

DATE: April 25, 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. PHD Program in Canadian Studies

SQAPC approval: April 11, 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 PHD program in Canadian Studies.

Senate Motion May 3, 2024:

THAT Senate approve the Final Assessment Report and Executive Summary arising from the Cyclical Review of the PHD program in Canadian Studies.

2. Graduate Programs in Political Economy

SQAPC approval: April 25, 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 graduate programs in Political Economy.

Senate Motion May 3, 2024:

THAT Senate approve the Final Assessment Report and Executive Summary arising from the Cyclical Review of the graduate programs in Political Economy.

SENATE QUALITY ASSURANCE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE
Cyclical Review of the graduate programs
in Canadian Studies
Executive Summary and Final Assessment Report

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

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Ph.D. program in Canadian Studies reside in the School of Canadian Studies, 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 Director of the School of Canadian Studies 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 April 11th, 2024.

FINAL ASSESSMENT REPORT

Introduction

The Ph.D. program in Canadian Studies reside in the School of Canadian Studies, a unit administered by the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences. This review was conducted pursuant to the Quality Assurance Framework and Carleton's Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP). As a consequence of the review, the programs were 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 November 28-30th, 2022, was conducted by Dr. Andrea Beverley, Mount Allison University, and Dr. Gabrielle Slowey, York University. The site visit involved formal meetings with the Provost of both Trent University and Carleton University, the Vice-Provost and Associate Vice-President (Academic) at Carleton University, the Dean of Graduate Studies and the Dean of Humanities and Social Sciences-Trent University, PhD Director of Canadian Studies-Trent University, Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, the Dean of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs and the Director of the School of Canadian Studies at Carleton University. The review committee also met with faculty members, staff, and graduate students from Trent University and Carleton University.

The External Reviewers' report, submitted on February 17, 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 School of Canadian Studies and the Frost Centre for Canadian Studies (Appendix A)
- The Report of the External Review Committee (Appendix B).
- The response and implementation plan from the Director of the School of Canadian Studies (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 Director of the School of Canadian 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 administrative and coordination support offered to both students and faculty sounds extraordinary. They work on finances, timetable, events, student paperwork, student finances, TA assignments, etc. Overall, it seems like there is good communication between the faculty (grad supervisors, director) and the administrative staff" (p.14).

Curriculum

The external reviewers noted that the [p]rogram is structured in a way that is consistent with many Humanities PhD programs across the country. It clear that there are faculty members who are working to improve the curriculum and structure of the program – as seen, for instance, in the recent revision to the comps process at Carleton, and in SICS' revised PhD guidelines. This is currently the only PhD program in Canadian Studies in Canada, which makes it very unique and its continuation as a program (programs) is hence critical. The potential for deep and generative interdisciplinarity is also a huge strength" (p. 5).

Opportunities for program improvement and enhancement

The External Reviewers' Report made 7 recommendations for improvement (Trent specific recommendations have been left off):

1. Terminate the Joint Program

It is the recommendation of the external reviewers that the joint program that exists between Trent University and Carleton University be dissolved and severed as soon as practical, or immediately. That is, the reviewers recommend that the current structure be terminated and that each institution be encouraged to explore ways it can potentially offer a stand-alone, quality PhD program independent of one another. The reviewers recognize that each institution will need to figure out the smoothest path forward to dissolving the jointness of the program and transitioning to independent programs. The reviewers recommend that leaders and administrators at both universities offer ample support for this process.

1.1 In relation to the potential development of a PhD in Indigenous Studies at Carleton, and more generally in relation to the future relationship between Indigenous Studies and Canadian Studies at Carleton, the reviewers recommend that there be careful consideration of the processes through which such decisions will be made, and that assumptions about the outcomes be intentionally put aside as all relevant parties work through those processes. Although there have been some recent hires, it is important to note that the Indigenous faculty are overly engaged in the process of decolonizing the

university. Therefore, it is recommended that more resources, supports and additional hires be provided to the unit to assist it to achieve the innovative programming the University seems to want to see in place.

3. Determine how to offer more graduate student training related to critical pedagogy, research methodologies, and career skills. Consider introducing new methods and critical pedagogy courses. Consider ways to promote university-wide trainings to graduate students.

3.1: Review the Comps process (Trent) and assess if recent changes to the comps process are having the desired effects (Carleton).

4. Revise and align the way that the programs' strengths are articulated across websites, learning outcomes, program priorities, and areas of study.

