

DATE: February 23, 2024

TO: Senate

FROM: Dr. David Hornsby, Vice-Provost and Associate Vice-President (Academic), and  
Chair, Senate Quality Assurance and Planning Committee

RE: Final Assessment Reports and Executive Summaries

---

The purpose of this memorandum is to request that Senate approve the Final Assessment Reports and Executive Summaries arising from cyclical program reviews. The request to Senate is based on recommendations from the Senate Quality Assurance and Planning Committee (SQAPC).

The Final Assessment Reports and Executive Summaries are provided pursuant to article 5.4.1. of the provincial Quality Assurance Framework and article 7.2.24 of Carleton's Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP). Article 7.2.24.3 of Carleton's IQAP (passed by Senate in November 2021 and ratified by the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance in April 2022) stipulates that, in approving Final Assessment Reports and Executive Summaries 'the role of SQAPC and Senate is to ensure that due process has been followed and that the conclusions and recommendations contained in the Final Assessment Report and Executive Summary are reasonable in terms of the documentation on which they are based.'

In making their recommendations to Senate and fulfilling their responsibilities under the IQAP, members of SQAPC were provided with all the appendices listed on page 2 of the Final Assessment Reports and Executive Summaries. These appendices constitute the basis for reviewing the process that was followed and assessing the appropriateness of the outcomes.

These appendices are not therefore included with the documentation for Senate. They can, however, be made available to Senators should they so wish.

Any major modifications described in the Implementation Plans, contained within the Final Assessment Reports, are subject to approval by the Senate Committee on Curriculum, Admission, and Studies Policy, the Senate Quality Assurance and Planning Committee (SQAPC) and Senate as outlined in articles 7.4.1 and 5.1 of Carleton's IQAP.

Once approved by Senate, the Final Assessment Reports, Executive Summaries and Implementation Plans will be forwarded to the Ontario Universities' Council on Quality Assurance and reported to Carleton's Board of Governors for information. The Executive Summaries and Implementation Plans will be posted on the website of Carleton University's Office of the Vice-Provost and Associate Vice-President (Academic), as required by the provincial Quality Assurance Framework and Carleton's IQAP.

**Omnibus Motion**

In order to expedite business with the multiple Final Assessment Reports and Executive Summaries that are subject to Senate approval at this meeting, the following omnibus motion will be moved.

Senators may wish to identify any of the following 2 Final Assessment Reports and Executive Summaries that they feel warrant individual discussion, that will then not be covered by the omnibus motion. Independent motions as set out below will nonetheless be written into the Senate minutes for those Final Assessment Reports and Executive Summaries that Senators agree can be covered by the omnibus motion.

**THAT** Senate approve the Final Assessment Reports and Executive Summaries arising from the Cyclical Reviews of the programs.

**Final Assessment Reports and Executive Summaries**

**1. Undergraduate and Graduate Programs in European, Russian and Eurasian Studies**

**SQAPC approval:** February 8, 2024

SQAPC Motion:

**THAT** SQAPC recommends to SENATE the approval of the Final Assessment Report and Executive Summary arising from the cyclical program review of the undergraduate and graduate programs in European, Russian and Eurasian Studies.

**Senate Motion March 1, 2024:**

**THAT** Senate approve the Final Assessment Report and Executive Summary arising from the Cyclical Review of the undergraduate and graduate programs in European, Russian and Eurasian Studies.

**2. Undergraduate and Graduate Programs in History**

**SQAPC approval:** February 8, 2024

SQAPC Motion:

**THAT** SQAPC recommends to SENATE the approval of the Final Assessment Report and Executive Summary arising from the cyclical program review of the undergraduate and graduate programs in History.

**Senate Motion March 1, 2024:**

**THAT** Senate approve the Final Assessment Report and Executive Summary arising from the Cyclical Review of the undergraduate and graduate programs in History.

## **SENATE QUALITY ASSURANCE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE**

### **Cyclical Review of the undergraduate and graduate programs in European, Russian and Eurasian Studies Executive Summary and Final Assessment Report**

This Executive Summary and Final Assessment Report of the cyclical review of Carleton's undergraduate and graduate programs in European, Russian and Eurasian Studies are provided pursuant to the provincial Quality Assurance Framework and Carleton's Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP).

#### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The undergraduate and graduate programs in European, Russian and Eurasian Studies reside in the Institute of European, Russian and Eurasian Studies, a unit administered by the Faculty of Public Affairs.

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

The External Reviewers' report offered a very positive assessment of the programs. Within the context of this positive assessment, the report nonetheless made a number of recommendations for the continuing enhancement of the programs. These recommendations were productively addressed by the Director of the Institute of European, Russian and Eurasian Studies and the Dean of the Faculty of Public Affairs in responses to the External Reviewers' report and Implementation on Plan that was submitted to SQAPC on December 14<sup>th</sup>, 2023.

## FINAL ASSESSMENT REPORT

### Introduction

The undergraduate and graduate programs in European, Russian and Eurasian Studies reside in the Institute of European, Russian and Eurasian Studies, a unit administered by the Faculty of Public Affairs. 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 categorized by Carleton University's Senate Quality Assurance and Planning Committee (SQAPC) as being of good quality. (Carleton's IQAP 7.2.13-14).

