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1. Introduction

This report describes the activities of the Senate Committee on the Evaluation of Undergraduate Programs (SCEUP) for the period from September 1, 2014 to June 30, 2015. The mandate of the SCEUP is to support the Vice-President Academic in implementing the University of Ottawa’s policy on the evaluation of programs leading to an undergraduate degree. This policy takes into account the University’s pedagogical criteria and the requirements of the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (CQA), which reports to the Council of Ontario Universities (COU). The evaluation of undergraduate programs must comply with the Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP) approved in June 2011 by the CQA. The University has always evaluated its programs periodically to ensure that it is offering its students an education of the highest quality and relevance and it will continue to do so under the new IQAP.

The periodic evaluation consists of (a) a self-evaluation completed by the academic unit, (b) an evaluation of the self-evaluation report by the SCEUP, (c) an external evaluation conducted by two professors from other universities, and (d) a summary report presenting recommendations. The SCEUP put in place a rigorous, systematic process to guide this periodic evaluation and ensure follow-up on the recommendations.

The Senate Committee on the Evaluation of the Undergraduate Programs (SCEUP) met 14 times between September 1st, 2014 and June 30, 2015. During these meetings the Committee:

a) discussed the periodic evaluation of 15 programs, whose summary evaluation reports are provided in the following pages;

b) examined how the progress reports made for other 15 programs evaluated in previous years have been implemented;

A bilingual information workshop was held on November 7, 2014 with representatives from each academic unit whose program(s) will be evaluated during 2015-2016. This was an opportunity to explain the Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP) approved by the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (OUCQA) on June 28, 2011, the goal of the evaluation, the importance of the self-evaluation process and to present the timeline for the various activities as well as the statistics available from the Institutional Research and Planning Office. Fourteen people representing eleven units attended the workshop.

The members of the SCEUP are aware of the demands associated with the periodic evaluation and would like to thank the individuals from the different academic units who were extensively involved in the evaluation process and who generously contributed to its success. Thank you also to the external evaluators for their dedication and professionalism. By openly sharing their questions and perspectives, they bring new outlooks and approaches, thus making it possible to improve our programs. The SCEUP wishes to acknowledge the work of Jovan Groen and Patrick Milot, program development and learning quality advisors with the Teaching and Learning Support Service for the support they provided to the academic units with respect to their work on learning outcomes and curriculum coherence. Lastly, the SCEUP wishes to recognize the Institutional Research and Planning team consisting of Serge Nadeau, Associate Vice-President, Linda Manuella Sandé and Marie-Ève Meunier.

As Chair of SCEUP, I would like to acknowledge the contribution of each Committee member to fulfilling our mandate and the prevailing collegial atmosphere that has made the evaluation process a dynamic, efficient and stimulating one. Thank you to Benoit Dionne (Science), Cédric Jourde et Phyllis Rippeyoung (Social sciences), Dany Laveault (Education), François Robitaille (Engineering), Fabrice Blée (St-Paul University), Isabelle Giroux (Sciences de la santé), Margarida Garcia (Droit), Paul Merkley et Mawy Bouchard (Arts). A special thank you to Madeleine Boisvert, Coordinator, Evaluation of Programs and Courses at the Office of the Vice-President Academic and Provost, and to Rachel Ouellette, Chief of staff, Office of the Vice-President Academic and Provost for their outstanding administrative support to the Committee and for ensuring that each step of the evaluation process was run smoothly.
2. Programs evaluated between September 2014 and June 2015

2.1 Faculty of Arts

2.1.1 Second Language Teaching

(Date of visit: January 23, 2015)

Evaluated Program: BA in Second Language Teaching

In addition to being critical to the University of Ottawa’s bilingual vocation, this program is of high quality in many respects. The reports (self-evaluation and external evaluators) make mention in particular of “the program’s unique character, relevance and effectiveness as a bilingual, multidisciplinary and inter-faculty program that makes it possible to train students demonstrating a high degree of expertise in the field of teaching and learning the two national languages as second languages in a variety of environments.”

The external evaluators mention that students are very satisfied with the expertise and availability of professors. They also note that all of the professors were active in research in the last two years, that their expertise is complementary and that there are enough of them.

The external evaluators identify several aspects that need to be corrected:

1) The dissatisfaction of students with the very limited number of spaces available in the compulsory courses.
2) Certain courses that do not reflect the program’s learning outcomes;
3) The absence of ways to assess a student’s progress in terms of mastery of the language;
4) Work is often over-evaluated even if it contains deficiencies in terms of content and language mastery;
5) The language test needs to be reviewed to ensure an accurate evaluation of the students’ level of proficiency;
6) At present, instructional support technology appears still to be used on a very limited basis in the program’s courses.

The external evaluators offered a few suggestions to improve the program. They note that there are no activities to integrate and synthesize the material of several courses. They suggest developing opportunities to ensure student mobility and “immersion in a completely Francophone environment for students in the French section.”

Lastly, the external evaluators recommend reviewing the program based on the new BEd requirements that will now be a two-year program. They suggest creating an integrated SLT/BEd bachelor’s degree that might reduce the length of studies.

Recommendations

1. The SCEUP recommends that the program collectively review all course plans to properly identify the learning outcomes for each of them, in compliance with the table in Appendix 2. It is critical that all of the learning outcomes be covered by the end of the program.
2. The SCEUP recommends that the program review its evaluation criteria and methods to provide students with an accurate assessment of their level of knowledge.
3. The SCEUP recommends that the program review the language test for admission and set appropriate standards to ensure that students have the required knowledge to succeed in their studies.
4. The SCEUP recommends that the program offer compulsory courses in both languages at least every two years.
5. The SCEUP recommends that the program examine the possibility of creating certain hybrid or entirely online courses, and develop an environment that supports and recognizes the effort of professors who create such courses.

6. The SCEUP recommends that the program develop activities that would allow students to incorporate and synthesize what they have learned in their studies.

7. The SCEUP encourages the program to foster student mobility to enable Anglophone students to access immersion practicums in a completely Francophone environment.

8. The SCEUP recommends examining the possibility of integrating the bachelor’s degree in education with the bachelor’s degree in second language teaching.

The SCEUP requests that a progress report be submitted to it by November 30, 2015.

2.1.2 ESL / FLS
(Date of visit: March 28, 2014)

Evaluated Programs: BA with a Major in English as a Second Language, Majeur en Français langue seconde.

The evaluators found that the program’s objectives are well aligned with those of the University of Ottawa. However, the major in ESL and FLS programs have significant shortcomings that will need to be addressed as quickly as possible.

The evaluators believe that the program of study reflects the state of the discipline in the 1980s and 1990s. They suggest that the Official Languages and Bilingualism Institute (Institute) adopt current, more task-based and experiential approaches in keeping with the evolution of the discipline. In their report, they expressed concern about the “lack of knowledge or curiosity shown by the parties consulted regarding the evolution of the discipline and its applications to teaching in the context of the program.” The evaluators also suggest updating the software in the labs.

The evaluators note that “The program’s admissions test is not designed to evaluate the ability of students to function in the two official languages in their studies and their career despite the fact that the desired learning outcomes of graduating students are defined in these terms (high level of functional bilingualism).” The evaluators suggest that the Institute clarify the expectations for the level of bilingualism required.

The program’s self-evaluation report and that of the evaluators indicate that there is a discrepancy between the learning outcomes reported in the survey of graduating students and the expectations of the program’s professors. Although the Institute has already made improvements in this regard, the evaluators suggest that the Institute examine the courses and ensure that full-time and part-time professors fully understand the program’s expectations and work to achieve them.

The evaluators write that the language proficiency expected of international students and the regulations regarding the language courses they have already taken prevent their admission to the program. This situation should be corrected.

There are enough full-time professors for the ESL program but the reliance of the FLS program on part-time professors is too great according to the evaluators: 74% of FLS courses are taught by part-time professors.
Recommendations

1. The SCEUP enjoins the Institute to adopt and enact current approaches and practices of second-language teaching, and wishes to see the action plan and timetable for their implementation. The SCEUP wishes a follow up report on major revision of the program.

2. The SCEUP requests that the Institute put in place a mechanism to ensure that professors have the competencies and training required to deliver courses using current approaches and thus ensure that pedagogical practices remain current.

3. The SCEUP recommends that the Institute define the level of proficiency required as a learning outcome in the second language and that these expectations be clearly indicated to students.

4. The SCEUP recommends that the Institute undertake a curriculum mapping exercise to contribute to overall program outcomes. All professors must understand the learning outcomes and insure that these are aligned with the program and met in their courses.

5. The SCEUP recommends for the ESL program that the Institute review its admissions policies for international students whose first language or prior language of instruction was not English and make appropriate adjustments. The committee wishes to receive a report of the impact of these changes on the enrolment of international students in the program.

6. The SCEUP is concerned with the very high percentage of part time instructors. It recommends that the Institute deploy its teaching personnel in a way that improves the ratio of courses in the FLS major taught by regular professors.

7. The SCEUP recommends the Institute to implement the new software as part of the updating of the program, and wishes to receive a report on the impact of this change.

8. The SCEUP recommends that the following courses be abolished: ESL 2181, ESL 3181, ESL 3341 and FSL 3741.

The SCEUP requests that a progress report be submitted to it by August 31, 2015.

2.1.3 Physical Geography

(Date of visit: September 19, 2014)

Evaluated Program: Honours BSc in Physical Geography

It comes out from the comments of the evaluators that the professors involved in the program of Physical Geography are leading experts. The evaluators note several times in their report that the faculty members are very active in research and that this knowledge percolates down to the classroom for the benefit of the students.

The external evaluators’ recommendations and concerns raised by SCEUP need to be addressed. There are serious concerns about this program: low enrollment - only 10 students were admitted in the past 8 years and an average of 7.5 students registered across the 4-year program; duration of studies - it takes an average of 17 sessions to complete the program in comparison to 13 in Geography; curriculum coherence – prerequisites and repetition of content; the geoscience accreditation, etc.

One of the major issues is the title of professional geoscientist. The external evaluators recommend to simply drop this goal of the program in physical geography. They wrote that “Geoscience accreditation is perhaps more in line with an interdisciplinary program such as Environmental Science at the University of Ottawa – this should be explored.” The evaluators consider that trying to meet the requirements for the geoscience accreditation is a commendable goal but “it is by no means something essential” for a program in Physical Geography and is “probably fairly unique to Ottawa.” They finally added that “[the title of professional geoscientist] is not a requirement in many fields of professional work open to physical geographers and as such need not be a necessary component or goal.”
Taking into account the very low level of enrollment and the fact that the actual program is much more demanding than any other in Canada, maintaining the requirements for the geoscience accreditation does not seem appropriate. Past experience shows that this has not been an attracting feature of the program.

