



**Internal Academic Review 2007-2008
Department of Global Development Studies
Internal Academic Review Committee Report to Senate**

The Internal Academic Review (IAR) of the Department of Global Development Studies is now complete. The Internal Academic Review Committee (IARC) has taken into consideration all of the submissions related to the IAR of the Department of Global Development Studies and respectfully submits the following report. The IARC Report to Senate is intended to supplement the findings of the attached Review Team Report and to provide a mechanism for the Head of the Department and the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Science to jointly report on the progress in addressing the Review Team recommendations (please see the “Outcomes” section of this report).

Summary of the Internal Academic Review of the Department of Global Development Studies

The Department of Global Development Studies is to be applauded for its strong commitment to excellence, for developing a well-respected reputation nationally and internationally, and for maintaining relevance and interest through the academic program offerings. The IARC also commends the Department for progress made since the last IAR and acknowledges the tremendous growth and maturation of the program over a short period of time.

The IARC agrees with the Review Team and the External Consultants in their recommendation that the Department must manage growth, cautiously finding the balance required to support flourishing undergraduate and graduate programs in an environment with uncertain resources available in the future.

The Department would benefit from expanding course options to foster methodological richness and creating a coherent disciplinary foundation that would include more basic politics and basic economics. The IARC supports the suggestion that the Department continue to foster strong relationships with cognate departments so that opportunities can be explored and leveraged to provide students with a greater breadth of learning.

The IARC agrees with the IAR report view that this Department is a flagship for internationalization for Queen’s, however the current growth of experiential learning is not sustainable without additional funding. The IARC acknowledges that many areas on campus are developing and maintaining community service learning and it would be wise to explore ways to improve university-wide coordination of this effort and consider efficiencies for delivering this method of learning.

The IARC recognizes the Department of Global Development Studies as strong and energetic, and anticipates continued success and innovation. The IARC fully supports the Department in its efforts to balance growth with limited resources and encourages the Department to work in collaboration with the Faculty of Arts and Science and cognate departments to address the recommendations of the IAR Reports.

Outcomes of the Internal Academic Review of the Department of Global Development Studies

*Joint response submitted by the
Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Science and the
Head of the Department of Global Development Studies*

The Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Science and the Department of Global Development Studies (DEVS) welcome the very positive assessment of the Department by the IARC, and are pleased that the report noted the international recognition of DEVS faculty, the high quality of students, the skilled and committed staff, the excellent curriculum, and the Department's innovative programs of experiential learning.

The Department looks forward to the possibility of expanding its curriculum in such core areas as politics, economics, gender, the environment, and indigenous studies. While this curriculum expansion can be accomplished to some degree by strategic cooperation with cognate units within and beyond the Faculty of Arts and Science, the Department remains committed to developing in-house courses that would speak directly to the field of development studies. The Department and the Faculty will continue to work together towards this goal within the framework of overall Faculty priorities.

Prudent management of growth, as recommended by the IARC, has been a constant for the Department over the past several years, given dramatically increasing student demand at the undergraduate level—the latter a disciplinary development that is being replicated at universities across the country. Admission to the undergraduate program is already highly competitive and is becoming more so every year. Demand for the Department's experiential learning and study-abroad programs is likewise steadily increasing and likewise continues to require careful management.

The Department's curriculum, its experiential learning programming, and its flourishing study-abroad programs in China and Cuba fit squarely with the University's official adoption of interdisciplinarity and internationalization as strategic institutional priorities. Increasing demand in all of these areas indicates that students enthusiastically share these priorities. The challenge for the Department and the Faculty is to work together towards meeting these demands.

The introduction of a graduate program in 2009-10 will undoubtedly bring its own challenges. Since the beginning of the IAR process, however, the Department has been allocated a half-time graduate studies administrator, thus reducing any adverse impact on

undergraduate students. The Department has also been provided with expanded office space to accommodate graduate students.

Attachment:
Review Team Report

**Report of the Internal Review Team For the Internal Academic Review
of the Global Development Studies Department**

Queen's University

October 2008

Executive Summary

The Global Development Studies (DEVS) Department has experienced dramatic growth since its inception as an undergraduate program a decade ago. It has grown from one program director and one development studies Medial program to a department with six full-time faculty, two administrative staff, and three undergraduate programs (a Medial, Minor and Major) provided to about 280 students. Research output has also grown apace. The undergraduate numbers are expected to rise to about 400 students, and an MA program in development studies has been approved internally.

The external consultants as part of the IAR process have written an excellent report that provides a thoughtful, thorough, and informative review of the DEVS Department. It provides a number of recommendations. We concur with the broad views and recommendations of their report.