The site visit, which took place on April 17 and 18<sup>th</sup>, 2023, was conducted by Dr. Serhy Yekelchuk from the University of Victoria, Dr. Willem Maas from York University, and Dr. Trygve Ugland from Bishop's University. The site visit involved formal meetings with the Provost, the Vice-Provost and Associate Vice-President (Academic), the Associate Dean of the Faculty of Public Affairs, the Dean of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs and the Director of the Institute of European, Russian and Eurasian Studies. The review committee also met with faculty members, staff, and undergraduate and graduate students.

The External Reviewers' report, submitted on May 15, 2023, 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 Implementation Plan

This report draws on five documents:

- The Self-study developed by members of the Institute of European, Russian and Eurasian Studies (Appendix A)
- The Report of the External Review Committee (Appendix B).
- The response and implementation plan from the Director of the Institute of European, Russian and Eurasian Studies (Appendix C)
- The response from the Dean of the Faculty of Public Affairs (Appendix D).
- The internal discussion's recommendation report (Appendix E).

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

This Final Assessment Report contains the Implementation Plan (Appendix C) developed by the Director of the Institute of European, Russian and Eurasian Studies and agreed to by the Dean of the Faculty of Public Affairs for the implementation of recommendations for program enhancement identified as part of the cyclical program review process.

The Implementation Plan identifies who is responsible for implementing the agreed upon recommendations, as well as the timelines for implementation and reporting.

## **Strengths of the programs**

### **The external reviewers noted the following strengths in their report:**

- Among comparable Canadian programs, EURUS is a clear national leader in terms of teaching, research, and outreach on Russia and the EU. The Centre runs a highly successful and reputable MA program in the field, which every year attracts a large and competitive group of students from Canada and beyond. The undergraduate program feeds into the graduate program and provides successful and large service courses for the university.
- The opportunity for 4<sup>th</sup> year students to enroll in graduate seminars is a major strength with the undergraduate programs offered by EURUS. Both the undergraduate and graduate students that the external reviewers met with highlighted this as a unique and rewarding opportunity for undergraduate students.
- Compared to other, similar programs in Canada, EURUS has successfully maintained both student enrolments and high academic standards. What is even more remarkable is that the Centre did all that while maintaining a relatively large—the largest in Canada—annual intake of graduate students. The factors behind this success include considerable time and workload commitment on the part of the director and other faculty members. EURUS works closely with its MA students, helping them to map out their programs and guiding them in their research. The fact that EURUS offers only a thesis-based MA—something students very much appreciate— sets it apart from other comparable centres and makes the program stand out nationally and internationally.

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

The External Reviewers' Report made 5 recommendations for improvement:

1. Update EURUS' strategic vision in light of current international events.
2. Reorient student travel towards other countries of the region.
3. Consider the ad hoc nature of some arrangements crucial for the program's continuation.
4. Consider how language instruction is taught.
5. Review aspects of student research travel in light of war on Ukraine.
6. Determine the optimal size of the undergraduate programs in European and Russian Studies.
7. Create a more cohesive undergraduate cohort of 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> year students.

## **The Outcome of the Review**

As a consequence of the review, the undergraduate and graduate programs in European, Russian and Eurasian Studies were categorized by Carleton University's Senate Quality Assurance and Planning Committee (SQAPC) as being of **GOOD QUALITY** (Carleton's IQAP 7.2.13-14).

### **The Implementation Plan**

The recommendations that were put forward as a result of the review process were productively addressed by the Director of the Institute of European, Russian and Eurasian Studies and the Dean of the Faculty of Public Affairs in a response to the External Reviewers' report and Implementation Plan that was considered by SQAPC on December 14, 2023. The Department agreed unconditionally to recommendations #1, 2, 5, and 7, and agreed to recommendation #4 if resources permit. They also agreed to recommendations #6 in principle, and did not agree to recommendation #3.

It is to be noted that Carleton's IQAP provides for the monitoring of implementation plans. A monitoring report is to be submitted by the academic unit(s) and Faculty Dean(s), and forwarded to SQAPC for its review by June 30<sup>th</sup>, 2026.

### **The Next Cyclical Review**

The next cyclical review of the undergraduate and graduate programs in European, Russian and Eurasian Studies will be conducted during the 2027-28 academic year.

**European, Russian, and Eurasian Studies (EURUS)**  
**Unit Response to External Reviewers' Report & Implementation Plan**  
**Programs Being Reviewed: Undergraduate and Graduate Programs**

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

**Introduction & General Comments**

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

The external reviewers' report evaluates the quality of the EURUS undergraduate and graduate programs very positively, emphasizing that "Among comparable Canadian programs, EURUS is a clear national leader in terms of teaching, research, and outreach on Russia and the EU." (p. 4). We are encouraged by the positive nature of the report. We note that the report does not raise any fundamental concerns about the program's overall architecture, including its ability to help students reach the stated learning outcomes. The report does, however, highlight several constructive suggestions that deserve future attention, on which we wish to comment in this memo.

