



OFFICE OF THE VICE-PRESIDENT, ACADEMIC AND PROVOST

8888 University Drive, Burnaby, BC  
Canada V5A 1S6TEL: 778.782.3925  
FAX: 778.782.5876vpacad@sfu.ca  
www.sfu.ca/vpacademic**MEMORANDUM**

---

**ATTENTION** Senate **DATE** June 16, 2015  
**FROM** Jon Driver, Vice-President, Academic and Provost, and Chair, SCUP **PAGES** 1/1  
**RE:** Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences: External Review Report of the Department of Political Science (SCUP 15-24)

---

At its June 3, 2015 meeting, SCUP reviewed the External Review Report for the Department of Political Science. The Department will produce an Action Plan and forward it to SCUP and Senate by July 2016. The report is attached for the information of Senate.

c: J. Craig



OFFICE OF THE VICE-PRESIDENT, ACADEMIC AND PROVOST

8888 University Drive, Burnaby, BC  
Canada V5A 1S6TEL: 778.782.3925  
FAX: 778.782.5876vpacad@sfu.ca  
www.sfu.ca/vpacademic**MEMORANDUM**

---

**ATTENTION** SCUP **DATE** May 26, 2015  
**FROM** Jon Driver, Vice-President, Academic and **PAGES** 1/1  
Provost  
**RE:** External Review of the Department of Political Science

---

The Office of the Vice-President, Academic approves Dean Craig's pragmatic approach and looks forward to what comes in due course. In the meantime, the Department of Political Science can take advantage of good advice in the review and move forward wherever possible.

Attachments



Academic Quadrangle Room 6168  
8888 University Drive, Burnaby, BC  
Canada V5A 1S6

TEL 778.782.4415  
FAX 778.782.3033

fassdean@sfu.ca  
www.fass.sfu.ca

**MEMORANDUM**

---

<b>ATTENTION</b>	Jon Driver, VP, Academic	<b>DATE</b>	26 May 2015
<b>FROM</b>	John Craig, Dean	<b>PAGES</b>	1/1
<b>RE:</b>	External Review of the Department of Political Science		

---

To the members of the Senate Committee on University Priorities

I have given close consideration to the recommendations found in the External Review of the Department of Political Science. Our office has taken seriously the recommendation made by the reviewers that we should explore the ‘establishment of a wide-tent school (including the alignment of the Department of Political Science, SIS, SPP and Urban Studies) whose purpose would be to conduct research and deliver academic and professional programs in an integrated manner reflective of the subject matter and the needs of the associated constituencies of the four units.’ We have begun the process of exploring how the Department of Political Science might share resources with other units. In light of these discussions we have refrained from proceeding to a final Action Plan with the Department.

Sincerely,

John Craig,  
Dean

JC/jl

cc: Gord Myers, Associate Vice President, Academic  
Glynn Nicholls, Director, Academic Planning & Budgeting

**Report of External Review Team  
Department of Political Science  
Simon Fraser University**

**Review Committee**

**Herman Bakvis, University of Victoria**

**Janine Brodie (Chair), University of Alberta**

**Rianne Mahon, Balsillie School of International Affairs, Wilfrid Laurier University**

**Site Visit: March 5-7, 2014**

**Report Submitted: April 16, 2014**

## **Introduction**

The 2014 **External Review Team (ERT)** for the Department of Political Science met on Simon Fraser University's main campus in Burnaby for three days from March 5 to March 7, 2014. The three-member ERT was comprised of Dr. Herman Bakvis (University of Victoria), Dr. Janine Brodie (University of Alberta), and Dr. Rianne Mahon, Basillie School of International Affairs, Wilfrid Laurier University. The team was assisted on campus by Dr. Jack Little (History, Simon Fraser University). On the first morning of the visit the ERT met with senior members of the SFU administration, including Drs. Gordon Myers, Glynn Nicholls, Norbert Haunerland, Wade Parkhouse and John Craig. This was followed by an orientation meeting with the Chair of the Department of Political Science, Dr. Busumtwi-Sam and then with an introductory meeting with members of the department as a whole. The following two and a half days were comprised of a series of tightly scheduled confidential interviews with ten departmental faculty members, a tele-conference with another, and an email exchange with another. The ERT also interviewed a sessional instructor, a small group of graduate and undergraduate students, teaching faculty for the French Cohort Program (FCP), the leadership of the Bureau des affaires francophones et francophiles (BAFF) program, representatives from Centre for Online Distance Education (CODE) and the Library, and the Department Manager (Lynne Kool) and Department support staff. The ERT also met privately with John Craig, Dean FASS, Wade Parkhouse, Dean Graduate Studies, and Norbert Haunerland, Assoc. VP Research.

We appreciate the obvious efforts of the organizers of the review and participants in the review process to prepare a comprehensive package of documentation and to provide us with additional documentation upon request. The team was also impressed with the candor and thoughtfulness that participants brought to the interview process. Three initial reflections emerged from our site visit and review of the extensive documentation of the Department's progress since the 2007 external review. First, the Department is under-resourced and at risk of losing its coherence and identity without an infusion of new faculty. Second, the Department is in a period of transition that demands both strategic thinking and leadership. Third, there is openness, among both members of the Department of Political Science and the senior SFU administrations, to pursue new strategic thinking that would strengthen the many contributions that the Department of Political Science already brings to SFU and broader community. We hope that this report will help advance this process of revitalization and renewal.

The report is divided into six parts:

1. Undergraduate program
2. Graduate Program
3. Faculty
4. Governance and administration
5. Relations with other units in the university
6. Major Recommendations

## 1. Undergraduate Program

The ERT has been asked to assess the undergraduate program with respect to structure, breadth, orientation and integration in light of resource allocations, existing faculty complement, and teaching quality and research as well as review measures in place to ensure the evaluation and revision of the teaching programs (See Appendix A).

With these questions at the forefront, we applaud the Department's ongoing attempts to sustain and improve the undergraduate program in Political Science, especially in light of a dramatic decrease in the number of full-time faculty since the last external review (2007). We also share the concerns raised about the Department's capacity to offer a full-service undergraduate program in the future without a substantial reinvestment in full-time faculty replacements.

The Department mounts a strong undergraduate program, which is comparable with its competitors – indeed, with much larger Political Science departments in Canada. It offers a Major, Minor and Honours program as well as Joint Majors (with Economics, French and History, and Gender, Sexuality and Women's Studies). It mounts a series of lower and upper undergraduate courses in traditional fields in political science – Political Theory, International Relations, Comparative Politics, Canadian Politics, and Public Policy and Administration. Lower level service courses also are offered to the general population of undergraduates at SFU.