The evaluators make some recommendations to streamline the program in Physical Geography: the creation of different stream like Geomatics, eliminating some courses in geology, mathematics and physics (which will make the professional title less accessible), and removing some requirements. The external evaluators recommend that the program be revisited, in particular the component offered by the faculty of Science, and that the coherence of the whole program should be improved.

**Recommendations**

1. The SCEUP recommends that the program be reviewed independently of the requirements for the Geoscience accreditation.

2. The SCEUP recommends that the department of Geography follow up on the proposal of the external evaluators to offers streams, one in Physical Geography and the other in Geomatics. The SCEUP recommends that this proposal be examined as profiles within a B.Sc. Honours degree in Geography.

3. In the context of the previous two recommendations, the SCEUP recommends that the Department of Geography review the stream in Physical Geography and address the external evaluators’ concerns about the courses offered in Mathematics, Statistics and Physics.

4. The SCEUP recommends that the Department of Geography review the prerequisites and contents of its courses to eliminate repetition as much as possible.

5. The SCEUP recommends that a curriculum mapping be completed to insure the coherence of the program and that all learning outcomes are met and evaluated.

6. The SCEUP recommends that the Department of Geography provide better guidance and support to lecturers to inform them of the learning outcomes and ensure that these outcomes are properly understood and integrated in the courses they offer.

The SCEUP recommends that suspension of admissions to the Physical Geography program be continued. Based on the above recommendations, the SCEUP requests that the Department of Geography undertake a major program redesign and submit a market study and clear plan for the recruitment of students. The new program must be strongly differentiated from similar programs already at the University (Environmental Studies, Environmental Sciences, Geomatics, etc.) and must not compete with them. The suspension of admissions will not be lifted until the Senate has approved the program’s redesign.

The SCEUP submits two possible scenarios to the Department of Geography:

- **Scenario 1.** The Department of Geography closes its Honours BSc in Physical Geography immediately without proceeding with the suggested redesign.

- **Scenario 2.** The Department of Geography proceeds with a major redesign of its Physical Geography program taking into account the SCEUP’s recommendations. The Department should undertake to complete the redesign with the goal of new admissions in September 2017. If the redesign is not implemented in 2017, the program will automatically close in accordance with the IQAP requirement (a program with no admissions over a period of three consecutive years will be considered closed and will not be subject to the evaluation process).
Regardless of the scenario chosen, the SCEUP requests to be informed of the decision by May 15, 2015.

2.1.4 History
(Date of visit: March 2, 2015)

**Evaluated Programs:** Honours BA with Specialization in History, Honours BA in History and Political Science and Major in History

The external evaluators “were generally impressed by the quality and the effectiveness of the undergraduate education at the University of Ottawa’s History Department.” Faculty are well qualified and students are satisfied of the education they receive.

More than half of history courses are taught by part-time faculty. This situation is more apparent for first year courses. This heavy reliance on part-time faculty needs to be addressed to ensure long-term program stability and quality. Evaluators suggested to “Drastically reduce reliance on part-time faculty for the first year”. Due to heavy reliance on part-time faculty, coordination is necessary to ensure consistency in program delivery. Evaluators acknowledged the department has started the process with scrutinising syllabi, but pointed out that more can be done.

Evaluators were “particularly concerned that there are virtually no seminars or other opportunities to interact with faculty before the 4th year.” They also reported that “Students repeatedly expressed their desire for more in-class discussion at all levels” during the site visit. Some students reported that the current teaching approach is passive and does not fully engage them. It appears that the main evaluation methods used to assess students’ achievement of learning outcomes in history program courses are multiple choices questions and essay examinations. According to evaluators, multiple choice questions “are not appropriate for the discipline of History, which relies on narrative and nuance”.

**Recommendations**

1. The SCEUP recommends that the Department of history examine ways to reduce the proportion of history courses taught by part-time faculty, especially in the first year courses. The SCEUP wants to be informed of the solutions that will be implemented.

2. The SCEUP recommends that the Department of history continue its work to increase program consistency by coordinating the work of part-time faculty. The SCEUP wants to be informed of the progress made.

3. The SCEUP recommends that the Department of history include various pedagogical approaches to engage students actively in learning in courses starting before the 4th year, such as opportunities for students to interact with faculty (e.g. collaborative-based learning, etc.). The university teaching and learning center may be helpful in this regard. The SCEUP wants to be informed of the pedagogical approaches used in history to engage students in learning.

4. The SCEUP recommends that the Department of history use various assessment methods to evaluate students’ achievement of learning outcomes. The university teaching and learning center may be helpful. The SCEUP asks to be informed of the assessment methods used in history to evaluate students’ achievement of learning outcomes.

5. The SCEUP recommends that the Department of History find a solution to the problem of courses not being offered after examining the program’s course offering in French. The SCEUP requests that it be informed of the possible solutions examined, the solution chosen and the rationale for the choice.

The SCEUP requests that a progress report be submitted to it by November 30, 2015.
2.1.5 Modern Languages and Literatures (Spanish)
(Date of visit: March 21, 2014)

Evaluated Program: Honours BA with Specialization in Spanish, Major in Spanish.

The external evaluators note that “there is no doubt about the quality of the teaching staff” and that the professors of Hispanic studies are among the most prestigious in Canada. However, they add that there could be more professors.

The external evaluators conclude that the “program's structure is aligned with the specified program learning outcomes and with the expectations of the university graduates concerned.” The survey at the end of the program shows that students believe that the full-time professors of the Spanish program provide instruction of high quality.

There has been a more than 50% decline in enrolment in the Honours program with specialization since 2005. There are very few students in this program. The major appears to have absorbed some of the students who, before its creation, would have enrolled in the Honours program with specialization. One of the reasons for the decrease in the number of students in the Honours bachelor’s program with specialization in favour of the major is possibly provided by the students who mention having serious scheduling conflicts, especially with the compulsory courses. This is also mentioned in the report from the external evaluators who note that “the course offering and respective scheduling of the discipline’s courses are a personal decision of the teaching staff.”

Particular attention should be given to courses ESP1991 and ESP1992. These are the first Spanish courses that students can take at the University of Ottawa. They are also the courses that the program could use to recruit students for the major or the Honours degree in Spanish. The evaluators add “teaching of these language courses is left almost entirely in the hands of graduate students with little or no teaching experience.”

Several suggestions are made by the external evaluators to increase the success of these language courses in Spanish.

Recommendations
1. The SCEUP recommends that the program develop recruitment strategies to increase the number of students in its Honours program, and report on the strategies implemented.
2. The SCEUP recommends that the program review the time schedule of its courses, in particular for the compulsory courses in the Honours program, to ensure that there is no scheduling conflict and that the students can complete their program in a timely fashion.
3. The SCEUP recommends that the program review the structure of its program to provide 4000 level courses specifically for the undergraduate students. The SCEUP would like to know which initiatives have already been implemented by the program following last summer meeting or which ones will be implemented.
4. The SCEUP recommends the creation of a committee to review the structure and teaching outcomes of the major and the Honours BA with Specialization in Spanish in order to rationalize and update the course offering.
5. The SCEUP recommends that the program review the way language courses are taught, in particular ESP1991 and ESP1992. In doing so, the program must address the recommendations of the external evaluators and assure that the course learning outcomes are reached. The SCEUP would like to know which modifications have been implemented and their impact on the courses.
6. The SCEUP recommends that the program find means to provide adequate academic advice to the students who may need it. The SCEUP would like to know the solution that has been implemented to address this issue.
7. The courses ESP2103 and ESP2503, ESP3905, ESP3906, ESP3915, ESP3919, ESP4910, ESP4917, ESP4922, ESP4926 and ESP4932 should be removed from the academic calendar.

The SCEUP requests that a progress report on the seven recommendations be submitted to it by September 30, 2015.

2.1.6 Linguistics  
(Date of visit: March 7, 2014)

Evaluated Programs: Honours BA with Specialization in Linguistics, Major in Linguistics, Joint Honours BA in Psychology and Linguistics.

The external reviewers find the faculty in this department is truly excellent. They are active researchers, with a remarkable level of external funding.

The evaluators’ report of these programs is very positive, reflecting its strengths. There are few causes for concern. One is the departure of the three professors from the important field of phonology. The dean gives his assurance that two of these posts will be opened shortly.

The quality of the teaching is good and evaluation is appropriate. Most of the students are very satisfied with the program. However, Francophone students told evaluators that they have difficulty completing the program in French. Several courses have low enrolment of Francophone students. As a result, these courses are cancelled and create significant disruption for students. It should be noted that the University has a policy that requires the cancellation of courses in French to be approved by the Vice-President Academic. In addition, the Office of the Vice-President Academic provides funding to maintain courses in French with low enrolment.

Part-time professors mentioned to evaluators that they did not receive good guidance and support from the Department. It is important for part-time professors to understand the learning outcomes and the level that must be achieved in the courses they offer in order to preserve curriculum coherence.

The evaluators comment that the program is very demanding and suggest more relaxed requirements. The Department indicates that the professors do not agree with this suggestion and doubt its effectiveness. Nevertheless, professors admit that the requirements of the joint program are demanding and it seems that lightening the courses warrants exploration.

Recommendations

1. The SCEUP recommends that the program ensure an adequate and fair offering of courses in French that makes it possible for all students, including those in the Joint Honours program, and those who enter one of the programs from a CEGEP, to complete their programs in French in a timely fashion.

2. The SCEUP recommends the professors responsible for the program to continue their efforts to integrate the part-time professors more fully into the teaching and intellectual life of the program.

3. The SCEUP recommends that the professors of the programs examine the list of compulsory courses, streamlining the curriculum where academically desirable, with a view to making the rotation more flexible and the program less dependent on part-time teaching.

4. The SCEUP recommends that the following courses be abolished: LIN 2302, LIN 2786, LIN 3340/3740, LIN 3733, LIN 3782, LIN 4381.

5. The SCEUP requests that a progress report be submitted to it by August 31, 2015.
2.2 Faculty of Engineering

2.2.1 Software Engineering

(Date of visit: February 27, 2015)


In a prelude to their recommendations, the external reviewers stated: “[…] it should be emphasized that the school has worked hard and successfully to ensure that all aspects of the undergraduate experience in the B.A.Sc. in Software Engineering and its Engineering Management and Entrepreneurship Option programs is a very positive one, and that the students are very appreciative of these efforts made on their behalf.”

