part of the membership. 166 persons applied for the vacant positions. The Chair and Vice-Chair will be meeting with three potential candidates to discuss the time commitment, skill set and preferences and will be bringing two new candidates forward at the June 28th meeting for approval.

8. OPEN – OTHER BUSINESS

No additional business was raised.

9. OPEN – QUESTION PERIOD

No additional questions were raised.

10. END OF OPEN SESSION AND BRIEF NETWORKING BREAK

It was moved by Mr. Wener, seconded by Mr. Javanpour to adjourn the open session of the board at approximately 5:42 pm.
CHANCELLOR SEARCH MEMBERSHIP

The Issue

The Chancellor’s search commenced on June 16, 2016 with membership following the Chancellor’s Appointment Guidelines approved in April 2014. The Appointment Guidelines were up for a mandatory review in April 2017 and went to the Governance Committee for consideration on May 10, 2017. The revised appointment guidelines were approved at the June 29th, 2017 Board meeting (attached).

The Chancellor Search is ongoing and with the change in membership of the Board of Governors the membership of the committee will need to be updated. Once the membership is confirmed a meeting of the search committee members will be needed to consider next steps and the possibility of expanding the nominee pool.

Chancellor Search Committee Current Membership:

Alastair Summerlee    Chair ex officio
Chris Carruthers      Board representative
Gina Courtland        Board representative
Tony Tattersfield     Board representative
Rebecca Stiles        Board representative - student
Janine Debanné        Senate representative
Mira Sucharov         Senate representative
Jerry Tomberlin       Senate representative – senior admin
Amanda Goth           Secretary to the Committee

Note: Tony Tattersfield and Rebecca Stiles will be retiring from the Board on June 30, 2018 and will need to be replaced on the committee.

Recommendation and Next Steps:

Dr. Bacon would like to continue with the Chancellor Search upon his appointment and to do so a revised membership will be needed to continue with the process. It is recommended that Nik Nanos and Alaine Spiwak names be put forward as replacements for the two retiring board members on the Chancellor Search Committee.
Minutes of the 36th Meeting of the Governance Committee  
Thursday, February 1st, 2018 at 4:00p.m.  
Room 617 Robertson Hall

Present:  
Mr. K. Evans, Chair  
Mr. O. Javanpour, Vice-chair  
Mr. E. Berhe  
Dr. C. Carruthers  
Dr. I. Lee  
Ms. R. Stiles  
Dr. A. Summerlee  
Mr. A. Ullett

Regrets:  
Dr. I. Lee  
Mr. J. Nordenstrom  
Mr. N. Nanos

Staff:  
Ms. A. Goth  
Mr. S. Levitt  
Ms. A. Deeth (Recording Secretary)

1. CALL TO ORDER AND CHAIR’S REMARKS

The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

The Chair made remarks concerning the recruitment process and selection criteria for new Governors.

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 declared.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Dr. Carruthers moved, and it was seconded by Mr. Javanpour to approve the agenda as presented. The motion carried.
4. ITEM(S) FOR APPROVAL

4.1 Minutes of Previous Meeting

Mr. Berhe moved, and it was seconded by Mr. Ullett, to approve the minutes of the 35th meeting of the Governance Committee as presented. The motion carried.

5. ITEM(S) FOR DELIBRATION

5.1 Executive Committee Terms of Reference

The Executive Committee Terms of Reference were circulated in advance.

At a prior meeting, a question raised regarding the decision-making process for the Executive Committee. In response, the Executive Committee Terms of Reference were reviewed. It was determined that the sections relating to the powers of the Executive Committee should be amended to conform to the current sections Section 8.01 (c) and (d) of the Bylaws.

It was reiterated that the primary role of the Executive Committee is to exercise the powers of the Board between meetings of the Board, including the powers specifically delegated to the Executive Committee by the Board. Where time and circumstances permit, decisions will be deferred to be made or approved at an open or closed session of the Board as appropriate.

Mr. Ullett moved, and seconded by Dr. Summerlee to amend the Executive Committee – Terms of Reference, as discussed. The motion carried.

5.2 Presidential Assessment

A report containing compiled research relating to best practices for the assessment of the President’s performance was circulated in advance.

It was agreed that there should be an annual assessment as well as a more detailed 360 review, perhaps with the assistance of an independent consultant, every 3-5 years. The president should be an integral participant in the process in establishing goals and performance indicators at the beginning of each term and a self-assessment at the end, of the results and success achieved. The relationship between the president and the chair should also be included in the assessment. There should also be broad consultation with Board members, senior staff, Carleton Community, stakeholders and others. The distribution of the assessment should be considered.
There was a brief discussion about salary structure for the president and the awarding of a bonus. There are benefits and draw-backs to bonus structures. These are issues for the HR Sub-Committee of the Executive Committee to consider.

The committee agreed that the goal and purpose of the assessment is important and must be clearly defined. Further discussion is required and will be followed up at future meetings of the Governance Committee.

5.3 Board Self-Assessment 2017/2018

The 2016/2017 Board Self-Assessment and summary report were circulated in advance. The Board Self-Assessment survey and questionnaire were reviewed last year. This assessment will be part of a planned review of Board Governance and the current process will be adopted until changed.

5.4 Proposal for Governance Review

A memo and Proposal for a Governance Review were circulated in advance. The Executive Committee authorized an independent, external review be carried out under the auspices of the Governance Committee to assess the effectiveness of the Board to ensure the Board is meeting and exceeding professional standards and expectations for best practices in not-for-profit boards, particularly university boards.

The scope of the review might focus on what are the best practices for boards to be effective (organization of meetings, briefing materials, frequency, structure of meetings, transparency and communication). Also the best practices for board recruitment-how to attract, educate and retain talent.

Nik Nanos, Ken Evans and Steve Levitt will carry out a search for an appropriate consultant and report back to the committee.

6. OTHER BUSINESS

A question was raised about an issue concerning a student movement for the removal of the Gandhi statue in front of the Richcraft building. Dr. Alastair Summerlee will investigate further.

7. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at approximately 5:36 pm. The motion carried.
The charts below list new academic programs, completed cyclical program reviews and some major modifications. In 2017-18, 29 major modifications were approved, of which only a selection is mentioned below. Those listed represent major modifications that have a more substantial impact on the affected program.

### New Academic Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Program Approval</th>
<th>Approved by Senate</th>
<th>Approved by the Quality Council</th>
<th>Submitted to MAESD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.Sc. in Management</td>
<td>November 24, 2017</td>
<td>February 16th, 2018</td>
<td>January 16, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.Sc. Interdisciplinary Science and Practice</td>
<td>March 28, 2018</td>
<td>May 10, 2018</td>
<td>April 17, 2018 Decision Expected: August 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cyclical Program Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cyclical Program Review</th>
<th>Approved by Senate</th>
<th>Received by the Quality Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Music (BA, MA)</td>
<td>November 24, 2017</td>
<td>November 27, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art History and History and Theory of Architecture (BA, MA)</td>
<td>November 24, 2017</td>
<td>November 27, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Science (BSc.)</td>
<td>November 24, 2017</td>
<td>November 27, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Rights (BA)</td>
<td>May 4, 2018</td>
<td>May 14, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion (BA)</td>
<td>May 4, 2018</td>
<td>May 14, 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Substantial Graduate Major Modifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Modifications</th>
<th>Approved by Senate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>PhD in Public Policy</em>: Substantial additions and deletions to existing course offerings. Substantive changes to program requirements.</td>
<td>November 24, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>MA Psychology with Specialization in Data Science</em>: addition of the Data Science Specialization.</td>
<td>January 26, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>MA in History with Specialization in Data Science</em>: addition of the Data Science Specialization to Masters Research Paper option.</td>
<td>January 26, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Master of Information Technology with Specialization in Data Science</em>: Addition of the Data Science Specialization.</td>
<td>January 26, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>MA in Canadian Studies with Specialization in Digital Humanities</em>: Addition of the Digital Humanities specialization to the coursework option.</td>
<td>January 26, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>MA, MEng, MASc in Sustainable Energy</em>: Substantial changes to coursework and the addition of SERG 5004: Applied Interdisciplinary Project for MA and MEng students.</td>
<td>January 26, 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Substantial Undergraduate Major Modifications**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Modifications</th>
<th>Approved by Senate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BA Arts, Sociology (Honours, Combined Hons.):</strong> Substantial additions and deletions to existing course offerings. The addition of capstone seminar (SOCl 4700 Honours Capstone Seminar).</td>
<td>January 26, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BA Arts, Religion (Honours, Combined Hons., Minor in Islamic Studies and Minor in Jewish Studies):</strong> Substantial additions and deletions to existing course offerings and breadth requirements. The addition of capstone seminar (RELI 4741: Contemporary Issues in the Study of Religion).</td>
<td>January 26, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interdisciplinary Public Affairs:</strong> The addition of IPAF 3900 and IPAF 3901 as International Internships available to students in the Faculty of Public Affairs</td>
<td>January 26, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bachelor of Journalism:</strong> Added a concentration in Health Sciences to the existing BJ program to fill demand for experts in science communication. Also, the addition of a capstone project (NSCI 4901 Science Journalism Independent Project).</td>
<td>January 26, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disability Studies:</strong> Substantial additions and deletions to course offerings to the existing minor.</td>
<td>January 26, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Global and International Studies, Concentration in World Religion:</strong> a new specialization was added to the existing GINS program that emphasizes the Francophone histories, culture and languages.</td>
<td>May 4, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B.Sc. Honours in Biology, Concentration in Biodiversity, Natural History and Conservation:</strong> a new concentration was added to the existing Biology program with an emphasis on Biodiversity, Natural History and Conservation.</td>
<td>May 4, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Certificate in Public Service Studies:</strong> Certificate was deleted.</td>
<td>January 26, 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CARLETON UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON QUALITY ASSURANCE

Cyclical Review of the undergraduate and graduate programs in Music
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 Music are provided pursuant to the provincial Quality Assurance Framework and Carleton’s Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The undergraduate programs (BMus; BA in Music) and graduate program (MA in Music and Culture) reside in Music, a sub-unit of Carleton University’s School for Studies in Art and Culture, 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 School in Art and Culture on January 4th, 2016, 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 and the Assistant Director (Music) of the School for Studies in Art and Culture, the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, and the Dean of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs in a response to the External Reviewers’ report that was submitted to CUCQA on June 22nd, 2016.

An Action Plan detailing how, when and by whom the recommendations will be implemented was received and approved by CUCQA on October 11th, 2017.
FINAL ASSESSMENT REPORT

Introduction

The undergraduate programs (BMus; BA in Music) and graduate program (MA in Music and Culture) reside in Music, a sub-unit of Carleton University’s School for Studies in Art and Culture, a unit administered by the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences. This review was conducted pursuant to the Quality Assurance Framework and Carleton’s Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP). As a consequence of the review, the programs were categorised by the Carleton University Committee on Quality Assurance (CUCQA) as being of GOOD QUALITY (Carleton’s IQAP 7.2.12).

The site visit, which took place on November 2nd and 3rd, 2015 was conducted by Dr. Jacqueline Warwick from Dalhousie University and Dr. Susan Lewis from the University of Victoria. The site visit involved formal meetings with the Assistant Vice-President (Academic), the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, the Dean of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs, and the Director and the Assistant Director (Music) of the School for Studies in Art and Culture. The review committee also met with faculty members, contract instructors, staff, and undergraduate and graduate students.

The External Reviewers’ report, submitted on December 22nd, 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 School for Studies in Art and Culture (Appendix A)
- Communication from CUCQA regarding the outcome of the external review (Appendix C)
- The response from the Director and the Assistant Director (Music) of the School for Studies in Art and Culture, the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, and the Dean of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs to the Report of the External Review Committee (Appendix D).
- The internal discussant’s recommendation report (Appendix E).
- The communication from CUCQA regarding the outcome of the review (Appendix F).
- The program’s Action Plan (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 and the Assistant Director (Music) of the School for Studies in Art and Culture, the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, and the Dean of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs, regarding the implementation of recommendations for program enhancement 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 “Music is a vibrant program within the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences and within the Carleton campus and community,” with a “strong sense of purpose to the programs and to the value of the music area as a whole.” Carleton University “has developed a strong identity in the regional market.”

*Faculty*

The External Reviewers’ Report indicates that “quality of the regular faculty is high and they are active at the national and international level in research, publishing, composing, performing, and presenting their work in a variety of venues.” The External Reviewers noted “overwhelming evidence of collegiality and high morale.”

*Students*

The Self-Study identified a high level of student satisfaction with the programs. This includes the undergraduate students, of which “many find suitable paths of employment and success after graduation.” Graduate students found the thesis process intensive but “with much faculty oversight, and that core classes provided good guidance and support for writing and research methods. Several recent graduates have earned places in doctoral programs and the strong intellectual profile of the program is well supported by the diverse research strengths and innovative curriculum.”

*Curriculum*

The External Reviewers noted distinct characteristics of the Carleton Music programs. For example, a defining feature of the Bachelor of Music program is the “studio lessons in performance on an instrument/voice.” This allows students to achieve “significant performing skills on a principal musical instrument, along with musicianship skills, at or near a professional level.” The External Reviewers also describe a strong BA program as one that “awakens the imagination and gives a broad view of possibilities, enabling students to pursue a broad range of interests and career paths” and note that “Carleton’s BA in Music is healthy and open-ended.” The MA program offers a full roster of classes that “is exciting and at the vanguard of current research in music scholarship, ensuring that the program is distinctive from comparable MA programs in Ontario and beyond,” and providing “a thorough grounding in classic texts and schools of thought, various methodologies in music scholarship, and extend also to cutting-edge intellectual trends and debates.”

**Challenges faced by the programs**
While the programs are generally successful, the External Reviewers did note some challenges. Specifically, they identify that the “space in which the programs are offered is also below national standards in terms of size and number of practice and rehearsal rooms.” They noted a need to enhance and consolidate space, as well as ensuring adequate workspace for graduate students.