The Department's undergraduate program has many positive features that compare well with its competitors. These include:

- Strong Canadian politics and public policy/administration streams.
- A commitment to the development of methodological literacy and skills
- A commitment to maintaining a range of 'W' (writing intensive) options at the undergraduate level despite resource allocation issues.
- An ongoing commitment to quality in course design and teaching among full-time faculty.<sup>1</sup>
- Ongoing success in co-op placement – the highest in the FASS

As noted above and discussed in more detail in Section 3 "Faculty", the Department has experienced a significant reduction in its full time faculty since the last external review in 2007. We thus commend the Department's many efforts to maintain and improve its undergraduate program in light of diminished resources. A comparison of the 2008/09 and 2012/13 data from the Academic Information Report from the Office of the VP Academic shows that:

---

<sup>1</sup> With a few notable exceptions, student assessments of the quality of the course and the quality of the full-time instructor are very high. The vast majority rate the course and instructor as A or as A/B

- Majors in Political Science have decreased by approximately 18% from 461 to 382
- Majors and Minors have decreased by 15% from 595 to 508
- Total enrolments have increased by 10% from 3754 to 4133
- Undergraduate sections have increased by 13% from 71 to 81
- Undergrad sections taught by sessionals have increased from 32% to 52%
- Undergrad co-op placements have increased by 33% (from 25 to 37)

We also commend the Department's very successful collaboration with the BAFF and the **French Cohort Program (FCP)**. The leadership of both the Department and the BAFF as well as full time instructors in the program all emphasized the good fit and strong collaborative relationships that have been established since the FCP was established in 2004. The French Cohort Program, which offers two versions of a combined honours (political science and French) is an excellent program and should be highlighted by the FASS. In addition to developing a bilingual cadre of undergraduates, it offers small classes, opportunities to study in a francophone milieu (Quebec or Europe), and experiential learning through participation in research projects related to public policy and civil society organisations. We also believe that an MA program developed in collaboration with universities in Montreal and Belgium is a strong innovation that builds upon the strong foundations already set in place by the undergraduate program. .

The two junior faculty recruited to teach in the FCP program are promising scholars whose research interests coincide with and complement research activities in the Department of Political Science. We strongly support processes which we understand are underway to appoint a third full time position in the FCP in international relations. This position is crucial to maintaining this program. In addition to adding an important area of specialisation, a new position will help cover teaching needs created by sabbaticals and other leaves and potentially enable FCP faculty to teach graduate courses in their areas of specialisation in the Department. At the moment only .25% of one faculty member's load includes an English-language course. There is a good fit between the current research interests of the FCP faculty and one of the department's emerging research areas (identity/diversity/migration). These synergies should be encouraged. The fostering of connections between this group and others in Quebec and the European Union opens up possibilities for collaborative projects partially funded by the Quebec government and the European Commission.

We concur with the Department's decision not to terminate its **honours program**, even though its elimination was recommended by the 2007 external reviewers. An honours program remains a standard option in most political science departments as it offers a means to attract and develop top level students, especially those planning to continue their studies in graduate and professional programs. A robust honours program also can serve as a feeder stream into the MA program. In 2013/14, however, there were only 8 students in the honours program. Honours students are required to enrol in POL 499 – the Honours essay course but there is little more "value-added" for Honors students. We note that currently there is room for some expansion of the honours program, especially now that the university

has changed the course requirements to bring them in line with the overall undergraduate requirements. **We recommend that the department consider mounting an Honours capstone course that would provide professional development (for example, training in writing a CV, briefing notes, funding applications) and enable students to develop, refine and present their first class honours essays.** Such a course could be taught by two professors, representing the different research traditions within the department.

The success of the department in maintaining, even growing the undergraduate program, in a context of declining faculty complement, however, exacts other costs to the program, which raises serious questions about sustainability over the long term. The ERT has four specific concerns.

**First**, the ERT is concerned about the depth and breadth of teaching capacity in some undergraduate streams in light of previous and pending retirements, especially with respect to International Relations (IR) and International Political Economy (IPE). Across political science departments in Canada, IR/IPE courses are the most popular among both undergraduate and graduate student populations. We note that the Department has taken a number of steps to compensate for eroding faculty capacity in IR/IPE such as lifting the cap on third year IR courses so that they can accommodate as many as 100 students. We also note that the Department recognizes approximately a dozen upper courses offered by the School of International Studies (SIS) to count toward POL degree programs. (The department also recognizes courses in History, Geography, Gender, Sexuality and Women's Studies, Labour Studies and Sociology and Anthropology as counting toward POL degree programs.) These measures, however, are neither optimal nor sustainable. Students indicate that it is difficult to get into SIS courses as students in that program have priority in course selection. Students also indicate that there are scheduling conflicts in POL and SIS course offerings that prevent them from enrolling in IR courses that might otherwise be available to them. We also note that in the last six semesters (May 2012-April 2014) none of the lower division courses in IR (regular classes, distance or French Cohort) were taught by full time faculty members. Approximately the same number of upper level IR courses was taught by full time faculty (16) and sessional instructors (15). There are few courses offered in IPE and this gap will intensify with retirements on the horizon. Although there is an obvious need for replacement positions in each of the five fields, the case for IR is immediate and necessary.

**Second**, the ERT is concerned by the increasing reliance on sessional instructors throughout the undergraduate program. In lower level regular and distance courses the ratio of sessional to full time faculty instructors is approximately 3:2; in upper level the ratio is reversed at 4:5. The Department's Self-Report explains that there was a conscious decision to concentrate full time faculty in upper level undergraduate courses to facilitate contact hours with professors. This enables full time faculty to more confidently write letters for senior undergraduate students when they are applying for graduate and professional programs. At the same time, the Department loses a powerful recruitment tool for majors and minors. Exceptional full time faculty teaching introductory courses can stream students into one of the five subfields offered by the Department. The Academic Information Report



(January 2014) that was included in the documentation for this review indicates that the percentage of course sections taught by teaching appointments has increased from 32% in 2008/09 to 52% in 2012/13. This growth, of course, mirrors the substantial decline in full time faculty in Political Science in the same period. Although other Political Science departments in Canada also increasingly rely on sessional instructors to deliver core undergraduate programs, the Department's Self Study indicates not only that 52% of courses are delivered by sessionals but that fully 70% of all those enrolled in Political Science courses are taught by sessional instructors, reflecting the fact that these instructors are mainly responsible for teaching the larger lower level courses.