The external evaluators mentioned the quality of teaching assistants’ work as a major issue. Teaching assistants (TA) play an important role in the EECS students’ learning. That is why it is so important that they have the skills to play their role adequately. Measures to develop and improve TAs’ teaching skills must be put in place to insure a good student experience.

As for the program, the external evaluators recommend offering prerequisite courses more often to avoid delaying the academic progress of students. They also mention that the first year is very dry and does not contain any SEG software engineering courses. In their view, a course on general software engineering concepts should be offered in first year, which would motivate students and ensure better retention.

The retention rate of first-year students is a concern. It is important that students who have been admitted and who experience learning difficulties be screened as soon as possible and that appropriate support be provided to them.

The external reviewers recommended that the communication between classes be improved “to ensure that the program objectives are met.” According to the director and associate director, “an integrated oversight committee for the school (EECS)” has just been created.

Recommendations

1. The SCEUP recommends to be informed of the solutions that will be implemented to develop the skills of teaching assistants as well as of the impact of these new measures on students.

2. The SCEUP supports any initiative that could help students who experience learning difficulties as mentioned by the Vice-Dean program. It is crucial that better communication of program requirements (including course in Maths/Science) be put in place. The SCEUP wants to be informed of the schedule of implementation of the new support measures and of their impact on the students’ experience and the retention rate of first-year students.

3. The SCEUP would like to be informed of the work of the integrated oversight committee especially regarding the coordination of courses that SEG students take from CEG, SEG and CSI.

4. The SCEUP requests that a report be prepared on the recommendations of the coordinating committee as well as their impact on student achievement.

5. The SCEUP requests that all the recommendations provided by the team of external reviewers be answered to, whether they are intended to be implemented or not.

6. The SCEUP would like to be informed of the efforts undertaken to follow up on prerequisite courses and on a course on general software engineering concepts.
7. The SCEUP recommends that the School addresses the concerns expressed by the external reviewers regarding the results of the survey on the students’ perception of their learning and development (Table 13E).

8. The SCEUP would like to be informed of the School’s specific needs that are not currently being met and how it intends to address them.

The SCEUP urges the School to continue its efforts to improve the students’ experience and requests that a progress report on the above recommendations be submitted to it by May 31, 2016.

2.3 Faculty of Science

2.3.1 Physics / Physics-Mathematics

(Date of visit: February 14, 2014)

Evaluated Programs: Honours BSc with Specialization in Physics, Major in Physics, Honours BSc with Specialization in Physics-Mathematics.

The physics programs are of superior quality and comparable to those offered in recognized North American universities. The professors are leading researchers and excellent teachers. However, some changes should be made to continue to improve the student experience.

The first issue is the time taken by a majority of students to complete their degree. The evaluators note that: “on average, an extra academic year is needed to complete the program.” Moreover, students indicate a problem with course scheduling: 70% for the compulsory courses, 60% for the optional courses and even 70% for the elective in the Honours B.Sc. in physics. The situation is even worse for the Honours B.Sc. in physics mathematics with 100% of the students reporting scheduling problems in all three categories.

The second area of concern for the SCEUP is access to quality courses in French, especially at the 3000 and 4000 level. In an effort to reduce the length of studies, the Department is proposing to offer 3000 and 4000 level courses in English every year and to keep the two-year cycle for courses in French. Francophone students, who are generally bilingual, will take the courses that interest them when they are offered even if they are given in English. The result could reduce the number of students enrolled in courses in French.

In addition, the evaluators note: “Currently a large number of courses are offered in French by contractually limited appointment faculty. They do an excellent job, but maintaining a high quality of instruction with contractually limited appointments is very difficult to achieve” and underscores the needs related to teaching in French. “There is a need to increase the number of full-time French speaking faculty so that the bilingual curriculum can be offered more effectively.”

The evaluators mention: “The increase in teaching capability has not been as high as it might have been since many new faculty members are CRCs for which there is a reduction in teaching load and no requirement for speaking French.” The Department’s response is that it looks first for excellence in research when hiring. Without denying the importance of research, the SCEUP must remind the Department of the University’s unique mission to enable Franco-Ontarians to pursue post-secondary studies in French with the goal of supporting and contributing to the development of the Franco-Ontarian community. The Dean responds: “The approved strategic hiring plan of the Faculty of Science call for several hires in Physics, specifically in the area of Advanced Materials – we are hopeful that at least 50 % of the new hires will be able to teach in French».

The evaluators are concerned by the lack of concrete mechanisms to evaluate the oral communication skills of the students. As communication skills are part of the learning outcomes, it is essential that mechanisms to assess them be implemented.
The low level of enrollment in physics programs and the even much lower level of enrollment of women are serious issues. It is clear that these problems are not unique to the University of Ottawa. The Department of Physics must put more effort in recruiting francophones and female students. The SCEUP recommends that the Department build initiatives along the lines of similar on campus initiatives to promote the recruitment of female students such as GirlSci, Go ENG Girl, Allez coder les filles, etc.

**Recommendations**

1. The SCEUP recommends that the Department investigate the problem of course scheduling as well as the issue related to time of completion and be informed of the solutions that will be implemented.

2. The SCEUP recommends that the Department and Faculty ensure that new hires make it possible to address the need for instruction in French.

3. The SCEUP recommends that the Department make every effort to offer compulsory courses in both languages on an annual basis so that students do not experience a delay in obtaining their bachelor’s degree.

4. The SCEUP recommend that the Department implement mechanisms to assess the oral communication skills of all their students before they graduate. The SCEUP would like to receive a report on this issue.

5. The SCEUP would like to receive the schedule of implementation of the proposed initiatives towards improving recruitment; in particular, for the female students and Francophones.

6. The SCEUP recommends that the Department oversees the content of its website and collaborate with the Faculty of Science communication group and ensure that their outreach initiatives will be posted on the departmental website, and report the results to the SCEUP.

The SCEUP requests that a progress report be submitted to it by December 18, 2015.

**2.3.2 Environmental Studies**

**Evaluated Programs:** Honours BSc in Environmental Science (multidisciplinary), Conservation and Biodiversity Option; Honours BSc in Environmental Science (multidisciplinary), Global Change Option; Honours BSc in Environmental Science (multidisciplinary), Environmental Geochemistry and Ecotoxicology Option.

The evaluators note that the teaching team, which it describes as skilled, involved and passionate, probably represents the program’s best asset. The evaluators describe the Environmental Science program as excellent and of very high calibre. They identify as significant assets the program’s bilingual character, the presence of compulsory practical/field courses, the availability of specializations and a co-op option, the international exchanges and the availability of research projects integrated in the curriculum.

The SCEUP notes the decrease in the number of students enrolled in the program since 2009. The evaluators note the substantial decline in the proportion of Francophone students enrolled in the program. In addition, the SCEUP notes the decline in the proportion of offers of admission made to Francophone candidates, and both the evaluators and the SCEUP consider the evolution in the proportion of Francophone students concerning. The evaluators point out the lack of specific measures to increase the proportion of Francophone students enrolled in the program, and suggest that the bilingual component be promoted to all students in the Environmental Science program, as it appears essential to their employment in the Ottawa region. It is also suggested that recruitment activities targeting Francophone candidates be enhanced, notably for those coming from CEGEPs.
The SCEUP notes that the program’s coordination committee does not meet on a regular basis. Further, the evaluators make a number of comments on (1) the need to strengthen teaching of the socio-economic aspects of environmental science issues and such specific aspects as impact studies and preparation for professional practice; (2) the lack of information on learning outcomes and the link to degree-level expectations; (3) the need to reorganize and streamline the course offering, notably to ensure that students can complete their program in the expected time without requiring exceptional administrative measures; and (4) the limited offering of courses exclusive to the program.

The SCEUP and the evaluators note management issues related to the interdisciplinary nature of the program. The self-evaluation report expresses the desire for the program to be based in the Department of Earth Sciences with a change in the latter’s name. The evaluators suggest that this change is imminent although the report does not indicate the official measures taken to accomplish it.

The evaluators identify, in particular, the challenges related to teaching assignments within the Faculty of Science and the priority given by departments to the courses required by the programs that each manages. This is detrimental to the courses required by EVS. The SCEUP also notes the lack of effective influence over the definition, level and method of course delivery and over the hiring of professors for courses that are not coded EVS but that are, nevertheless, compulsory for the Environmental Science program; this is true even within the Faculty of Science. The evaluators point out that the challenges related to teaching assignments within the Faculty of Science around the EVS program have existed since the internal evaluation exercise in 2005 and have still not been resolved.

In another vein, the evaluators mention on many occasions the management difficulties related to the fact that certain courses are offered by the Faculty of Arts. They mention the need to strengthen the interactions with this faculty, which should include an enhanced course offering to enrich discussion of the social and human aspects of environmental issues. However, because of past difficulties and the existence of other programs offered by the Faculty of Arts, program management prefers an interdisciplinary approach developed within the Faculty of Science.

The SCEUP notes the problems associated with the Global Change option due to the fact that certain courses are offered by the Faculty of Arts. It is imperative that a serious discussion take place between program management, the Faculty of Science, the Department of Geography of the Faculty of Arts, the Faculty of Arts and other affected entities so that all of the parties examine and agree on the learning outcomes and the elements that differentiate the Physical Geography, Geomatics, Environmental Studies, Geography, Geology and other undergraduate programs offered by the Faculties of Science and Arts.

Lastly, the SCEUP notes the lack of a sense of belonging to the program that was mentioned by students to the external evaluators and by those who responded to the surveys conducted as part of the program quality evaluation procedures established by the University.

Recommendations

1. The SCEUP recommends that program management establish a strategy, clear objectives and a schedule to increase the number of students enrolled in the program without reducing admission requirements.

2. The SCEUP recommends that program management establish a strategy, clear objectives and a schedule to increase, explicitly and separately, the proportion of Francophone students enrolled in the program.

3. The SCEUP recommends that program management add a clause to its bylaws that will require meetings of the program coordination committee to be held a minimum of once a semester.

4. The SCEUP recommends that program management proceed with a review of the objectives, structure and content of the Environmental Science program and to the formal definition of the learning outcomes for EVS coded courses in collaboration with the University’s Teaching and Learning Support Service.
5. The SCEUP recommends that program management proceed with a formal analysis of the curriculum that will indicate the learning outcomes for each of the courses and how the latter fit into the program as a whole.

6. The SCEUP recommends that program management clearly define the objectives of the interdisciplinary approach.

7. The SCEUP recommends that the Dean of the Faculty of Science ensure that teaching assignments take into account the needs of the EVS program by all necessary means, including a review of the Environmental Science program, if applicable.