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

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

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

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

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

**Calendar Changes**

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

**Hiring**

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

## UNIT RESPONSE AND IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

Programs Being Reviewed: Undergraduate and Graduate Programs in European, Russian and Eurasian Studies

Prepared by (name/position/unit/date): Crina Viju/Director EURUS/June 25, 2023

External Reviewer Recommendation & Categorization	Unit Response (choose only one for each recommendation): 1- Agreed to unconditionally 2- Agreed to if additional resources permit (describe resources) 3- Agreed to in principle 4- Not agreed to Rationales are required for categories 2, 3 & 4	Action Item	Owner	Timeline	Will the action described require calendar changes? (Y or N)
<p>1. Update EURUS' strategic vision in light of current international events (opportunity)</p>	<p><i>Agreed to unconditionally.</i></p> <p>The reviewers noted that “EURUS can capitalize on its existing expertise by developing new courses in the field, organizing conferences, and providing policy advice to Canadian institutions” related to the war in Ukraine and the changing geopolitics of the region. We agree. Indeed, due to the timeline of this review, the Self Study did not include a detailed description of the Institute’s responses to the Russian invasion of Ukraine. The following measures defined our leadership in the area and our strategic vision:</p> <p>- keep the community informed: EURUS organized outreach events related to the war in Ukraine with academics, diplomats and policy makers targeting different audiences (students, Carleton community more generally, policy makers and the public); increased our presence on social media; expanded and enhanced the War in Ukraine Observatory (With the financial support from various projects funded by</p>	<p>- EURUS will continue to respond to current international events through organizing public and government outreach events, and supporting faculty research and teaching.</p>	<p><i>EURUS</i></p>	<p><i>Ongoing</i></p>	<p><i>N</i></p>



	<p>Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union and from the Faculty of Public Affairs, EURUS launched a new web portal, War in Ukraine Observatory, with the main goal of promoting an informed Canadian understanding of the war and its implications (<a href="https://carleton.ca/eurus/warinukraineobservatory/">https://carleton.ca/eurus/warinukraineobservatory/</a>).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- engage students in faculty research projects: most of the EURUS faculty members were successful in grant applications from SSHRC and European Commission on research topics related to the implications of the War (Paul Goode, Jeff Sahadeo, Crina Viju).</li> <li>- educate new generation of students: EURUS offered new courses related to the current regional situation and its global implications; added content related to the current situation to most other courses; and offered at least one course per year in an online format so that it is accessible by students from outside Ottawa.</li> <li>- continue involving the EURUS-hosted scholars at risk from the region in events/teaching.</li> </ul>				
<p><b>2. Reorient student travel towards other countries of the region</b> (opportunity)</p>	<p><i>Agreed to unconditionally.</i></p> <p>We have already made efforts to move in this direction by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- supporting our students' travel to Central and Eastern Europe, Central Asia and Caucuses for research and language training purposes. In the summer of 2023 already, several of our MA</li> </ul>	<p>- EURUS will continue to support our students' travel to the region, search for new funding sources, such as Mitacs funding as well as European Commission travel grants (through Erasmus + Mobility programmes – please see below) to partly support our students' travel. Additionally, launch a fundraising campaign by contacting private companies and NGOs</p>	<p><i>EURUS</i></p>	<p><i>Ongoing</i></p>	<p><i>N</i></p>

	<p>students are traveling to Czech Republic, Kyrgyzstan, Kazakhstan, and Georgia.</p> <p>- negotiating various MoUs for academic exchanges and research with different universities from the region.</p>	that need regional expertise and language skills.			
<p><b>3. Ad hoc nature of some arrangements crucial for the program's continuation</b></p> <p>To address this problem, EURUS may want to reconsider the way it deploys contract instructors. Another possibility is to factor in the program balance in the new hires. (weakness)</p>	<p><i>Not agreed to.</i></p> <p>We don't agree with this reflection, and we would like to point out that all interdisciplinary programs are facing similar issues. However, EURUS maintains strong relationships with all associated departments. We are comfortable with the structure of direct, usually informal, contacts with units as well as the more formal meetings in the Management Committee. The Deans and Associate Deans of the Faculty of Public Affairs and the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences have both offered support for EURUS when we see needs arising that can be met with the assistance of other units or in their own offices. The existing structure works well to fit our needs, including the cross-listing of courses.</p> <p>We do not envision new hires in EURUS in the short/medium term due to lack of resources. However, we do not agree that there has been an imbalance between the number of courses offered on Russia and the EU. Contract instructors were hired to teach courses that otherwise were taught by full-time faculty on administrative leaves. In our communication with the students, we will be careful to outline which courses are related to a specific sub-region if the titles are not self-explanatory (for example, a course focused</p>	n/a	n/a	n/a	N

