



DATE: May 16, 2023

TO: Senate

FROM: Dr. Dwight Deugo, 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 Program in Engineering Physics

SQAPC approval: May 11, 2023

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 program in Engineering Physics.

Senate Motion March 31, 2023:

THAT Senate approve the Final Assessment Report and Executive Summary arising from the Cyclical Review of the undergraduate program in Engineering Physics.

2. Master of Social Work

SQAPC approval: May 11, 2023

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 Master's programs in Social Work.

Senate Motion March 31, 2023:

THAT Senate approve the Final Assessment Report and Executive Summary arising from the Cyclical Review of the Master's programs in Social Work.

**CARLETON UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON
QUALITY ASSURANCE
Cyclical Review of the undergraduate program
In Engineering Physics
Executive Summary and Final Assessment Report**

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

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The undergraduate program in Engineering Physics resides in the Department of Electronics, a unit administered by the Faculty of Engineering.

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 Electronics and the Dean of the Faculty of Engineering and Design in response to the External Reviewers' report and Implementation Plan that was submitted to SQAPC on May 11, 2023.

FINAL ASSESSMENT REPORT

Introduction

The undergraduate programs in Engineering Physics reside in the Department of Electronics, a unit administered by the Faculty of Engineering and Design. 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 25 - 27, 2022, was conducted by Dr. Glenn H. Chapman from Simon Fraser University and Dr. Rafael Kleiman from McMaster 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 Engineering and Design, and the Chair of the Department of Electronics. The review committee also met with faculty members, staff and undergraduate students.

The External Reviewers' report, submitted on June 08, 2022 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 Engineering Physics (Appendix A).
- The Report of the External Review Committee (Appendix B).
- The response and implementation plan from the Chair of the Department of Electronics (Appendix C).
- The Response from the Dean of the Faculty of Engineering and Design s (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 Electronics and agreed to by the Dean of the Faculty of Engineering and Design for implementing 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' Report states that, "the Engineering Physics program at Carleton University is a joint effort between the Department of Electronics and the Department of Physics. However, the program is an accredited Engineering program wholly administered by the Department of Electronics. The program blends the core offerings of the Electrical Engineering program with a core offering from the Department of Physics. This combination provides the Engineering Physics students with a strong foundational background in Physics and mathematical methods, while maintaining the essential elements, and practical experience, of an Engineering education. There appears to be good synergy and working relationship between the two departments around this program. The Engineering Physics program is a distinct and important linear combination of course elements from the Department of Electronics and the Department of Physics. As such, they successfully leverage the considerable and well-established strengths of both departments in terms of course offerings, faculty, staff, research expertise, and teaching laboratories. The program presents itself as a demanding 'elite' program with high standards that attracts students eager for this challenge. That approach and strategy appears to be successful in attracting a modest cohort (~25 per year) of students who are accepted in a direct entry to the program."

Opportunities for program improvement and enhancement

The External Reviewers' Report made 13 recommendations for improvement:

1. Implement broad-based admissions process to increase diversity of incoming student population. (*opportunity*)
2. Restore an introductory Engineering Physics course back to Level 1, to establish cohesion and community for the students in the program. (*concern*)
3. Streamline and simplify process for transfer from other Engineering programs into Engineering Physics after Level 1. (*opportunity*)
4. Explore possibilities to add more electives to Engineering Physics program within the current unit count, providing more flexibility to students. (*opportunity*)
5. Employ more proactive enrolment management methods to improve overall retention and reduce fluctuations in student numbers. (*concern*)
6. Explore opportunities to mitigate disruption to student programs upon return from co-op, course failures, pandemic disruption, by communicating registration pathways and duplicate offerings of a few key courses. Overall, this would reduce time to completion. (*concern*)
7. Provide clear information about program structure and requirements on the Department website (*opportunity*).
8. Provide support to the students to re-establish an Engineering Physics Society and seek input from them on program improvements. (*opportunity*)
9. Plan a few key informational activities for the students, such as option selection and career/graduate school opportunities. (*opportunity*)
10. Provide more venues for connection between students and faculty through informational

activities and/or research opportunities. (opportunity)