**Opportunities for program improvement and enhancement**

The External Reviewers’ Report made 18 recommendations for improvement:

**General**

1. Consolidate and integrate music facilities in the Loeb Building.
2. Enhance and optimize space in the Jacob Siskind Music Resource Centre.
3. New base budget funding is required to hire additional professional support for juries and auditions.
4. Employ tenure-track performance area faculty members to support a higher level of performance activities.

**Bachelor of Music**

5. As courses, studio lessons should be administered for the entire term.
6. Increase professional support for juries and auditions.
7. Enhance and optimize space in the Jacob Siskind Music Resource Centre.
8. Have ensemble courses count for credit, and contract instructors given clear criteria on which to evaluate student work.
9. Redesign musicianship courses and curriculum.

**Bachelor of Arts in Music**

10. Develop strategies for mentoring contract instructors and enhancing their sense of being valued contributors.

**Master of Arts in Music and Culture**

11. Graduate Supervisor should continue in their position for a term of three to five years, according to Carleton norms. Thereafter, the position should rotate regularly to ensure steady renewal.
12. Guidelines for the colloquium series should be established to ensure that speakers represent a range of scholarly approaches in music studies, including musicologists, music theorists, and others.
13. Options for study in the MA should be limited to academic approaches but wide-ranging within that domain.
14. Graduate supervisions should continue to be evenly distributed amongst the faculty.
15. More workspaces for grad students are needed.

**Faculty and Governance**

16. The Assistant Director of Music should be located in situ to foster stronger connections to students and faculty.
17. The workload and working conditions of support staff should be assessed to ensure they are properly supported.

18. All students, faculty, and staff should participate in activities to promote awareness of healthy, appropriate relationships in the workplace.

CUCQA considered all recommendations pertinent and invited the School to address each of them in their response and subsequent Action Plan, recognizing that some recommendations relate to issues that are beyond the control of the School, especially the possibility of a tenure-track appointment in the area of performance.

The Outcome of the Review

As a consequence of the review, the undergraduate and graduate programs in Music 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 and the Assistant Director (Music) of the School for Studies in Art and Culture, the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, and the Dean of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs in a response to the External Reviewers’ report that was considered by CUCQA on June 22nd, 2016. An Action Plan detailing how, when and by whom the recommendations will be implemented was received and approved by CUCQA on October 11th, 2017.

The School was generally pleased with the report and agreed to implement a number of recommendations. The School unconditionally agreed to take action on recommendations #8, #10, #11, #12, #14, #17, and #18. The School also agreed to take action on recommendations #1, #2, #3, #4, #5, #6, #7, #15, #16; however, these are contingent on support or resources outside of the School.

The response to the remaining recommendations provided justifications for the School’s decision to decline taking action. The reason for such decisions was that the School disagreed with the External Reviewer’s assessment (recommendations #9, though the School will still “review the relevant courses with the aim of improving and expanding musicianship as a whole” and #13 as the School believes “the number of students that may be allowed to pursue performance or composition related work... will be extremely limited” and “do not perceive that this would place a great deal of strain on [their] practice facilities”). CUCQA accepted the School’s rationale regarding recommendations that were declined.

It is to be noted that Carleton’s IQAP provides for the monitoring of action plans. A joint report will be submitted by the academic unit(s) and Faculty Dean(s), and forwarded to CUCQA for its review. In the case of the programs in Music, the majority of monitoring will be achieved by means of an update on the Action Plan, which is expected by January 1st, 2019.

The Next Cyclical Review

The next cyclical review of the programs in Music will be conducted during the 2021-22 academic year.
Cyclical Program Review of Undergraduate and Graduate Programs in Music

On 15 June 2016, The Music Program of the School for Studies in Art and Culture submitted 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, received by us (via the Office of the Vice-Provost) on 04 January 2016. An Addendum to our Response was submitted on 08 September 2016 as a reply to budgetary and other questions raised by the Carleton University Committee on Quality Assurance (in a memo dated 28 June 2016). These documents serve as the background to the Action Plan outlined here and provide our views on the recommendations and a rationale for the Actions undertaken.

We have delayed the submission of the Action Plan until this date, in part, because of a new Instructor-level hire, the completion of library renovations and equipping of the Siskind Centre, the institution of the Kallman Chair in Canadian Music, and ongoing negotiations regarding the acquisition of Dominion Chalmers church (the latter would have a major impact on Music and the manner in which it delivers its programs). Several of these factors have a direct relationship on the Action Plan and are especially pertinent to issues of space and overall support for the Music program. Given that the latter negotiations are still in progress, however, some of the Actions outlined may need to be modified in response to future developments.

Recommendations and Actions already taken and/or planned:

1. Consolidate and integrate music facilities in the Loeb Building.

   In the fall of 2016, Music was able to free up a teaching studio on the 9th floor of Loeb in order to create office space for one faculty member whose office had previously been across campus in St. Pat’s. The larger space issue and the need for additional faculty offices has arisen again, however, in light of the recent Instructor-level hire, and the upcoming need for office and research space for the Kallmann Chair in Canadian Music. The Director of SSAC is working with the Dean of FASS to find long-term solutions: the Dean of FASS has initiated discussions with other units in Loeb to resolve the space issues and these discussions are presently underway. The entire question of consolidation, especially as regards spaces for practice, rehearsal, recitals and masterclasses (but not office space, per se), may need to be revisited, depending on the outcome of negotiations over the acquisition of Dominion Chalmers church.

2. Enhance and optimize space in the Jacob Siskind Music Resource Centre.

   Throughout the past academic year, a Music sub-committee has worked closely with the MacOdrum Library administration to finalize plans for renovating and equipping the Siskind Centre as a multi-function space for Music. Funded largely through donations to the Library and additional funds from SSAC, equipping of the facility was completed and the Siskind
Centre officially opened on 08 June 2017. Plans are in place to begin full utilization of the Centre in the fall of 2017.

3. **New budget funding is required to hire additional professional support for juries and auditions.**

In the summer of 2016, the Dean of FASS allocated funds, for a two-year period, in support of additional professional help for juries and auditions. These funds were first implemented in the 2016-17 academic year and were tremendously helpful. Mechanisms for long-term support of this kind following the two-year period are being sought.

4. **Considerable investment is required to employ tenure-track performance area faculty members to support a higher level of performance activities.**

Together with the funds mentioned above (in item #3) the Dean of FASS allocated monies for the hiring of a part-time Performance Logistics Coordinator (also for a two-year period). This position is intended to support the performance area as a whole and has been very successful in its first year of operation. The Director of SSAC is pursuing the possibility of permanent funding for this position. Depending on the outcome of a proposed certificate program in Jazz and Creative Improvisation, the Logistics Coordinator position may be complemented (or replaced) by a full-time Instructor who will act as performance director and administrator of the JCI certificate program. The acquisition of Dominion Chalmers is also a factor in these decisions. The specific comment regarding tenure-track performance faculty stems from a conservatory model of music instruction sometimes adopted by larger music departments and Faculties where some instruments – piano, voice, strings, etc. – are taught by full-time instructors. Our more comprehensive approach seeks to balance instrumental instruction with course work in music history and culture. The long-term implications of adopting a conservatory-style model will be discussed further by Music; even if such a model were to be adopted, however, the hiring of tenure-track performance faculty is largely out of the hands of the program or the School.

**BMUS program**

5. **As courses, studio lessons should be administered for the entire term.**

The Dean of FASS has allocated additional funds to the SSAC budget to support a full twelve weeks of instrument instruction for BMUS students. This represents a significant increase (approximately 9%) in the overall budget for studio lessons and performance. The additional lessons were implemented in the 2016-17 academic year.

6. **Additional funds are required so that ensemble courses count for credit, and contract instructors given clear criteria on which to evaluate student work.**

As mentioned in our response to recommendation 4, above, Carleton’s BMUS program seeks to balance instrumental instruction and the acquisition of music skills (such as working in
ensembles) with academic course work. Within this comprehensive approach, emphasis is placed on students obtaining a well-rounded understanding of classical, popular and world musics; BMUS students obtain credit for their individual instrument instruction but offering additional credit for ensembles could disrupt this balanced, comprehensive approach. As a result, the issue of ensemble credit has larger implications with regards to the overall credit structure of the BMUS program. As mentioned in our response to the recommendations, the issue of offering credit for ensembles has been discussed by Music before but the issue will be taken up again with the registrar’s office in the coming academic year, 2017-18. It is not clear whether additional funds are necessary at this time; if this becomes apparent after discussions are completed, a request will be submitted. The criteria for evaluating student work, however, is a separate matter and will be addressed in the coming year by the Supervisor of Ensembles, Masterclasses and Practica, and the Music program as a whole.

7. Musicianship courses and curriculum require a redesign.

During the Winter term of 2017, and in anticipation of his taking over the role of Undergraduate Supervisor in the fall, Professor James McGowan consulted with other faculty members in a redesign of the musicianship courses. This included revision of course materials, putting greater emphasis on ear training and other skills, as well as the consolidation and rescheduling of several courses (changing 0.25 credit offerings across two terms to regular 0.5 credit courses – changes that have since been submitted as calendar modifications for future years). Professor McGowan will follow up on these initiatives during the coming academic year and reassess them for further revision as needed.

BA in Music

8. Develop strategies for mentoring contract instructors and enhancing their sense of being valued contributors.

The hiring of the Performance Logistics Coordinator from among the ranks of long-time Contract Instructors has given Music the opportunity to include a CI in our regular faculty meetings; in this regard the PLC has acted as a representative for CI concerns. In addition, in January of this year Music hosted what is hoped will be the first of many joint events that included regular faculty, contract and instrument instructors in a discussion of issues around teaching and student well being. Music will continue to host such events and consider more formal and individual forms of mentorship in the coming year.

MA in Music and Culture

9. Anna Hoefnagels should continue in the position of Graduate Supervisor for a term of three to five years, according to Carleton norms.

Some concern was voiced by the External Reviewers that administrative roles within the music program were often taken on for long periods of time (sometimes for upwards of ten
years) and, while this was beneficial in terms of continuity, it could also result in certain areas of the program becoming stale over time, or certain aspects of administration being neglected, depending on the skills and interests of those holding these positions. The Master’s program was identified as one area where Dr. Hoefnagels’ influence (as a temporary, Acting Supervisor) had had a positive effect. In a resolution passed in by Music faculty during the past year, all administrative positions are now for terms of three years, after which positions may be renewed or rotated. Professor Hoefnagels was initially appointed as acting Graduate Supervisor but that position has since been confirmed for a full term. She will be on sabbatical for the 2017-18 academic year and it is expected that Dr. Hoefnagels will resume her role as Graduate Supervisor upon her return.

10. Guidelines for the colloquium series should be established to ensure that speakers represent a range of scholarly approaches in music studies.

As mentioned in our response, we do not see the need for formal guidelines to govern the selection of colloquium guests. However, the Graduate Supervisor will keep records of all colloquium speakers and the MA Committee will periodically assess these records and ensure that a wide and balanced spectrum of themes, perspectives, and disciplinary concerns are represented in the colloquium series.

11. Options for study in the MA should be limited to academic approaches but wide-ranging within that domain.

As argued in our response to the reviewers’ comments, all of our programs encourage a holistic approach to music study and, when combined with historical and theoretical inquiry, performance and composition should also be considered as forms of knowledge creation. For this reason, the MA program has introduced, on a very limited scale, courses that may include a practical component; this should not, however, be confused with an attempt to introduce a performance of composition stream within the MA program. We will reassess the viability of these courses in the coming two years.

12. Graduate supervisions should continue to be evenly distributed amongst the faculty.

The MA committee regularly takes proposals for theses, major research papers and directed reading courses in hand and attempts to assign supervisors as equitably as possible. The addition of courses that include a practical component enhances our ability to respond to student interests and to include faculty members who might otherwise have limited involvement with the MA program.

13. More workspaces for grad students are badly needed.

The completion of the Siskind Centre and the construction of additional graduate study areas in MacOdrum Library will, to some degree, help alleviate the space problem for graduate students. However, as with item #1, above, additional office space for graduate students is part of ongoing efforts to secure adequate space for Music in the Loeb building.
Governance

14. The Assistant Director of Music should be located in situ to foster stronger connections to students and faculty.

During the past academic year, it was possible for the Assistant Director to occupy, on a part-time basis, the office of a faculty member who was on sabbatical. However, with a new Instructor-level hire, this will no longer be possible. Once again, as with item #1, above, the problem of faculty offices is an ongoing concern that can only be addressed when adequate space can be allocated in Loeb.

15. The workload and working conditions of Tasneem Ujjainwala should be assessed to ensure she is properly supported.

Upon her appointment as the Administrative Assistant for the School for Studies in Art & Culture, Ms. Kristin Guth has made a thorough review of the roles and needs of administrative staff within the School. She has increased the level of coordination and support for Ms. Ujjainwala as instituted by the previous School administrator, improved support for our MA program, and generally helped to bridge the physical and administrative difficulties that arise from Music’s location at the opposite end of campus. The hiring of the part-time Performance Logistics Coordinator has also helped shift some scheduling and other duties from Ms. Ujjainwala. However, depending on whether the PLC position (or something like it) can be made permanent, care will need to taken that these duties do not simply revert to her in future. The AD for Music will continue to consult with the School Administrator and the Director of the School to ensure that Ms. Ujjainwala is properly supported.

16. All students, faculty and staff should participate in activities to promote awareness of healthy, appropriate relationships in the workplace.

During the past year and a half, both Music and SSAC have hosted a number of events that have included representatives from Human Resources and Equity Services to discuss appropriate workplace behaviour, support for students in crisis, and other issues. These include visits to faculty meetings, orientation sessions for students and Teaching Assistants, and a special joint meeting (mentioned above in item #8) for faculty, contract and instrument instructors, and TAs. The latter was especially well received, with instructors contributing their concerns and insights, and voicing their support for the initiative. The Music program (and SSAC) will continue to pursue these activities on a regular basis in future.