We did not review student evaluations of sessional instructors, but even if we assume that they are all fine teachers, such a heavy reliance on sessional instructors has negative implications for the fashioning of coherent connections between lower and upper level undergraduate courses. The Department Self-Study notes that sessional instructors are often assigned to selected topics courses in upper level undergraduate courses because these one-off courses are more directly suited to the individual instructors' skills and interests. Students, however, complain that they do not know the content of selected course offerings sufficiently in advance. More important, as was noted by a number of the faculty members that we interviewed, the Department's upper level course offerings too often resemble a "smorgasbord" or a "moveable feast." The coherence and logical progression of courses within subfields from lower to upper level undergraduate courses as well as the building of a departmental identity and brand is potentially diluted in the progress. The ERT is fully aware of the hard choices that present to Department leaders when program funding is tied to enrolments. Political Science has been able to grow its enrolments and course sections largely through funding secured through SFU NOW, which provides compensation for faculty teaching at the Harbourfront and Surrey campuses, and by introducing more distance education courses. However, there are many negative outcomes potentially associated with almost half of undergraduate course sections being funded by variable sources which are external to the department<sup>2</sup>. Put at risk are the capacity to build and sustain an integrated stream of courses in each of the subfields, long-term curriculum planning tied to the research strengths of the full time faculty, and the promotion of a departmental identity that distinguishes it from its competitors both inside and outside of SFU.

**Third**, as noted, the Department of Political Science has been able to maintain robust enrolments in recent years through the introduction of several distance education courses. In 2013, 930 students were enrolled in 21 sections of distance education courses and virtually all were taught by sessional instructors and tutors. It is possible for students to acquire 22% of their undergraduate credits by distance (68, Self-Study). A significant portion of student enrolment in Political Science courses, 17.8 percent of the Department's "Activity FTE" in 2012-13, is accounted for by distance courses delivered online. This mode of delivery has allowed the Department to increase its course offerings from 71 to 81 between 2007

---

<sup>2</sup> 45% of sections funded by sources outside the department, p. 27 self-study

and 2013, a development the Department would like to extend by introducing additional sections at the 300 level. For the Department and the University this is seen as a very cost effective way of expanding enrolments while at the same time offering students more choice and flexibility. Among other things, the Department bears no direct costs for online teaching since the cost of the instructors and the delivery platform and its associated support are borne directly by SFU's Centre for Online and Distance Education (CODE). While we appreciate the benefits that online delivery of courses can bring to the Department and students, financial and otherwise, we do have some concerns.

Online teaching can take many forms, ranging from Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs) with enrolments in the thousands, frequently offered free to students and the general public, to low enrolment courses featuring active involvement in class discussion by the instructor. SFUs online offerings in Political Science, with enrollments of between 40-50 students are certainly not of the MOOC variety. At the same time, they fall short of what would constitute an actively led model. The instruction provided in SFU Political Science courses is essentially passive. The courses are divided into discussion groups of 10-15 students, which, while monitored by tutors, are not actively led. If there is no discussion a tutor will remind the participants in the group but the onus is primarily on students to start and maintain discussion of the question or questions set for that week. Assignments are submitted and graded. The responsibility of the instructor for the course as a whole appears primarily one of providing oversight. This mode of instruction is different from one where online discussion is actively led by an instructor and where an effort is made to engage students in a manner similar to what one would find in a regular classroom. It should be further noted that while the online courses for the most part are designed by regular faculty, the preponderance of the teaching or supervision of these courses falls to sessional instructors, while the monitors of the discussion groups are primarily MA students. Data provided by the Political Science Department indicate that over the six semesters from May 2012 through April 2014, just two of the 14 upper level distance courses were delivered by regular faculty with the remainder taught by sessional instructors; regular faculty taught 6 of the 15 lower level undergraduate distance courses.

The ERT met with a representative from the Centre for Online and Distance Education who stated that SFU's online courses were comparable in quality and student satisfaction to regular course offerings, though no data were provided to back up this claim. We were able to meet with only a limited number of undergraduates, only one of whom had taken an online course, an experience she described as disappointing and akin to reading a self-study guide with virtually no direct interaction with the instructor. The student wondered aloud as to why she was paying for a course that was effectively self-directed. Clearly a sample of one student is an insufficient basis for generalizing to the broader student experience with the online format. Nonetheless, given the literature on what constitutes best practices in online teaching – fostering active engagement by students through the deliberate and ongoing actions of faculty coupled with small class size (e.g. see Lewis and Abdul-Hamid 2006) – we are not convinced that the online courses in question in their current format provide for a quality learning experience. At the same time, we would be reluctant to see this method of

course delivery rolled back or eliminated. It does provide students with the opportunity to take courses that, because of the student's location, time-table conflicts or the oversubscription of regular courses, would otherwise not be available to them. As well, we understand that the plan to add additional online courses would help fill the need for online international relations classes at the 300 level, which is important to maintain the balance between the different fields among the online offerings. We would urge, however, that some basic research be done using existing course evaluation data to test the validity of the claim that the quality of the instruction and the student learning experience is comparable to that of regular courses. **We advise the Department to collect and evaluate data which compare student assessments of course sections offered by regular faculty, sessional instructors, and through distance education.**

The Department and University also may wish to experiment with a more active instructional mode, one where there is more in the way of direct synchronous interaction between the instructor and students and then make comparisons with those classes still relying on a passive, less interventionist approach. The dilemma, of course, is that if the former is shown to provide a superior outcome, a compelling case would then exist for extending the active delivery mode to all online courses. This would undoubtedly undermine the cost-effectiveness of the present model since a more active model is much more resource intensive. Nonetheless, unless there is good evidence that the online courses are in fact comparable to regular courses – using criteria such as instructional quality as measured through student evaluations and, ideally, evidence of comprehension of course materials – **the Department should restrict online course delivery at its current level with some slight expansion to take into account the need for additional 300 level international relations courses.**

**Fourth**, we concur with the sentiments expressed to us by students and faculty alike that the **Department needs to undertake an extensive undergraduate curriculum review.** As noted, the coherence of the undergraduate program has been diluted by departure of full time faculty (whether through retirement or exit to other departments or through cross-appointment to other SFU programs) and by the introduction of numerous special topics courses that reflect the strengths of the instructor rather than the needs of the various fields. This process will intensify in the near future with a number of anticipated retirements. The Department has done an admirable job in maintaining undergraduate enrolments in difficult circumstances. Curriculum planning also presupposes new full time faculty appointments. However, we would advise that the Department undertake a review, not only to identify gaps and spaces of unfulfilled student demand but also to highlight places where existing and emerging departmental expertise can be strengthened over the medium and long term. Each of these considerations is important to make strong claims for new full time faculty appointments. The Department already has thought through important elements of requirements for the various streams of the undergraduate program and has introduced a new 200 research design course that provides conceptual foundations for more intensive quantitative and statistical training at the 300 level. A similar exercise focusing on

the connection between lower and upper level courses should be undertaken by the sub-field committees, which have been recently revived after a period of dormancy.