8. The SCEUP considers that the status quo is not acceptable given the difficulties identified with the Global Change option. It requests that a serious discussion be undertaken between program management, the Faculty of Science, the Department of Geography of the Faculty of Arts, and the Faculty of Arts to establish a clear vision for this option.

9. The SCEUP recommends that program management, in collaboration with the assembly and the University's Teaching and Learning Support Service, demonstrate leadership and make a clear, firm decision during the 2015-2016 academic year on the program's objectives and the options offered. If the decision is to repatriate and transform the Global Change option, management and the assembly must set clear content and learning outcomes and a defined schedule for their implementation. Furthermore, official measures to this end are required and must be undertaken.

10. The SCEUP recommends that program management put in place the appropriate measures, including any required changes to the program, in order to strengthen the sense of belonging of students to their program, in a spirit of cohorts.

List of courses not offered for more than three years and the reasons.

- GEO4332 Permafrost Geomorphology: last offered in the winter of 2007. No reason given; discussions said to be ongoing.
- GEC4129 Global Climate Change: last offered in the fall of 2009. No reason given; discussions said to be ongoing.

The SCEUP requests that the above courses be offered on a regular basis, in both French and English, or abolished and removed from the calendar.

The SCEUP requests that a progress report be submitted to it by December 11, 2015.

2.4 Faculty of Social Science

2.4.1 Anthropology

(Date of visit: February 28, 2014)

Evaluated Programs: Major in Anthropology, Joint Honours BA in Sociology and Anthropology.

The external evaluators indicate that the full-time professors are active in research and capable of ensuring the quality of the program. The teaching by the full-time professors appears to be excellent. They are innovators and do not hesitate to address new themes.

The situation appears to be quite the opposite in the case of the lecturers. The external evaluators made this a major theme of their report. Lecturers teach the majority of the program's courses, indeed, almost two-thirds of them. The external evaluators identify several problems arising from this situation including:

(a) the lack of innovation;
(b) hesitation to develop new teaching approaches;
(c) a lack of interest in addressing new themes;
(d) courses that present a conservative view and interpretation of the subject;
(e) material (e.g. history of anthropological ideas) that is repeated in several courses;
(f) problems achieving the learning outcomes.

These problems are raised a number of times in the report of the external evaluators. They recommend that “an academic or pedagogical committee examine this situation to ensure better coordination of course material.”

For their part, the part-time professors “feel marginalized”. The external evaluators note “a lack of pedagogical coordination among non-permanent faculty, which tends to not identify closely with the Department.” Part-time professors find that they do not receive sufficient guidance from full-time staff. The evaluators comment that “these individuals do not talk to each other, at least when it comes to pedagogical coordination.”

A problem raised in the self-appraisal report submitted by the School of Sociological and Anthropological Studies is the lack of preparation of some students taking advanced courses in Anthropology. The external evaluators mentioned: « What many professors in anthropology courses have to balance is the fact that some students are coming into advanced classes without the appropriate background in anthropology. If students do not understand basic concepts, it can make courses more difficult to teach since you have to balance between those who have no prior knowledge and those who are in the program. The pedagogical challenge is at times to revisit basic concepts without making it redundant for our majors ». This may have a negative impact on the level and quality of the advanced courses.

Other problems identified by the external evaluators are related to the program’s content:
(a) the inadequate number of courses offered at the 3000 and 4000 level and (b) the very high concentration of cultural material in the courses (Anthropology of Latin America and the Caribbean, Anthropology of Oceania, Anthropology of Africa and Anthropology of Asia). The SCEUP recommends that the School review the distribution of material.

In conjunction with the creation of the specialization in anthropology, the School announced the introduction of four new courses at the 3000 level and five new courses at the 4000 level. These changes might address some of the concerns mentioned earlier.

The creation of a specialization in Anthropology and the hiring of new professors do not eliminate the SCEUP’s concerns about the School’s heavy reliance on part-time professors. The School needs to develop a more innovative approach than simply hiring professors to reduce its reliance on lecturers. The evaluators offer as possible solutions the “not insignificant number of anthropologists attached to other departments of the University” and the use of technologies in certain universities. The external evaluators wonder why the courses given by anthropologists associated with other departments “cannot be incorporated directly in the Anthropology program....”

The Major in Anthropology and the Specialization in Anthropology that were recently created by University of Ottawa add to the many programs in this discipline in Ontario and Quebec universities. To quote the external evaluators, “universities and, in particular, certain non-technical disciplines (such as anthropology) are competing for clients. This requires financial resources (staff) and the motivation to innovate. The latter is somewhat lacking at the School.” The evaluators mention the co-op program as an innovative program, but is it enough to sufficiently distinguish the Anthropology program at the University of Ottawa from similar programs at other universities?

Very little was said in the School's self-evaluation report and in the report of the external evaluators about the Joint BA, which should be distinctive from a double major.

The self-evaluation report by the School of Sociological and Anthropological Studies mentions that “In certain cases, proficiency (in English and in French) is too low and represents an obstacle to the success of our students.” The SCEUP requests that the Department
inform it of the measures taken to assist students in meeting these requirements.

Recommendations

1. The SCEUP recommends that a mechanism be put in place to ensure coordination of the courses offered by part-time professors and better guidance and support for them. The SCEUP requests that it be informed of the mechanism put in place.

2. The SCEUP recommends that the School of Sociological and Anthropological Studies establish an inclusive policy with respect to part-time professors so that they are able to develop a sense of belonging to the program. The SCEUP requests that it be informed of the progress made in this regard.

3. The SCEUP recommends that the School of Sociological and Anthropological Studies ensure that its part-time professors fully understand the expected learning outcomes for the courses they offer. The SCEUP also requests that measures be taken to enable part-time professors to be involved in pedagogical discussions. The SCEUP requests that it be informed of the measures put in place.

4. The SCEUP recommends that the program review the prerequisites for the advanced courses in anthropology to insure that students taking these courses have sufficient knowledge to succeed in the course.

5. The SCEUP requests that it receive confirmation that the number of 3000 and 4000-level courses will be increased.

6. The SCEUP recommends that the School of Sociological and Anthropological Studies adopt concrete measures to reduce the proportion of courses offered by part-time professors. The SCEUP requests that it be informed of the measures taken and the impact of those measures on the number of courses taught by part-time professors.

7. The SCEUP recommends that the School of Sociological and Anthropological Studies develop strategies to distinguish it from the programs offered by other universities. The SCEUP would like to be informed of the strategies put in place and their success.

8. The SCEUP recommends that the joint program be closed if the School of Sociological and Anthropological Studies is not prepared to make significant improvements to make it a program in which the two disciplines are well integrated and bring added value to the option that is not available to students completing a double major.

9. The SCEUP recommends that the School of Sociological and Anthropological Studies give particular attention (assign a language quality grade) to language proficiency in English and French, which represents a challenge for many students.

The SCEUP requests that a progress report be submitted to it by March 31, 2015.

2.4.2 Criminology

(Date of visit: January 16, 2015)

Evaluated Programs: Honours BA with Major in Criminology, Honours BA with Specialization in Criminology, Joint Honours BSocSc in Criminology and Women's Studies.

The evaluators point out that the program’s professors are notable in the Faculty for the quality of their teaching and often win awards for teaching excellence.

The Department does an excellent job of maintaining the linguistic balance and the level of bilingualism is among the highest at the University. It would be good to open this bilingualism to the scientific culture by promoting the teaching of various traditions in the other language. This openness would further enrich the linguistic balance already in place.
The evaluators mention that the program is well balanced in terms of theory and practice and in its ability to prepare students for a variety of jobs in the field. However, the program is not as successful at developing students’ skills in the areas of written communication and quantitative methodology.

Some of the components of the University of Ottawa’s Criminology program must be viewed from the perspective of the creation of a new college of criminologists in Quebec. The evaluators mention the concern raised by the program’s professors and students with respect to Quebec’s new policies that will affect the future of criminology graduates. It is important to maintain a productive dialogue with those in charge of the professional association to foster, as much as possible, the admission of the program’s graduates to the Ordre des criminologues du Québec. The program’s proven success depends as much on the integrity of the program’s direction as on the markets assured by that training in Quebec.

The evaluators suggest increasing access to concrete learning experiences and the possibility of applying the theoretical knowledge to the real world. Introduction of the Wall-to-Bridges program in fall 2016 represents the main response to this request at this time.

The students interviewed, and the evaluators themselves, believe that it would be very beneficial for the program to examine ways to develop the practical teaching aspect (“clinical” in Quebec terminology) more fully without altering the program’s overall direction. The approach would consist mainly of making one-off additions and including minor complements to the program.

Student access to placements represents a problem. According to the evaluators, “Students deplore the fact that there are not enough placements and that they are reserved for students based on overly restrictive and exclusive criteria. This aspect also needs to be thoroughly examined by those in charge of the training.” Whether this situation is based on objective facts or it is an inaccurate perception of reality, it seems important to clarify the criteria for the assignment of placements. Consideration should be given to expanding participation in these highly coveted placements by making strategic changes to the selection criteria.

In the previous report, even before there was a 40% increase in enrolment, the problem of the teacher-student ratio was raised. Today, this is an even greater problem; the Department’s ratio is the highest in the Faculty. Professors are being used to their maximum with a graduate program that is almost as popular as the undergraduate program.

Admission to the Criminology program is restricted by various practices specific to the Department of Criminology. The program’s students must maintain a 7.0 average after the first year or leave the program. In addition to contravening the Faculty’s and University’s regulations, internal management of academic progress raises anxiety and discontent among the program’s students who cannot be assured of achieving all of their objectives during their studies. The limited access to fourth-year courses through the cumulative 7.0 average, as well as the limited access to the “placement” option, appear to be linked more to the problems of the teacher-student ratio than to a pedagogical concern. Reflection is needed on the validity of these practices from an overall pedagogical perspective that takes into account the challenges of the ratio for courses at all levels (with particular attention to first year courses); this reflection is necessary following the completion of a very productive self-evaluation during which several issues appear to have become clearer.

Certain concerns were identified with respect to the Joint Criminology and Women’s Studies program. Consideration needs to be given to content that would highlight interdisciplinarity and encourage the development of critical thinking on bidisciplinarity issues.

Recommendations

1. The SCEUP suggests that individuals be appointed internally to take the lead in assuring liaison with and monitoring the developments related to the Ordre professionnel des criminologues du Québec and the University of Ottawa’s Criminology program.
2. The SCEUP recommends that the primary goal of the discussion be to ensure the interests of graduates and the integrity and strengths of the program.

3. The SCEUP recommends that the Department continue to develop new opportunities for experiential learning for its students in real or simulated forms at levels comparable to those of the Faculty.