More specifically, we follow the consultants' recommendation that the current set of teaching programs have been operating very successfully, but the Major's program would benefit from greater disciplinary foundation in basic economics and basic politics. Indeed, the first priority in further hiring should be a micro-economist specializing in development economics or economic history of development. There should also be a quantitative methods requirement in the Major's program. We feel that the DEVS department is underresourced for the planned increased student loads and agree with the consultants' recommendation that two new faculty members is entirely reasonable if

planned growth is to be sustainable. Otherwise, we have concerns about proceeding with the MA program under existing circumstances. We feel that the work/study option is a key component of the DEVS program, and its current mode of delivery is not sustainable with planned future student numbers. We feel that a new staff member is needed to support Professor Kumar in helping to provide this component of the program. This issue of support for short-term international learning placements is also a more general problem across campus, and the university should look more strategically at ways to support and build collaboration for such programs. Finally, ways should be worked out for better coordination between DEVS and key cognate departments so that DEVS students have improved access to relevant cognate courses in order to improve the core selections available to their program.

1. Introduction

The internal review team for the review of the Global Development Studies (DEVS) Department, Faculty of Arts and Science, Queen's University, was as follows:

Dr. Charles Beach, Economics (Chair)

Dr. Martin Duncan, Physics, Engineering Physics and Astronomy

Ms. Marie-Lyne Grenier, student

Dr. Kevin Hall, Civil Engineering

Ms. Angela James, School of Business

Dr. Terry Krupa, Rehabilitation Therapy

Mr. Stephen Shepherd, student

The information for this report has been collated from the following sources: the Unit Self-Study document produced by the Global Development Studies Department; a meeting with Professor David McDonald, the Department Head, on December 7, 2007; Department interviews of the external consultants Dr. Jo Beall – Development Studies Institute, London School of Economics, and Dr. Kris Inwood - Department of Economics, University of Guelph, and their meetings with Development Studies faculty group, counselors and students on November 23 and 24, 2007; and from the external consultants' report which was made available to the Internal Review Team on June 16, 2008. The review team met throughout the process in order to discuss how to approach the review task in general, the format for the interviews with the consultants, and the

planning of the current report. The report reflects all of these sources of information and has been endorsed by the entire Review Committee team, with the exception of the students as the process spanned two academic years.

2. Current Activities of the Development Studies Department

In response to the previous 2000 IAR report and following the strong desire of the department to increase exposure to undergraduate and graduate students, DEVS has implemented a number of key initiatives and activities, has increased scholarship and research productivity, and has aligned goals and objectives of the department with the general objectives of the university (based on the latest strategic plan for the university).

The department currently comprises of 6 full-time faculty members and a support staff of two. Additionally, advisors and adjuncts from cognate departments play an integral role in the functioning of the department.

Teaching Programs

Substantial revisions to the undergraduate curriculum have occurred including many new innovative courses that allow undergraduate students a broad range of degree options within DEVS. Work-study programs in China and Cuba have been added and expanded. These programs are currently supported by a full time academic Placements Coordinator. In addition, a proposal for a Master's Degree in DEVS has been developed, which includes a research-based stream and a course-work stream. The Masters will capitalize on the lack of similar programs in the province and will therefore add needed capacity.

Scholarship and Research

As a result of an increased faculty complement, DEVS has been able to produce high quality peer reviewed academic work resulting from various research projects and programs. Publication and recognition at both national and international levels have improved the profile of the department in recent years. Efforts have been made to cover as wide a thematic and geographic span as possible given the number of faculty members. The Self-Study document lists regional and thematic foci within the department.

In the past 7 years, research output has increased significantly and has included 11 single-authored books, 13 edited books, 48 book chapters and 66 peer reviewed articles (for the 6 full-time DEVS faculty only). These numbers are almost doubled if DEVS-affiliated faculty are taken into consideration. In addition, faculty have been very involved in non-traditional academic output such as magazine and newspaper articles, newsletters, pamphlets, occasional papers, etc. This format mix of academic output is very effective in reaching appropriate audiences in the development field.

3. Response to Previous Internal Academic Review

DEVS last underwent an Internal Academic Review in 2000. The recommendations offered in that review highlighted the importance of developing the infrastructure

required to support DEVS in achieving its vision and objectivities. Overall, DEVS has successfully addressed the recommendations presented in that report under the leadership of the full-time Director (Dr. David McDonald), a position established the year following the review. The position has now become head.

The recommendation to create a full-time Administrative Assistant position has been met. With the continuing growth of the DEVS program, the unit has added a second (term contract) support position, titled a “Departmental Assistant”. These positions have contributed greatly to the creation of a stable departmental infrastructure, although these administrative supports appear to have now reached their capacity.