5. As the program separate, evolve and transform, the capacity of both institutions to admit doctoral candidates going forward will be tied to the redesign of the respective programs. Therefore, Admission number need to be re-evaluated in the future.

6. Increase the number of dedicated faculty to the Canadian Studies programs and increase the diversity of faculty and perspectives/areas of research/expertise.

7. Explore new/local resource opportunities for graduate students/programs.

7.1 Clarify supervisor roles/faculty

7.2 Monitor graduate levels of funding and expose funding opportunities

7.3 Reconsider and review the physical space and location of the program.

8.1 Recognize the essential role played program support staff.

The Outcome of the Review

As a consequence of the review, the Ph.D. programs in Canadian Studies 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 Canadian Studies and the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences in a response to the External Reviewers' report and Implementation Plan that was considered by SQAPC on April 11th, 2024. The Department agreed unconditionally to recommendations #5, 7, 7.2, and 8.1 and agreed to recommendations #4 and 6 if resources permit. They also agreed to recommendations #3, 3.1 and 7.1 in principle.

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 30th, 2025.

The Next Cyclical Review

The next cyclical review of the Ph.D. program in Canadian Studies will be conducted during the 2028-29 academic year.

Joint program in Canadian Studies
Unit Response to External Reviewers' Report & Implementation Plan
Programs Being Reviewed: PHD Program

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.

[Sample Text: The Department/School/Institute was pleased to receive the Reviewers' very positive External Reviewers' report on [date]. This report was shared with our faculty and staff, and we are committed to the continual improvement of our programs to enhance the student, staff, and faculty experience. This document contains both a response to the External Reviewers' Report and an Implementation Plan (Section B) which have been created in consultation with the Dean(s).

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: David Carment Prepared by (name/position/unit/date): March 21, 2024					
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)
3.0: DETERMINE HOW TO OFFER MORE GRADUATE STUDENT TRAINING RELATED TO CRITICAL PEDAGOGY, RESEARCH METHODOLOGIES, AND CAREER SKILLS. CONSIDER INTRODUCING NEW METHODS AND CRITICAL PEDAGOGY COURSES. CONSIDER WAYS TO PROMOTE UNIVERSITY-WIDE TRAININGS TO GRADUATE STUDENTS.	Agreed to in Principle With respect to training in research methods, the PhD Core Seminar CDNS6900, "Interdisciplinarity in Canadian Studies: Concepts, Theories and Methods," is our 1.0 credit required course that provides training in methods and theory. Students discuss and evaluate research methods and their combinations in assigned readings that model different kinds of interdisciplinary research designs. They practice interdisciplinary methodology in course assignments. Whereas the core course provides methodological breadth, the preparation for the second comprehensive exam is designed, in part, to develop the methodological expertise necessary to pursue the dissertation project. The dissertation proposal is the written component of the second comprehensive exam so a portion of the readings on that list	We will continue to discuss TA responsibilities in the Fall orientation with the Graduate Supervisor and encourage students to attend TLS and FGPA workshops. The School's Director and the Graduate Supervisor will continue to hold workshops on drafting grant applications, conference papers and the peer review process including Journal and Book manuscript proposals. We will modify the calendar language for CDNS6900, as per below. CDNS 6900 [1.0 credit] Ph.D. Core Seminar: Interdisciplinarity in Canadian Studies: Concepts, Theories and Methods Available only to Ph.D. students in Canadian Studies. An examination of the complex theoretical and methodological issues in associated with the discourse on an-interdisciplinary study of Canada.	School Director/Graduate Supervisor	2023-2024 Curriculum change will be made in 2024-25.	Y

	<p>concern methodology. Because we have relatively small PhD cohorts, the matter of ensuring that PhD students develop methodological expertise also occurs through consultation with the Graduate Supervisor on course selection at the outset of the program. Students are permitted to take 0.5 credits outside of CDNS. PhD students in the collaborative specialization in Political Economy take not only our CDNS6900, but also the 0.5 PECO6000 “Political Economy: Core Concepts.”</p>	<p>Consideration of models of interdisciplinary research on Canada and practice with research project design. Offered at Carleton and Trent through a combination of joint sessions at both universities and regular electronic communication.</p> <p>Prerequisite(s): enrolment in the Canadian Studies Ph.D. program.</p>			
3.1: ASSESS IF RECENT CHANGES TO THE COMPS PROCESS ARE HAVING THE DESIRED EFFECTS (CARLETON).	Agreed to in Principle	<p>The Carleton part of this recommendation refers to the fact that in the summer of 2022 we made some changes to our two comps. The main changes were to the second comp, the written portion of which is now the dissertation proposal. Students are supposed to be doing this comp in March of year 2. We will examine how many have accomplished this and whether the fusion of the proposal and the second comp is speeding up progress. We will look at the last 6-7 years and see how far into their program our PhD students have been when they submit their dissertation proposals then compare that to data from the past year.</p>	Graduate Committee	2023-2024	N
4.0: REVISE AND ALIGN THE WAY THAT THE PROGRAMS' STRENGTHS ARE ARTICULATED ACROSS WEBSITES, LEARNING OUTCOMES, PROGRAM PRIORITIES, AND AREAS OF STUDY.	Agreed to if Resources Permit	<p>In Fall 2023, we revised the bullet points describing our “unique interdisciplinary space” on the graduate portion of our website to line up with the new situation in which we are no longer paired with Indigenous Studies, and indicates our faculty members’ strengths. In the context</p>	School Director/ Graduate Committee/ School Administrator	2023-24	N