4. The SCEUP recommends that the Department’s professors find ways to immediately incorporate the demand for practical training in discussions of the program’s development.

5. The SCEUP recommends that the Department review its criteria for assignment of placements and ensure that those criteria are properly disseminated to and understood by students.

6. The SCEUP recommends that various proposals be brought to it on ways to mitigate the problem of the very high ratio at the same time as the hiring of two new members of the teaching staff.

7. The SCEUP recommends that the Department comply with Senate-approved academic regulations or submit a formal request for an exception to the Senate for approval.

8. The SCEUP recommends that the Department review its academic practices regarding the cumulative weighted averages required to access the fourth year of study and to be admitted to the program’s “placement” option in accordance with the academic regulations approved by the Senate.

9. The SCEUP recommends that particular thought be given to the theoretical and critical components of the Joint Criminology and Women’s Studies program to strengthen the bidisciplinary aspects of the program as compared to the double major.

10. The SCEUP recommends that the Department of Criminology give special attention (e.g. through diagnostic tests, development or upgrading of courses) to the challenge of linguistic proficiency in English and French experienced by many of its students.

The list of courses not offered for more than three years and the reasons:

- CRM 3324 - Intervention Practice
- CRM 4333 - Epistemology and Methodology
- CRM 4716 - Violence et société
- CRM 4733 - Épistémologie et méthodologie

The SCEUP recommends that courses CRM 4333 and 4733 be abolished and that an audit be done before abolishing courses CRM 3324 and 4116 to ensure that the equivalent courses in French have not been given in the last three years.

The SCEUP requests that a progress report be submitted to it by December 11, 2015

2.4.3 Conflict Studies and Human Rights
(Date of visit: February 13, 2015)

Evaluated Programs: Honours BA in Conflict Studies and Human Rights

According to the external evaluators, the University of Ottawa’s ECH program is a leader in its field:
“The ECH program already provides a much more coherent and focused treatment of conflict and human rights issues than that offered by any other Canadian university, and is well positioned to remain a national leader in this respect.”
That being said, the student retention rates in the program are below the average for the FSS. The reasons that students leave the program are unclear and warrant further exploration, especially when, in the opinion of the external evaluators, the evaluations from students who graduate from the program are very positive. The external evaluators note that full-time professors offered only half of the courses in 2013. As for the evaluation of learning outcomes, the grade distribution is a median of about A-, which the external evaluators believe presents a risk of grade inflation that should be examined. The external evaluators offered numerous recommendations. Given that there was no major disagreement on any of the recommendations made in either the self-evaluation report or in the report of the external evaluators, and indeed, there was a high level of agreement on the assessment of the program and its objectives by the various players, the SCEUP supports the analysis of the situation and approves all of the recommendations made.

This first evaluation of the program in recent history is very encouraging and motivating from the perspective that the external evaluators went so far as to suggest that “the University of Ottawa may want to develop a branding strategy tailored to ECH as a distinctive flagship undergraduate program.”

**Recommendations**

1. From the perspective of both the self-evaluation report and the external evaluators, the SCEUP asks that ECH undertake a revision of the program’s structure that would improve it further. To that effect, special care should be given to the following:
   a) While course descriptions still focus on content, course outlines may be used to add the learning and skills outcomes for each course.
   b) The program should be structured more systematically around imparting skills specific to the level of learning of a given course.
   c) The St. Paul course requirement should be dropped.

2. The SCEUP agrees with the self-evaluation report and asks that the causes for the relative low retention rates be identified and appropriate policies devised to improve retention rates.

3. The SCEUP recommends that ECH ensure courses are more systematic in the skills and learning outcomes they impart. One option, as suggested by external evaluators, would be to develop sample syllabi for each course with corresponding learning outcomes.

4. The SCEUP recommends that ECH foster systematic coordination among English and French instructors on course structure, evaluation, learning objectives and outcomes.

5. The SCEUP recommends that the ECH undertake a systematic analysis of grading practices to reduce the risk of ongoing grade inflation.

6. The SCEUP recommends ECH to consider offering one or more online distance education courses.

7. The SCEUP recommends that the library develop a specialist resource guide on conflict studies with the assistance of ECH and that the program take advantage of the assistance of the library’s ECH program representative.

8. The SCEUP recommends that alternative teaching delivery methods be considered as suggested by the external evaluators. Here are some of their suggestions that could be implemented:
   a) Introduce experiential learning into the classroom through problem-based learning, gaming, simulations, and the “inverted-classroom” approach.
   b) Put more emphasis on teaching quantitative methods within methods classes, and on debating “the limits of the knowledge acquired”, especially within the 3rd and 4th year seminars.
   c) Provide access to selected high-performing ECH undergraduate to GSPIA graduate seminars, where space is available.
   d) Offer the opportunity of a capstone course to some of the better students.
9. As mentioned in the self-evaluation report, the SCEUP supports any measures that would contribute to a clearer and more transparent governance structure.

10. As mentioned in the self-evaluation report and by external evaluators, the SCEUP recommends that communications between the FSS and ECH students be improved with regard to international experiences.

11. The SCEUP recommends that the unit uses tools such as the uCal university website to disseminate information about events.

12. The SCEUP recommends that ECH communicate program requirements and structure more systematically to students, and work strategically with cognate departments to make departmental electives more accessible.

13. The SCEUP recommends that ECH coordinate more closely with cognate departments to avoid overlap in courses that appear to have similar course descriptions, and parts partnering in the teaching of these courses.

14. The SCEUP recommends that ECH conduct a needs-based analysis among prospective employers to ensure the skills imparted by the program align with labour-market demands.

15. The SCEUP recommends that ECH builds more strategic bridges with organizations engaged in the field(s) of conflict mitigation and/or human rights to improve graduates’ chances of finding employment that aligns with their field of study.

16. The SCEUP recommends that ECH improves significantly its recruitment strategy. Among the possible means to achieve this goal, the ECH should consider the following suggestions by the external evaluators:
   a) develop a specific strategy targeting immersion high school students with a prospective interest in ECH;
   b) improve the intake among international students, especially among French-speaking international students;
   c) make more explicit and market the employment skills and prospects to be gained from the program;
   d) follow up on university offers of admission to international students by making direct contact with individuals.

List of courses not offered for more than three years.

Based on the self-evaluation report, the following courses have not been offered for more than three years for the reasons given in the report (p. 24).

ECH3340 Social Inequalities, International Agreements and Social Movements
ECH 3740 Inégalités sociales, conventions internationales et mouvements sociaux
ECH 4355 Conflicts and the Peace Process: Selected Topics
ECH 4320 Conflict Resolution and Peace Building
ECH4755 Conflits et processus de paix : thèmes choisis
ECH4735 Diplomatie de Deuxième Niveau

17. The SCEUP requests that courses be abolished when both the French and English version of the same course have not been offered for more than three years.

The SCEUP requests that a progress report on implementation of its recommendations be submitted by May 30, 2016.

2.4.4 Women Studies
(Date of visit: March 25, 2014)

Evaluated Programs: Major in Women’s Studies, Joint Honours BSocSc in Criminology and Women’s Studies, Joint Honours BSocSc
in Women’s Studies and Political Science, Joint Honours BScSc in Women’s Studies and Sociology.

The external evaluators highlight the excellence and international recognition of the full-time teaching staff. “This is a truly excellent group of researchers and they consolidate the University of Ottawa’s reputation as a leader in the field of feminist and gender studies, particularly in the Social Sciences.”

The external evaluators indicated that they were impressed by the new curriculum; professors work in and teach leading-edge topics (transnationalism, racism, disabilities, sexuality, queer studies, etc.), while always conscious to focus on interdisciplinarity. The professors also offer students opportunities to develop excellent oral and written communication skills.

In terms of the teaching staff, the external evaluators note an imbalance between full-time and part-time professors. More than 50% of the undergraduate courses are given by lecturers. There is also a high percentage of part-time professors: 71% for 1000-level courses in 2011-2012 and 58% for 2000-level courses in the same year.

The joint programs appear to be more double majors; there are no real bridges between the two disciplines of the respective programs (Women’s Studies and Sociology, Women’s Studies and Political Science, Women’s Studies and Criminology).

Although enrolment has increased notably (73 students in 2011-2012), it is not distributed equally across all programs, which raises the question: should all three programs be continued? The evaluators recommend giving this question careful thought before making the decision to create new compulsory courses in both languages knowing that they might not necessarily be delivered by full-time professors.

The self-evaluation report mentions the weakening of the IWS’s Francophone programs because of the small number of students in the Francophone cohort. This demonstrates a need to continue recruitment efforts, especially through the campus visits introduced in 2012-2013, and to continue to provide a diverse, quality French-language course offering.

In recent years, new admissions to the major have been very low. Avenues need to be explored to reverse this trend. The potential pool for recruitment that is the 1000-level course should not be overlooked.

According to the external evaluators, there “is a strong support for more practical learning experiences in the programs offered by IWS.” Hence, they recommend to explore several avenues that should be taken into account by the IWS.

There is a lack of engagement by students in their own association. They should be encouraged to become more invested in it, knowing that the active participation of students in the life of the program will have a positive impact on recruitment.

The list of courses not offered for more than three years and the reasons:

FEM 3500 – Thème choisi en études des femmes; FEM 3100 – Special Topic in Women’s Studies.

This course should be abolished.

**Recommendations**

1. The SCEUP recommends that the IWS evaluate the relevance of maintaining three joint programs. If the IWS decides to keep them, it must ensure a clear integration of the two disciplines.
2. The SCEUP recommends that, building on current efforts, the IWS develop strategies to recruit Francophone students.

3. The SCEUP recommends that the IWS develop strategies to increase recruitment of students and address the challenge of retention.

4. The SCEUP recommends that the IWS ensure that full-time professors contribute to the delivery of 1000 and 2000-level courses.

5. The SCEUP recommends that the IWS increases practical learning experiences for its students.

6. The SCEUP recommends that the person responsible for undergraduate studies work with the student association to improve student engagement.

The SCEUP requests that a progress report be submitted to it by November 30, 2015.

2.4.5 Sociology

(Date of visit: March 14, 2014)

Evaluated Programs: Honours with Specialization in Sociology, Major in Sociology, Joint Honours BSocSc in Communication and Sociology, Joint Honours BSocSc in Geography and Sociology.

The evaluators find that the professors are qualified and that almost all are active in research. The quality of instruction and evaluation is good and the students are satisfied. The evaluators believe that the quality of services and resources is appropriate.