11. Allocate some resources to long term planning for the evolution of the Engineering Physics program, by the leadership team championing the program. (opportunity)

12. Strengthen the faculty connection to the Eng. Physics program both in Electronics and Physics. In Electronics a clear backup person to the current leader is needed. (opportunity)

13. Physics needs a better connection to the Engineering physics students, in addition to just the classes. Participation in the 4th year Eng Physics lab cooperatively with Electronics faculty is one possibility. Ideally, get a Physics faculty member to get a P.Eng status to help with CEAB metrics. (opportunity)

The Outcome of the Review

As a consequence of the review, the undergraduate program in Engineering Physics was 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 Electronics and the Dean of the Faculty of Engineering and Design in response to the External Reviewers' report and Implementation Plan that was considered by SQAPC on May 11, 2023. The Department agreed unconditionally to recommendations #7, 9,10,11, and 12 and agreed in principle to recommendations #1,4,5,6,8 and 13. The department did not agree to recommendations #2 and 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 and Faculty Dean, and forwarded to SQAPC for its review by June 30th, 2024.

The Next Cyclical Review

The cyclical program review (CPR) aligns with the Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board review of the undergraduate engineering programs. The Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board's review typically occurs within 1- 6 years; this time frame falls within the program's next CPR cycle. Based on this approach, the next CPR will be held by 2028/29.

Unit Response to External Reviewers' Report & Implementation Plan
Programs Being Reviewed: Engineering Physics

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 Department of Electronics appreciates the Reviewers' commitment to complete this review and we value their comments. We are committed to the continual improvement of our programs to enhance the student, staff, and faculty experience and will strive to integrate as many of these recommendations as possible into our program. This document contains both a response to the External Reviewers' Report and an Implementation Plan, which have been created in consultation with the Dean of the Faculty of Engineering and Design.

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: Engineering Physics

Prepared by (name/position/unit): Niall Tait, Chair, Department of Electronics

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)
1. Implement broad-based admissions process to increase diversity of incoming student population. (Opportunity)	<i>Agreed to in principle</i> <i>Undergraduate admissions are managed by the Registrar's office.</i>	<i>Contact the RO to explore the process and feasibility of expanded admission requirements incorporating CV or other information.</i>	<i>Niall Tait, Dept. Chair and Tom Smy, program coordinator</i>	<i>Fall 2022</i>	<i>No</i>
2. Restore an introductory Engineering Physics course back to Level 1, to establish cohesion and community for the students in the program. (Concern)	<i>Not agreed</i> <i>A common first year for all Engineering students was established by the Associate Dean's office in fall 2019 and this change would mitigate benefits gained.</i> <i>First year seminar (ECOR 1055) might serve a similar purpose</i>	<i>Review ECOR 1055 delivery for Engineering Physics section and update as appropriate.</i>	<i>Niall Tait, Dept. Chair and Tom Smy, program coordinator</i>	<i>ECOR 1055 fall 2023</i>	<i>No</i>
3. Streamline and simplify process for transfer from other Engineering programs into Engineering Physics after Level 1. (Opportunity)	<i>Not agreed</i> <i>There is a process in place which is simplified by the common first-year program (see recommendation 2).</i>	<i>Improve documentation of the process for transfer into EP.</i>	<i>Niall Tait, Dept. Chair and Tom Smy, program coordinator.</i>	<i>Fall 2022</i>	<i>No</i>
4. Explore possibilities to add more electives to Engineering Physics program, within the current unit count, providing more flexibility to students. (Opportunity)	<i>Agreed to in principle</i>	<i>Review program requirements to identify required courses that could be removed. Program content is constrained by CEAB accreditation requirements.</i>	<i>Department curriculum committee</i>	<i>Fall 2023 calendar change submission (for fall 2024 calendar)</i>	<i>Yes, possibly</i>