The recommendation focusing on the need for a designated half-time academic instructor position, to develop and oversee work placements and internships, has been addressed. DEVS was provided with the funding to hire a half-time Coordinator (filled by Professor Paritosh Kumar) with a broad range of responsibilities related to work and study abroad. These placement and global study options are labour intensive in order to ensure that pedagogical objectives are met, students are supported and safe, and collaborations with community partners are strong. The creation of this designated position has undoubtedly strengthened the work-study portfolio of DEVS, but the department is experiencing ongoing pressures with regards to capacity to provide these opportunities for all interested DEVS students.

The recommendation focusing on the need for designated and permanent space was also addressed in 2002 with the allocation of a suite of offices, meeting and storage rooms. This space has provided a “home” for DEVS, but again this space allocation is now inadequate to meet basic departmental needs given their ongoing growth. Finally, DEVS has also attended to many recommendations related to academic programs, interdisciplinary programming and internal admissions processes.

4. Summary of the Report of the External Consultants

Our committee is unanimous in thanking the two external consultants, Professors Beall and Inwood, for providing a very comprehensive readable report filled with constructive comments. It is thoughtful, thorough, well written and nicely organized, and forceful in its commentary and recommendations. In what follows we will review the key points in their evaluation of DEVS and its progress, highlight the issues raised in their report, and summarize their recommendations.

The report begins by providing several useful defining characteristics of International Development Studies to set the field in a Canadian and international context. The authors note in §1.2 of their report that Queen’s University is unique in the Canadian university setting, insofar as it “is the only leading university to have made a sizable commitment to a dedicated department consisting of specialized faculty and other resources” (p.3).

After a brief summary (§2.1) of the dramatic growth of DEVS since the first students

entered in 1997, the authors “pause to take stock and refocus for the future” regarding the curriculum. While noting that there is a sensible degree structure, they comment on three curriculum features (§2.2).

First, they feel that it is simply incorrect to label DEVS 230 as a ‘finance/economics’ course. They note that the “immediate corollary of lacking a required course in economics is a significant share of the DEVS students will graduate with no exposure to one of the basic building blocks of development studies” (pp. 5-6).

Second, they are surprised that none of the DEVS specializations specify a quantitative methods requirement. They note that courses of this type are taught in all the social science disciplines at every university. “Specifying one of these courses already offered at Queen’s would be a small but useful improvement to the degree without draining resources from DEVS itself” (p.6).

Third, it is apparently possible for DEVS students to graduate without ever having been exposed to basic economics, basic politics, etc. This and the other two comments are offered as ideas to be considered as part of the next routine review of the DEVS curriculum – the authors, however, do not suggest that the current curriculum is inadequate in any major way.

The consultants are impressed that “DEVS looks very good on every possible indicator” of success (p.7). They then go on in §3 to discuss “themes emerging from the consultation”. Of particular note is the strong support for the DEVS department head, Professor David

McDonald, and the fact that the department is staffed by “strong faculty members with good academic track records... or up-and-coming scholars” (p.7). Student satisfaction is high, with the main problem apparently being that upper-year students are having difficulty in finding an adequate number of advanced courses, in part because they lack the background for such courses in some of the social sciences. Some tensions with cognate departments were discussed, with the authors noting that “Improved collaboration between DEVS and the cognate departments...would be of benefit to all departments and strengthen the University’s internationalization agenda” (p.10). In connection with the latter, §3.4 reviews the complex issue of how DEVS can grow and still maintain the very valuable but labour-intensive supervision of programs for students to study and/or work abroad. It may be possible to foster more contact and collaboration with the university QUIC services.

In §3.5 it is stated that the biggest challenge in taking DEVS forward into MA teaching and potential Ph.D. supervision lies in balancing the demands of undergraduate teaching with the specialization and depth required in guiding postgraduate students. To achieve even modest expansion into postgraduate teaching, the consultants feel that additional resources are clearly necessary. The authors suggest that the introduction of two research-led teaching streams could combine the apparently conflicting goals. The first stream “relates to the *Political Economy of Development* in which DEVS has considerable strength... To bolster the stream it would be important to assure first-year exposure to disciplinary courses in politics and economics. The second easily identifiable stream is *Development and Social Change*. Here the obvious cognate courses are sociology, geography and cultural studies... In terms of research, the national and international

profile of the department is particularly strong in relation to Africa, especially Southern Africa” (p.13).