Other

17. The external reviewers also encourage more formalized advising for BMus students, possibly embedded in course content, on issues of professional practice in the music industry. While this is not a formal recommendation, we urge the School to consider and respond to this suggestion.
As mentioned in our response to the Reviewers suggestions, Music already includes issues related to industry and professionalization in several of its course syllabi; they are also a part of regular invited presentations and masterclasses. In the past year, we have redoubled these efforts by inviting, as part of the masterclass series, a presentation from the Regional Education Coordinator for FACTOR (a major industry foundation), and a series of noon-hour conversations between Artist in Residence, Kellylee Evans, and invited guests (the conversations were focused around a number of concerns ranging, from individual practice to industry relations). These activities were extremely well received by students and the program hopes to continue in this vein in the future. If the acquisition of Dominion Chalmers church is approved, Music plans to move some of these activities to the downtown location, further enhancing Carleton’s relationship with local industry leaders and musicians.
### SSAC – Music: ACTION PLAN – TABULAR FORM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Comments / Actions</th>
<th>Responsible Individuals</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation #1</strong>&lt;br&gt; <strong>Consolidate and integrate music facilities in the Loeb Building</strong></td>
<td>Temporary solutions to the shortage of office space in Loeb have been implemented; the Dean of FASS has initiated discussions with other units in Loeb to find long-term solutions. Other consolidation plans await the outcome of facility negotiations.</td>
<td>AD Music, Director of SSAC, &amp; Dean of FASS (and the University)</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation #2</strong>&lt;br&gt; <strong>Enhance and optimize space in the Jacob Siskind Music Resource Centre</strong></td>
<td>Renovations and equipping of the Siskind Centre have been completed and the official opening took place on 08 June 2017.</td>
<td>Music’s Siskind Centre sub-committee, SSAC Director, and Library administration.</td>
<td>Completed, June 2017. Full use of the Centre will begin in the fall term, 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation #3</strong>&lt;br&gt; <strong>Funding to hire additional support for juries and auditions</strong></td>
<td>Additional funds have been allocated for a two-year period (beginning in the fall of 2016). Long-term funding solutions are being pursued.</td>
<td>Director of SSAC &amp; Dean of FASS</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation #4</strong>&lt;br&gt; <strong>Investment to employ tenure-track performance area faculty members to support a higher level of performance activities</strong></td>
<td>A part-time Performance Logistics Coordinator was hired (for a two-year period) in support of the performance area as a whole. Permanent funding is being sought. Other program initiatives (e.g., a proposed certificate program) may have a positive impact on the performance area as a whole.</td>
<td>JCI sub-committee, AD Music, Director of SSAC, &amp; Dean of FASS</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BMUS:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation #5</strong>&lt;br&gt; <strong>Studio lessons should be administered for the entire term</strong></td>
<td>Increased base funding has been allocated by the Dean of FASS (as of July 2016)</td>
<td>Dean of FASS</td>
<td>Completed and implemented in the fall of 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation #6</strong>&lt;br&gt; <strong>Ensemble should courses count for credit, and contract instructors given clear criteria on which to evaluate student work</strong></td>
<td>The issue of offering credit for ensembles courses will be discussed by the Music program and with the Registrar’s Office. It is not clear whether additional funding is required. Evaluation criteria will be established in the coming year.</td>
<td>AD Music, Supervisor of Ensembles (SEMP)</td>
<td>Within the academic year 2017-18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation #7</strong>&lt;br&gt; <strong>Musicianship courses and curriculum require a redesign</strong></td>
<td>The musicianship courses have been redesigned in terms of both content and scheduling. Evaluation of these changes will take place during the coming academic year.</td>
<td>Undergraduate Supervisor</td>
<td>Implementation and assessment of the new course structure 2017-18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BA Music:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation #8</strong></td>
<td>Music has begun hosting events for faculty, CIs and performance instructors. Further opportunities</td>
<td>AD Music &amp; Undergraduate Supervisor</td>
<td>2017-18 and ongoing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td>Responsible Party</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA in Music &amp; Culture:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation #9</td>
<td>Anna Hoefnagels position as Graduate Supervisor has been confirmed for a period of 3 years, after which the position may be renewed or rotated.</td>
<td>AD Music &amp; Director of SSAC</td>
<td>No action is required at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation #10</td>
<td>The Graduate Supervisor will maintain records of all colloquium speakers and the MA committee will ensure that a broad spectrum of disciplinary perspectives are represented.</td>
<td>Graduate Supervisor and the MA committee</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation #11</td>
<td>Courses that include a practical component have been introduced on a very limited scale; no performance or composition streams are planned.</td>
<td>MA committee</td>
<td>Course content to be reassessed in 2018-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation #12</td>
<td>The MA Committee regularly assesses supervisions and continues to distribute these as equitably as possible.</td>
<td>MA committee</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation #13</td>
<td>The opening of the Siskind Centre will help alleviate this problem but, as with item #1, additional student space in Loeb is desperately needed.</td>
<td>AD Music, Director of SSAC, &amp; Dean of FASS (and the University)</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation #14</td>
<td>A temporary office was found for the past year but this option is no longer available. Again, as with items #1 &amp; 13, additional office space in Loeb is a top priority.</td>
<td>AD Music, Director of SSAC, &amp; Dean of FASS (and the University)</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation #15</td>
<td>The new Administrative Assistant for SSAC and the appointment of the Performance Logistics Coordinator have helped alleviate some of the workload stresses placed on the Music coordinator. Ongoing efforts will be required to maintain this support.</td>
<td>AD Music, School Administrator, Director of SSAC</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation #16</td>
<td>A series of visits and events including members of Human Resources and Equity Services have already taken place. We will attempt to continue these</td>
<td>AD Music, Undergraduate and Graduate Supervisors, Director of SSAC</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relationships in the workplace</td>
<td>programs, in regular orientations and other forums.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation #17 Advising for BMus students on issues of professional practice in the music industry.</td>
<td>Professionalization activities have become a regular part of masterclasses and the Artist in Residence program. We will continue to seek similar opportunities and to extend these activities to Dominion Chalmers should it be acquired.</td>
<td>AD Music, Undergraduate Supervisor, and Supervisor of Ensembles, Masterclasses &amp; Practica</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CARLETON UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON QUALITY ASSURANCE

Cyclical Review of the undergraduate and graduate programs in Art History, and History and Theory of Architecture
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 Art History, and History and Theory of Architecture are provided pursuant to the provincial Quality Assurance Framework and Carleton's Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The undergraduate programs (BA in Art History; BA in History and Theory of Architecture) and graduate program (MA in Art History) reside in Art History, a sub-unit of Carleton University's School for Studies in Art and Culture, 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 School in Art and Culture on February 23rd, 2016, 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 and Assistant Director (Art History) of the School in Art and Culture, the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, and the Dean of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs in a response to the External Reviewers’ report that was submitted to CUCQA on October 26th, 2016.

An Action Plan detailing how, when and by whom the recommendations will be implemented was received and approved by CUCQA on October 11th, 2017.
FINAL ASSESSMENT REPORT

Introduction

The undergraduate programs (BA in Art History; BA in History and Theory of Architecture) and graduate program (MA in Art History) reside in Art History, a sub-unit of Carleton University’s School for Studies in Art and Culture, a unit administered by the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences. This review was conducted pursuant to the Quality Assurance Framework and Carleton’s Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP). 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 14th and 15th, 2016, was conducted by Dr. Sharon Gregory from St. Francis Xavier University and Dr. Catherine MacKenzie from Concordia University. The site visit involved formal meetings with the Vice-Provost and Associate Vice-President (Academic), the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, the Dean of 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, and undergraduate and graduate students.

The External Reviewers’ report, submitted on February 16th, 2016, 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 School for Studies in Art and Culture (Appendix A)
- Communication from CUCQA regarding the outcome of the external review (Appendix C)
- The response from the Director and Assistant Director (Art History) of the School for Studies in Art and Culture, the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, and the Dean of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs to the Report of the External Review Committee (Appendix D).
- The internal discussant's recommendation report (Appendix E).
- The communication from CUCQA regarding the outcome of the review (Appendix F).
- The program’s Action Plan (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 and Assistant Director (Art History) of the School for Studies in Art and Culture, the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, and the Dean of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs, regarding the implementation of recommendations for program enhancement to have been advanced as a consequence of the cyclical program review process.

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

**Strengths of the programs**

**General**

The External Reviewers’ Report states that “the unit is a vibrant site for student learning and for the creation of new, and in many cases internationally appreciated, scholarly insights through the work of its faculty, and its students as mentored by their faculty advisors.” The External Reviewers also stated that they “were struck by the many ways in which the programs take advantage of Carleton University’s location in a city that houses major national art and material culture museums and an increasingly vibrant gallery scene . . . The “Capital Advantage” is not a hollow public relations term here, but rather a genuine part of what makes the Art History programs distinct from many of their counterparts in Canada.”

**Faculty**

The External Reviewers’ Report indicates that faculty members have a commitment that “is grounded in a highly admirable ethos of teaching and mentoring in the unit: that this is often combined with excellent to outstanding research productivity makes the obvious dedication to teaching even more noteworthy”. The reviewers were “struck by the care with which course descriptions and syllabi were prepared and with the variety of intellectual frameworks and assignment structures that were offered across the unit” and that student are able to develop “a variety of important skills through carefully considered and in many cases innovative assignments.” Graduate students had “expressed their gratitude to faculty for their ‘flexible and agile’ approach to responding to their varied academic needs, and for the very high level of mentoring that they experience in the unit.”

**Students**

The Self-Study identified a high level of student satisfaction with the programs, which was confirmed in the External Reviewers’ interviews with students during their site visit. The students “stressed the quality of the faculty and their high availability to students and their engagement.” In particular, undergraduate students “appreciated the focus on academic development, skills, and resources, as well as the many ways they were afforded to become involved in the Ottawa arts community, and opportunities afforded through field trips and travel abroad” and graduate students had “a special appreciation for the degree of mentoring support they receive from faculty.”

**Curriculum**

The External Reviewers noted distinct characteristics of the Carleton undergraduate Art History programs, including “its deep commitment to Canadian art, and... its long-standing focus on Aboriginal art, both historical and contemporary” and “its emphasis on richly layered experiential learning.”
Challenges faced by the programs

While the programs are generally successful, the External Reviewers did note some challenges. Specifically, they identify “the most important issues facing the undergraduate programs in the unit arise from pending faculty retirements on the immediate horizon.” These anticipated retirements, include a notable senior faculty member who has a strong presence in teaching, graduate supervision, and research, including a high level of research funding. As well, one of the three faculty members directly associated with History and Theory of Architecture program was also anticipated to retire.

Opportunities for program improvement and enhancement

The External Reviewers’ Report made 19 recommendations for improvement:

1. The central university office/offices of institutional analysis responsible for providing information about students in programs and across programs should supply data that gives external reviewers adequate support for their tasks.
2. SSAC, working in conjunction with senior administrators at Carleton University, should ensure that the Art History unit be provided with the necessary resources to retain the faculty position in the area of historical aboriginal arts and cultures that might otherwise be lost due to retirement.
3. The unit should plan a system of rotation in Study Abroad experiences, so that all faculty members who wish to travel abroad with students are afforded the opportunity to do so.
4. The Art History unit should work to strengthen its ties with alumni to find potential financial support for a Study Abroad program.
5. The unit might consider the possibility of offering students the opportunity for a semester abroad in their third year.
6. ARTH 2406 should be moved to the Post-1750 section of the second-year requirements, or at least re-articulate the sections to state that courses are required from Pre-1800 and Post-1800.
7. SSAC, working in conjunction with senior administration at other levels at Carleton University, should ensure that a third position associated with the BA in the History and Theory of Architecture be maintained.
8. The current funding packages for domestic MA students should be continued at current levels.
9. The unit should attempt to ensure that all adjunct professors be employed in a more extensive capacity than as occasional guest lecturers in existing courses.
10. We encourage SSAC to continue to pursue workload analyses and revisions to job descriptions for administrative staff in light of the changing, sometimes expanding needs of its reporting units. The Undergraduate Administrator position should be made permanent.
11. SSAC should continue to pursue the easiest pathways for team-teaching in SSAC to increase the possibility of pursuing academic connections that might involve two or three of the programs on a regular, more than perfunctory basis.
12. The Art History unit is encouraged to continue its conversations about synergetic hiring, with input from all members.
13. The Art History unit should consider developing direct recruitment and mentoring activities that involve undergraduate and graduate students.
14. The unit should search for ways of encouraging HTA students to participate more fully in the life of the unit and to cohere more with the Art History cohort.
15. The unit develop a system whereby the destination of students graduating from the various streams of the MA be tracked for at least the first five years.
16. Administrative staff representatives, with the support of the Director of SSAC, must ensure that classroom assignments are appropriate for the teaching and learning needs of those involved in the Art History unit.
17. Through their appropriate administrators, the Art History unit and the Carleton University Art Gallery should seek to identify a room in the gallery complex for course-related activities and objectives that circulate around objects in the collections.
18. Art History should work towards the creation of a dedicated common area for MA students in the immediate proximity of faculty offices.
19. Carleton University, recognized for its commitment to Aboriginal studies, must identify funding to host the Knowledge Sharing database (known as the GKS) in a data centre, perhaps the department’s Audio-Visual Resources Centre.

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

**The Outcome of the Review**

As a consequence of the review, the undergraduate and graduate programs in Art History and History and Theory of Architecture 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 and Assistant Director (Art History) of the School for Studies in Art and Culture, the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, and the Dean of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs in a response to the External Reviewers’ report that was considered by CUCQA on October 26th, 2016. An Action Plan detailing how, when and by whom the recommendations will be implemented was received and approved by CUCQA on October 11th, 2017.

The School was generally pleased with the report and agreed to implement a number of recommendations. The School unconditionally agreed to take action on recommendations #3, #4, #6, #9, #10 (noting the Undergraduate Administrator position has always been a permanent position), #11, #12, #13, #14, #15, and #19. The School also agreed to take action on recommendations #1, #2, #7, #8, #16, and #18; however, these are contingent on support or resources outside of the School.

The response to the remaining recommendations provided justifications for the School’s decision to decline taking action. The reasons for such decisions were related either to issues of resources that are beyond the School’s control (recommendations #17), or to the School’s opinion that alternative actions should be taken instead (recommendations #5). CUCQA accepted the School’s rationale regarding recommendations that were declined.