		<p>of a hiring freeze, we working on expanding the 0/100 cross-appointments of faculty members from around the university: those with expertise on Canada whose research helps us support the areas of study listed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the discourses, institutions and practices that construct “Canada”; the history and present of settler colonialism; regional studies • the politics of language, identity, race, and nation in Canada and Quebec; diasporic worlds within and beyond the settler nation-state; local and global scales and strategies of decolonization; Canada in the world and nation branding • cultural and spatial heritages; sustainable heritage conservation; cultural heritage and climate change; public memory and history, alternative archives and emotional geographies <p>As to learning outcomes, in Winter 2024 the Graduate Committee is meeting to discuss revisions to be presented to the School for approval. The two goals are a) to revise according to the new context of separation from Indigenous Studies and b) to better articulate outcomes specific to expertise on Canada, which our graduates go on to use in careers in mainly in research and policy, or academia.</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

<p>5.0. AS THE PROGRAMS SEPARATE, EVOLVE AND TRANSFORM, THE CAPACITY OF BOTH INSTITUTIONS TO ADMIT DOCTORAL CANDIDATES GOING FORWARD WILL BE TIED TO THE REDESIGN OF THE RESPECTIVE PROGRAMS. THEREFORE, ADMISSIONS NUMBERS WILL NEED TO BE RE-EVALUATED IN THE FUTURE.</p>	<p>Agreed to Unconditionally</p>	<p>We will monitor admissions. We are doing more to promote, our program through PhD graduate success stories for the website as well as our alumni letter.</p>	<p>Graduate Committee</p>	<p>2023-2024</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>#6.0: INCREASE THE NUMBER OF DEDICATED FACULTY TO THE CANADIAN STUDIES PROGRAMS AND INCREASE THE DIVERSITY OF FACULTY AND PERSPECTIVES/AREAS OF RESEARCH/EXPERTISE</p> <p>It is the recommendation of the external reviewers that the Canadian Studies programs at both institutions in general but at Trent in particular review the diversity of faculty approaches (diverse frameworks and perspectives around race, gender, etc.) and perspectives (what is Canadian studies and what is being taught today?). The aim of this review will further ensure that the programs can better “foster an appropriate intellectual climate that will sustain the program and promote innovation.” At Carleton, it is particularly recommended that the university hire an Indigenous Studies professor to replace an Indigenous Studies professor who recently moved to another university. For this position the university should consider hiring faculty at the level of Associate or Full Professor. In relation to Indigenous Studies at Carleton, it is recommended that the Indigenous Studies faculty members have the time, support, and autonomy to ponder whether they will remain with the School or have a separate department or another type of arrangement. Concrete ideas for support these deliberations could include: time and funding to consult with Indigenous faculty at other universities, and course releases (with replacements) to work on development of new governance models and programming. (These are just suggestions.)</p>	<p>Agreed to if Resources Permit</p> <p>The School is committed to expanding diversity beyond the settler-Indigenous framework and to expanding our faculty complement in focused ways. The School's urgent needs are for full time faculty hires in the areas of a) Black Canadian Studies and Historical Memory; b) Diasporas in Canada/Canada and the Globe and c) Regional Studies. We are in the process of discussing the graduate course offerings that need to change in order to better reflect who we are and aspire to be.</p>	<p>We are deleting one of our two offerings focused on the North (CDNS5101 “Indigenous Peoples, Canada and the North”) but keeping CDNS5700 “Changing Dynamics of the North in Canada” as we have been able to offer that course through a cross-listing with GEOG in recent years. Additionally, we are discussing the renaming and reframing of CDNS5202 “Gendering Canada: Selected Contemporary Debates” as a course that would focus, instead, on Black Canadian Studies or Diasporas in Canada/Canada and the Globe. This change is still “If Resources Permit,” although we intend to advocate strongly for the conversion of one Instructor position to Assistant Professor, Tenure Track, as well as a new Hire at the Assistant, tenure-track, level. We think we have an excellent case, having lost 55 per cent of our full-time faculty through unit-shifts and retirements in the past 12 months. In the past year, we also have been building out our 0/100 cross-appointments and Adjunct Research Professor positions with individuals appropriate to participation in our graduate programs.</p>	<p>School Director/Hiring Committee/Dean of FASS</p>	<p>2024-2025</p>	<p>Y</p>