The evaluators believe that the Francophone cohort should be increased. The linguistic imbalance raises concerns and efforts should be made to recruit Francophones.

The evaluators note the weak sense of belonging among students. If as the program's officials indicate, the student association is also having difficulty involving students, this issue becomes very important and should be the focus of serious reflection.

The evaluators reviewed the joint programs. They encourage the professors in these programs to consider ways to ensure a more successful integration of the disciplines. The program's officials acknowledge that there is little difference between the joint programs and the double majors. The Dean, while not commenting on these programs in particular, is also of the view that this type of program must offer value added, that the two disciplines must be well integrated and that simply providing a combination of courses is not sufficient. Reflection and, if necessary, adjustments will have to be made to ensure there is a distinction between the joint programs and double majors.

The evaluators believe that students are making little progress in terms of written communication skills. In response, the Dean states that the Faculty will be examining fundamental skills training in the coming months.

The evaluators believe that too many courses are offered by part-time professors. To overcome the challenges associated with having a significant number of courses offered by part-time faculty, it is essential to ensure that these professors are fully integrated into the programs and receive the appropriate guidance and support.

To sum up, this is a program in which the full-time professors are well qualified and the curriculum is sound, but tangible and intangible problems with the student experience require prompt attention before they undermine the good work that the professors are doing. The challenges facing these programs seem not so much issues of resources as they are questions of collective faculty attention, issues of the encadrement of part-time faculty and students. To all appearances the programs are not working well as a learning community.
The dean has drawn the committee’s attention to the amalgamation of these programs and the general BSc into a school, and he has pointed out that the responsibility for faculty allocation for all of these programs will rest with the school. It is not immediately clear to the committee what the impact of this administrative change will be.

The list of courses not offered in more than three years and the reasons:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOC 2105/SOC 2505</td>
<td>Introduction à l’écologie sociale *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC 3111/SOC 3511</td>
<td>Éthique, technologie et société</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC 3303/SOC 3730</td>
<td>Mondialisation, identités et liens sociaux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC 2308</td>
<td>Sociology of Francophone Communities Outside Quebec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC 3303</td>
<td>Sociology of Quebec Society</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The SCEUP requests that confirmation be provided that these courses have been abolished or will be soon.

**Recommendations**

1. The SCEUP recommends that the program implement new measures to recruit francophone students and report on the effectiveness of these.
2. The SCEUP recommends that the department take steps to build the program’s learning community, and report on the effectiveness of these.
3. The SCEUP recommends that the department either improve these programs, so that the disciplines are well integrated and there is an added value for the students, different from what could be achieved in a double major, or close the two bidisciplinary programs.
4. The SCEUP encourages the Faculty in its reflection on communication abilities and core requirements, and wishes to receive a report on the changes adopted or measures taken to improve this weakness, as to how these measures will apply to the programs in Sociology.
5. The SCEUP recommends that the program adopt new measures to integrate part-time professors more fully into the program.

The SCEUP requests that a progress report be submitted to it by March 31, 2015.

**2.5 Saint-Paul University**

**2.5.1 Theology**

(Date of visit: October 21, 2014)

The evaluators point out the importance of the work accomplished with respect to learning outcomes. However, they note the need to further clarify these objectives, to differentiate between academic learning objectives and spiritual learning outcomes and to better tie these objectives to the grading criteria. In addition, special attention needs to be given to measuring learning objectives and coherence between course plans.

The external evaluators note that few full-time professors are involved in teaching the 1000-level courses. When full-time professors teach first year courses it is generally acknowledged that it has a positive impact on student retention in the program. The issue of retention is especially critical in light of a significant decline in enrolment.
The evaluators note the significant decline in admissions applications over the past few years, the low rate of conversion to offers of acceptance, and the incomplete information on the Faculty’s site for students who might consider applying. The Dean comments, however, that since the release of the evaluators’ report, considerable efforts have been made to address these concerns including, notably, the creation of the MTh (MDiv) at MÉT (MTS) programs, the adoption of a personalized approach by phone to students making admissions applications, a review of the information on the Faculty’s website, and lastly, the establishment of a follow-up system with alumni to better publicize the job opportunities in the field.

Although the linguistic balance appears to have been respected among the teaching staff over the years, and will continue to be, the evaluators note that cyclical factors have led to a small proportion of women faculty members, a situation that is concerning. The establishment of practices to generate more female candidates (at the beginning of the recruitment process) and to better track candidates on short lists (e.g. carefully note and record the percentage of candidates accepted after each recruitment phase) should be considered.

The self-evaluation report points out that many courses have not been offered for three years. However, the report does not suggest possible solutions regarding these courses. Courses not offered during the entire time of a student’s undergraduate program (three or four years as the case may be) present a problem. Students interested in the program are given the impression that they will be able to take the course, which is not actually the case. In some respects, this amounts to false representation. Consequently, these courses need to be offered on a regular basis or removed from the course offering.

**Recommendations**

1. The SCEUP recommends that the Faculty of Theology inform it of the decisions made during Faculty Day in terms of identifying and clarifying learning objectives.

2. The SCEUP recommends that the Faculty of Theology inform it of the measures taken to properly measure learning outcomes.

3. The SCEUP recommends that the Faculty of Theology inform it of the proposal to introduce a system of peer evaluation of course plans.

4. The SCEUP recommends that a significant number of full-time professors teach first year courses or any other basic courses.

5. The SCEUP requests that it be informed of the results of recruitment-related efforts.

6. The SCEUP recommends that the Faculty inform it of the system to be put in place (in collaboration with the Development Office) to ensure better follow-up with alumni and better publicity of the job opportunities for graduates of the undergraduate Theology program.

7. The SCEUP enjoins the Faculty to take proactive measures be taken to generate female candidates in the next round of hiring (in advance of the process) and that it clearly document the number of applications received from women and the number of women short-listed (after the process).

8. The SCEUP enjoins the Faculty to inform it of its decision on each of the 20 courses not offered. These courses must either be offered in the next three years or removed from the course offering.

The external evaluators made 14 recommendations. It should be pointed out that a great many of these recommendations have since been implemented. However, a number of others must be addressed by the Faculty in the coming months. The SCEUP, along with the evaluators, urges the Faculty to adopt a “creative fidelity” strategy to comply with both the institutional and historic constraints it faces, while creatively adapting to the current context, characterized by the decline in enrolment at most North American faculties of theology, not to mention the closing of many of these faculties. Interest in religious and spiritual issues in a globalized world has not diminished, quite the contrary. The question is therefore how to translate the interest in these major issues into an interest in theological studies. In such a context, it is imperative for the Faculty to be able to propose and implement innovative solutions that will enable it to meet these new challenges if it is to survive.
It should be noted that admissions have been suspended to the five programs. The Faculty of Theology must respond to the progress report if the programs are not to be abolished.

The SCEUP requests that a progress report be submitted to it by November 30, 2015.

3. Progress reports

3.1 Faculty of Engineering

3.1.1 Mechanical engineering and biomedical mechanical engineering

(Date of visit: March 13, 2013)

The SCEUP discussed the progress report submitted by the Director of the Department of Mechanical Engineering.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Unit's Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The SCEUP recommends that the Department, in collaboration with the Faculty, propose solutions to offer more courses in French at the 3000 and 4000 levels. The SCEUP also requests to be informed of the implementation schedule for the adapted immersion program and its impact on enrolment for courses offered in French.</td>
<td>In the response from those in charge of the program, it is indicated that the course offering in French is dependent on demand. The SCEUP asks for an explanation of this reason since the data available on timetabling for the past few years shows that when courses are offered in French, they are not cancelled. The SCEUP can only conclude that there would be demand for courses offered in French. Thus, more courses could be offered, notably among the seven 3000-level and eight 4000-level courses that have never been offered in French. The SCEUP recommends that, each year, the course offering in French be increased by at least one 3000-level and one 4000-level course. The SCEUP recommends continuing recruitment efforts aimed at Francophones and Francophiles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The SCEUP requests that the Faculty of Engineering take the necessary initiatives to bring the length of studies in line with what is announced in the university calendar and to inform it of the timeline for implementation of this action.</td>
<td>The SCEUP is satisfied with the response and urges the Department’s Director to better communicate the real length of the program to students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The SCEUP requests that the Faculty of Engineering take steps to improve the quality of the student experience and the sense of belonging and inform it of these measures and the implementation schedule.</td>
<td>The SCEUP is satisfied with the reply to recommendation 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The SCEUP recommends that an equipment needs analysis be conducted for the short and medium terms and that mechanisms to increase the stability of funding for this equipment be examined and a report provided to the SCEUP.</td>
<td>The SCEUP is satisfied with the reply to recommendation 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The SCEUP requests that it be informed of the initiatives to be taken to identify this component in the programs and to ensure students receive the necessary training.</td>
<td>The SCEUP is satisfied with the reply to recommendation 5.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Recommendations | Unit's Response
---|---
6. The SCEUP requests that a list of the courses not offered for three years be provided to it and that the Department inform it of the action taken to offer these courses again or to remove them from the range of courses. | Since May 2012, the Faculty of Engineering has undertaken the process to remove from its range of courses those that it no longer intends to offer. The exercise has been completed for the Computer Science, Chemical Engineering and Civil Engineering programs. The Department's Director indicates that this exercise will be completed for the Mechanical Engineering program. The Department has already identified the following courses that have not been offered since 2008: MCG4132, MCG4107, MCG4108, MCG4324 (MCG4532, MCG4507, MCG4508, MCG4724).

**SCEUP’s response**

The SCEUP requests that a follow-up report on recommendation 1 be submitted to it by August 28, 2015.

### 3.2 Faculty of Science

#### 3.2.1 Biochemistry

(Date of visit: January 28, 2013)

The SCEUP reviewed the comments received from the Director, Biochemistry Undergraduate Program (Faculty of Medicine) and the Vice-Dean, Undergraduate Programs (Faculty of Science).

Major changes will be made to the governance of the Biochemistry programs. It appears that responsibility for these programs will be transferred to the Faculty of Science. We have been advised that an action plan will be submitted to the Vice-President Academic.

**SCEUP’s response**

The SCEUP requests that a follow-up report on the changes within the Department be submitted to it by September 30, 2015.