It is to be noted that Carleton’s IQAP provides for the monitoring of action plans. A joint report will be submitted by the academic unit(s) and Faculty Dean(s), and forwarded to CUCQA for its review. In the case of the programs in Art History, and History and Theory of Architecture, the majority of...
monitoring will be achieved by means of an update on the Action Plan, which is expected by January 1st, 2019.

The Next Cyclical Review

The next cyclical review of the programs in Art History, and History and Theory of Architecture will be conducted during the 2021-22 academic year.
### Action Plan
Cyclical Program Review of the Undergraduate and Graduate Programs in Art History and History and Theory of Architecture
School for Studies in Art and Culture: Art History
January 18, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External Reviewer’s Recommendation</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. The central university office/offices of institutional analysis responsible for providing information about students in programs and across programs should supply data that gives external reviewers adequate support for their tasks.</strong></td>
<td>This recommendation was referred to the SSAC Director for discussion with the Office of Institutional Research and Planning (OIRP).</td>
<td>SSAC Director</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>SSAC’s Director is at present in discussion with OIRP about the need to supply program-specific statistics, rather than only statistics that deal primarily or exclusively with the School as a whole.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. SSAC, working in conjunction with senior administrators, should ensure that the Art History unit be provided with the necessary resources to retain the faculty position in the area of historical aboriginal arts and cultures that might otherwise be lost due to retirement.</strong></td>
<td>This recommendation was referred to the SSAC Director, who is responsible for SSAC: Art History hires.</td>
<td>SSAC Director</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>There is at present a search for a new CRC in North American Indigenous Visual and Material Culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. The unit should plan a system of rotation in Study Abroad experiences, so that all faculty members who wish to travel abroad with students are afforded the opportunity to do so.</strong></td>
<td>This recommendation was referred to the Art History Planning Committee (AHPC), which has established a study abroad course.</td>
<td>SSAC Assistant Director: Art History</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>This course can be taught in any semester by any faculty who wishes to do so.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. The Art History unit should work to strengthen its ties with alumni to find potential financial support for a Study Abroad program.</strong></td>
<td>This recommendation will be referred to the AHPC, which will approach the FASS Development Officer to help</td>
<td>SSAC Director and SSAC Assistant Director: Art History</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. The unit might consider the possibility of offering students the opportunity for a semester abroad in their third year.</th>
<th>This recommendation was referred to the AHPC, which will continue to work on study abroad programs with Carleton International.</th>
<th>SSAC Assistant Director: Art History</th>
<th>Ongoing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. ARTH 2406 should be moved to the Post-1750 section of the second-year requirements, or at least re-articulate the sections to state that courses are required from Pre-1800 and Post-1800.</td>
<td>This recommendation was referred to the Art History Curriculum Committee.</td>
<td>SSAC Assistant Director: Art History</td>
<td>2016 We have decided to re-articulate the sections as ‘pre-1800’ and ‘post-1800’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. SSAC, working in conjunction with senior administration, should ensure that a third position associated with the BA in the History and Theory of Architecture (HTA) be maintained through a tenure-track hire.</td>
<td>This recommendation was referred to the SSAC Director, who is developing an application to hire a replacement for the HTA faculty member who will be retiring in 2017-18.</td>
<td>SSAC Director</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The current funding packages for domestic MA students should be continued at current levels.</td>
<td>This recommendation was referred to the Graduate Supervisor, who will discuss the matter with the Faculty of Graduate and Postgraduate Affairs (FGPA).</td>
<td>Art History Graduate Supervisor</td>
<td>Ongoing Funding packages are not under the purview of SSAC: Art History, but of FGPA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The unit should attempt to ensure that all adjunct professors be employed in a more extensive capacity than as occasional guest lecturers in existing courses.</td>
<td>This recommendation was referred to the AHPC, which has already implemented some actions and will continue to discuss</td>
<td>SSAC Assistant Director: Art History</td>
<td>Ongoing Some adjuncts are teaching courses as contract instructors; some HTA adjuncts have</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. We encourage SSAC to continue to pursue workload analyses and revisions to job descriptions for administrative staff in light of the changing, sometimes expanding needs of its reporting units. The Undergraduate Administrator position should be made permanent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The recommendation was referred to the SSAC Director, who is responsible for SSAC administrative staff. He will identify and implement useful alterations to the job descriptions of administrative staff.</td>
<td>SSAC Director</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. SSAC should continue to pursue the easiest pathways for team-teaching in SSAC to increase the possibility of pursuing academic connections that might involve two or three of the programs on a regular, more than perfunctory basis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This recommendation was referred to the AHPC and the SSAC Committee of the whole for further discussion.</td>
<td>SSAC Assistant Director: Art History and SSAC Director</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. The Art History unit is encouraged to continue its conversations about synergetic hirings, with input from all members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This recommendation was referred to the AHPC and to the SSAC Director, who is responsible for SSAC: Art History hires.</td>
<td>SSAC Director</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. The Art History unit should consider developing direct recruitment and mentoring activities that involve undergraduate and graduate students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This recommendation was referred to the AHPC, which has already</td>
<td>Art History Undergraduate and Graduate Supervisors,</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given architectural tours.
implemented some actions and will continue to discuss the matter. It has also been taken to the SSAC Recruitment & Retention Committee, which is exploring recruitment activities that are built around participation by current students.

14. The unit should search for ways of encouraging HTA students to participate more fully in the life of the unit and to cohere more with the Art History cohort.

This recommendation was referred to the AHPC, which has already implemented some actions will continue to discuss the matter.

Art History and HTA Undergraduate Supervisors

15. The unit should develop a system whereby the destination of students graduating from the various streams of the MA be tracked for at least the first five years.

This recommendation has been referred to the Art History Graduate Committee, which will look into ways to track our MA

Art History Graduate Supervisor

The unit has kept a fairly thorough, if informal, record of MA alumni through email correspondence
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. Administrative staff representatives, with the support of the Director of SSAC, must ensure that classroom assignments are appropriate for the teaching and learning needs of those involved in the Art History unit.</td>
<td>SSAC Director</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>This recommendation has been referred to the SSAC Director, who has discussed this matter with the university scheduling office. The scheduling office, on the request of the SSAC Director, will be implementing new scheduling procedures in summer, 2017 to meet our specific classroom needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Through their appropriate administrators, the Art History unit and the Carleton University Art Gallery (CUAG) should seek to identify a room in the gallery complex for course-related activities and objectives that circulate around objects in the collections.</td>
<td>SSAC Director</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>This recommendation was referred to the SSAC Director, who is responsible for SSAC space management. He will discuss the issue with the CUAG Director. The development of a CUAG study room has been an ongoing concern for some time now, but the challenges with meeting this recommendation are: 1. CUAG is independent from SSAC and has its own priorities; 2. allotment of space at Carleton is ultimately a university (not a departmental) decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Art History should work towards the creation of a dedicated common area for MA students in the immediate proximity of faculty offices.</td>
<td>Art History Graduate Committee</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>This recommendation was referred to the Art History Graduate Committee. At present, the Art History MA students have two large student offices and the kitchen reception area is...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>available for their use. Space in St. Pat’s is very tight and although we regularly encourage the creation of facilities like those described here, SSAC does not have a claim to space that it does not already own.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Carleton University, recognized for its commitment to Aboriginal studies, must identify funding to host the Knowledge Sharing database (known as the GKS) in a data centre, perhaps the department’s Audio-Visual Resources Centre.</td>
<td>No action</td>
<td></td>
<td>The database is based in GRASAC, which is led by CRC Ruth Phillips and is housed in Carleton’s ICSLAC. SSAC: Art History has no authority in the matter.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CARLETON UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON
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Cyclical Review of the undergraduate program in Food Science and Nutrition
Executive Summary and Final Assessment Report

This Executive Summary and Final Assessment Report of the cyclical review of Carleton’s undergraduate program in Food Science and Nutrition are provided pursuant to the Quality Assurance Framework and Carleton’s Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The undergraduate program (B.Sc.) in Food Science and Nutrition is hosted by the Department of Chemistry, a unit administered by the Faculty of Science.

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

The External Reviewers’ report, submitted to the Department of Chemistry on April 6th, 2016, offered a very positive assessment of the program. Within the context of this positive assessment, the report nonetheless made a number of recommendations for the continuing enhancement of the program. These recommendations were productively addressed by Instructors in the Food Science and Nutrition program, the Chair of the Department of Chemistry and the Dean of Science in a response to the External Reviewers’ report that was submitted to CUCQA on August 10th, 2016.

An Action Plan detailing how, when and by whom the recommendations will be implemented was received and approved by CUCQA on October 11th, 2017.
FINAL ASSESSMENT REPORT

Introduction

The undergraduate program (B.Sc.) in Food Science and Nutrition is hosted by the Department of Chemistry, a unit administered by the Faculty of Science. This review was conducted pursuant to the Quality Assurance Framework and Carleton’s Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP). 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 March 7th and 8th, 2016 was conducted by Dr. Richard Holley from the University of Manitoba and Dr. Valerie Orsat from McGill University. The site visit involved formal meetings with the Assistant Vice-President (Academic), the Associate Dean of Undergraduate Affairs in the Faculty of Science, and the Chair of the Department of Chemistry. The review committee also met with faculty members, staff, and undergraduate students.

The External Reviewers’ report, submitted on April 6th, 2016, 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 Department of Chemistry (Appendix A)
- Communication from CUCQA regarding the outcome of the external review (Appendix C)
- The response from the Instructors in the Food Science and Nutrition program, the Chair of the Department of Chemistry and the Dean of Science to the Report of the External Review Committee (Appendix D).
- The internal discussant’s recommendation report (Appendix E).
- The communication from CUCQA regarding the outcome of the review (Appendix F).
- The program’s Action Plan (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 Department of Chemistry and the Dean of the Faculty of Science, regarding the implementation of recommendations for program enhancement 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 Food Science and Nutrition program (FSN) at Carleton University is unique by its emphasis on food regulations, risk management, and food contaminants.”

*Faculty*

The External Reviewers’ Report indicates “The program is offered by a group of young, enthusiastic and talented academic staff.” The External Reviewers also noted “There is considerable synergy as a result of the FSN program being housed in the Chemistry Department, and students are exposed to well qualified staff and fully equipped student and research laboratories.”

*Students*

The External Reviewers noted “a close working relationship between faculty and students” and that “the students expressed positive experiences and an appreciable level of enthusiasm.”

*Curriculum*

The External Reviewers noted “one of the strengths of the program is the experiential learning students achieve through laboratory instruction.”

**Challenges faced by the programs**

While the programs are generally successful, the External Reviewers did note some challenges. Specifically, they identify that the “program delivery is substantially dependent upon sessional instructors which may bring significant variations in the quality of the course delivery.” They noted a need to review laboratory space and “to continue to work with their University Teaching Services to improve their assessment and reporting tools on learning outcomes.”

**Opportunities for program improvement and enhancement**

The External Reviewers’ Report made 9 recommendations for improvement:

1. **Provision must be made to ensure individual honours projects are appropriately mentored without compromising project quality. Group projects should not be considered a viable solution to increased enrollment.**

2. **Where areas of course material duplication are identified as being non-productive by academic staff consultation, corrective action should be undertaken.**

3. **Where the amount/nature/complexity of course material is considered inadequate, again by staff consultation, action should be taken to correct the situation. Information on food processing, food product development, nutraceuticals, health claims, food adulteration, and supplemented food ingredients are examples of subjects that could be added prior to**
development of individual courses on these subjects. Resolution of this issue should occur before the implementation of subject streams in the program.

4. Provision should be made to include at least one (possibly two) courses on oral and written communications skills.

5. A course on critical thinking and professional ethics should be considered.

6. Emphasis should continue to be placed upon development of laboratory section scheduling in such a manner that the laboratory coordinator is not overworked and the laboratories are not overcrowded. When opportunity occurs, acquisition of laboratory space should take place.

7. Consideration should be given to the development of a module or a course at the 200 level on food processing or food plant operations to enable better student understanding of the course on Food Engineering.

8. Work should continue on development of learning outcomes to a level where it can competently predict that courses are being efficiently delivered and are effective in achieving desired outcomes. Academic staff should develop mechanisms to monitor, with proper evidence, that the students are acquiring these specific learning outcomes.

9. Presently strong motivation for FSN program quality and improvement resides in the program core instructor III position. It is unlikely that this energy and enthusiasm is sustainable in the longer term without further commitment from the Department of Chemistry.

CUCQA considered all recommendations pertinent and invited the department to address each of them in their response and subsequent Action Plan. Additionally, CUCQA also requested that the department address the issue of the word ‘nutrition’ in the program name. While the external reviewers did not make this one of their formal recommendations, they raised the issue for consideration.

The Outcome of the Review

As a consequence of the review, the undergraduate program in Food Science and Nutrition was categorised by the Carleton University Committee on Quality Assurance (CUCQA) as being of GOOD QUALITY (Carleton’s IQAP 7.2.12).

The Action Plan

The recommendations that were put forward as a result of the review process were productively addressed by the Food Science and Nutrition leads, the Chair of the Department of Chemistry and
the Dean of the Faculty of Science in a response to the External Reviewers’ report that was considered by CUCQA on August 10th, 2016. An Action Plan detailing how, when and by whom the recommendations will be implemented was received and approved by CUCQA on October 11th, 2017.

The department was generally pleased with the report and agreed to take action on all of the recommendations. The department unconditionally agreed to take action on recommendations #2, #3, #5, #6, #8, and the CUCQA recommendation regarding reviewing the name of the program. While the department has agreed to make course changes to address recommendations #1, #4, and #7, the hiring of new faculty is contingent on support or resources outside of the department. The department has also agree to take action on recommendation #9, however, it is also contingent on support or resources outside of the department.

It is to be noted that Carleton’s IQAP provides for the monitoring of action plans. A joint report will be submitted by the academic unit(s) and Faculty Dean(s), and forwarded to CUCQA for its review. In the case of the program in Food Science and Nutrition, the majority of monitoring will be achieved by means of an update on the Action Plan, which is expected by June 1st, 2019.