The ERT also heard numerous concerns that the undergraduate course offerings were too tied to narrow or “mainstream” conceptions of political science with insufficient courses exploring alternatives to that model and new areas of political research. We note, for example, that there are few or no courses offered on, to name a few, indigenous politics, the environment, international development and critical theory, although the undergraduate students interviewed expressed strong interest in having a broader range of courses offering such perspectives. We also note that exits and retirements have/will reduce teaching capacity in such important areas as global political economy and gender and politics. Growth, decline and renewal are part of the lifecycle of all communities, including academic departments. We suggest that the Department of Political Science use the current period to renewal to project itself as a stronger entity into the future. This process may involve hard choices such as foregoing service course offerings in the lower undergraduate tier, which may result in lower enrolments in the short term, and redirecting faculty teaching capacity to POLS subfields. A review also may raise the question of whether the Department has the resources to offer a suite of tiered courses in all five subfields in the undergraduate program.

The Department has much to recommend it in a field of tough competitors, including the opportunities afforded by the co-op program, the FCP, methodological training, and a strong and dedicated faculty who are nationally and internationally recognized for their research expertise. An undergraduate curriculum review will better enable the Department to make the case for new hires, envision new ways to build upon emerging faculty research strengths, and better position the Department in competitive internal and external environments.

## **2. Graduate Program**

The ERT was asked to assess the quality of the graduate program, the measures in place for evaluation and revision of the program and the preparation provided to graduates for both academic and non-academic careers.

The Department of Political Science has full service graduate program, offering a doctoral degree and both MA course intensive and MA thesis options. The graduate program is modest in size compared to other graduate programs but intake has remained stable or improved since the last external review. In 2008, for example, the program admitted 13 MA and 2 PhD students: by 2013 these numbers had increased to 14 and 4 respectively. The number of graduate course sections has increased from 21 to 28 while average graduate class size has decreased marginally from 7 to 5 students during the same period. Since the last external review the percentage of graduate courses taught by faculty has increased from 90% to 96%. We concur with the Department’s Self-Study that there is room to increase the size of the graduate program, particularly in the MA course-intensive stream.

Both the faculty and the students who were interviewed expressed satisfaction with the graduate program, a sentiment that is supported by a variety of indicators. For example, one doctoral student was awarded a SSHRC doctoral fellowship in 2013, a MA won SSHRC support in 2011 and a graduate won a prestigious SSHRC postdoctoral fellowship in 2010. In addition, a few of graduate students have begun to establish an active publishing profile with nine journal articles published in 2012-13. Four of these were co-authored with one faculty member, a practice we encourage. Since 2007, the Department also has made 57 MA co-op placements. This is an impressive accomplishment and a strong indicator of preparation for non-academic employment.

We note with some caution, however, that the percentage of women recruited to the graduate program has dropped significantly since the last external review from 54% in 2008/09 to 32% in 2012/2013. This is a mirror image of trends in our own departments where the proportion of female graduate students has steadily increased over the past decade. We are uncertain why this should be so but do note that few graduate courses are taught by female faculty whose numbers also have declined in recent years. The question of why the graduate program is less attractive to prospective female graduate students also may reflect course offerings. The Department should be concerned about the decline in female graduate admissions, if for no other reason than that this trend may negatively affect its plans to grow its graduate program.

The Department also has demonstrated a willingness to tailor its program both to reflect departmental strengths and improve the skills-set that graduates acquire for future employment in both academic and non-academic settings. In 2010, the Department reorganized its graduate program around three substantive research clusters that better reflected the strengths of departmental members than the traditional five field structure common to many graduate programs in Political Science in Canada. These clusters were 1. Global and Regional Politics, 2. Democracy and Representation, 3. Governance, Public Policy and Political Economy. Due to the departure or exit of key faculty members, however, the Department abandoned this reorganization plan and returned to the five field model. In light of our above comments about undergraduate curriculum review and below with respect to emerging faculty strengths, the Department may wish to revisit the strategy of defining its graduate program in terms of strategic research clusters and opportunities for co-op placements. These factors, we believe, would greatly enhance recruitment opportunities, especially for the MA course-intensive stream.

The Department also has taken steps to increase prospects for academic and non-academic employment of its graduate students with the reorganization of its methodology requirements. All graduate students are now required to take POL 801 "Theoretical Perspectives in Political Science" and either POL 802 "Political Research Design and Analysis" or POL 803 "Qualitative Research Methods." This new requirement has added to the number of courses required for a graduate degree – from 5 to 6 for doctoral students, 4 to 5 for MA thesis-stream and 6 to 7 for MA course intensive. The introduction of POL 803 recognizes the diversity of methodologies currently deployed in both academic and non-academic settings

and we believe that the attention that the Department gives to methodology training distinguishes it from other comparable graduate programs in Political Science in Canada. On a cautionary note, however, the Department will need to monitor whether the requirement of seven courses for course-intensive MAs will affect completion times and recruitment numbers. **We also suggest that POL 801 be redesigned to provide a broader and more inclusive overview of “theoretical perspectives” in Political Science.** This course appears to reproduce what one would assume is part of POL 802 and currently concentrates on game theory to the exclusion of the rich and diverse theoretical approaches to the study of politics.

Similar to the 2007 external review team, we are concerned that the funding package offered to incoming graduate students may not be competitive with that offered by competing institutions. We note that doctoral students are guaranteed approximately \$20K for three years with unspecified funding available another year. The norm for competing doctoral programs is now four years of guaranteed funding. MA students receive only one term of RA funding, although currently 50% receive two terms of funding. We also note that RA funding is based on 16 hours per week of work in contrast to competitor universities that require 12 hours. The issues of funding and required work may have to be revisited, if the Department wishes to increase graduate enrolments. This is especially the case with respect to the recruitment of top-notch students who are competitive for external grants such as the Canada Graduate Scholarships. Graduate recruitment takes place in an increasingly competitive environment in which prospective students now actively negotiate for the best package among several graduate programs. We note in this context that faculty funding for the Department’s graduate program has not increased in the past 6 years.