<p>5. Employ more proactive enrolment management methods to improve overall retention and reduce fluctuations in student numbers. (Concern)</p>	<p><i>Agreed to in principle</i></p>	<p><i>A first step may be to try and increase engagement with the group through an EP-specific town-hall meeting. The unit will engage with TLS to explore pedagogical possibilities for improving student retention and graduation</i></p>	<p><i>Niall Tait, Dept. Chair and Tom Smy, program coordinator</i></p>	<p><i>Winter 2023</i></p>	<p><i>No</i></p>
<p>6. Explore opportunities to mitigate disruption to student programs upon return from co-op, course failures, pandemic disruption, by communicating registration pathways and duplicate offerings of a few key courses. Overall, this would reduce time to completion. (Concern)</p>	<p><i>Agreed to in principle</i></p>	<p><i>It is not possible to support every off-pattern pathway. Key courses in 1st and 2nd year are offered multiple times each year, including summer session, to support off-pattern students. Key 3rd year courses are offered multiple times each year to support co-op students. We can consult with TLS on how to foster the successful return of coop students into courses</i></p>	<p><i>Barry Syrett, Assoc. Chair UG.</i></p>	<p><i>Fall 2022</i></p>	<p><i>No</i></p>
<p>7. Provide clear information about program structure and requirements on the Department website (Opportunity)</p>	<p><i>Agreed to unconditionally</i></p>	<p><i>Students should be aware that program requirements are provided in the calendar and planning support is provided through Engineering Undergraduate Academic Support Office. This can be linked through the Department web page.</i></p>	<p><i>Niall Tait, Dept. Chair</i></p>	<p><i>Fall 2022</i></p>	<p><i>No</i></p>
<p>8. Provide support to the students to re-establish an Engineering Physics Society and seek input from them on program improvements. (Opportunity)</p>	<p><i>Agreed to in principle</i></p>	<p><i>EP students can be encouraged to resurrect their society but the action is primarily up to the students. Carleton and FED have extensive support for student run clubs and extracurricular activities.</i></p>	<p><i>Niall Tait, Dept. Chair</i></p>	<p><i>Fall 2022</i></p>	<p><i>No</i></p>
<p>9. Plan a few key informational activities for the students, such as option selection and career/graduate school opportunities. (Opportunity)</p>	<p><i>Agreed to unconditionally</i></p>	<p><i>Offer information sessions specifically for the EP class. Information sessions are offered several times during the academic year for the general population of Department of Electronics students.</i></p>	<p><i>Tom Smy, program coordinator</i></p>	<p><i>Winter 2023</i></p>	<p><i>No</i></p>

<p>10. Provide more venues for connection between students and faculty through informational activities and/or research opportunities (Opportunity)</p>	<p><i>Agreed to unconditionally</i></p>	<p><i>Target promotion of research opportunities to EP class. There are already general announcements for summer and ongoing research opportunities such as USRA, Student as Partners Program, and iCureus.</i></p>	<p><i>Niall Tait, Dept. Chair</i></p>	<p><i>Winter 2023</i></p>	<p><i>No</i></p>
<p>11. Allocate some resources to long term planning for the evolution of the Engineering Physics program, by the leadership team championing the program. (Opportunity)</p>	<p><i>Agreed to unconditionally</i></p>	<p><i>Establish EP curriculum sub-committee to review curriculum development.</i></p>	<p><i>Dept. Curriculum Committee</i></p>	<p><i>Fall 2022</i></p>	<p><i>No</i></p>
<p>12. Strengthen the faculty connection to the Engineering Physics program both in electronics and physics. In Electronics, a clear backup person to the current leader is needed (Opportunity).</p>	<p><i>Agreed to unconditionally</i></p>	<p><i>Establish EP curriculum sub-committee to engage faculty with program content. Prof. Steven McGarry is very familiar with this program and acts as a backup to Prof. Tom Smy. There are several additional faculty members at various career stages who are engaged with the program.</i></p>	<p><i>Dept. Curriculum Committee</i></p>	<p><i>Fall 2022</i></p>	<p><i>No</i></p>
<p>13. Physics needs a better connection to the Engineering physics students, in addition to just the classes. Participation in the 4th year Eng Physics lab cooperatively with Electronics faculty is one possibility. Ideally get a Physics faculty member to get a P.Eng status to help with CEAB metrics. (Opportunity)</p>	<p><i>Agreed to in principle</i></p>	<p><i>Encourage project co-supervision (with P.Eng.) by Physics faculty. As mentioned in the report, there is little incentive for Physics faculty to go through the licensing process.</i></p>	<p><i>Tom Smy, program coordinator</i></p>	<p><i>Fall 2023 projects</i></p>	<p><i>No</i></p>