**The Next Cyclical Review**

The next cyclical review of the program in Food Science and Nutrition will be conducted during the 2022-23 academic year.
DATE:    July 21st, 2017

TO:    Dr. Lorraine Dyke, Vice-Provost and Associate Vice-President (Academic)

FROM:    Dr. Véronic Bézaire, Food Science and Nutrition CPR Chair, Department of Chemistry
    Dr. Tyler Avis, Food Science and Nutrition CPR Interim Chair, Department of Chemistry
    Dr. Robert Crutchley, Chair, Department of Chemistry

RE:    Action Plan for the CPR of the Undergraduate Food Science and Nutrition Program

The Food Science and Nutrition Program from the Department of Chemistry would like to thank the Carleton University Committee on Quality Assurance and External Reviewers for their feedback, comments, and recommendations in improving our Program. We believe the action plan below will convince you of our dedication to implementing your recommendations and improving our Program.

1. Provision must be made to ensure individual honours projects are appropriately mentored without compromising project quality. Group projects should not be considered a viable solution to increase enrollment.

   ACTION: The hiring of three Faculty members is needed to ensure quality of Honours projects in themes that are aligned with our program vision. The first faculty member will be hired at the Assistant Professor rank (Hire #1 in Table) and have expertise in food toxicology. The second faculty member will be hired at the Assistant Professor or Instructor rank (Hire #2 in Table) and have extensive (10 years +) experience in the food industry. The third faculty member will be hired as an Instructor (Hire #3; shared with FPA) and will have expertise in food law and regulation. All three hires will contribute to supervisory duties of Honours theses (laboratory- and literature-based) in areas that are essential to our program’s uniqueness.

   We will also introduce a Major CGPA minimum criterion of 8.0 (out of 12.0) for Honours projects. Students who do not meet the CGPA criterion will be directed to a new capstone course (FOOD 4905 Honours Workshop), modeled after an existing BIOL course. FOOD 4905 Honours Workshop will be a 1.0 credit course lead by a single instructor for groups of up to 10 students. Learning outcomes for this course will be consistent with Honours courses.

2. Where areas of course material duplication are identified as being non-productive by academic staff consultation, corrective action should be undertaken.

   ACTION: Group course revisions took place this summer (Jun-Jul 2017) for the third consecutive year, in the shape of workshops with experts in course design from Carleton’s Educational Development Centre. The objective is to formulate course-level learning outcomes, eliminate redundant material, ensure appropriate complexity of material, and alignment of assignments. This exercise once again required in-depth consultation between the Program Faculty members. Courses successfully revised so far are: FOOD 2001, 3001, 3002, 3003, 2002/3004, 3005. The review of the remaining FOOD courses and new FOOD courses will be completed over the next two years.
3. Where the amount/nature/complexity of course material is considered inadequate, again by staff consultation, action should be taken to correct the situation. Resolution of this issue should occur before the implementation of subject streams in the program.

**ACTION:** Same as recommendation #2. With regards to timing and implementation of subject streams, new courses suggested by Reviewers and Program Faculty have been approved for the 2017-18 academic year. However new advanced courses will not be offered until the review of existing FOOD courses is completed and resources are available. Developing subject streams will follow, if appropriate, a few years later.

4. Provision should be made to include at least one (possibly two) courses on oral and written communications skills.

**ACTION:** We completely agree with this recommendation. A new core introductory-level course (2000-level) in scientific writing has been approved for 2017-18 academic year. Effort will be placed in reinforcing scientific writing skills in 3000-level lectures and labs to yield significant improvement at the 4000-level.

5. A course on critical thinking and professional ethics should be considered.

**ACTION:** We believe that elements of critical thinking and professional ethics should be incorporated in a number of 4000-level courses and presented from different perspectives to further reinforce these notions. Therefore, instead of creating a new course on critical thinking and professional ethics, these concepts will be added as learning objectives in FOOD 4001, FOOD 4102, and FOOD 4103. For both critical thinking and professional ethics, emphasis will be placed on understanding uncertainties in the information available to food regulators and the responsibilities associated with decision-making.

6. Emphasis should continue to be placed upon development of laboratory section scheduling in such a manner that the laboratory co-ordinator is not overworked and the laboratories are not overcrowded. When opportunity occurs, acquisition of laboratory space should take place.

**ACTION:** In response to this recommendation, the maximum number of students per lab section in the food teaching lab space has already been reduced from 12 to 8 students, effective September 2017. This will reduce congestion in FOOD 3001, FOOD 3002, and FOOD 3005. This will obviously result in more lab sections for a given course. However, multiple sections for a given course will be offered successively to minimize the laboratory coordinator’s set up and tear down time necessary with different courses.

To further alleviate the load on the laboratory coordinator, we will attempt to maintain the maximum number of lab sections per coordinator, per term, in line with other units in the Faculty of Science. To meet this requirement, another laboratory coordinator with knowledge in microbiology AND chemistry may be required.

With regards to space, optimization of the food teaching laboratory space may reduce the need for additional space. This will be attempted before requesting additional space.
7. Consideration should be given to the development of a module or a course at the 2000 level on food processing or food plant operations to enable better student understanding of the course on Food Engineering.

**ACTION:** An introductory level course (2000-level) in food processing has been approved for the 2017-18 academic year. This course will be a logical building block for the suite of core FOOD courses offered at the 3000-level. A specific set of learning outcomes has been formulated for food processing. Some basic concepts of food processing are currently included in FOOD 3004 (Food Engineering). Therefore, learning outcomes and course content for FOOD 3004 will be revised to ensure that lecture material and skills build upon those presented in the new food processing course.

8. Work should continue on development of learning outcomes to a level where it can competently predict that courses are being efficiently delivered and are effective in achieving desired outcomes. Academic staff should develop mechanisms to monitor, with proper evidence, that the students are acquiring these specific learning outcomes.

**ACTION:** We have been assessing program learning outcomes for the past four years. In fact, as of this summer, all twelve program learning outcomes have been assessed at least once. In a joint effort with the Office of Quality Assurance, we tested different assessment approaches. I believe that we have finally developed a true culture of assessment, with proper evidence, modes of storage, and evaluation. At our last ‘Assessment Day Retreat’, we finally had genuine and constructive conversations about what students know/do not know, what they can/cannot do, why, and how to modify courses and assignments to rectify the situation. As we embark on the second round of assessment for all twelve program learning outcomes, we will examine the impact of our own assessment. We will also aim to make the process more efficient.

9. Presently strong motivation for FSN program quality and improvement resides in the program core Instructor III position. It is unlikely that this energy and enthusiasm is sustainable in the longer term without further commitment from the Department of Chemistry.

**ACTION:** The Department of Chemistry’s commitment to the FOOD program quality and improvement will be in the form of three future Faculty hires (Hires #1, #2, and #3 introduced in Q1 and described again below). Following the unsuccessful CRC recruitment, the Department of Chemistry requested the hiring of one Faculty member, at the Assistant Professor rank, in the area of food toxicology (Hire #1). This position is currently being advertised with a start date of January 2018. This Faculty member will expand research in food analysis and regulation, host Honours students, and teach existing or proposed courses related to food toxicology, risk assessment, and analysis of food contaminants.

The second faculty hire will have several years (10 or more) of experience in the food industry (Hire #2). The Instructor/Assistant Professor will teach the most applied courses in our program (food processing, food packaging, food engineering, and food quality control) and host Honours students. Our FOOD program will require an additional faculty member with a degree in Food Science should it decide to seek accreditation with the Institute of Food Technologists.

A third faculty hire will be an Instructor (joint with FPA) to teach two courses in food law and regulation (Hire #3). This will offer much-needed stability in the regulatory aspect of the program. This Instructor
will develop and teach regulatory courses to further strengthen this unique aspect of our program. The Instructor will also build our new co-op program with government agencies and food industries.

Altogether, these three new hires will allow for newly proposed courses to be taught. It will also result in a much-needed redistribution of the administrative load over a larger number of Faculty members.

Lastly, CUCQA would like us to address the issue of the word ‘nutrition’ in our program name in the current action plan. The external reviewers also raised this issue, but did not make a formal recommendation. The core Food Science and Nutrition faculty in consultation with the Department Chair will meet in the Fall 2017 to discuss options and consequences of maintaining or changing the program name. We expect to discuss the following options:

1. Shortening program title to ‘Food Science’
2. Changing program title to highlight its unique regulatory nature
3. Keeping program title as ‘Food Science and Nutrition’
4. Keeping program title as ‘Food Science and Nutrition’ with creation of more nutrition courses
## FOOD ACTION PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Individual/Committee</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Provision must be made to ensure individual honours projects are appropriately mentored without compromising project quality. Group projects should not be considered a viable solution to increase enrollment. | Hire one new faculty at assistant professor rank; expertise in food toxicology *(Hire #1)*; will teach 1.5 cr in current and future courses and host Honours students  
   In the meantime, **request CI for 0.5 cr** *(FOOD 4103)*  
   Hire one new faculty at assistant professor or instructor rank; expertise in food industry *(Hire #2)*; will teach 1.5 to 3.0 cr in current and future courses and host Honours students  
   In the meantime, **request CI for 1.0 cr** *(FOOD 3003, 4001)*  
   Hire new faculty at Instructor rank *(Hire #3)*; will teach 1.0 cr in current and future courses, host Honours students, and build co-op;  
   In the meantime, **request CI for 1.0 cr** *(FOOD 2003, 4102)* | Faculty Dean  
   Departmental Chair  
   Hiring Committee | Closing date for applications: October 31<sup>st</sup> 2017. Start date January 2018.  
   **CI – Approved for 2017-18;**  
   Discussions with Faculty Dean in Fall 2017.  
   **CI – Approved for 2017-18;**  
   Discussions with Faculty Dean in 2018.  
   **CI – Approved for 2017-18;** |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Individual/Committee</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduce CGPA cutoff for 4907 and 4908 courses. Develop new 4905 Group Honours Workshop course for students below CGPA cutoff or other students who may prefer this option. Request CI for 1.0 cr</td>
<td>Introduce CGPA cutoff for 4907 and 4908 courses. Develop new 4905 Group Honours Workshop course for students below CGPA cutoff or other students who may prefer this option. Request CI for 1.0 cr</td>
<td>Departmental Chair CPR Chair Current FOOD instructor</td>
<td>Course approved for 2017-18 calendar. Available as an option in 2018-19. Effective for all students in 2020-21.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Where areas of course material duplication are identified as being non-productive by academic staff consultation, corrective action should be undertaken</td>
<td>Continue annual summer FOOD Faculty workshop with course design experts from EDC until all current and future FOOD courses have been revised</td>
<td>FOOD Faculty members FOOD Contract Instructors EDC staff</td>
<td>Summer 2017: FOOD 2001, 2004, 2003/4103 Summer 2018: FOOD 4102, 4201, 4203, 4002, 4301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Where the amount/nature/complexity of course material is considered inadequate, again by staff consultation, action should be taken to correct the situation. Resolution of this issue should occur before the</td>
<td>Same as point #2</td>
<td>Same as point #2</td>
<td>Same as point #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>Actions</td>
<td>Individual/Committee</td>
<td>Timeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>implementation of subject streams in the program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Provision</td>
<td>Develop mandatory 2000-level Scientific Writing Course</td>
<td>CPR Chair</td>
<td>Course approved for 2017-18 calendar; syllabus developed in summer 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hire one new faculty at assistant professor or instructor rank; expertise in food industry (Hire #2); will teach 1.5 to 3.0 cr in current and future courses; will permit redistribution of teaching load among Faculty</td>
<td>Current FOOD Instructor</td>
<td>Discussions with Faculty Dean in Fall 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. A course on critical thinking and professional ethics should be considered.</td>
<td>Add learning outcomes associated with critical thinking and professional ethics to FOOD 4001, 4102, and 4103</td>
<td>FOOD Faculty members FOOD Contract Instructors EDC staff</td>
<td>Summers 2017 and 2018, as per FOOD workshop schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Emphasis should continue to be placed upon development of laboratory section scheduling in such</td>
<td>Set maximum number of students per section to 8</td>
<td>Departmental Chair FOOD lab Instructors FOOD lab Coordinator Peter Mosher</td>
<td>Effective 2016-17; to be reviewed annually.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>Actions</td>
<td>Individual/Committee</td>
<td>Timeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| a manner that   | Maintain number of lab sections per term per coordinator in line with  | Departmental Chair  
                 | the laboratory co-ordinator is not overworked and the     | FOOD lab Instructors              | Effective 2016-17.                   |
|                 | laboratories are not overcrowded. When opportunity occurs, acquisition | FOOD lab Coordinator  
                 | of laboratory space should take place.                     | Peter Mosher                       | To be reviewed annually              |
|                 | Evaluate need for additional lab space and new laboratory              |                                                          | based on enrollment figures.       |                                    |
|                 | coordinator with experience in microbiology and chemistry              |                                                          |                                    |                                    |
| 7. Consideration| Develop mandatory 2000-level Food Processing Course                    | Faculty Dean  
                 | should be given to the development of a module or a       | Departmental Chair                  | Course approved for 2017-18          |
|                 |                                                                       | Hiring committee                                         | calendar; syllabus developed in    | Decision on new Instructor          |
|                 | Hire one new faculty at assistant professor rank or instructor rank;   |                                                          | summer 2017;                       | hire will be made in Fall 2017;     |
|                 | expertise in food industry (Hire #2); will teach 1.5 to 3.0 cr in     |                                                          |                                    | CI – Approved for 2017-18;          |
|                 | current and future courses; will permit redistribution of teaching    |                                                          |                                    |                                    |
|                 | load in the meantime, request CI for 0.5 cr                           |                                                          |                                    |                                    |
| 8. Work should  | Seek methods to improve assessment efficiency                           | CPR Chair  
<pre><code>             | continue on development of learning outcomes to a level    | FOOD Faculty members, Office of   | Fall 2017                           |
</code></pre>
<p>|                 | Assess impact of learning outcome assessment practices                 | Quality Assurance, Office of Quality Initiatives         |                                    |                                    |
|                 |                                                                       |                                                          |                                    |                                    |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Individual/Committee</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Presently strong motivation for FSN program quality and improvement resides in the program core instructor III position. It is unlikely that this energy and enthusiasm is sustainable in the longer term without further commitment from the Department of Chemistry.</td>
<td>Hire one new faculty at assistant professor rank; expertise in food toxicology (Hire #1)</td>
<td>Faculty Dean Departmental Chair Hiring Committee</td>
<td>Closing date for applications: October 31&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; 2017. Start date January 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hire one new faculty at assistant professor rank or instructor rank; expertise in food industry (Hire #2)</td>
<td>Faculty Dean Departmental Chair Hiring Committee</td>
<td>Discussions with Faculty Dean in Fall 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hire one new faculty at instructor rank; expertise in food law and regulation; to be shared in FPA (Hire #3)</td>
<td>Faculty Deans (Science, Public Affairs) Departmental Chair Hiring Committee</td>
<td>Discussions with Faculty Deans in Fall 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. CUCQA: Concern expressed by the external reviewers regarding the lack of “Nutrition” content</td>
<td>Discussion on revision of program name</td>
<td>Departmental Chair FOOD faculty members</td>
<td>Fall 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and the ensuing misalignment between the program and its title. Any proposed solution to remedy this discrepancy should be included in the Action Plan.
CARLETON UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON QUALITY ASSURANCE

Cyclical Review of the undergraduate programs in Human Rights
Executive Summary and Final Assessment Report

This Executive Summary and Final Assessment Report of the cyclical review of Carleton's undergraduate programs in Human Rights are provided pursuant to the provincial Quality Assurance Framework and Carleton's Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The undergraduate programs in Human Rights (BA Honours, BA Combined Honours, BA General) reside in the Institute of Interdisciplinary Studies, 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 Institute of Interdisciplinary Studies on August 22, 2016 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 Institute of Interdisciplinary Studies and the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, in a response to the External Reviewers’ report that was submitted to CUCQA on December 1st, 2016.