<p>7.0: EXPLORE NEW/LOCAL RESOURCE OPPORTUNITIES FOR GRADUATE STUDENTS/PROGRAMS</p> <p>It is recommended that both institutions find a way to hear from students (e.g. survey, focus groups) about areas of expertise that are on the growing edges of each program. Where would they like to see development or growth? This can be not just faculty hires but possible collaborations (e.g. with local organization or communities, or with other units within the university), or possible new courses.</p>	<p>Agreed to Unconditionally</p>	<p>We will take up this recommendation enthusiastically as it is part of how we see ourselves growing. We will have a focus group session so that we can find out what PhD students are seeing as the “edges” of Canadian Studies, where it overlaps with other Carleton units (in their experience) and with outside organizations. We could develop a list of organizations and communities with which our PhDs have been involved as researchers, volunteers, employees. When we look at redesigning our graduate course offerings, we’ll be looking at the units we tend to be drawing from for comps and supervisory committees, or which our graduate students are going to for electives, and we’ll be thinking about how we might formalize those relationships through cross-appointments and permanently cross-listed courses. The Practicum course is an option that is taken up more often by MA students than by PhD students and I think this makes sense (PhD students in their coursework ideally are training for comps and dissertation research).</p>	<p>Graduate Committee/School Director</p>	<p>2023-2024</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>7.1: CLARIFY SUPERVISOR ROLES/FACULTY</p> <p>It is recommended that both institutions clarify supervisory faculty (who is available and who can supervise) privileges.</p>	<p>Agreed to Unconditionally</p>	<p>We will continue to ensure that our PhD Guidelines specify that dissertation committees have to include at least one School member (some units say the supervisor has to be from that unit, but we just don’t have enough faculty to say that). We say this about comp committees too.</p>	<p>PhD Committee</p>	<p>2023-2024</p>	<p>N</p>

<p>7.2: MONITOR GRADUATE LEVELS OF FUNDING AND EXPOSE FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES</p> <p>It is recommended that both institutions remain vigilant about funding for students. Although statistics and charts were provided, they were difficult to decipher and therefore it is unclear whether or not students are “well-funded.”</p> <p>It is recommended that maintaining consistent graduate/doctoral funding be a standing agenda item for departments to monitor. In addition, students should be exposed to, encouraged and supported in applying for external funding opportunities. Levels of success should be monitored and recorded and clearly communicated and celebrated across the institution.</p>	<p>Agreed to In Principle</p> <p>The Graduate Supervisor holds a grant application workshop every September and students are strongly encouraged to attend and to produce applications. The Graduate Supervisor and/or faculty with subject area expertise read and comment on draft applications. Our grad committee reads and ranks applications once they are formally submitted. We produce an excel spreadsheet, updated as necessary, dedicated to tracking the funding allocated to each current student: endowment upon admission, university-wide and unit-specific endowments and awards given out each year, who applied/received OGS and SSHRC, and any Vanier nominations/recipients. While there are sensitivities to consider regarding the communication of information about the distribution of donor-funded awards among the graduate cohort, successful applications for SSHRCC and Vanier awards are celebrated in our newsletter and as news items on our website, with the agreement of the students.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>8.1: RECOGNIZE THE ESSENTIAL ROLE PLAYED BY PROGRAM SUPPORT STAFF</p> <p>Both faculty and staff raved about the outstanding support they received from the support staff in their respective departments and institutions. They were indispensable and the reviewers recommend that both institutions recognize the importance of these roles and the people who currently occupy them. Each department should determine concrete ways to advocate for their staff and to celebrate their contributions.</p>	<p>Agreed to Unconditionally</p>	<p>We nominated our excellent School Administrator for the Sheila McCallum Award in Fall 2023 and will do so again in Fall 2024. In 2023, the School functioned without a Program Administrator for three months, and without a permanent Program Administrator for four months. We are happy to report that we hired an excellent Program Administrator in August, and we fully intend to nominate her for a Service Excellence Award once</p>	<p>School Director/Graduate Supervisor</p>	<p>2023-2024</p>	<p>N</p>

		we are able to speak to her first year of service with the School.			
--	--	--	--	--	--

Note: recommendation #8.0 in the report refers to a previous recommendation and therefore has not been listed.