**CARLETON UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON
QUALITY ASSURANCE
Cyclical Review of the Master of Social Work
Executive Summary and Final Assessment Report**

This Executive Summary and Final Assessment Report of the cyclical review of Carleton's Master of Social Work are provided pursuant to the provincial Quality Assurance Framework and Carleton's Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Master of Social Work resides in the School of Social Work, 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 School of Social Work, and the Dean of the Faculty of Public Affairs in response to the External Reviewers' report and Implementation Plan that was submitted to SQAPC on May 11, 2023.

FINAL ASSESSMENT REPORT

Introduction

The Master of Social Work resides in the School of Social Work, 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 October 18 -20, 2022, was conducted by Dr. Judith Hughes from the University of Manitoba and Dr. Raven Sinclair from the University of Regina. The site visit involved formal meetings with the Provost, the Vice-Provost and Associate Vice-President (Academic), the Dean of the Faculty of Public Affairs, the Dean of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs, and the Director of the School of Social Work. The review committee also met with faculty members, staff, and graduate students.

The External Reviewers' report, submitted on November 14, 2022, 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 School of Social Work (Appendix A)
- The Report of the External Review Committee (Appendix B).
- The response and implementation plan from the Director of the School of Social Work (Appendix C)
- The Response from the Dean of the Faculty of Public Affairs and the Dean of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs (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 Director of the School of Social Work Studies 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 Master of Social Work Program operates within the Carleton School of Social Work which is housed within the multi-disciplinary Department of Public Affairs. The School of Social Work program is consistent with the university mission and strategic plan and we suspect that the SSW is a leading academic unit in that regard. Their innovative and creative responses to budget constraints, the pandemic, and TRC/EDI calls for action are noteworthy."

Faculty

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

"The school enjoys a strong complement of faculty with diverse specialties and expertise, complemented by a strong collective of contractual lecturers. The quality of supervision is evident, as are mentoring for faculty and students. No concerns were identified beyond the stated desire to limit contract instructors. This, of course, relates to replacing retiree positions and funding for new positions."

Students

The external reviewers noted that "students have access to an array of printed and online manuals and materials to support their education at Carleton. The online practicum manual is an exemplar and the school has access to the Office of Community Engagement – another exemplar – which supports students and community connections. The students stated that there were many opportunities to be involved in school governance and they expressed a generally high level of satisfaction with the program in terms of quality and preparation for practice, with two exceptions. In recent years, the school responded to concerns brought forward by both the social work community and other community agencies as well as students in updating their curriculum. The revised curriculum was described as offering more choice for students and as a balance of meeting the needs of students and community with faculty interests. However, in our meeting with students, there was a clear message that they do not feel that they are prepared for practice in the areas of policy and clinical social work."