An Action Plan detailing how, when and by whom the recommendations will be implemented was received and approved by CUCQA on February 14, 2018.
FINAL ASSESSMENT REPORT

Introduction

The undergraduate programs in Human Rights (BA Honours, BA Combined Honours, BA General) reside in the Institute of Interdisciplinary Studies, a unit administered by the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences. This review was conducted pursuant to the Quality Assurance Framework and Carleton's Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP). 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 March 31\(^{st}\) - April 1\(^{st}\), 2015, was conducted by Dr. Malinda Smith from the University of Alberta, and Dr. Sunera Thobani from the University of British Columbia. The site visit involved formal meetings with the Vice-Provost and Associate Vice-President (Academic), the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, and the Director of the Institute of Interdisciplinary Studies. The review committee also met with faculty members, contract instructors, staff, and undergraduate students.

The External Reviewers’ report, submitted on August 22\(^{nd}\), 2016, 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 review team. (Appendix A)
- Communication from CUCQA regarding the outcome of the external review (Appendix C)
- The response from the Director of the Institute of Interdisciplinary Studies and the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to the Report of the External Review Committee (Appendix D).
- The internal discussant’s recommendation report (Appendix E).
- The communication from CUCQA regarding the outcome of the review (Appendix F).
- The program’s Action Plan (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 Interdisciplinary Studies and the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences regarding the implementation of recommendations for program enhancement to have been advanced as a consequence of the cyclical program review process.
The Action Plan provides an account of who is responsible for implementing the agreed upon recommendations, as well as of the timelines for implementation and reporting.

**Strengths of the programs**

**General**

The External Reviewers’ Report states that “the external review team was particularly impressed with the obvious commitment of the continuing faculty, contract instructors, students, staff and unit and senior administrators to the HRP.”

**Faculty**

The External Reviewers’ Report states that they were “very impressed with the unit’s ability to mount and deliver a strong, high quality undergraduate program in HR, particularly given the very modest faculty complement and the challenge of accessing teaching assistantships.” They were particularly impressed by the faculty’s “commitment to quality program design and excellence in curriculum delivery,” though noted concern with “the HRP’s capacity to continue to offer this strong program without significant investment of resources, including faculty positions, and more robust engagement with their sister unit.”

**Students**

The External Reviewers’ met with students during their site visit and found they were “overall very enthusiastic about the program” and showed “particular appreciation for the knowledge they acquired in individual classes and cumulatively over the course of the program.”

**Challenges faced by the programs**

While the programs are generally successful, the External Reviewers provided a statement on the challenges they have identified as below:

“The very talented, albeit relatively junior, faculty are currently overburdened and taxed to the limit by the rising demands on their time, and both professional and personal well-being. These demands are shaped by two factors: first, as a result of the program’s success – such as rising student demand and uncertain teaching assistantships; and, second, because of professional and career expectations the faculty are having to supervise and mentor graduate students external to the HRP. Third, faculty are also overburdened by a cumbersome administrative structure. A fourth challenge familiar to all universities is the lack of adequate space and other resources that would organically provide cohesion to relatively new units and those within it. One consequence of the lack of adequate space is the erosion of a sense of community, cohesion, and camaraderie among faculty, contract instructors, and students.”

**Opportunities for program improvement and enhancement**

_A memo provided by the Office of the Vice-Provost and Associate Vice-President dated August 22, 2016 identified the following recommendations based on the External Reviewers’ report, and additional items identified by CUCQA:_

---

**Page**

---
External Reviewers’ Recommendations

The External Reviewers provided the following recommendations:

1. Creation of a minimum of three new faculty positions to ensure the Institute’s capacity to offer the undergraduate programs and develop a graduate program;
2. A peer and co-mentoring program for both faculty members and students: a) mentoring is required for new and continuing faculty for career advancement (the reviewers were concerned that there are no full-professors in the faculty complement), for accessing external research funding, for teaching etc.; b) mentoring is required for students for enhancing learning, applying for scholarships and awards, and especially for external applications like Canada Graduate Scholarship MA;
3. Creation of a mechanism to ensure ongoing communication between HRP and sister units, particularly with regard to curriculum development and course offerings; retreats with sister units are also recommended;
4. Creation of a mechanism for regular communication, consultation and feedback from students regarding curriculum and course offerings;
5. A dedicated space to build community, enhance collegiality, increase student interaction with faculty and CIs, and develop a distinct and cohesive program identity;
6. Development of a co-op program and the enhancement of the current Practicum option;
7. Provision of TAs, drawn from the Political Economy Program until such a time when the HR Graduate Program can meet this need;
8. Provisions be made in anticipation of the increased workload for administrative staff that will result from the new MA.

Additional CUCQA Recommendations

1. The Reviewers highlight a few gaps in the Program’s curriculum;
2. The Reviewers note that students reported dissatisfaction with classes where some of their peers lack substantive background in human rights;
3. The Reviewers believe that there should be a greater emphasis on connections between the classroom and the broader community;
4. The Reviewers see a need to build leadership capacity from within the HR program and across the Institute;

The Outcome of the Review

As a consequence of the review, the undergraduate programs in Human Rights 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 of Interdisciplinary Studies and the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences in a response to the External Reviewers’ report that was considered by CUCQA on December 6th, 2016. An Action Plan detailing how, when and by whom the recommendations will be implemented was received and approved by CUCQA on February 14, 2018. The unit responded to all of the recommendations and additional concerns, and has provided an
ongoing plan for action and consideration on all items except additional concern #2. Additional concern #2 noted student dissatisfaction with courses where some of their peers lacked substantive background. The unit has provided rationale for not considering this comment based on the low number of student attendees (2) involved in meetings with the external reviewers, and that there was no other substantiating evidence for this dissatisfaction, with any evidence pointing to the contrary. The faculty resource issue identified by the External Reviewers in recommendation #1 is under discussion with the Dean in conjunction with the possibility of launching a graduate program.

It is to be noted that Carleton’s IQAP provides for the monitoring of Action Plans. A joint report will be submitted by the academic unit and Faculty Dean, and forwarded to CUCQA for its review. In the case of the program in Human Rights, the majority of monitoring will be achieved by means of an update on the Action Plan, which is expected by June 30th, 2019.

The Next Cyclical Review

The next cyclical review of the programs in Human Rights will be conducted during the 2022-23 academic year.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
<th>ACTION/ACTIVITY</th>
<th>TIMELINE</th>
<th>PERSONNEL RESPONSIBLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The Reviewers recommend the creation of a minimum of three new faculty positions to ensure the Institute’s capacity to offer the undergraduate programs and develop a graduate program;</td>
<td>Discussion with Dean Possible cluster hire awaits establishment of grad program</td>
<td>Fall 2017</td>
<td>Director HR&amp;SJ Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Peer and co-mentoring program for both faculty members and students: a. mentoring is required for new and continuing faculty for career advancement</td>
<td>Pending cluster hire; mentoring only possible with a healthier faculty compliment</td>
<td>July 2018</td>
<td>Director HR&amp;SJ Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The Reviewers recommend the creation of a mechanism to ensure ongoing communication between HRP and sister units, particularly with regard to curriculum development and course offerings; retreats with sister units are also recommended;</td>
<td>Meeting with sponsoring departments Regular contact with sponsoring depts.</td>
<td>Nov. 2016</td>
<td>Director Associate Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The Reviewers recommend the creation of a mechanism for regular communication, consultation and feedback from students regarding curriculum and course offerings;</td>
<td>CASG Student representation on IIS (HR&amp;SJ?) Meetings</td>
<td>Ongoing: Rep started attending meetings in Nov. 2016</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The Reviewers recommend that the Program be provided with a dedicated space to build community, enhance collegiality, increase student interaction with faculty and CIs, and develop a distinct and cohesive program identity;</td>
<td>Negotiate with FASS Dean Phased conversion of DT Floor # 13 as future home of IIS/HR&amp;SJ</td>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The Reviewers recommend the development of a co-op program and the enhancement of the current Practicum option;</td>
<td>Discuss integration of co-operative option – agenda item for next HR&amp;SJ meeting</td>
<td>Oct. 2017</td>
<td>HR&amp;SJ Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The Reviewers recommend the provision of TAs, drawn from the Political Economy Program until such a time when the HR Graduate Program can meet this need</td>
<td>Discussion with Associate Dean</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The Reviewers recommend that provisions be made in anticipation of</td>
<td>The review of administrative</td>
<td>Winter 2018</td>
<td>Director HR&amp;SJ Faculty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the increased workload for administrative staff that will result from the new MA.

**Additional concerns**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern</th>
<th>Recommended Action</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. The Reviewers highlight a few serious gaps in the Program’s curriculum e.g. critical race theory | One new instructor hire  
Discussion with Dean  
Cluster hire awaits establishment of grad program | - Winter 2018  
- Fall 2018 | Director HR&SJ Faculty |
| 2. The Reviewers note that students reported dissatisfaction with classes where some of their peers lack substantive background in human rights. | No need for action; conclusion based on limited evidence (only two students talked with the Reviewers). | N/A | N/A |
| 3. The Reviewers believe that there should be a greater emphasis on connections between the classroom and the broader community. | Discuss the practicum – agenda item for next HR&SJ meeting  
Identify relevant organisations | - Oct. 2017  
- Ongoing | Director Practicum Coordinator HR&SJ Faculty |
| 4. The Reviewers see a need to build leadership capacity from within the HR program and across the Institute. | Creation of IIS Associate Director position | - Ongoing | Director |
This Executive Summary and Final Assessment Report of the cyclical review of Carleton's BA program in Religion is provided pursuant to the provincial Quality Assurance Framework and Carleton's Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The BA program in Religion is administered by the University’s College of the Humanities, an academic unit in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences.

As a consequence of the review, the program was categorised by the Carleton University Committee on Quality Assurance (CUCQA) as receiving GOOD QUALITY (Carleton’s IQAP, articles 7.2.12 and 7.2.13.2).

The External Reviewers’ Report, submitted to the College of Humanities on January 4, 2016, offered a positive assessment of the programs and made a number of recommendations for the continuing enhancement of the programs. These recommendations were addressed by the Director of the College of Humanities and the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, in a response to the External Reviewers’ Report that was submitted to CUCQA on April 27, 2016. Concerns raised by CUCQA were addressed in a second report provided by the unit on June 16, 2017.

An Action Plan detailing how, when, and by whom the recommendations will be implemented was received and approved by CUCQA on February 28, 2018.
FINAL ASSESSMENT REPORT

Introduction

The BA program in Religion is administered by the University’s College of Humanities, an academic unit of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences. This review was conducted pursuant to the Quality Assurance Framework and Carleton's Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP). As a consequence of the review, the program was categorised by the Carleton University Committee on Quality Assurance (CUCQA) as being of GOOD QUALITY. (Carleton’s IQAP 7.2.12).

The site visit for this cyclical program review took place on November 9th and 10th, 2016 and was conducted by Dr. Richard S. Ascough, Queen’s University, and Dr. Arthur McCalla, Mount Saint Vincent University. The reviewers met with Dr. André Loiselle, Assistant Vice-President (Academic), Dr. Catherine Khordoc, Interim Dean, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, Dr. Farhang Rajaee, Director of the College of the Humanities, Dr. Zeba Crook, Program Coordinator, Program Faculty, Contract Instructors and undergraduate students.

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 College of Humanities (Appendix A)
- Communication from CUCQA regarding the outcome of the external review (Appendix C)
- The response from the Director and Assistant Director, and the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to the Report of the External Review Committee (Appendix D).
- The internal discussant’s recommendation report (Appendix E).
- The communication from CUCQA regarding the outcome of the review (Appendix F).
- The program’s Action Plan (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 College of Humanities and the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, regarding the implementation of recommendations for program enhancement to have been advanced as a consequence of the cyclical program review process.

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

Strengths of the programs
General

CUCQA noted from the External Reviewers’ Report that: “the learning outcomes for the various programs are clearly stated, appropriately designed and structured, and meet University Undergraduate Degree Level Expectations.” The Committee also noted from the report that: “our visit leaves us in no doubt that the Program provides its students with a good educational experience.”

Faculty

The External Reviewers’ Report indicates “the faculty complement status quo is sustainable but to thrive as a combined teaching and research unit will require additional FT faculty.”