	<p>on the war in Ukraine is relevant to both specializations, Russia/Eurasia and Europe/EU).</p>				
<p><b>4. Language instruction</b></p> <p>The study of the Russian language, which is crucial for MA students, and particularly those coming from universities not offering Russian, has been farmed out to a tutor working outside of the university structure. Students indicated to the external reviewers that they would have much preferred a for-credit graduate-level university course, perhaps a course in Russian taught in English for reading knowledge (“Russian for Reading Knowledge”), as offered at other universities. There are other possible configurations for solving this problem, which seems to have persisted since before the previous review. (weakness)</p>	<p><i>Agreed to if additional resources permit.</i></p> <p>We agree with the reviewers that Russian language instruction at Carleton is currently not sufficient to meet the needs of the EURUS MA, even though we recognize the efforts of the School of Linguistics and Language Studies to provide the best possible services within their limited resources. EURUS has taken steps since the last review to mitigate this.</p> <p>In 2021, due to another Summer without opportunities for immersion training in the region, we employed two teaching assistants (through the Kinross Fund and the FPA Dean’s office) to give 1-on-1 or small group intensive training sessions to our graduate students. In light of recent regional events, the tutoring program continues with funds provided by the FPA Dean’s office. Since Fall 2020, we assigned a dedicated RA (a native speaker) attached to EURUS specifically to help with Russian language training.</p> <p>In addition, we prepare a spreadsheet of all existing language programs in Russia/Eurasia and hold a meeting in January for all students who still need to acquire Russian to discuss training possibilities in the region and introduce them to other students who have recently returned from such programs.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Director will initiate discussions with School of Linguistics and Language Studies and the Deans of FPA and FASS about an appropriate cost-sharing model to secure the provision of 4000-level Russian language instruction.</li> <li>- Director will discuss with Dean of FPA continued support of our tutoring program;</li> <li>- Director will continue to pursue external funding opportunities for students to acquire Russian language training in the region. (We are in the process of negotiating several Erasmus+ Mobility agreements with universities from the European Union (Rome III (Italy), Babes-Bolyai (Romania), Latvia, which (if approved) will provide funding to students to travel to these universities for exchanges, research, and language training. All the above universities provide Russian language courses at different levels of instruction.)</li> <li>- Support students in applying for Mitacs funding to travel to the region for language training in parallel to research.</li> </ul>	<p><i>EURUS Director Dean, FPA</i></p>	<p><i>Fall 2023 and ongoing</i></p>	<p><i>N</i></p>

	Offering a graduate-level university course is not feasible as the enrollment will be very small given that students are at different levels of language skills.				
<b>5. Student research travel</b>  Russia’s war on Ukraine has limited opportunities for student travel to these two countries, as well as Russia’s ally, Belarus. Although such trips were not undertaken for language study per se, they also served as an opportunity for students to improve their Russian. EURUS has no control over when such travel will become available again. (weakness)	<i>Agreed to unconditionally</i>	<i>Please see number 2 above.</i>	<i>EURUS</i>	<i>Ongoing</i>	<i>N</i>
<b>6. Determine the optimal size of the undergraduate programs in European and Russian Studies</b>	<i>Agreed to in principle</i>  We agree in principle with this evaluation, but we have had a difficult time determining the optimal size of the undergrad programs. BA numbers remain modest, even when taking into account the associated BGIInS specialization and stream.	- Director will research similar programs across North America and make inquiries about their size  - Director will initiate a discussion with Associate Dean (Students and Enrolment), EURUS BA supervisor and EURUS BA administrator on the optimal size of the program given its regional focus and EURUS resources.	<i>EURUS Director</i>	<i>2024-2025</i>	<i>N</i>
<b>7. Create a more cohesive undergraduate cohort of 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> year students</b>	<i>Agreed to unconditionally</i>  This is a goal that we have worked towards for many years with mixed results. EURUS hosts a wide array of academic events, including lectures, conferences, and workshops. In addition, the Centre for European Studies also hosts events that are of interest to EURUS students. EURUS	- EURUS will organize a “welcome back” event for all students that will include presentations by students who have returned from academic exchanges or by 3rd and 4th year students on language training or university courses. This will	<i>EURUS</i>	<i>Fall 2023 and ongoing</i>	<i>N</i>

	<p>also has been hosting career development nights with presentations by EURUS alumni to help students bridge the gap between university and work life. All these events are organized mainly for our students (undergraduate and graduate). One issue that has been raised in the previous review was the low attendance of BAs at these events. Part of the issue is that EURUS social events have often been oriented towards or dominated by the MA students. BA students have expressed the desire for more events that are BA specific. That being said, our attempts to gather BAs for social events so far have not proven effective. We have had more success in integrating external presentations into the core courses for the BAs.</p>	<p>allow more contact between students in different years of the program.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Director will encourage 3rd and 4th year students to revive the EURUS BA student society.</li> <li>- Director will work with the student society to increase the number of events oriented towards BA students or increase the attendance of BAs at other EURUS events.</li> <li>- The Institute will encourage the undergraduate students to use the EURUS lounge space for study sessions as well as for social gatherings.</li> </ul>			
--	---	---	--	--	--

**SENATE QUALITY ASSURANCE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE**  
**Cyclical Review of the undergraduate and graduate programs**  
**in History**  
**Executive Summary and Final Assessment Report**

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

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The undergraduate and graduate programs in History reside in the Department of History, a unit administered by the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences.