Curriculum

The external reviewers noted that “the MSW curriculum reflects the current state of the discipline and shows innovation and responsiveness to changing landscapes. These are evident in the accreditation self-study. The unit is working on integrating the updated CASWE core learning objectives and diversity requirements and they have a curriculum specialist to guide adaptations. We appreciated the commitment to keep course enrollment low to ensure the quality and training provided to masters- level students. The Accreditation report outlines the array of delivery modes and their manuals and policies clearly outline learning outcomes and essential requirements.”

Opportunities for program improvement and enhancement

The External Reviewers’ Report made 13 recommendations for improvement:

1. Current class sizes be maintained. Allow the school to replace retiring faculty members – enrollments in social work have not declined. (concern)
2. Reconsider the contract hiring policy that sets minimum enrollment numbers for courses for the SSW. Faculties and schools of Social Work have a specific curriculum that must be taught to meet the CASWE accreditation standards and, especially the core learning objectives for the MSW curriculum. The possibility of cancelled courses or increases in class sizes place the quality of training provided to social work students and program accreditation at risk. (concern)
3. Departmental allocation of funds to units based on enrolment be proportionally applied rather than shared equally among units. The SSW is a smaller school that is hit harder by reductions than larger units where reductions are more easily absorbed. (concern)
4. Additional staff be hired in key positions to alleviate the untenable workload burden on existing staff. This particular concern is reaching a critical juncture and must be addressed forthwith. (concern)
5. The need for the intensive week be reconsidered and an alternative be sought that meets the needs of the revised curriculum and reduces the stress of that component for students. (concern)
6. Policy courses be adapted to include a high level of preparation for policy placements – eg. writing briefs and how to advocate for positive or anti-oppressive changes in government settings. (concern)
7. The requirement of French language or bilingual placements be communicated to students and language learning resources be compiled for students. This will meet the francophone criteria of the CASWE core learning objectives. (concern)

8. The school revise their paid practicum placement policy to allow for students to readily access federal and other placements where pay is mandated or offered. (concern)
9. Clinical courses be examined for overlap and duplication of content, and courses be revised to ensure broad and thorough coverage of clinical theory and skills. (concern)
10. Restore extra funding for a limited-term position that will allow the field practicum office to liaise effectively with community organizations and provide quality placement for students. (concern)
11. Provide financial resources to reinstate the Practicum Fair. (concern)
12. The school explain whether options exist for research course sequencing changes. (concern)
13. Carleton make concerted efforts to recruit Indigenous and Black and other diversity group faculty and students. The school may wish to examine why Indigenous students are not moving from the BSW to the MSW. It may be that Indigenous specialization MSW programs are drawing students to other provinces. (concern)

The Outcome of the Review

As a consequence of the review, the Master of Social Work was 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 School of Social Work, the Dean of the Faculty of Public Affairs, and the Dean of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies in a response to the External Reviewers' report and Implementation Plan that was considered by SQAPC on May 11, 2023. The Department agreed unconditionally to recommendations #3, 6,7,9 and 13 and agreed to recommendations #1,2,4 and 10 if resources permit. They also agreed to recommendations #5,8, and 11 in principle. The unit did not agree with recommendation 12.

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 and Faculty Dean, and forwarded to SQAPC for its review by June 30th, 2026.

The Next Cyclical Review

The next cyclical review of the Master of Social Work will be conducted during the 2028-29 academic year.

Master of Social Work
Unit Response to External Reviewers' Report & Implementation Plan
Programs Being Reviewed: MSW