SENATE QUALITY ASSURANCE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE
Cyclical Review of the graduate programs
in Political Economy
Executive Summary and Final Assessment Report

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

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

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

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

The External Reviewers' report offered a very positive assessment of the programs. Within the context of this positive assessment, the report nonetheless made a number of recommendations for the continuing enhancement of the programs. These recommendations were productively addressed by the Director of the Institute of Political Economy and the Dean of the Faculty of Public Affairs in responses to the External Reviewers' report and Implementation on Plan that was submitted to SQAPC on April 11, 2024.

FINAL ASSESSMENT REPORT

Introduction

The graduate programs in Political Economy reside in the Institute of Political Economy, 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 September 27-28, 2023 was conducted by Dr. Eric Helleiner from the University of Waterloo, and Dr. John Shields from Toronto Metropolitan University. 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 Public Affairs, and the Director of the Institute of Political Economy. The review committee also met with faculty members staff, and graduate students.

The External Reviewers' report, submitted on January 23, 2024 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 Political Economy (Appendix A)
- The Report of the External Review Committee (Appendix B).
- The response and implementation plan from the Director of the Institute of Political Economy (Appendix C)
- The Response from the Dean of the Faculty of Public 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 Institute of Political Economy 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

General

The External Reviewers' Report states that "the programs have developed a highly rigorous interdisciplinary program of study that trains graduate students who have successful gone on to employ this knowledge in their work with all levels of government, the community and private sectors and as scholars. The programs have also given enhanced emphasis to the issues of decolonization and Indigeneity, EDI, social inequality and social justice."

Faculty

Speaking with regard to faculty, the external observed the range of professors from junior to senior and praised the program's ability to attract such a large range of faculty members. The reviewers found them to be highly productive scholars with excellent records of achievement. They noted that many are engaged in research that is societally relevant, topical, and expanding the frontiers of political economy.

Students

The external reviewers felt the students of the program were very high calibre, and many spoke to the reputation of the program for attracting extremely good students who are strongly research oriented.

Curriculum

The external reviewers noted that the overall program structures, requirements, and learning outcomes of the MA and PhD degrees are on a very solid foundation. They identified that bringing in two visiting professors each year to teach special topics was a special feature of the program, and allowed emerging scholars to bring fresh perspectives to the area of political economy. The introduction of specializations in the MA program, and option to complete a placement have all been enhancements showing initiative on the part of the program.

Opportunities for program improvement and enhancement

The External Reviewers' Report made 7 recommendations for improvement:

1. Ensure consistent descriptions of the core courses.
2. Review core course content to take into consideration how the field of political economy has evolved since the last program review and how this evolution relates to the programs' goals, the place of core courses within the programs, and changes in composition of faculty associated with the programs. The review should involve not just the Director and Curriculum Committee but also the wider PECO Board.
3. Consider a direct entry option to the collaborative PhD.
4. Develop a clearer outline of standard procedures and job description for the program administrator.
5. Place existing resource commitments to the program on a more secure foundation with longer term commitment, including support for the visiting scholars program and the Work and Labour seminars and associated placements. Consider a more formal agreement between FPA and FASS on the coordination of resources that support the programs.

6. If financial support for domestic full time MA students is guaranteed, this should be advertised explicitly by the program to help with recruitment.
7. The programs should promote the link to the considerable research related activities with the Institute as a resource for students as part of their recruitment.

The Outcome of the Review

As a consequence of the review, the graduate programs in Political Economy 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 Political Economy and the Dean of the Faculty of Public Affairs in responses to the External Reviewers' report and Implementation Plan that were considered by SQAPC on April 11, 2024. The Institute agreed unconditionally to recommendations #1, 2, 4, 6, and 7, and agreed in principle to recommendations #3 and 5.

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 graduate programs in Political Economy will be conducted during the 2028-29 academic year.

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

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

Introduction & General Comments

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Calendar Changes

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

Hiring

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

UNIT RESPONSE AND IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

Programs Being Reviewed: MA and Collaborative PhD in Political Economy

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

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

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

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