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

The External Reviewers' report offered a very positive assessment of the programs. Within the context of this positive assessment, the report nonetheless made a number of recommendations for the continuing enhancement of the programs. These recommendations were productively addressed by the Chair of the Department of History and the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences in responses to the External Reviewers' report and Implementation on Plan that was submitted to SQAPC on December 14, 2023.

## **FINAL ASSESSMENT REPORT**

### **Introduction**

The undergraduate and graduate programs in History reside in the Department of History, 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 categorized by Carleton University's Senate Quality Assurance and Planning Committee (SQAPC) as being of good quality. (Carleton's IQAP 7.2.13-14).

The site visit, which took place on January 25-27<sup>th</sup>, 2023 was conducted by Dr. Laura Shire from the University of Western and Dr. Susan Roy, from the University of Waterloo. The site visit involved formal meetings with the Provost, the Vice-Provost and Associate Vice-President (Academic), the Associate Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Social Science, the Dean of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs and the Chair of the Department of History. The review committee also met with faculty member, staff, and undergraduate and graduate students.

The External Reviewers' report, May 9, 2023, 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 Implementation Plan

This report draws on five documents:

- The Self-study developed by members of the Department of History (Appendix A)
- The Report of the External Review Committee (Appendix B).
- The response and implementation plan from the Chair of the Department of History (Appendix C)
- The response from the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences (Appendix D).
- The internal discussant's recommendation report (Appendix E).

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

This Final Assessment Report contains the Implementation Plan (Appendix C) developed by the Chair of the Department of History and agreed to by the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences for the implementation of recommendations for program enhancement identified as part of the cyclical program review process.

The Implementation Plan identifies who is responsible for implementing the agreed upon recommendations, as well as the timelines for implementation and reporting.

### **Strengths of the programs**

#### *General*

The External Reviewers' Report states that "the History department is full of outstanding scholars, engaged undergraduate and graduate students, and dedicated and exceptional administrative staff. The Department has been attentive to the needs of its students and the broader community, sensitive to shifting demographics and fields of study, and expansive in its approaches to the study and practice of History."

### *Faculty*

Speaking with regard to faculty, the external reviewers' stated:

"Faculty members are active and accomplished researchers with high rates of success in securing Tri-Council grants and publishing their work in peer-reviewed journals and with university presses. Faculty are also at the leading edge of developing and supporting new forms research dissemination such as digital, public history, and community-engaged histories that reach wider publics, policy makers, and communities in the Ottawa region, Canada, and beyond. Faculty are innovative and inspiring teachers, as reflected by the enthusiasm that both undergraduate and graduate students expressed in our meetings with them. "One of the graduate program's strengths is its dedicated faculty. This is evident through their commitment to graduate supervision at the MA and PhD level, even though participation through supervision or other aspects of graduate training is voluntary and does not count towards teaching credit.

### *Students*

Through consultation with students, the external reviewers' learned a strength of the research-based PhD program is that it prepares students for career paths beyond academia, through its new professional development project or internship, again drawing on its special relationship with Ottawa-based partners.

### *Curriculum*

The external reviewers noted that the curriculum is structured so that students can take courses that enhance their conceptual understandings, build methodological competence and conduct original and independent research. A unique strength is the program's experiential learning and internship initiatives, which allows students to develop professional skills and capacity to apply their historical knowledge and skills beyond academia. The program also supports other forms of professional development, such as workshops for students at all stages of the program and its graduate student-run Underhill Colloquium that attracts students from programs at Carleton and other universities. Another strength are the unique collaborations developed by faculty with archivists, librarians, and other researchers to build oral history collections, curate exhibitions, and "gamify" research skills.

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

The External Reviewers' Report made 12 recommendations for improvement:

1. Tenure-Track/Tenured faculty hire in Public History. The Public History programs are high profile and high impact and need to be maintained with faculty renewal. With the upcoming retirement of the full-time Public Historian, a faculty hire is required to maintain these programs.



2. Full-time administrative hire to support internship placements in Public History, department administration, and LACS program.
3. Improve communications in the graduate program between the graduate chair, graduate administrator, the department, and graduate students. Increase the level and types of communications in the graduate program through updating the Graduate Handbook, committee meetings, and other forms of communication. Consider developing a faculty handbook for the graduate program, to record regulations and priorities, and/or holding annual meetings for graduate faculty and administration.
4. Plans to renovate Paterson Hall should include consulting with faculty and students so that space and accessibility needs are addressed and resolved.
5. Fund PhD students more equitably and/or be more transparent with prospective students about funding shortfalls. Continue advocating for increased funding for graduate students.
6. Improve faculty compensation. Find a way to give credit to those who are doing more graduate supervision and administrative work in the department; or find a way to distribute this workload more evenly.
7. Ensure all university resources (History awards) are utilized for graduate students. If not already in place, hold SSHRC/OGS workshops.
8. Get university level resources involved in recruiting undergraduate majors.
9. Survey the graduate students about their experiences and expectations – were those we spoke with representative?
10. Review Department committees to ensure they are active and effective. Create an awards committee that identifies awards to nominate graduate students, undergraduate students, faculty, and staff.
11. Review collaborative programs to ensure they are working for History and not drawing on limited resources.
12. Consider formal mentoring for new faculty, sessional instructors, contract faculty, post-docs, etc. Consult with recently hired faculty about their experiences and what resources they would have liked in terms of mentoring. Consult with other units at the university to build awareness or develop resources for new faculty. What are the History-specific considerations for mentoring (grant writing, tenure applications, teaching strategies, etc.)?