Students

The external reviewers’ commented “the student survey responses and our face-to-face interview with undergraduates during our visit leave us in no doubt that the Program provides its students with a good educational experience.”

Curriculum

The External Reviewers noted that “the revitalized BA and the new minors made possible by the renewal of Program faculty over the last decade are structured by a blend of ‘tradition-based’ courses and ‘thematic courses’.”

Challenges faced by the programs

The principal concerns raised by the external reviewers were: the number of courses offered by the program; an overly heavy reliance on contract instructors; the structure of the program and the manner in which the curriculum is determined on an annual basis; and student advising. The external reviewers viewed these issues as being integrally related.

Opportunities for program improvement and enhancement

A memo provided to the unit by the Office of the Vice-Provost and Associate Vice-President dated January 4, 2016 identified the following recommendations based on the External Reviewers’ report:

1. *That there be greater financial transparency in how resources are allocated across the College of Humanities.*

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

3. *That the Program’s website delineate undergraduate courses offered on a regular basis (annually or biannually) from courses offered occasionally or rarely. The Program should aim to reduce or eliminate many of the latter courses and with particular attention to reducing dependence on C/S.*
4. That the Program improve student engagement by upgrading advising, communication, and the Program’s web page.

5. That the Program expand the dedicated Religion Program Writing Lab.

The second report, requested by CUCQA, required the unit to address the following items:

1. The program’s learning outcomes should be revisited to ensure that they are appropriate to a program that is structured ‘from the perspective of its students,’ and not predominantly according to the teaching preferences of faculty.

2. The structure of the program should then be revisited to determine if it should be more focused than is currently the case in order to effectively achieve the program-level learning outcomes. It may be that the number of required courses could be increased, or it may be that more guidance through the program could be afforded students in terms of concentrations or identified pathways.

3. A curriculum mapping exercise should then be undertaken to ensure that all courses adequately serve the program’s learning outcomes and attendant structure, and are necessary and desirable for these outcomes to be achieved.

4. The number of courses thus identified should ensure that the courses can be offered on a regular basis during the lifetime of a student in the program. In thus determining the character and number of courses, attention should be paid to the number of contract instructors required to deliver the program. It is expected that the number of contract instructors necessary to deliver the program will be reduced significantly as a consequence of this exercise.

The Outcome of the Review

As a consequence of the review, the BA in Religion was categorised by the Carleton University Committee on Quality Assurance (CUCQA) as being of GOOD QUALITY (Carleton’s IQAP 7.2.12).

The Action Plan

The recommendations that were put forward as a result of the review process were addressed by the Director of the College of Humanities and the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences in a response to the External Reviewers’ Report that was considered by CUCQA on April 27, 2016. Concerns raised by CUCQA were addressed in a second report provided by the unit on June 16, 2017. An Action Plan detailing how, when and by whom the recommendations will be implemented was received and approved by CUCQA on February 28, 2018. The unit responded to all of the recommendations and issues, and has provided an ongoing plan for action and consideration on all items except for recommendation #1 and #5. Regarding recommendation #1, the Religion Program is administered in the same manner as all programs in the College of the Humanities. The specific resource issue identified by the External Reviewers, supplying faculty for two BHum courses, has been resolved; these courses are now open to Religion students. Regarding recommendation #5, the College of the Humanities is able to continue the Religion Program Writing Lab, however, will not expand the program, as additional resources are not available for expansion currently.
It is to be noted that Carleton’s IQAP provides for the monitoring of action plans. A joint report will be submitted by the academic unit(s) and Faculty Dean(s), and forwarded to CUCQA for its review. In the case of the BA program in Religion the majority of monitoring will be achieved by means of an update on the Action Plan, which is expected by June 30th, 2019.

**The Next Cyclical Review**

The next cyclical review of the BA program in Religion will be conducted during the 2021-22 academic year.
DATE:  January 31, 2018

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

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

CC:  Dr. Wallace Clement, Interim Dean of FASS
     Dr. Richard Mann, Associate Dean of FASS (Curriculum, Programs and Planning)
     Christina Noja, Manager, Office of the Vice-Provost and Associate Vice-President (Academic)
     Tiffany Douglas, Program Review Officer, Office of the Vice-Provost and Associate Vice-President (Academic)

RE:  Religion BA Action Plan

As requested in the September 7, 2017 memo from Dr. Lorraine Dyke, this Action Plan takes into account the issues identified by the external review and those subsequently identified by CUCQA, particularly in the memo of May 16th, 2016 from Dr. John Shepherd. We have also taken to heart a suggestion made in the same September 7, 2017 memo: “CUCQA also recognizes that Religion has already made progress on many of the recommendations, as outlined in their reports. This should allow the Action Plan to be succinct on such items, summarizing the steps taken.”

Recommendations made by the external reviewers:

1. Recommendation: That there be greater financial transparency in how resources are allocated across the College of Humanities.
   This recommendation was made in the context of College governance. The specific items noted by the external reviewers were: “The Religion Program has no control over its budget; it can be difficult to obtain accurate data for the Religion Program alone; and the necessity of supplying faculty for two BHum courses (from which Religion students are excluded) is a drain on faculty resources.” It is true that the current Director of the College does not come from the Religion program, and it might be said therefore that Religion does not control the budget for the Religion program. Since, however, Religion is housed in the College and is administered, like the other College programs, by a Director whom it has recommended to the Dean through a collegial selection process, there is really no question of it controlling this budget. On the other hand, the Religion Program does have access to a significant endowment (Davidson Fund), and faculty members do control its funds. The issue of supplying faculty for two BHum courses has now been resolved by opening those courses to Religion students.

   Steps to be taken: None
   Personnel responsible: N/A

2. Recommendation: That the Religion Faculty move towards including clearly stated Learning Objectives and linked Outcomes on all undergraduate syllabi as the mechanism through which student learning is assessed and monitored.
Steps to be taken: The exercise of formulating Learning Objectives and linked Outcomes for the BA program was included in our June 16th Report to CUCQA. We will now move toward the goal of including these as a part of the undergraduate syllabi in the program, with a goal of including them in all most of our syllabi for the 2018-19 academic year.
Personnel responsible: Religion undergraduate coordinator, Religion faculty

3. Recommendation: That the Program's website delineate undergraduate courses offered on a regular basis (annually or biannually) from courses offered occasionally or rarely. The Program should aim to reduce or eliminate many of the latter courses with particular attention to reducing dependence on CIs.

Steps to be taken: None. This list has been created and is now posted on our website: https://carleton.ca/religion/undergraduate-courses/ Courses rarely offered have been removed from our Calendar entry through the curriculum changes process. Courses to be offered in the 2018/2019 academic year have been carefully chosen to reflect those most necessary for meeting the degree requirements.
Personnel responsible: N/A

4. Recommendation: That the Program improve student engagement by upgrading advising, communication, and the Program's web page.
In the June 16th report we outlined two actions for meeting this recommendation. One was a process of mandated individual March advising, and the other was fostering an active Religion Student Society.

Steps to be taken:
1) We will divide up the students among our faculty members and have each member contact the students to set up advising meetings in March. At the meetings, faculty members will let students know what courses will be offered in the coming year, and ensure that the students understand the state of their audit and what is required for them to graduate. We will also encourage Religion minors to attend such meetings.
2) We will actively look for students who might take the initiative with faculty support to form a student society for Religion. Such a society would help students develop a sense of community with each other and facilitate interaction between students and faculty.
Personnel responsible: Religion undergraduate coordinator, Religion faculty

5. Recommendation: That the Program expand the dedicated Religion Program Writing Lab. The College has been able to continue this program, which is funded almost entirely through ODFASS, but there are not resources available to expand the program at this time.

Steps to be taken: None.
Personnel responsible: N/A

In the May 16, 2016 memo sent on behalf of CUCQA from Dr. John Shepherd regarding the Outcome of the Cyclical Program Review for the BA Program in Religion, the CUCQA committee identified several issues of concern to which it asked the program to respond in our report of June 16, 2017.
These issues were the following:

**Issue #1:** Structure of the program and the manner in which the curriculum is determined on an annual basis
As related in the June 16, 2017 Religion report, (under "4. Structure of the Program," p. 10-15) the Religion program proposed a series of steps to restructure the Religion BA and thereby ensure breadth of knowledge, achieve program-level learning outcomes, respond to student requests regarding course content, and to regularize course offerings. This initiative involved numerous changes to the calendar. All of the proposed changes have been made and the program has been restructured as indicated in the report. Calendar changes are currently working their way through the university's system for approval.

Steps to be taken: none
Personnel responsible: N/A

**Issue #2: Curriculum mapping of Program Learning Outcomes**

Steps to be taken: None. This exercise was completed and included in the June 16th report.
Personnel responsible: N/A

**Issue #3: The number of courses in the calendar**

One of CUCQA's major concerns was the large number of courses offered by the program. We responded in the June 16th report: We conducted a review of all the courses that have been taught in the BA over the last five years, and determined which courses could not be offered by existing full-time faculty in a meaningful timeframe. We have identified 19 such courses to be removed from the calendar. A further 6 language courses can be subsumed under a generic language tutorial course code. The proposed changes will bring the total number of RELI courses in the calendar down from 89 to 64. An additional 5 of these are cross-listed courses, which are therefore neither controlled nor taught by the Religion Program. This brings the number of courses in the Religion BA down to 59.

Steps to be taken: None.
Personnel responsible: N/A

**Issue #4: Reliance on contract instructors**

As noted in the June 16th report, we are pleased to note that the program received two limited-term Instructors (Jewish Studies: one year; East Asian Studies: two year), whose teaching load will be 3/4. Our CI request for 2018-19 has been reduced to 4.5 credits from 8.5 the previous year (2016-17) and 7.5 in 2015-16.

Steps to be taken: None
Personnel Responsible: N/A
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Steps to be taken and timeline</th>
<th>Personnel responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. That there be greater financial transparency in how resources are allocated across the College of Humanities.</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. That the Religion Faculty move towards including clearly stated Learning Objectives and linked Outcomes on all undergraduate syllabi as the mechanism through which student learning is assessed and monitored.</td>
<td>The exercise of formulating Learning Objectives and linked Outcomes for the BA program was included in our June 16th Report to CUCQA. We have now move toward the goal of including these as a part of the undergraduate syllabi in the program, with a goal of including them in all of our syllabi for the 2018-19 academic year.</td>
<td>Religion undergraduate coordinator, Religion faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. That the Program’s website delineate undergraduate courses offered on a regular basis (annually or biannually) from courses offered occasionally or rarely. The Program should aim to reduce or eliminate many of the latter courses with particular attention to reducing dependence on CIs.</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. That the Program improve student engagement by upgrading advising, communication, and the Program’s web page. In the June 16th report we outlined two actions for meeting this recommendation. One was a process of mandated individual March advising, and the other was fostering an active Religion Student Society.</td>
<td>1) We will divide up the students among our faculty members and have each member contact the students to set up advising meetings in March. At the meetings, faculty members will let students know what courses will be offered in the coming year, and ensure that the students understand the state of their audit and what is required for them to graduate. We will also encourage Religion minors to attend such meetings. 2) We will actively look for students who might take the initiative with faculty support to form a student society for Religion. Such a society would help students develop a sense of community with each other and facilitate interaction between students and faculty.</td>
<td>Religion undergraduate coordinator, Religion faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. That the Program expand the dedicated Religion Program Writing Lab.</td>
<td>None. The College has been able to continue this program, which is funded almost entirely through ODFASS, but there are not</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue #1: Structure of the program and the manner in which the curriculum is determined on an annual basis.</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue #2: Curriculum mapping of Program Learning Outcomes.</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue #3: The number of courses in the calendar.</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue #4: Reliance on contract instructors.</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Carleton University Senate
Meeting of May 4, 2018 at 2:00 p.m.
Senate Room, Robertson Hall

MINUTES


Recording Secretary: K. McKinley

Open Session:

1. Welcome (Chair)

The Chair called the meeting to order at 2:04 p.m.

2. Approval of Agenda (open)

It was MOVED (K. Lumsden, W. Jones) that Senate approve the agenda for the meeting of Senate on May 4, 2018. It was noted that a Notice of Motion was presented to the Clerk and will be added to the agenda under Other Business. The motion PASSED.
3. **Minutes:** March 23, 2018 (open session)

It was **MOVED** (L. Dyke, P. Gunupudi) that Senate approve the minutes of the open session of the Senate meeting of March 23, 2018, as presented. The motion **PASSED**.

4. **Matters Arising:**

Dean Clement of FASS provided an update on the Academic Integrity Appeal process during and after the recent labour disruption. Dean Clement acknowledged that appeals were initially halted, but requests were triaged and reviewed once it became evident that the strike would last longer than one week.

5. **Chair’s Remarks**

The Chair announced that the Board of Governors has chosen Benoit A. Bacon to be the next President of Carleton University. The Chair then read a statement that Mr. Bacon had prepared for Senate:

   Dear Members of Senate,

   It is a great honour to have been selected as President and Vice-Chancellor of Carleton University. I can’t wait to be on campus and to get to work. I very much look forward to meeting all members of the Carleton community, and to work with Senate towards further successes for Carleton. Thank you all for your great work this year; I wish you a productive and restful summer season, and will see you in a few short months!

   All the best,
   Benoit

**New Government Funding:** The Chair next announced $5M in provincial government funding for the David C. Onley Initiative for Employment and Enterprise Development, to support students with disabilities. This funding compliments $800,000 from the provincial government Career Ready Fund to create the Carleton University Accessible Experiential Learning (CUAEL)
project, which provides opportunities for work experience to students with disabilities during their studies. The fund will be managed through the Paul Menton Centre and the Office of the VP Students & Enrollment, and will be expended over a two-year period. The university is investigating a means to make this funding sustainable and permanent.

**Dominion Chalmers Church Purchase Update:** Carleton is close to drafting a purchase agreement, which will be reviewed by Church authorities as early as next week. Three levels of approval are required, but the final decision could be made in time for the May 24 meeting of the Board of Governors. The Chair thanked all of those involved in this initiative.