The Department’s graduate program is relatively small but it does have considerable room to grow, especially in the course-intensive MA stream. There are advantages of small programs, among them, faculty are keen to work with graduate students and, graduate students have greater opportunities to interact closely with faculty and to teach undergraduate courses after their own course work and comprehensive exams have been completed. At the same time, the small size of the doctoral cohort, in particular, makes it vital that the Department fosters a strong supportive research environment. One of the ways to do so is to organise regular departmental seminars or ‘brown bag’ lunches. The graduate students are more likely to participate in these 1) if there is strong faculty presence and 2) if they have a chance to participate in the selection of speakers and/or topics. Another means for fostering a strong research culture is to include graduate students, especially doctoral students (not just initial year) in projects as research assistants and possibly co-authors of conference papers and publications. Some department members have co-presented and co-authored research with graduate students. We applaud this form of professional skills development and mentorship. Graduate students also should be encouraged to participate in faculty-organised institutes and centres, which tend to be linked to departmental research clusters.

The graduate program does contribute to the development of a set of skills that are advantageous in contemporary competitive job markets, both academic and non-academic.

The Department's emphasis on advanced training in research design and either quantitative or qualitative research methods provides a competitive advantage. The opportunity for MA students to participate in co-op placements also is a significant strength of the Department's graduate program. The Department appears to be doing rather well in providing such opportunities relative to other units in the faculty.

The ERT was asked if the Department had measures in place to evaluate and, if required, restructure the graduate program. We found that the Department has been involved in an ongoing process of re-evaluation but recognize that this process is hindered by ongoing uncertainties about faculty complement. However, because the co-op program has the potential to be an important component in building the MA program, **we recommend that some form of exit survey be conducted whereby co-op students are asked to assess the benefits and shortcomings of their co-op experience.** An exit-survey also would enable the Department to assess the quality of the placements offered by its community partners.

### **3. Faculty**

The ERT was asked to evaluate size and quality of the faculty complement in relation to the Unit's responsibilities, assess the current research strengths of the Department, and identify emerging areas that should be pursued. In addition, we were asked to evaluate the Department's hiring priorities in light of the Department's Strategic 5-year Plan, teaching and research needs, and its demographic (age, gender, etc.) profile.

The ERT interviewed (on site visit or via teleconference or email) all but four members of the Department full time faculty (two not interviewed were cross-appointments and another was on leave). We found a vibrant faculty that is deeply engaged in research, teaching and the broader community and committed to departmental renewal. This palpable desire to "move on" was especially apparent among the junior faculty who hold great promise for the Department's future teaching and research achievements and leadership. Our overall impression was that, despite past difficulties in the Department's history, the full time faculty continue to build on existing research and teaching strengths and are opening up new and promising areas for research collaboration and funding.

The Department has experienced a sharp drop in faculty complement since last external review. Since 2008, the number of full time faculty has dropped from 23 to 17. This latter number, however, overstates the Department's capacities to meet ongoing teaching and administrative requirements. During the same period, the Department also has lost capacity through a series of partial exits, whether through extended leave, cross-appointments to other units within the FASS or the reduction of teaching load among faculty approaching retirement. There have been five new faculty appointments since the last external review as well. Two of these, however, were externally funded positions for the FCP. These are strong hires that contribute to the success of the FCP and to the research culture of the Department but add only .25 FTE to the Department's capacity to teach its undergraduate or graduate programs. Moreover, none of these new appointments was in the IR/IPE field, the most

popularly subscribed sub-field and most adversely affected by recent retirements and departures. When these and other factors are brought into the equation, the actual faculty complement is closer to 14.5 – an approximate 40% drop in capacity since the last review. Left un-remedied, this erosion of capacity will intensify over the short and medium term as five more full-time faculty members are in the pre-retirement bracket. We also note with concern that (for a number of reasons) the proportion of women faculty also has declined significantly since the last external review.

The ERT strongly concurs with the Department's self-study that declining faculty complement is the most significant challenge that it confronts at the present time and that the acquisition of new full time faculty is its top priority. Indeed, many of the concerns that we have raised about over-reliance on sessional instructors, distance education, and curriculum review are directly tied to the imperative to maintain enrolments and programs in the face of an ongoing erosion of full time faculty complement. New full-time positions are critical to the renewal of the Department.

At the same time, we are concerned that the Department has not been able to make the case for strategic hiring priorities in its most recent 5 year Strategic Plan or in the Self-Study provided to us as documentation prior to our site visit. In our interviews with faculty and the Department Chair, we began to appreciate the Department's apparent hesitancy to think strategically and definitively about hiring priorities. Many faculty members expressed the view that, although the Department had made great progress in recovering from the breakdown in collegiality that began in 2008/09, the real test for the Department would come with the determination of hiring priorities and in the recruitment process itself. The Department's 5 year plan reflects this tentativeness, listing as its priorities one new position for each of the Department's five sub-fields (which are listed in alphabetical order rather than on the basis of need or strategic planning).

We appreciate the pressures that encourage a "chicken in every pot" hiring strategy. It reflects the fact that all of the five sub-fields lack depth in faculty complement, creating a situation in which one or two retirements or other forms of exit would threaten the Department's capacity to offer a suite of courses at the undergraduate and graduate levels. However, this strategy also encourages inertia with respect to filling the obvious gaps in faculty complement. On one hand, FASS and the SFU top administration are unlikely to grant scarce full time faculty positions to the Department of Political Science in the absence of a forward-oriented strategic vision, one grounded in a departmental consensus about hiring priorities. On the other hand, there is little incentive for strategic thinking, which might ruffle the calming waters in the Department, in absence of some signal from the FASS and upper administration that new full-time positions would be available to realize the ambitions of a new strategic vision for the Department. As a result, deep gaps in the faculty complement remain unfilled or filled through insufficient measures such as cross-listing courses from other, often competing units, lifting caps, or sessional hiring. None of these strategies builds the identity, research capacities or broader profile the Department. The most obvious case in point is the growing gap in capacity in IR/IPE. In absence of a collaborative strategy to



restore faculty complement, we recommend that a contractually-limited appointment (CLA of 2 or 3 years) in IR/IPE is immediately warranted on the basis of both declining faculty complement in this field and ongoing and unmet student demand. A more comprehensive plan to restore faculty complement should await a Departmental consensus around a strategic vision that prioritizes hiring needs in relation to diverse criteria, including current and anticipated student demand, program maintenance and program building, and existing and emerging research strengths. We also recommend that the criteria for both CLA and full time appointments be broadly conceived and specified to encourage applications from women, in order to begin to rectify the gender imbalance in full-time faculty, and, more broadly, to encourage applications from all four federally-designated groups – women, visible minorities (non-white people), indigenous peoples, and persons with disabilities.