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

Introduction & General Comments

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: Master of Social Work

Prepared by (name/position/unit/date): Dr. Sarah Todd and Dr. Susan Braedley

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>Recommendation 1: Current class sizes be maintained. Allow the school to replace retiring faculty members – enrollments in social work have not declined. (concern)</p>	<p>2 - Agreed to if additional resources permit</p> <p>The School has been supported in maintaining current class sizes to date. The School has also been successful in receiving replacement positions to date so that class sizes remain stable for the foreseeable future.</p>	<p>Ongoing discussions with ODFPA</p>	<p>Director/Dean</p>	<p>ongoing</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>Recommendation 2: Reconsider the contract hiring policy that sets minimum enrollment numbers for courses for the SSW. Faculties and schools of Social Work have a specific curriculum that must be taught to meet the CASWE accreditation standards and, especially the core learning objectives for the MSW curriculum. The possibility of cancelled courses or increases in class sizes place the quality of training provided to social work students and program accreditation at risk. (concern)</p>	<p>2 - Agreed to if additional resources permit</p> <p>The policy to cancel classes that have low enrolment is due to resource constraints. When an essential or required course has low enrolments, ODFPA has always been open to discussions regarding the implications of cancellation. In addition, ODFPA supports all the field seminars operating below the cut off numbers. Given resource constraints the School also cross lists courses between programs etc., to boost enrolment and ensure the continuation of the curriculum.</p>	<p>Ongoing discussions with ODFPA</p>	<p>Director/Dean</p>	<p>ongoing</p>	<p>N</p>

<p>Recommendation 3: Departmental allocation of funds to units based on enrolment be proportionally applied rather than shared equally among units. The SSW is a smaller school that is hit harder by reductions than larger units where reductions are more easily absorbed. (concern)</p>	<p>1 - Agreed to unconditionally</p> <p>This is already a consideration in negotiations, and we are confident it will continue to be so.</p>	<p>Ongoing discussions with ODFPA</p>	<p>Director/Dean</p>	<p>ongoing</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>Recommendation 4: Additional staff be hired in key positions to alleviate the untenable workload burden on existing staff. This particular concern is reaching a critical juncture and must be addressed forthwith. (concern)</p>	<p>2 - Agreed to if additional resources permit</p> <p>This recommendation pertains to administrative positions. There has been significant turnover and change among administrative staff, due to retirements and leaves, with some positions empty for short periods. This has made many demands on the team, in losing the expertise of long-time team members, in continually orienting new staff, in adjusting to constant staff change, and in continually covering for empty positions. At the time of writing all positions are filled, but more change is ahead.</p> <p>This recommendation also pertains to additional stress for Black, racialized, and Indigenous faculty due to recruitment of more students from these communities and the mentoring associated with this positive result. The School has addressed this by redistributing service work, so that Black, racialized, and Indigenous faculty who are doing mentorship and leadership on issues pertaining to racism and decolonization have room in their service schedule to do it. For example, when an Indigenous professor took over graduate program supervision, the tasks of MSW CPR and Accreditation that normally would be conducted by the person in this role were assigned to another faculty member, to allow service time for their important leadership on Indigenous issues. Further, by leading specific activities and</p>	<p>Continue to monitor administrative team workloads and revise job descriptions when required.</p> <p>Work efficiently to fill positions when they become vacant.</p>	<p>Director Departmental Administrator</p>	<p>ongoing</p>	<p>N</p>