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

As a consequence of the review, the undergraduate and graduate programs in History were categorized by Carleton University's Senate Quality Assurance and Planning Committee (SQAPC) as being of **GOOD QUALITY** (Carleton's IQAP 7.2.13-14).

### **The Implementation Plan**

The recommendations that were put forward as a result of the review process were productively addressed by the Chair of the Department of History and the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Social Science in responses to the External Reviewers' report and Implementation Plan that was considered by SQAPC on December 14, 2023. The Department agreed unconditionally to recommendations #3, 4, 10, 12 and agreed to recommendations #1, 2, and 5 if resources permit. They also agreed to recommendation #6 and 11 in principle, and did not agree to recommendations #7, 8, and 9.

It is to be noted that Carleton's IQAP provides for the monitoring of implementation plans. A monitoring report is to be submitted by the academic unit(s) and Faculty Dean(s), and forwarded to SQAPC for its review by June 30<sup>th</sup>, 2026.

### **The Next Cyclical Review**

The next cyclical review of the undergraduate and graduate programs in History will be conducted during the 2028-29 academic year.

**History**  
**Unit Response to External Reviewers' Report & Implementation Plan**  
**Programs Being Reviewed: Undergraduate and Graduate**

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

**Introduction & General Comments**

On behalf of the Department of History, the Cyclical Program Review Committee warmly thanks the reviewers for their report. We appreciate the time, engagement, and thought that has gone into its production. We welcome their recognition of the many ways in which our faculty, staff, instructors, and students make an outstanding contribution to the teaching and research missions of the department, the faculty, and the university. We appreciate their recognition and praise of our engaged and innovative teaching, learning, and research, our commitment to collaboration across disciplines and across campus, and our steadily growing efforts to engage with wider communities in Ottawa and beyond. The reviewers also recognized that, across these various areas of priority, the Department of History is very much in step with the major goals of Carleton's Strategic Integrated Plan.

This document contains a response to the External Reviewers' Report and an Implementation Plan (Section B). A separate response from the Latin American and Caribbean Studies program is attached. Departmental colleagues were consulted in its preparation, as was the Office of the Dean of FASS.

There are several points that we would like to emphasize here, in addition to our comments in the plan grid below.

1. Public History Hire. The CPR Committee fully shares the reviewers' sense of urgency regarding the need for a new colleague specializing in Public History. This is the absolute minimum needed to maintain the viability and integrity of our Public History graduate and undergraduate programs. The reviewers made this their chief recommendation in light of the retirement this year of senior Public History colleague, David Dean. It is important to recognize, however, the previous retirement of Professor Bruce Elliot, in 2019, also a key contributor to our Public History program. And since the reviewers' submitted their report, Professor Paul Litt (appointed 50/50 with Canadian Studies) has decided to retire at the end of 2023, for a total loss of 2.5 faculty since 2019. Without renewal in this area, the department will not be able to maintain our graduate and undergraduate Public History programs without significant use of Contract Instructors. Maintaining the current level of graduate supervisions would not be feasible, at a time when Public History students are key to the continued success of our MA program and our recently introduced doctoral program. At the undergraduate level, we would be unable to adequately staff the Public History Concentration in the BA, our major recent initiative to expand experiential learning opportunities to our students. As of January 1, we will have a new Public History colleague, appointed 50% in History and 50% in the Institute for Comparative Studies in Literature, Art, and Culture (ICSLAC). At the time of the position's approval, it was made clear that this was "a net new position, not a replacement for any impending retirements." This appointment is very welcome, but additional support in the form of a full-time position remains essential.

2. We very much appreciated the reviewers' positive assessment of our commitment to developing and sustaining learning outcomes designed to reflect and shape our academic priorities when it comes to teaching and learning. This is an area we have put a lot of work into in the last few years, especially when it comes to assessing whether and how outcomes are being achieved by our students. This work is ongoing, and we take particular note of the reviewers' suggestions with regard to the learning aims and outcomes of our graduate programs.

3. With regard to the recommendation that an administrative position be approved, split 50/50 between History and Latin American and Caribbean Studies (LACS), History strongly agrees that an additional 0.5 administrative position in History is much needed, given the expanding workload expectations in areas such as website maintenance, social media, and recruitment activities; and to assist, as the reviewers emphasize, in the time-consuming work of finding and coordinating internship and practicum placements for our graduate and undergraduate students. History also strongly supports the need for LACS to have significant and consistent administrative support, although not necessarily connected to History. LACS has submitted a separate response to this recommendation (attached).