#### 3.2.2 Biopharmaceutics Science

(Date of visit: March 15, 2013)

The SCEUP discussed the progress report submitted by the program's Director.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Unit's Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The SCEUP recommends that the Dean of the Faculty of Science in collaboration with the departments of Biochemistry, Biology, and Chemistry, and the PBS executive increase the number of professors from these three departments who are affiliated with the BPS program.</td>
<td>The SCEUP is satisfied with the replies to recommendation 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. As suggested by the BPS executive, the SCEUP recommends the creation of a committee composed of the Vice-Dean, undergraduate studies; the chairs of the Departments of Biochemistry, Biology, and Chemistry; and the BPS executive. This committee should meet on a regular basis to address academic issues related to the BPS program, and to select the courses and their schedule for the following year.</td>
<td>The SCEUP is satisfied with the replies to recommendation 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>Unit's Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The SCEUP recommends that the BPS executive investigate the possible lack of advanced training and quantitative skills that may limit access to some fields of graduate studies. Should there indeed be a problem, the SCEUP would like to receive a report on the measure adopted to resolve this problem. A thorough analysis of the curriculum and learning outcomes of the program as suggested by the Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents should greatly help.</td>
<td>The SCEUP is satisfied with the replies to recommendation 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The SCEUP recommends that the BPS executive assess the feasibility of adding an option in biopharmaceutical regulations and economics. If such an option cannot be considered at this time, the SCEUP would like to learn what alternative solution has been adopted to provide some training in biopharmaceutical regulations and economics.</td>
<td>The SCEUP is satisfied with the replies to recommendation 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The SCEUP recommends that the program, in collaboration with the Faculty, propose solutions to increase recruitment of Francophone students.</td>
<td>The SCEUP is satisfied with the reply to recommendation 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The SCEUP encourages the program to pursue the initiative to create a BPS alumni association.</td>
<td>The SCEUP is satisfied with the replies to recommendation 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The SCEUP recommends that students should have easier access to advisers and administrative staff.</td>
<td>The SCEUP is satisfied with the replies to recommendation 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The SCEUP recommends that an area of the campus be assigned to the PBS program including space for the secretariat and students.</td>
<td>The SCEUP is satisfied with the replies to recommendation 8.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SCEUP's response**
The process of evaluation is finalized and no follow-up report is requested.

### 3.3 Faculty of Health Sciences

#### 3.3.1 School of Human Kinetics
(Date of visit: September 20, 2013)

The SCEUP discussed the progress report submitted by the Assistant Director, Undergraduate Studies and Student Affairs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Unit's Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The SCEUP recommends that the School of Human Kinetics explain the relevance of both programs and clarify further the distinction between the two programs in light of accreditation requirements and career paths.</td>
<td>The SCEUP encourages the School of Human Kinetics to continue the work and awaits the redesign of the programs before commenting on this recommendation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>Unit's Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The SCEUP requests that the School of Human Kinetics clarify the question of the ergonomics courses as it relates to the professional requirements and the training offered at the master’s level.</td>
<td>The SCEUP is not satisfied with the replies to recommendations 2 and 3. The SCEUP requests a follow-up report with specifics on the concrete measures taken to address the new requirements of the College of Kinesiologists of Ontario. Has the program received accreditation? The SCEUP recommends that the School proceed with an analysis of the curriculum to ensure that all of the learning outcomes will be covered and evaluated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The SCEUP requests that the School of Human Kinetics indicate how it intends to address the new kinesiology requirements of the College of Kinesiologists of Ontario.</td>
<td>The SCEUP is not satisfied with the replies to recommendations 2 and 3. The SCEUP requests a follow-up report with specifics on the concrete measures taken to address the new requirements of the College of Kinesiologists of Ontario. Has the program received accreditation? The SCEUP recommends that the School proceed with an analysis of the curriculum to ensure that all of the learning outcomes will be covered and evaluated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The SCEUP recommends that both programs (BHK and B.Sc.HK) improve the offering of optional courses in French. Measures should also be taken to improve the pedagogical material that supports teaching in French. The programs should report to SCEUP on the measures taken and the augmented course offering.</td>
<td>The SCEUP is not satisfied with the reply to recommendation 4 and request a follow-up report on the concrete measures to ensure the equitable offering of optional courses in French and English. The SCEUP encourages not only translation of material but the development of material in French.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The SCEUP recommends that both programs harmonize the students’ evaluation regardless of the language of the course.</td>
<td>The SCEUP is not satisfied with the reply to recommendation 5 and requests a follow-up report on the concrete measures taken to correct this situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The SCEUP encourages the programs to work with the Dean to ensure adequate staffing of and access to the laboratories, and that the equipment be updated.</td>
<td>The SCEUP requests a follow-up report on the concrete measures taken to correct this situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The SCEUP encourages the programs to continue to develop the possibilities for international experience by the students.</td>
<td>No reply has been received to recommendation 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The SCEUP recommends that the School of Human Kinetics abolish all courses not offered in the last three years, as presented in the self-evaluation report (Table 1b) – see appendix 1.</td>
<td>No reply has been received to recommendation 8.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SCEUP’s response**

The SCEUP requests to see the program redesign before concluding the process.

### 3.3.1 Nutrition Sciences

(Date of visit: January 31, 2014)

The SCEUP discussed the progress report submitted by the Director, Nutrition Program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Unit's Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The SCEUP recommends that the program examine the issue of equivalencies given for compulsory prior learning in chemistry and report on the measures adopted to correct the situation.</td>
<td>The SCEUP is not satisfied with the reply and requests a detailed report on the concrete measures taken.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Unit's Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. The SCEUP recommends that the program work with the Faculty to ensure reasonable access to proper laboratories.</td>
<td>The SCEUP is not satisfied with the reply and requests that the program's management and the Faculty find a solution. Has the option of using the kitchens on campus or close to campus been explored (e.g.: kitchen in Friel Residence)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The SCEUP recommends that the program take steps to communicate its expectations regarding grading methods to its part-time professors.</td>
<td>The SCEUP are satisfied with the replies to recommendations 3 and 4. They understand that this action will be carried out systematically and regularly with both new and returning professors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The SCEUP recommends that data on grading be collected annually to verify the effectiveness of the measures taken.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The SCEUP recommends that the program take steps to offer at least two of the three optional courses each year or abolish this component of the program.</td>
<td>The SCEUP is satisfied with the reply to recommendation 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The SCEUP urges the program to provide better guidance and support to part-time professors.</td>
<td>The SCEUP is satisfied with the reply to recommendation 6.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SCEUP's response

The SCEUP requests that a follow-up report on recommendations 1 and 2 be submitted to it by December 11, 2015.

### 3.4 Faculty of Social Science

#### 3.4.1 School of Social Service

(Date of visit: January 17, 2014)

The SCEUP discussed the progress report submitted by the Director, School of Social Work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Unit's Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The SCEUP recommends to the School of Social Work that it continue its initiatives to create a gerontology course in the BSASS. The SCEUP wishes to be informed of the implementation schedule.</td>
<td>The SCEUP is satisfied with the reply to recommendation 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The SCEUP recommends that the School of Social Work continue its initiatives to improve courses SVS1500, SVS2520 and SVS3505 in order to address the development of historical and cultural critical thinking.</td>
<td>The SCEUP requests a follow-up report demonstrating that the descriptions have been revised in the official descriptions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The SCEUP recommends that the School of Social Work continue its initiatives to increase the sense of belonging of students to the program and access to optional courses in third and fourth year. The SCEUP wishes to be informed of the implementation schedule.</td>
<td>The SCEUP is satisfied with the reply to recommendation 3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Unit's Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. The SCEUP recommends that the School of Social Work review the learning</td>
<td>The Director brought to the attention of the SCEUP a correction in the course code in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>results for courses SVS2530, SCS2550, SVS2520 and SVS2515 to respect the</td>
<td>recommendation 4 (SCS2550 and not SVS2550). The SCEUP is satisfied with the reply to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guidelines on expectations related to undergraduate university degrees.</td>
<td>recommendation 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The SCEUP recommends that the School of Social Work continue its initiatives</td>
<td>The SCEUP is satisfied with the reply to recommendation 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to promote better integration in the program of part-time professors. The</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCEUP wishes to be informed of the implementation schedule.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SCEUP's response

The SCEUP requests that a follow-up report on recommendation 2 be submitted to it by July 31, 2015.

## 3.5 Saint-Paul University

### 3.5.1 Conflict Studies

(Date of visit: February 7, 2014)

The SCEUP discussed the progress report that was submitted by the Director, Conflict Studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Unit's Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The SCEUP recommends that the program undertake a process to identify and</td>
<td>The SCEUP believes that it is in the program’s interest to clearly formulate its vision based on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>articulate the program’s vision based on SPU’s heritage.</td>
<td>St. Paul’s mission. The SCEUP requests that the professors of the Conflict Studies program examine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the issue more thoroughly by answering the following questions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Why do students enrol in this program at St. Paul University?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• How is it different from other programs including the University of Ottawa’s program?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• How does the program address the community’s needs? Integrate the confessional aspect, secular, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The SCEUP requests that the program review the program’s objectives which</td>
<td>The SCEUP recommends to the Director to take the comments of the external evaluators into</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the external evaluators consider too ambitious for an undergraduate program</td>
<td>consideration. The SCEUP is concerned that the objectives focus mainly on theory and give little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and to report the findings to the SCEUP.</td>
<td>attention to the practical component. In addition, the program’s officials should ensure that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the objectives are aligned with the learning outcomes, are measurable and that the evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>methods used are appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The SCEUP recommends that the program develop a strategy to create</td>
<td>The SCEUP is satisfied with the reply to recommendation 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>practicums for third and fourth-year students, set out realistic expectations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>based on the program’s curriculum, inform the students and inform the SCEUP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accordingly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The SCEUP recommends that the programme ensure that full-time professors</td>
<td>The SCEUP is satisfied with the reply to recommendation 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regularly give the undergraduate program’s introductory and compulsory courses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In addition, when hiring, new professors should be able to be active at all</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>program levels.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendations | Unit's Response
---|---
5. The SCEUP recommends that possible disparities between the program’s offering in French and English be verified, an action plan be established to this effect, if required, and the SCEUP be informed. | The SCEUP is satisfied with the reply to recommendation 5.  
The SCEUP is satisfied with the reply to recommendation 5.
6. The SCEUP recommends that the program conduct an analysis of the curriculum to ensure coherence among the courses and report to the SCEUP. | The SCEUP is satisfied with the reply to recommendation 6.
7. The SCEUP recommends that the program establish a mechanism to archive course plans and the information relevant to the program’s corporate history and to report to the SCEUP on these measures. | The SCEUP is satisfied with the reply to recommendation 5.

SCEUP’s response
The SCEUP is satisfied with the reply to recommendation 5.  
The SCEUP requests that a follow-up report be submitted to it by August 31, 2015.

4. Follow-up reports

4.1 Faculty of Arts

4.1.1 General Bachelor of Arts  
(Date of visit: November 28, 2011)

The SCEUP discussed the follow-up report submitted by the Vice-Dean, Undergraduate Studies and the person in charge of the Bachelor of Arts (General).