As already noted, the full time faculty in the Department of Political Science are highly capable and energetic teachers and researchers. Many have strong records of research, publication, and community engagement and are nationally and internationally recognized in their respective fields. The Department also has a strong cohort of junior faculty member that already have major publications to their credit and are involved in collaborative research projects with external funding. The Department's Self-Study indicates that, since 2007, faculty have produced 390 publications (consisting of books, edited collections, articles, book chapters, and policy papers for governmental and non-governmental research agencies). This is a strong publication record by comparative standards. The review committee, however, notes that the lack of standardization of faculty CVs, which were part of the materials provided to us before the site visit, made our assessment of research productivity more difficult. At the very least, faculty CVs should be standardized by reporting category and clearly distinguish between peer-reviewed and other forms of academic production. Indeed, the Department could consider putting such standardized CVs on the Department's website.

There is a significant degree of research collaboration among faculty members both in terms of co-authored publications and externally-funded research projects from traditional and non-traditional sources. Since 2007, \$650,000 external research funding has been secured by Departmental members, on average \$97,000 per year since the last review. These funds came from large collaborative grants (Dr. Cohen was a principle or co-investigator on three large CURA grants totalling \$3 million) and other traditional funding sources (Dr. Howlett was a principle investigator on a large SSHRC Collaborative Grant, \$850,000). External funding also came from non-traditional sources such as the Genome Canada and Genome BC projects (Drs. Howlett, Laycock, Hira and Weldon, \$660,00) and CIDA (Dr. Busumtwi-Sum \$178,000). The funding for many of these projects is now completed, though data from SFU's Institutional Research and Planning shows that Political Science still had a respectable amount of grant and contract funding available for expenditure for 2012-13. But applications for other research projects have been submitted. The Department's ongoing commitment to securing external funding is commendable and important for attracting and funding graduate students and for cultivating a robust research culture in the Department and Faculty. The Department also has a very good record with respect to its engagement with

government, industry, and the broader community. These activities are well-known in the Canadian political science community and are an integral part of the Department's identity and reputation.

The Department's faculty retains its research strengths in its five sub-fields, although as noted above the IR/IPE stream has been reduced by exits and retirements. Moreover, the Department is distinguished by its existing and emerging research strengths in several research clusters which could be further strengthened through strategic hiring. For example, the Department has indisputable strengths in the study of democratic theory/political representation/political participation. This research vector involves numerous senior and junior scholars, including Drs. Laycock, Warwick, Johnson, Weldon, Pickup and de Rooij and is supported by the Centre for Public Opinion and Political Representation. Another important area of strength could be broadly labelled as Governance and Public Policy, involving Drs. Hira, Howlett, Johnson, Perl, Smith, Heard, Moens, and Ross and is supported by the Institute for Governance Studies. The Department has demonstrated strengths in International Political Economy (Professors Ayers, Griffin-Cohen, Busumtwi-Sam, Hira, and Kawasaki and the Centre for Global Political Economy). There also is considerable strength in the area of gender and political economy.

Diasporic and Diversity studies is an important emerging research cluster that variously incorporates at least six faculty members whose research revolves around questions relating to diasporas, language minorities, sexuality, and identity. This research stream is partially supported by the Institute for Diaspora Research and Engagement, which recently received a grant from the University Priority Fund, but also aligns with faculty research on political representation and governance. This emerging area also involves faculty members in all academic ranks but is especially prominent among junior faculty members and, thus, creates numerous opportunities for collaboration. We also note that, unlike many other political science departments in Canada, the SFU Department has strength and depth in Urban Studies, an area with considerable potential given the university's location in one of Canada's largest metropolitan areas.

#### **4. Governance and Administration**

The external review team was asked to assess the Department's governance, staffing and other resources, and the participation of unit members in administration.

Since the last external review, the Department of Political Science experienced a severe breakdown in collegiality that precipitated the exit of key faculty members to other universities and to other units within FASS, the appointment of an interim Chair from another FASS unit, and the development of temporary governance mechanisms (for example the Policy and Planning Committee that was dissolved in 2010). During our interviews with faculty members and the Department's executive (comprised of the Department Chair and the Chairs of the Undergraduate and Graduate Committees) we were assured that the Department has moved on from the "troubles" and that collegiality has been progressively strengthened. Such collegiality is especially apparent among junior faculty members. The Department, in fact, has made notable strides toward rebuilding collegial governance in recent years. The Department's Self-Study notes the increased frequency of well-attended Departmental Council meetings, a rejuvenation of a departmental speakers' series, the reintroduction of a departmental bulletin in fall 2013, and a growing number of informal departmental get-togethers. More tangibly, there are numerous examples of collegial decision-making in the Department. For one, the sticky issue of equitable teaching load, which appeared in the 2007 external review, was resolved through committee work that devised a formula for the distribution of undergraduate and graduate teaching load over an eight course cycle. This formula, which normally applies to all faculty members, was approved by the Departmental Council in February 2013. The Department also held a successful faculty retreat in the fall of 2013 that came to important collective decisions about constitutional revisions and the revival of field committees dormant since 2007. There is ample evidence therefore that the Department is making important steps toward turning the corner on an unfortunate period in its history.

At the same time, it was clear to the ERT that the Department was enormously destabilized by "the troubles" and tentative about whether it has truly "turned the corner." For example, we often heard that the progress achieved remains fragile because it has been built on a brokered consensus that reinforces the identity and claims of competing factions, or the withdrawal of faculty, either figuratively or literally, from a collective vision, or an overly cautious Departmental leadership. Overall, we found a measured optimism as well as an underlying anxiety about whether the Department could maintain its momentum toward the recovery of a collegial environment and decision-making when the Department moves, as it must, from low to high priority collective decision-making such as strategic hiring priorities.

We are optimistic that the Department can make this transition. Many faculty members expressed their clear desire to "move on," emphasizing their belief that the Department's internal governance issues have harmed, and continue to harm, its status as a claims-maker in FASS and with central administration. They suggested that there is a palpable time lag

between the progress that the Department has made in restoring collegial governance and ongoing external perceptions of ongoing dysfunction and that, as a consequence, the Department experiences, not only, “benign neglect” but continues to be “penalized” for its past. These perceptions indicate the process of recovery is not only internal to the Department of Political Science but also involves rebuilding confidence between this unit and FASS and SFU academic leadership. We strongly concur with the often-expressed sentiment that the Department is at critical juncture and turning point and, in many ways, is eager for visionary leadership that will enable it to build upon its many strengths and emerging potentials.