**UNIT RESPONSE AND IMPLEMENTATION PLAN**

**Programs Being Reviewed: Undergraduate and Graduate programs in History**

**Prepared by (name/position/unit/date): James Miller, Chair, History, July 14, 2023.**

<b>External Reviewer Recommendation &amp; Categorization</b>	<b>Unit Response (choose only one for each recommendation):</b> <b>1- Agreed to unconditionally</b> <b>2- Agreed to if additional resources permit (describe resources)</b> <b>3- Agreed to in principle</b> <b>4- Not agreed to</b> <b>Rationales are required for categories 2, 3 &amp; 4</b>	<b>Action Item</b>	<b>Owner</b>	<b>Timeline</b>	<b>Will the action described require calendar changes? (Y or N)</b>
<b>1. Tenure-Track/Tenured faculty hire in Public History (concern)</b>	2. Resources: senior administration approval for a tenure-track hire in Public History. This is an urgent need. Two Public History colleagues are retiring this academic year, one on June 30, 2024, and the other (a 50/50 joint appointment with the School of Canadian Studies on December 31, 2023. (See additional comments in introductory marks above).	Submit proposal for this hire to the Dean of FASS for consideration and discussion.	Department Chair; Dean of FASS.	Request to be made in fall of 2023.	N
<b>2. Full-time administrative hire to support internship placements in Public History, department administration, and LACS program. (concern)</b>	2. Resources. Senior administration approval for position. History strongly agrees that its administrative staff is overworked and that both History and LACS require additional administrative support. LACS does not agree that these two roles should be combined in one position, for reasons set out in its separate response to the reviewers' report. Given this, History does not support the creation of this combined position, while being in full agreement with the reviewers	Submit request for additional administrative position to Dean of FASS.	Department Chair; Department Administrator; Dean of FASS.	Request to be made as part of budget submission in 2023.	N

	that there is an urgent need for additional administrative support in both units.				
<b>3. Improve communications in the graduate program between the graduate chair, graduate administrator, the department, and graduate students.</b> (weakness/opportunity)	1. Improvements in communications have been made in recent years. As the report acknowledges, complete standardization of such things as timelines for milestones and supervisor-student relationships is not possible, and in some respects probably not desirable. Concerns clearly remain, however, and will be addressed.	Priority for Graduate Committee to discuss and consult with colleagues and students on how communication might be improved, including the reviewers' suggestions such as upgrading the Graduate Handbook and developing a handbook for faculty.	Graduate Supervisor; Department Chair.	Recommendations to be made by end of 2023-24, for implementation in 2024-25.	N
<b>4. Plans to renovate Paterson Hall should include consulting with faculty and students so that space and accessibility needs are addressed and resolved.</b> (weakness/opportunity)	1. A major renovation of Paterson has been 'imminent' for quite some time now. The most recent information we have is that it will begin in 2025, after a period of assessment conducted by a consultant. We agree that it would be important for History to contribute to the consultation process.	The Department Administrator and Chair have already met with colleagues from Facilities Management and Planning (FMP), who advised on how best to engage with the consultation process that will precede the renovation work. Based on their advice, we will consult within the department and prepare a document for submission to FMP, outlining the changes to our space that the Department would like to see incorporated into the renovation plans. The reviewers' suggestions with regard to space (p.11) will be taken into account (and plans are already underway to make existing spaces more accessible to students as meeting and study places).	Department Chair; Department Administrator; Planning Committee.	2023-25.	N

<p><b>5. Fund PhD students more equitably and/or be more transparent with prospective students about funding shortfalls.</b> (weakness/opportunity)</p>	<p>2. We agree with the general sentiments expressed in this recommendation (and expanded upon at p.13 of the report), As the reviewers acknowledge, however, such matters are “not in the control of the Department.”</p>	<p>We will continue to advocate for improved funding, as the reviewers recommend.</p>	<p>Graduate Supervisor; FGPA.</p>		<p>N</p>
<p><b>6. Improve faculty compensation.</b> Find a way to give credit to those who are doing more graduate supervision and administrative work in the department; or find a way to distribute this workload more evenly. (weakness/opportunity)</p>	<p>3. This recommendation would need to be discussed by the department as a whole. ODFASS would also need to be consulted, as any proposed changes to teaching workloads would require its approval. Some years ago, an ODFASS Working Group attempted to address this issue across the Faculty, but nothing came of it, at least nothing in terms of guidelines or recommendations that reached departments.</p>	<p>Following the suggestion of the reviewers, we will appoint a committee and/or hold a retreat to address the issues of a) distributing supervisions more evenly; and b) teaching credit for significant numbers of supervisions.</p>	<p>Department Chair; Planning Committee; Graduate Supervisor; Dean of FASS.</p>	<p>2023-25</p>	<p>N</p>
<p><b>7. Ensure all university resources (History awards) are utilized for graduate students.</b> (opportunity)</p>	<p>4. All available graduate student donor funds are routinely disbursed. This recommendation appears to relate to donor-funded travel bursary funds. These funds accumulated during the pandemic; no disbursements were made in 2020–21. Disbursements have resumed. The Graduate Committee has determined a process of disbursement in the future that ensures that all students, particularly our doctoral students, have equitable access to travel funding throughout their program. This recommendation also included holding SSHRC/OGS workshops if not already offered. They are already offered.</p>				<p>N</p>