	<p>committees on these issues, leadership on Indigenous and Black issues is made more visible and valued as service. That said, these service allocations are a conversation and relationship. It is not assumed that all Black, Indigenous, and racialized faculty want, or have the skills, to do this mentorship and leadership.</p>				
<p>Recommendation 5: The need for the intensive week be reconsidered and an alternative be sought that meets the needs of the revised curriculum and reduces the stress of that component for students. (concern)</p>	<p>4 - Agreed to in principle (with alternative suggestions to reduce student stress)</p> <p>We agree that student stress can be reduced in the fall semester of the Foundation Year of our MSW program. However, the Intensives have had important positive impact, creating a tangible sense of community for students, as well as alleviating the stress of having another course each week in this semester. We have committed to a process to review the learning outcomes across courses in this semester to look for redundancies and to explore the possibility of reductions in the number and intensity of assignments, which is high. A committee of faculty and students from the MSW Foundation year program will conduct a thorough learning outcome and assignment review and make recommendations to the Graduate Program Committee to reduce stress related to course intensity across the Foundation Year first semester.</p>	<p>Review the learning outcomes across Fall semester MSW Foundation year courses to remove redundancies and explore the possibility of reductions in the number and intensity of assignments.</p>	<p>Graduate Program Supervisor</p>	<p>Completed by June, 2023</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>Recommendation 6: Policy courses be adapted to include a high level of preparation for policy placements – eg. writing briefs and how to advocate for positive or anti-oppressive changes in government settings. (concern)</p>	<p>1 - Agreed to unconditionally</p> <p>We agree that the policy courses in the MSW need to adapt to the requirements for policy placements. That said, MSW students come to the program with a wide variety of backgrounds in policy, including no policy background. The Foundations level course is designed to provide a solid skill foundation. The Advanced Policy course can and should achieve this outcome for students in the</p>	<p>Review MSW policy course syllabi and make necessary adjustments to ensure learning opportunities offer sufficient preparation for policy placements.</p>	<p>Graduate Program Committee/ Supervisor</p>	<p>Completed by September, 2025</p>	<p>N</p>

	Advanced Year. We will review MSW policy course syllabi to ascertain if and how improvements to preparation for the Advanced Year Practicum can be made for students who are pursuing policy placements, and the policy practice team will design adjustments in course syllabi to ensure learning opportunities offer this preparation with support from the Graduate Program Supervisor.				
Recommendation 7: The requirement of French language or bilingual placements be communicated to students and language learning resources be compiled for students. This will meet the francophone criteria of the CASWE core learning objectives. (concern)	1 – Agreed to unconditionally We agree with this requirement. Requirements for French language in some placements is clearly outlined in the field placement materials and communications from the field team but is not outlined in our MSW recruitment materials. It will be added. Learning resources for French language training are available through the French department at Carleton, but for students with few existing French language skills, it will not be possible to do enough training to qualify for bilingual positions. Students will be made aware in advance, and this will be added to our recruitment materials on line and in person.	Revise MSW recruitment materials.	Graduate Program Supervisor	Completed by April, 2023	N
Recommendation 8: The school revise their paid practicum placement policy to allow for students to readily access federal and other placements where pay is mandated or offered. (concern)	4 – Agreed in principle This recommendation is based on incorrect information. There is no policy to prevent students from accessing paid placements, and indeed, we have students in paid practicums quite regularly. The majority of placements are unpaid, however, due to the funding constraints within health care and social services in Ontario.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N

<p>Recommendation 9: Clinical courses be examined for overlap and duplication of content, and courses be revised to ensure broad and thorough coverage of clinical theory and skills. (concern)</p>	<p>1 - Agreed to unconditionally</p> <p>We agree that there is duplication among the clinical courses. Some of this duplication is necessary, because students in the Advanced Year come from Carleton programs and a wide variety of other programs, with often significantly different skills in clinical work. To achieve a base line of skills necessary for professional practice, students inevitably relearn some of what they have learned in the past. That said, reviewing the clinical curriculum, which has been in development over the past five years, is due.</p>	<p>Review the clinical course syllabi to assess how learning outcomes are scaffolded and how skills are introduced, consolidated, and assessed. Identify areas for improvement to enhance the depth, breadth, and coverage of clinical training.</p>	<p>Graduate Program Committee/ Supervisor</p>	<p>Completed by September, 2024</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>Recommendation 10: Restore extra funding for a limited term position that will allow the field practicum office to liaise effectively with community organizations and provide quality placement for students. (concern)</p>	<p>2 - Agreed to if additional resources are made available.</p> <p>The extra funding for this position was a Covid-19 initiative due to historically unprecedented pandemic-related shifts and contractions in the availability of field education opportunities for our students. While these conditions have eased, field conditions have not returned to their pre-pandemic conditions, nor are they anticipated to do so. With more programs initiating co-operative and practice learning, there is intense competition for field education placements and supervision. In health and social services, labour shortages and burnout have meant more organizations have reduced capacity to offer training opportunities. An additional position allows the field team to be more agile and aggressive in pursuing field opportunities and maintain strong relationships with key field partners.</p>	<p>Ongoing discussions between director and ODFPA</p>	<p>Director/Dean</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>N</p>