**Traffic and Parking:** Facilities Management & Planning are conducting a review of traffic and parking on campus. They are also considering additional access points to campus, and will be seeking feedback from members of the Carleton community on all of these issues.

**Sexual Violence Policy:** A review of this policy will occur in the fall when students are back on campus. Various student groups will be contacted over the summer to help plan the consultative process. In the meantime, the current policy has been flexible enough to manage all issues that have arisen. The Chair thanked VP of Students & Enrolment Suzanne Blanchard for her work on the policy, which continues to focus on supporting survivors.

**Capital Campaign Update:** The Chair was pleased to report that the Department of University Advancement has raised more than $42M this year towards the campaign. This is almost double the previous yearly average of $18 - $22M. The $300M campaign is scheduled to be completed at the end of the 2018 calendar year.

### 6. Question Period

a. Questions submitted in advance

1) The Carleton Academic Student Government (CAGS) held their executive elections recently. Why were only the 67 council members allowed to vote? Wouldn’t it be more democratic to have the entire student population vote for these executives that have
an influence over the University’s academic policies? (Attachment: 2018 CASG Executive Election Results.)

Emily Grant, President of CASG, spoke to this item. Electoral procedures for CASG are outlined in and determined by CASG governing documents. Normally there are closer to 100 council members, rather than the current 67, to vote in the executive. The system is democratic and resembles parliamentary democracy. Each councillor is elected individually through his/her program; the councilors in turn elect their executive. There are no immediate plans to change CASG’s electoral system, but it is reviewed periodically.

2) At the February 16th Senate meeting, the updated Honorary Degree Policy was approved. A new section regarding the rescinding of Honorary Degrees was approved, but what is the process? How does a member of Carleton, or a member of the public, put an individual's name forward to have that individual's Honorary Degree rescinded? Who will vote to rescind the degree, the Honorary Degree Committee or Senate?

Rafik Goubran, Chair of the Honorary Degrees Committee, outlined the process involved in rescinding an honorary degree. After a request is received through the Senate Office or the President’s Office, the Honorary Degrees Committee meets to determine the facts and make a recommendation. If the committee decides in favour of rescinding the degree, that recommendation will be brought to a closed session of Senate for approval.

3) In light of the postponement of the original planned April Senate meeting by one week, what arrangements (if any) will be made for members of Senate who are unable to attend on May 4? For example, can members be patched in by teleconferencing (as per the apparent arrangement for the March 27 meeting of the Board of Governors)?

The Assistant University Secretary noted that an effort was made to accommodate Senators who sent regrets because of the date
change for this meeting, but none of them were able to join by teleconference. The Clerk of Senate added that the acoustical challenges of the Senate room make teleconferencing impractical to use in this space.

b. Questions from the floor
   1) Question from Senator Clayden regarding the Truth & Reconciliation Commission’s Call to Action: Senator Clayden asked for an update on the progress made in the TRC Calls to Action for post-secondary institutions, specifically in Articles 16, 24, and 28. Will Carleton’s curriculum reflect the TRC’s Calls to Action?

   The Provost responded that there is an ongoing discussion with the Indigenous Education Council about the Indigenization of curriculum at Carleton. A course, led by Professor Horn-Miller, is being developed; it could be modularized and made available to other faculty members. Work with Senator Clayden and his colleagues on this initiative and others will continue in the coming year.

   2) Senator Ramasubramayan, President of the Graduate Students’ Association, asked for more details regarding the recent announcement by the provincial government of increased funding for international graduate students. Some universities have acted upon this announcement and made radical changes to ensure that international graduate students do not face severe financial burdens when coming to Ontario to study. What is Carleton doing?

   The Chair responded that some universities in Ontario have advertised that fees will be reduced to the domestic level for all international graduate students. This is not true. There are restrictions on the number of PhD students that qualify for this program.

   The Dean of the Faculty of Graduate & Postdoctoral Affairs agreed that there is some confusion about the exact terms of the provincial government’s program and how it should be implemented. The University of Ottawa has a plan in place for September, but the details on how many students will qualify and how the fee
reductions will be achieved have yet to be worked out. Deans and senior management at Carleton are engaging in a process to determine Carleton’s plan moving forward. International Graduate Student working groups at Carleton will be informed of these discussions. On a positive note, as of yesterday, the Ministry has lifted the embargo on releasing information about the limited number of PhD students that would qualify for this program, which should add some clarity to the situation.

7. Presentation: Faculty/Contract Instructors, Percent Female (J. Tomberlin)

The Provost gave the annual presentation on the percentage of female faculty and contract instructors employed at Carleton overall, and by Faculty. The presentation also compared Carleton’s statistics in major subject areas to the Ontario university averages.

Discussion: A Senator remarked that after last year’s presentation, the Provost claimed that Carleton’s target for gender parity was not 50% but the sector norm. Is that still the case, and if so, why? Also, the Provost was asked to comment on the disparities in female representation in the Instructor category vs. the Professor category. Could this be, as others previously claimed, due to a lack of qualified women for tenure-track jobs? The Provost responded that we cannot change the market pool, and are constrained by who is available. A good target for gender parity would be to at least match the provincial norms. However, the problem should be addressed at the student level by encouraging more women and girls to enroll in STEM disciplines, which Carleton is working hard to do.

To answer the second question about why more women are employed as Instructors vs. Professors requires more thought and careful examination. We are hiring more Instructors and Contract Instructors (i.e. teaching staff) in general, which is true also of many other universities.

The Provost was asked to comment specifically about the statistics for Engineering, and why there is not more apparent movement to Associate and Full Professor status among the female teaching staff. The Dean of FED replied that there were no specific incidents that would explain this phenomenon. FED is very conscious of the issue of women in STEM disciplines.
As a policy, the Dean returns any short list that does not include female candidates, and requests an explanation for their absence from the list.

Senators asked for more information to contextualize the data presented:
- The Collective Agreement allows for transfer of rank from Assistant Professor to Instructor. Is this disproportionately happening to women at Carleton?
- What is the comparative data for universities with partner-hiring policies? Could the lack of partner-hiring policies at institutions like Carleton partly explain the large number of non-tenured hires?
- What is the difference in pay between men and women in different faculties at Carleton, and at different universities? Are women paid less in general at Carleton as compared to other universities provincially (and nationally)?

Finally, one Senator called for more graduate scholarships for women in Science and Engineering, to encourage more women to continue in these fields.

8. **Motion regarding Academic Accommodation (A. Shotwell)**

The following motion was submitted to Senate by Senator Shotwell:

Whereas a labour disruption, legal strike, or lock-out at Carleton University may significantly affect students’ ability to attend class, access resources, receive academic guidance, and complete academic assignments in a timely manner; Whereas during a labour disruption, legal strike, or a lock-out it remains the obligation of Senate as the final academic authority on campus to ensure the maintenance of high academic standards and quality for all programs across the university: Students who are unable to participate in certain academic activities during a labour disruption, legal strike, or lock-out on campus, due to either hardship or the demands of conscience, are entitled to academic accommodation in a manner consistent with existing policies on accommodation for illness or religious observance. Senate asks SCCASP to develop a formal policy governing the process of providing accommodation for students unable to participate in academic activities in the case of a labour disruption, legal strike, or lock-out while maintaining academic standards under these circumstances.
It was **MOVED** (A. Shotwell, J. Paulson) that Senate approve the motion to refer the issue regarding academic accommodation for students to the Senate Committee on Curriculum Admissions & Studies Policy (SCCASP), as presented.

**Discussion:**
Senators debated at length a number of issues in the motion including:
- The potential problems in accommodating “demands of conscience” vs. other types of hardship in the context of a labour dispute.
- Whether the “demands of conscience” can or should be accommodated in the same way that we accommodate illness, religious observance or other existing conditions.
- The perceived language of entitlement in the motion, which some felt precluded the conclusions of the committee tasked with examining the issue.

After much discussion, a friendly amendment was proposed to alter the motion by removing this sentence:

> “Students who are unable to participate in certain academic activities during a labour disruption, legal strike, or lock-out on campus, due to either hardship or the demands of conscience, are entitled to academic accommodation in a manner consistent with existing policies on accommodation for illness or religious observance.”

The friendly amendment was accepted by Senator Shotwell, and the amended motion **PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

9. **Administration (Clerk)**

   a. The Clerk announced that several appointments have been made contrary to the advertising policy over the past month.

   b. The Clerk stated that once a Senator from a faculty has been elected to Senate, the Dean of the faculty will be notified of the
result and can circulate the information to the remainder of the faculty.

c. In response to a query from Senator Dion, the Governance Committee will be reviewing the eligibility requirements for the Clerk of Senate position to determine if non-tenured faculty (Instructors) could be eligible.

d. Senate vacancies: The Clerk reminded Senators of the following opportunities:
   - Clerk of Senate position
   - Senate representative on the Board of Governors
   - Chair of the Senate Review Committee

Senators are needed for all of these positions. The Senate Review Committee needs a Chair so that it can begin important business, including reviewing Senate's involvement in the Strategic Mandate Agreement.

10. Reports:

a. Senate Academic Program Committee (SAPC)

The Provost introduced one omnibus motion and two regular motions for Senate.

It was MOVED (J. Tomberlin, W. Clement) that Senate approve the introduction of the Bachelor of Global and International Studies, Specialization and Stream in Global Religions: Identity and Community, and the introduction of the Bachelor of Science, Concentration in Biodiversity, Natural History and Conservation Science, as presented with effect from Fall 2019. The motion PASSED.
Final Assessment Report and Executive Summary: Undergraduate Programs in Human Rights

It was MOVED (J. Tomberlin, L. Dyke) that Senate approve the Final Assessment Report and Executive Summary arising from the Cyclical Review of the undergraduate programs in Human Rights. The motion PASSED.

Final Assessment Report and Executive Summary: Undergraduate Programs in Religion

It was MOVED (J. Tomberlin, C. Dion) that Senate approve the Final Assessment Report and Executive Summary arising from the Cyclical Review of the undergraduate programs in Religion. The motion PASSED.

10. Reports (cont’d)

b. Senate Committee on Curriculum Admission and Studies Policy (SCCASP)

Howard Nemiroff presented 4 motions for Senate and 2 items for information.

1) Admission requirements for B. Science Honours Interdisciplinary Science & Practice (ISAP)

It was MOVED (H. Nemiroff, D. Deugo) That Senate approve Admission requirements for B. Science Honours (ISAP) for the 2019/20 Calendar as presented. The motion PASSED.
2) Transfers from Post-Secondary Institutions (Ontario Colleges)

It was **MOVED** (H. Nemiroff, L. Dyke) that Senate approve amendment to calendar language pertaining to Ontario College Admissions in the 2018/19 Calendar as presented. The motion **PASSED**.

3) Transfers from Post-Secondary Institutions (General Information)

It was **MOVED** (H. Nemiroff, C. Dion) that Senate approve amendment to calendar language pertaining to General Information on transfers from Post-Secondary Institutions in the 2018/19 Calendar as presented. The motion **PASSED**.

4) Revisions of R-UG-2.5 Deferral Final Examinations

It was **MOVED** (H. Nemiroff, S. Blanchard) that Senate approve amendment to R-UG-2.5 Deferred Final Examinations in the 2018/19 Calendar as presented. The motion **PASSED**.

5) Revisions to Academic Year Entry – AY Fall & Winter Terms and AY summer term

Modifications included the deadline for releasing course outlines. This was included for information only.
c. Senate Academic Governance Committee (Clerk)
   The Clerk presented 2 motions for Senate.

1) Student Membership on Senate – modifications to the AGU

   The Senate Academic Governance Committee proposed a number of changes to the AGU dealing with student membership on Senate. Changes were made to the language to broaden the eligibility for students to serve on Senate and Senate committees.

   It was MOVED (D. Russell, E. Grant) that Senate approve modifications to the Academic Governance of the University document, as presented.
   The motion PASSED.

2) Student Membership on Senate – Term Extension

   The next election for student Senators should include those newly eligible to vote. Since elections are held in September, to ensure representation on Senate and Senate committees, the Governance Committee is recommending a one-time extension of the terms of student Senators.

   It was MOVED (D. Russell, Z. Clayden) that Senate extend the terms of student Senators and student members on Senate committees until the first Senate meeting of the 2018-19 academic year.
   The motion PASSED.
10-Reports (cont’d)

d. Medals & Prizes Committee (Clerk)

A Senate motion is required to complete the update to the list of programs eligible for University Medals.

It was **MOVED** (D. Russell, D. Deugo) that Senate approve the addition of a University Medal in Health Sciences to the Senate Medals Policy.
The motion **PASSED**.

11. Reports for Information:

a. Senate Executive Minutes

- March 13, 2018
- April 12, 2018 (minutes of e-poll)

There was no discussion.

b. University Committee Membership Report (TPAC)

There was no discussion.

12. Other Business

Senator Paulson brought forward a request to waive the notice of motion and consider two emergency motions related to the perceived threat of a lockout of faculty at Carleton. The Clerk reviewed the rules for Waiver of Notice of Motion:

- The motion was handed to the Clerk before the meeting
- The motion responds to circumstances that developed after the date for proper notice
• The action specified in the motion cannot be delayed to permit consideration at the next meeting of Senate
• The motion addresses an issue of importance to the University
• A 2/3 majority of those present agrees to waive the requirement for the notice after hearing the motion read.

Senator Paulson stated that faculty recently received notice that the administration is walking away from the negotiations with CUASA and is preparing for a lockout. It is possible that the lockout could occur prior to the June 1 meeting of Senate. If this happens, 35 elected Senators would not be present and the integrity of any decisions made in Senate or Senate committees would be in question.

Senators then voted on the request to waive the notice of motion requirement.

It was MOVED (J. Paulson, J. Wolfart) that Senate waive the notice of motion and consider two emergency motions.

18 Senators voted in favour of the request.
18 Senators voted against the request.

Since a 2/3 majority in favour is required to waive the requirement, the request was DENIED.

The motions will be added to the agenda for the next meeting of Senate on June 1, 2018.

There was no other business.

13. Adjournment
The meeting was adjourned at 3:50 p.m.