The ERT is convinced that the Department has taken many important steps to improve its internal governance and restore collegiality but more is required. First, the Department should demonstrate more confidence in collective deliberation and decision-making by reasserting, where possible, the centrality of the Department Council and majority consensus-building and voting. Although the Department Council is convened more regularly than in the past, we believe that it should meet every month rather than once or twice a semester as is current practice. This practice not only keeps faculty members informed but also builds a sense of collective purpose and awareness of the trade-offs posed by difficult decisions. Second, we congratulate the Department’s initiative to hold a faculty retreat and recommend that this become an annual practice, enabling it to build consensus on delayed issues, the most immediate being the prioritization of full time faculty replacement positions. Third, we recommend that the Department begin to mentor and develop a new cadre of leadership among mid-stream and junior faculty. This process of building depth in departmental leadership should be attentive to enhancing gender and other forms of diversity in the Department’s committee and leadership structures, while, at the same time, be attentive to the possibility that minority faculty are sometimes assigned inequitable administrative duties precisely because they are an underrepresented group. The Department of Political Science is not alone in the challenge to build equitable and inclusive academic environments. In this regard, we were pleased to hear that SFU is currently undertaking a review of gendered wage gaps across the University and the possibility of gender-biased deployments of market supplements.

The ERT also met with representatives from CODE and the library as well as Departmental administrative staff. There do not appear to be issues with space or computer facilities and there was overall satisfaction expressed with the resources provided to the Department by distance education experts and the library. We were impressed with the resources that the Library provides both to teachers and students. Faculty members and undergraduate and graduate students expressed unequivocal praise for the administrative staff and their daily support of departmental functions. The graduate students, in particular, indicated that the upgrading of the Graduate Program Assistant from a 60% to 80% workload has significantly improved the administration of the graduate program. The Department Self-Study asks for the upgrading of all administrative positions to 100% or fulltime. Currently, the departmental receptionist is a 60% position. This effectively means that there is no one on the front desk on Monday and Friday. **We would recommend that in the immediate term**

**this position is funded to at least 80% similar to the Graduate Program Assistant** so that the Department has someone on the front desk Monday to Thursday. The question of whether these positions should be fully funded awaits a more complete assessment of departmental needs and position job descriptions. **We would also recommend that the Dean of FASS reassess the Department's operating budget allocation which has not changed since 2006.** An increase in the operational budget would be a gesture of good will as the Department rebuilds and, more tangibly, contribute to community and profile building initiatives such as, for example, enabling the Department to bring in speakers for its reinvigorated speakers' program.

## **5. Relations with other units in the university**

We have been asked to assess the Department of Political Science relations with other units at SFU and the broader community. We have already discussed many of the strong collaborations that the Department has built up through the joint majors programs and the FCP as well as through cross-appointments to SIS and Urban Studies. Department faculty also regularly teach in the SFU NOW initiative which, in turn, provides funding for sessional teaching on the main campus. In addition, however, we were specifically requested to "suggest ways in which the Department may pursue closer collaboration with cognate programs in FASS (e.g., International Studies, Public Policy) and elsewhere in the University." Given that the subject matter encompassed by the School of International Studies (SIS) and the School of Public Policy (SPP) in particular bears directly on the teaching and research interests of Political Science, the request is fully appropriate. What lends the request greater saliency, however, is that the university administration has, in the recent past, raised the issue of possibility of combining two of the units. Specifically, as part of the process leading to the drafting of the FASS Five Year Plan (2013-18), a report by an external consultant, Dr. Ronald Bond, was commissioned on the future directions of the Faculty. One of the areas examined by Dr. Bond was the realignment and integration of several units. In its submission to Dr. Bond, the Political Science department indicated that it was open to "creative synergies and solutions", including the pooling of teaching resources and possibly a more "'integrated' academic/administrative structure", subject to the identity and autonomy of Political Science as a discipline being preserved (Political Science Self Study, Appendix 5, p. 97). It suggested the School of Political Studies at the University of Ottawa, among others, as a possible model and identified three units within FASS – SIS, SPP, and Urban Studies (US) – as potential collaborators.

The recommendation of Dr. Bond, however, proposed only a combination of Political Science and Public Policy, to be housed within a new School of Public Policy and Political Studies. We are not clear on the details or level of integration between the two units within the proposed new School. (Unfortunately we did not have access to Dr. Bond's original report.) He also suggested placing international studies and urban studies together along with four other cognate programs in another new entity, a School of Global and Development Studies. According to the Political Science Self-Study, the recommendations "were not what we expected." Whether this surprise was due to the level of integration being proposed or the

absence of International and Urban Studies, the two units with which Political Science has had close links, including cross-appointments, over the years are not wholly clear. What is clear, however, is that the Department is still open to the idea of an integrated school encompassing multiple units, albeit one that includes not just Political Science and Public Policy but also International Studies and Urban Studies. This became evident in our discussion with members of the Political Science department both individually and collectively. Indeed, our sense is that in the time since the writing of the Bond Report and the Five Year Plan, departmental members have become not only more open to the idea of a new school composed of the four units but also quite enthusiastic.

We can appreciate that Dr. Bond, in trying to allocate not just Political Science but a host of other units in terms of broader organizational themes, decided that in order to make the model of a global and development studies school plausible he needed the presence of International Studies. From the perspective of Political Science, and perhaps Public Policy as well, however, the combination of one larger (Political Science) and one smaller (Public Policy) unit with quite different disciplinary orientations would be far from an optimal solution. Such an arrangement would essentially lack the balance that a larger number of different disciplinary orientations, large and small, would provide. And given the pre-existing links between Political Science and International Studies the question within the department naturally arose, why Public Policy but not International Studies?

We believe the combination of International Studies, Political Science, Public Policy and Urban Studies has considerable merit and one worth exploring further. Among other things this combination would provide opportunities for the delivery of minors or undergraduate certificates in public policy and public sector management; and for Public Policy and International Studies to fully participate in PhD level training. It would also make it easier for people in the four units to pursue teaching, research and applied work opportunities in the other units. Some political scientists in the quantitative area, for example, may well wish to take advantage of such opportunities in Public Policy. The potential of the French Cohort Program (FCP), which already delivers public administration courses in French, should not be ignored. Reorganization in the form of a wide-tent school would strengthen both the undergraduate and graduate programs of each unit, promising productive cross-listings, teaching and supervisory collaboration, provide a basis for each unit to better plan for strategic hiring priorities, and build upon existing and emerging research strengths through cross-unit collaboration.