<p>Recommendation 11: Provide financial resources to reinstate the Practicum Fair. (concern)</p>	<p>4 – Agreed in principle</p> <p>These resources were not removed, so there is no need to reinstate them. The Agency Fair, which was suspended due to Covid-19 concerns and additional workload, will be reinstated as soon as field faculty can organize it.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Recommendation 12: The school explain whether options exist for research course sequencing changes. (concern)</p>	<p>4 - Not agreed to</p> <p>The research course is offered in the fall semester of the Advanced Year, which is the first semester for 1 year MSW students and the 3rd semester for the 2 year MSWs.</p> <p>Students are able to take other research courses across the university concurrent with this course and if pursuing the thesis option, are encouraged to do so. They also have the option of replacing their MSW course with the School’s doctoral level research and methods course offered in the same semester, which explicitly teaches how to prepare a thesis proposal.</p> <p>There are no options for research course sequencing that allows students from the first Foundation year of the 2-year program to take their research course in their first year. This is because:</p> <p>A) The fall semester is composed of 4 required courses that must be taken before entering the full-time field practicum in the Winter semester. Students do take one course concurrent with their practicum, that is offered outside of their practicum hours. Only one course is offered, it is a required course, and it is not a research course. Priority is given to those courses that directly prepare students for their field work as students are often working with vulnerable populations and</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>

	<p>must be adequately prepared to do so in accordance to professional standards and ethics.</p> <p>b) 2 year and 1 year program participants – all who are eligible for the thesis option – take their research credit together in Fall. The pedagogical scaffolding logic is that students have at least a grounding in social work practice and a basis from which to build research thinking after completing a practicum.</p> <p>Our students are aware that if they choose the thesis option, they may need an extra semester of registration to complete their programs. However, MSW students do complete within the 1-year time frame. Factors involved in cases where they have enrolled for an additional semester include, for example, students’ need for full time paid work, qualitative community-based projects that sometimes involve additional ethics review or extended time to develop trust and connection with community members.</p> <p>Due to the reality that the thesis can, and is regularly, completed during the 1-year time frame, it is listed as such in the calendar. However, we provide a detailed articulation of the timeline on our website so students are able to pace themselves and assess where they are in the process in relation to the overall project timeline https://carleton.ca/socialwork/wp-content/uploads/MSW-Thesis-Timeline.pdf</p>				
--	---	--	--	--	--

<p>Recommendation 13: Carleton make concerted efforts to recruit Indigenous and Black and other diversity group faculty and students. The school may wish to examine why Indigenous students are not moving from the BSW to the MSW. It may be that Indigenous specialization MSW programs are drawing students to other provinces. (concern)</p>	<p>1 - Agreed to unconditionally</p> <p>The School continues to build on its efforts to recruit and retain Black and Indigenous students to the MSW. Using recruitment funds from the Dean's office, we have hired an MSW student with a background in communications to work with the Graduate Program Supervisor on targeted recruitment and reversion initiatives, with support from faculty. This is the second iteration of these initiatives that proved helpful in 2020, as our data collection included in our report shows.</p>	<p>Continue ongoing efforts to enhance recruitment and retention of Black and Indigenous students to the MSW.</p>	<p>Graduate Program Supervisor</p>	<p>February 2023 and ongoing</p>	<p>N</p>
--	---	---	------------------------------------	----------------------------------	----------

*Please note that there were two *recommendation 4* in the body of the External Reviewers' Report. The second recommendation 4 (from page 7 of the External Reviewer's report) was added to the implementation plan chart as recommendation #13