<p><b>8. Get university level resources involved in recruiting undergraduate majors.</b> (opportunity)</p>	<p>4. This is not an issue for the department. The university already puts significant resources into undergraduate recruitment. The department does not incur any costs for participating in university-level recruiting events.</p>				<p>N</p>
<p><b>9. Survey the graduate students about their experiences and expectations</b> (opportunity)</p>	<p>4. The rationale for this recommendation, as presented in the report, is to assess whether the concerns expressed by the students the reviewers met are representative of wider opinion. The graduate student representatives on the CPR committee conducted an extensive survey of the graduate students, which was included in the self-study (and which the reviewers refer to elsewhere in their report). As this survey does indeed reinforce the views of the students the reviewers met in person, there is no need to survey the students again so soon. We will, however, survey the students in future after any changes have been implemented. And students will be consulted on how to improve communications (see Recommendation 3).</p>				<p>N</p>
<p><b>10. Review Department committees to ensure they are active and effective.</b> (opportunity)</p>	<p>1.</p>	<p>Planning committee to conduct review of committees to assess and report on their effectiveness, with recommendations for potential organizational reforms.</p>	<p>Department Chair; Planning Committee.</p>	<p>2023-25</p>	<p>N</p>



<p><b>11. Review collaborative programs to ensure they are working for History and not drawing on limited resources.</b> (opportunity)</p>	<p>3. Changes to our BGINS specialization and stream have already been approved by the department, to be included in the 2024-25 calendar. These changes will resolve the resource-related problems this program has posed for the department. In terms of resources for other collaborative programs, History’s participation consists of making available courses that we would be offering anyway, or occasionally providing a faculty member to teach in the program. These commitments are made on the understanding that some contribution on our part to these collaborative programs is reasonable. These contributions do not impinge on the department’s ability to meet its other obligations.</p> <p>One area that would benefit from a Faculty- or University-wide policy, is the recruitment of faculty from larger units to administer or co-ordinate smaller programs. The informal process which seems to prevail— approaching the colleague first and even reaching an agreement—leaves the Chair of the affected department the last to know, and not best placed to say No.</p>	<p>Inform ODFASS of issues of faculty being approached to take up administrative positions with any prior consultation with the Chair of the affected unit. Suggest creation of a more effective process of consultation.</p>	<p>Department Chair.</p>	<p>2023-24</p>	<p>N</p>
<p><b>12. Consider formal mentoring for new faculty, sessional instructors, contract faculty, post-docs, etc.</b> (opportunity)</p>	<p>1. Departmental administrative staff are currently working on improving support for Contract Instructors, including a Contract Instructor handbook. Postdocs who take on teaching duties while here will receive this support too, as will doctoral students hired to teach courses under Article 17 of the Collective Agreement. As noted in the self-</p>	<p>As suggested by the reviewers, we will consult recently hired faculty and with other units as part of establishing best practices and develop resources to support the mentoring of new faculty (with particular attention to “History-specific considerations” when it comes</p>	<p>Department Chair; Department Administrator; Planning Committee.</p>	<p>2023-25</p>	<p>N</p>

	<p>study, the academic mentoring of postdocs is considered the responsibility of the sponsoring colleagues. The department will consider the introduction of a formal process for mentoring new faculty, that is both in step with the requirements of the Collective Agreement and that complements the new-faculty support provided by Faculty Affairs and the Office of the Dean.</p>	<p>to such matters as grant-writing, tenure applications, and teaching strategies.</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--



July 9, 2023

**Response from Latin American and Caribbean Studies**  
to External Assessors' Report  
Cyclical Program Review  
(Department of History)

---

The external assessors' report highlighted the need for administrative support for the Latin American and Caribbean Studies (LACS) program.

Additional administrative support is necessary for this fledgling program to grow.

The external assessors also suggested that LACS share an administrative position that would be shared with the Department of History. The proposal suggests a split of 50% to LACS with the remaining 50% to History.

Although this seems feasible on paper, the practicalities of this would make it *highly ineffective* for LACS.

LACS is an interdisciplinary program. As a result, it is a very different program from History. Both these programs require *different kinds of administrative competencies and knowledge*.

It would be burdensome to the administrator if expected to be effective in both departments.

**Proposed alternative:** LACS proposes a 0.5 position its program, that can be added to the existing administrative complement of a more interdisciplinarity-inclined unit.

Some of the key differences between LACS and History are listed below:

- The administrator of LACS needs to be in touch with the undergraduate and graduate administrators of all affiliated departments for the most minor and major of matters.
- Interdisciplinary administrators also deal with *both undergraduate and graduate matters*. There is no separation as is the case in History.
- LACS is also trying to **grow** this relatively new *interdisciplinary* program. We have completely different conversations and needs from that of the Department of History.
- Interdisciplinary programs such as LACS, do not have access to the same level of information to single discipline departments such as History. This creates another set of challenges in keeping the program running.

Bien cordialement,

Audra A. Diptée  
Coordinator

Latin American and Caribbean Studies