In raising the possibility of a school of policy, political and international studies we want to caution that the review committee has only spoken with members of one of the four units mentioned, namely Political Science. The views and perspectives of the other three units on the potential, desirability, and feasibility of such a school may well be quite different. If there is to be exploration of the idea of such a school their voices and concerns need to be heard. **The recommendation that we would make at this stage, therefore, is that FASS strike a decanal committee with a mandate to explore and make recommendations with regard to the alignment of the four units in question into a school whose purpose would be to**

**conduct research and deliver academic and professional programs in an integrated manner reflective of the subject matter and the needs of the associated constituencies of the four units.** This committee would need to examine not only the soundness of the basic concept of this school but also the practical details relating to implementation, internal governance arrangements, bridging cultural differences stemming from different disciplinary orientations, and, above all, the nature of the leadership required to launch and then develop the school during its critical first years. This committee also would want to examine the experiences of universities where this model has been implemented. The University of Ottawa and its School of Political Studies, which encompasses political science, international studies and public administration, and its Graduate School of Public and International Affairs, is the closest Canadian example that comes to mind. On a smaller scale there is the Glendon School of Public and International Affairs at York University; its bilingual mandate may suggest a role that FCP could play. There are also several Schools of Public Affairs in the U.S. offering a variety of different disciplinary combinations that can be usefully explored.

To conclude, the Political Science department has a good record of collaboration with other units, most notably with International Studies, Urban Affairs and the Office of Francophone and Francophile Affairs, although less so with Public Policy. While the vision of a School of Political, Policy and International Studies is, to be sure, a challenging one, nonetheless given the current willingness of the Political Science department and the potential that could be realized by combining the resources of the four units, this vision ought to be examined closely by FASS, subject to the full participation of the other three units in the consideration of this proposal.

## **6. Major Recommendations**

- 1. A contractually-limited appointment (CLA of 2 or 3 years) in IR/IPE is immediately warranted on the basis of both declining faculty complement in this field and ongoing and unmet student.**
- 2. New full-time positions are critical to the renewal. The Department should begin the process of prioritizing hiring needs in relation to current and anticipated student demand, program maintenance and program building, and existing and emerging research strengths.**
- 3. The criteria for both CLA and full time appointments should be broadly conceived and specified to encourage applications from women, to begin to rectify the gender imbalance in full-time faculty, and, to encourage applications from all four federally-designated groups – women, visible minorities (non-white people), indigenous peoples, and persons with disabilities.**
- 4. FASS should strike a decanal committee with a mandate to explore and make recommendations with regard to the establishment of a wide-tent school (including the alignment of the Department of Political Science, SIS, SPP and Urban Studies) whose purpose would be to conduct research and deliver academic and professional programs in an integrated manner reflective of the subject matter and the needs of the associated constituencies of the four units.**
- 5. The Department should undertake an extensive undergraduate curriculum review, which identifies the spaces of unfulfilled student demand, reinforces the links between lower and upper course field offerings and strengthens existing and emerging departmental research expertise.**
- 6. The department should mount an Honors cap-stone course focused on skills development and the refinement and dissemination of honours research.**
- 7. The Department should collect and evaluate data which compare student assessments of course sections offered by regular faculty, sessional instructors, and through distance education.**
- 8. The Department should restrict online course delivery at its current level with some slight expansion to take into account the addition of 300 level international relations courses.**
- 9. The Department should implement an exit survey among co-op students to assess the quality of the experience and the placements.**



10. POL 801 should be redesigned to provide a broader and more inclusive overview of “theoretical perspectives” in Political Science.
11. The Department should hold monthly Departmental Council meeting and adopt a majority vote model of decision-making.
12. The Department should hold an annual faculty retreat.
13. The position of Department Receptionist should be increased to 80% of a full time position.
14. FASS should reassess the Department’s operating budget allocation in light of current needs.

**References:**

Lewis, C. and H. Abdul-Hamid (2006). "Implementing Effective Online Teaching Practices: Voices of Exemplary Faculty", *Innovative Higher Education* 31(2), 83-98.

## **Appendix A**

Department of Political Science  
Simon Fraser University  
External Review Committee 2013/2014 - Terms of Reference

The review process is intended to ensure that:

(a) The quality of the unit's programs (graduate and undergraduate) is high and there are measures in place to ensure the evaluation and revision of the teaching programs. (Advice would be appreciated regarding the Educational Goals set for each program and how these should be assessed.<sup>1</sup>)

(b) The quality of faculty research is high and faculty collaboration and interaction provides a stimulating academic environment.

(c) Unit members participate in the administration of the unit and take an active role in the dissemination of knowledge.

(d) The unit's environment is conducive to the attainment of the objectives of the unit.

The Review Committee will assess the Unit and comment on its strengths and weaknesses, on opportunities for change and/or improvement, and on quality and effectiveness. The Review Committee should make essential, formal prioritized recommendations that address its major concerns, with reference to the resources available to the unit and the objectives described in its five-year plans.

Issues of particular interest to the University and/or the Unit that we would like the Review Committee to consider during the review are:

1. Assess the Department's undergraduate and graduate programs (MA & PhD) in the light of resource allocations, existing faculty complement, and quality of teaching and research experience. Does the graduate program prepare students well for academic and non-academic careers?
2. Assess the current research strengths of the department, suggest/evaluate new or emerging areas that should be pursued. Identify any important tradeoffs that may arise in building on existing strengths and/or adding new ones.
3. Evaluate hiring priorities in light of the Department's Strategic 5-year Plan, teaching and research needs, and its demographic (age, gender, etc.) profile.
4. Evaluate the Department's governance and its staffing resources.

1

In May 2013 Senate agreed that all academic units will develop and subsequently assess educational goals at the academic program level (majors, minors, masters and doctorates), as a part of the external review process. For the 2014 cycle these goals will be articulated in the external review self-study reports, and a process for assessment will be referenced in the Action Plan following the External Review. For the 2015 cycle both the Educational Goals and the assessment process and outcomes will be included in the self-study report.

5. Suggest ways in which the Department may pursue closer collaboration with cognate programs in FASS (e.g., International Studies, Public Policy) and elsewhere in the University.

The review team should also consider:

#### 1. Programs

- structure, breadth, orientation and integration of the undergraduate programs including the cooperative education program
- structure, breadth, depth and course offering schedule of the graduate programs
- graduate student progress and completion, and support for graduate students
- enrolment management issues at the undergraduate and graduate levels including, for the former, majors and service teaching

#### 2. Faculty

- size and quality of the faculty complement in relation to the Unit's responsibilities and workload
- teaching, research and service contributions of faculty members, including the level of external research support

#### 3. Administration

- size of the administrative and support staff complement, and the effectiveness of the administration of the Unit
- adequacy of resources and facilities provided to support teaching and research, including library, laboratory, equipment, computing, and office space

#### 4. Connection of the faculty within and outside the University

- the Unit's concept and plan for teaching and research and relationship with the other units within the University
- relationship between the Unit and the community

- relationship with alumni

**5. Future Directions**

- the plans of the Unit are appropriate and manageable.