Recommendations | Unit’s Response
---|---
1. The SCEUP requests that clear learning outcomes be established for the Bachelor of Arts (General) program. | The SCEUP requests that the Faculty clarify how the outcomes are linked to the program’s structure. It would like the Faculty to change the following item in the table of learning outcomes by specifying if the fields must be in the humanities:
1. Wealth and spectrum of knowledge
   […] the student will have
   • increased the depth of his knowledge in two fields (humanities) that interest him the most.

2. The SCEUP suggests that the program’s structure be reviewed taking into consideration the evaluators’ suggestions. | The SCEUP requests that the Faculty clarify if the interdisciplinary course is compulsory for the Bachelor of Arts (General).

3. The SCEUP requests that the Faculty review the basic training in the first language in the program with a minor so that the two programs have the same basic requirements. | The SCEUP is satisfied with the reply to recommendation 3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Unit's Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. The SCEUP requests that the Faculty review the distribution of courses by level to avoid a student being able to take up to 42 credits at the 1000 level.</td>
<td>If the possibility of taking 42 credits is maintained for a general bachelor's degree consisting of 90 credits, doubt will be cast on the achievement of the learning outcomes. Following the changes made to regulation 12.1, Conditions for obtaining a bachelor's degree, approved by the Senate for implementation in May 2015, a maximum of 36 credits may be completed at the 1000 level in future. The SCEUP requests that the Faculty review the number of 2000 and 3000-level courses to add depth to the program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The SCEUP urges the Faculty to create a program committee to ensure the program's quality.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The SCEUP urges the Faculty to develop strategies to ensure better support to students experiencing difficulty.</td>
<td>The SCEUP is satisfied with the replies to recommendations 5 and 6.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SCEUP's response**

The SCEUP requests a follow-up report be submitted to it by September 30, 2015.

### 4.1.2 Classics and Classical Studies
(Date of visit: March 22, 2012)

The SCEUP discussed the follow-up report submitted by the Dean and Vice-Dean, Undergraduate Studies.

The SCEUP is satisfied with the replies to the recommendations made regarding program redesign. This completes the program evaluation process.

### 4.1.3 Aboriginal Studies
(Date of visit: January 20, 2012)

The SCEUP discussed the follow-up report submitted by the Dean and Vice-Dean, Undergraduate Studies.

The SCEUP is concerned about the redesign. It requests to see the program redesign and wants to know the precise schedule for submission of the changes and recommendations.

### 4.1.4 Religious Studies
(Date of visit: September 29, 2011)

The SCEUP discussed the follow-up report submitted by the Director, Undergraduate Studies, Classical and Religious Studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Unit's Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The SCEUP recommends that the Department establish a mechanism to harmonize grades in courses at the same level.</td>
<td>The SCEUP is not satisfied with the reply. As stipulated in the letter from the Vice-President Academic (June 27, 2014), the SCEUP had requested a curriculum analysis, with the assistance of Jovan Groen, and to ensure that learning outcomes were evaluated using the same criteria in all sections of the same course.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SCEUP's response**

The SCEUP requests that a follow-up report be submitted to it by December 11, 2015.
4.2 Faculty of Education

4.2.1 Formation à l’enseignement
(Date of visit: March 16, 2012)

The SCEUP discussed the follow-up report submitted by the program’s director.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Unit’s Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The SCEUP requests that the Faculty identify the scope of the problem and take the action required to address it.</td>
<td>The SCEUP requests that the program’s director continue to make professors aware of the problem of excessively high grades and evaluate the situation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SCEUP’s response

The SCEUP request that a follow-up report be submitted to it by September 30, 2015.

4.3 Faculty of Engineering

4.3.1 Chemical and Biological Engineering
(Date of visit: March 8, 2013)

As requested by the Dean, Faculty of Engineering and the Director, Department of Chemical Engineering, the members of the SCEUP met with the persons concerned to clarify the expectations related to the SCEUP’s recommendations. A discussion took place between management of the Department and members. Following that meeting, the SCEUP requested a follow-up report be submitted to it by Friday, November 28, 2014.

4.4 Faculty of Social Science

4.4.1 General Social Science
(Date of visit: April 1, 2011)

The SCEUP discussed the follow-up report submitted by the Director of the School of Sociological and Anthropological Studies. The general Social Sciences program has been under the responsibility of the new School of Sociological and Anthropological Studies (SSAS) since summer 2014. The latter will gradually assume the administrative and pedagogical functions of the program in May 2015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Unit’s Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The SCEUP requests that clear learning outcomes be established for the general bachelor’s degrees in social sciences.</td>
<td>The Director confirms that review of the program began in summer 2015. The SCEUP requests that a follow-up report on the establishment of learning outcomes be submitted to it by September 30, 2015.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The SCEUP recommends that the Faculty take the necessary action to improve the technical and computer skills of students.</td>
<td>The Directors confirm that exploration of the possibility of enriching the current theoretical training through the addition of practical courses aimed at developing expertise will begin in the summer-fall 2015 for implementation in 2016. The SCEUP requests that the School submit the course creation request to the Faculty Council. The request must then be approved by the Council on Undergraduate Studies in November 2015 for implementation in 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>Unit's Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The SCEUP recommends that the Faculty take the necessary steps to improve the mother tongue language proficiency of students (particularly in French). In the latter case, discussions should be undertaken with the Department of French of the Faculty of Arts, which is responsible for basic language courses.</td>
<td>The Faculty of Social Sciences has undertaken a major review of language training that could extend to all of the Faculty’s programs. The SCEUP is satisfied with the reply to recommendation 3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SCEUP’s response**

The SCEUP requests a follow-up report on recommendations 1 and 2 be submitted to it by September 30, 2015.

---

### 4.5 SAINT PAUL UNIVERSITY

#### 4.5.1 Ethics

(Date of visit: April 1, 2011)

At its meeting on May 21, 2015, the members of the SCEUP reviewed the follow-up report submitted by the Dean and Vice-President, Teaching and Research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Unit's Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Given that only 20% of courses are given by the full-time professors of this unit, the SCEUP recommends the creation of a program committee with representation from professors of the other units involved in this program.</td>
<td>Changes were made to the workload of professors and two new positions were created and filled. A program committee has been created. All of the committee’s work was discussed at the School of Public Ethics’ forum, which brings together all professors involved in the program. All of the results of the committee’s work were also discussed by the Faculty’s executive committee, which is a multidisciplinary committee consisting of professors from all of the schools of the Faculties of Humanities and Philosophy, and headed by the Dean. The executive committee meets weekly and continues to ensure the proper operation of the program and to ensure that the changes made meet quality standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2. The SCEUP urges those in charge of the program to examine the resources available in the library which should be representative of the themes currently being discussed in ethics programs. | To accurately determine the resources available in the library, we sought the assistance of the Chief Librarian, Liz Hayden, who is on loan to the University of Ottawa. She holds this position with the goal of ensuring the proper operation of the library and to make the necessary adjustments to offer the student body and teaching staff all of the resources required to achieve our academic objectives. Here is her response:  
- **One of the 6 projects identified in the recent Library transition exercise is to engage YBP our distributor for book acquisitions. This will allow us to set-up a specific ethics profile and ensure we acquire the current relevant material to our specific programs.**  
- **The Professors (knowledgeable about the ethics programs) and the Librarians (knowledgeable about library materials) should meet annually to review/refine the YBP ethics profile and to discuss new courses or program needs.** |
3. The SCEUP urges those in charge of the program to find solutions concerning access to and the borrowing of books and various documents from the library.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Unit's Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. The SCEUP urges those in charge of the program to find solutions concerning access to and the borrowing of books and various documents from the library.</td>
<td>Via a partnership with the University of Ottawa Library, all SPU students and professors have access to the uOttawa material (print and electronic). As an example, their <a href="#">discovery tool</a> hosts over 1,000,000 items related to ethics; and over 450,000 items related to public ethics. Access to the uOttawa print material is facilitated by <a href="#">free shuttle service</a> between the 2 universities. uOttawa has 700 databases, 100,000 electronic journals and almost 1,000,000 electronic books in their e-resources collection. This material is available to SPU students and professors 24/7/365. The records from the SPU catalogue will soon be viewable in the uOttawa Search+ discovery tool allowing for a one-stop shop search option for users.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SCEUP's response**

The SCEUP is satisfied with the reply to recommendations 2, 6 and 7. This completes the program evaluation process.

5. **The year’s programs**

The members of the Senate Committee on the Evaluation of Undergraduate Programs wish to acknowledge the quality of the self-evaluation reports.

This year, the members of the SCEUP want to mention the quality of the presentation of the self-evaluation report for Conflict Studies and Human Rights of the Faculty of Social Sciences. Along with the external evaluators, the SCEUP congratulates the authors of the self-evaluation report for their excellent work. A report of this quality will have enabled them to appreciate the high quality of the current program and assisted them in finding ways to advance it even further.

6. **Conclusion**

Periodic evaluation of undergraduate programs is an important activity that allows us to look critically at the programs offered at the University of Ottawa and engage in serious reflection. It helps ensure that the University offers students the best and most relevant education possible.

Preparation of self-evaluation reports represents an extremely demanding task for the units responsible for the programs evaluated. Being aware of the burden of this task, the members of the SCEUP reviewed the template for preparation of self-evaluation reports during 2014-2015. Working with Institutional Research and Planning, the SCEUP modified the template to simplify it, eliminate redundancy and ensure the relevance of the data and information required. In addition, in future, all institutional data will be inputted to the template given to the academic units, thus reducing preparation time.

Program evaluation enables the SCEUP to gain a global perspective and to identify certain trends in terms of the expectations associated with the quality of undergraduate programs. During 2014-2015, the external evaluators of several programs expressed concerns about the quality of the oral and written communication skills of students in both English and French courses. The members of the SCEUP consider it important to mention this apparently growing trend. They point out that communication skills are part of the learning objectives to be achieved at the end of an undergraduate program. Thus, it is important for the quality and development of communication skills to be the topic of institutional discussions to identify mechanisms that will enable our students to achieve this learning objective.

Courses delivered by part-time professors were also the subject of several comments and recommendations in most of the reports submitted by the external evaluators. A great many part-time professors mentioned to the evaluators that they were not well supported
nor well integrated in the various programs in which they were involved. It is critical that part-time professors be included in pedagogical discussions and that they understand the learning outcomes and the level that must be achieved in the courses they offer in order to preserve coherence in the curriculum and thus ensure the quality of training received at the University of Ottawa.
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