In §3.6, the authors note that the main challenge facing DEVS at this point is how to manage its success and handle the challenges of future growth. Their “resounding answer seems to be modest expansion, sensibly paced” (p.14). They feel that “to be able to claim that IDS is being adequately taught as an interdisciplinary field, it is also important to improve student exposure to quantitative methods and either development economics or the economic history of development” (p.14). They also encourage the department to utilize the fact that DEVS’ own reputation and that of Queen’s overall is strong in the area of sub-Saharan Africa.

In general terms, the consultants felt that the request for two new faculty members was entirely reasonable and they concurred with the argument that the new MA program must have administrative as well as faculty support. In addition, the request for additional and integrated space was deemed an important request that needs addressing. In particular, they argued that at least **one full-time appointment in the near future** represents a sensible expectation for a department poised to introduce a new MA program. More specifically, they felt that **DEVS’ greatest and most immediate need is for a development economist or an economic historian**. Accompanying this appointment, they argued, should be **the commencement of curriculum revision along the lines suggested in section 2.2**.

They concluded with the recommendation that a sensible way forward must be sought to

support and embellish rather than deplete the excellent work of the current placements coordinator and to place DEVS at the center of Queen’s international outreach as it relates to developing countries and particularly Africa.

5. Issues and Recommendations

Our committee strongly supports the report of the external consultants and its recommendations. The following comments on issues and recommendations perhaps better reflect the Queen’s context, but are fully in tune with the consultants’ report.

The report points out that the current set of teaching programs have been operating very successfully. **But the authors feel that Major’s program would benefit from greater disciplinary foundation in basic economics and basic politics.** “.. The portion of the DEVS degrees that involves courses taught in other disciplines has very little structure... it is possible for DEVS students to graduate without ever having been exposed to basic economics, basic politics, and so on. This is surprising.” (p.6) “To achieve interdisciplinarity within DEVS itself, foundational courses need to be extended, for example to include the politics of development and development economics. In turn this presupposes a need for introductory courses in the cognate disciplines, and yet these courses are not required in the Major degree” (p.8). We concur with this view and encourage DEVS to work with these departments to bring about these changes.

Indeed, the consultants feel that first priority in further hiring in the program should be a micro-economist specializing in development economics rather than a specialist in Aboriginal studies. “Here we should suggest that DEVS’ greatest and immediate need is for a development economist or an economic historian” (p.17). Furthermore, if the department is planning to bring in a Master’s program with graduate supervision, there is a strong argument for building on existing strength, such as in the African studies area, rather than branching into the new area of Aboriginal studies.

We also concur with the external consultants’ recommendation that there should be a quantitative methods requirement in at least the Major program. “In our view a semester-long quantitative methods course of some kind is desirable in any development studies programme... Development studies graduates need to be familiar with quantitative methods in a way that only a dedicated course can provide” (p.6). How this is done we leave to the unit to work out what works best for them. One route might be to have the economic development hiree teach it in house; an alternative route could be to make arrangements with a cognate social science department which already runs an introductory Q.M. course to service the DEVS students as well.

We feel that the DEVS department is underresourced for the planned student loads. The current enrollment in DEVS programs is approximately 280 students. The specific program breakdown in 2006-07 was: 98 Minors, 107 Medials and 45 Majors. Since the latter program was introduced only in 2006, its numbers are bound to go up. Anticipated growth cited in the unit self-study is to more than 400 undergraduate students. Yet the

department has only six full-time faculty, some of whose time is bought out for research purposes and administration. We simply do not believe this is sustainable with the increased numbers.

In particular, the work-study option is a key component of the DEVS program and one that should be encouraged and supported. But such an option poses a heavy administrative burden which is fully administered by DEVS and which falls principally on Professor Paritosh Kumar. As student numbers continue to increase this burden will not be sustainable. **We concur with the consultants' conclusion that "it is crucial that resources be allocated towards enhancing capacity in relation to the study aboard programme and experiential learning.** A sensible way forward must be sought to support and embellish rather than deplete the excellent work of the current placements coordinator..." (p.17).

The consultants' report considers more coordination between the DEVS department and the services of the Queen's University International Centre (QUIC) as a way of spreading the burden. But we agree with the students' view that QUIC is not really equipped to deal with this specialized advising; the service is better provided by the academic unit or by the faculty. The students continually spoke of their appreciation for the individualized support provided by both the staff and faculty in DEVS. **Our opinion is that, moving forward, a new staff member is needed to support Professor Kumar in this activity and efforts should be made to try to reorganize the administrative burden so that it can be more readily shared with the staff member.**

In our discussions, we felt that this problem is more general across the university than just the DEVS situation. **We feel that there is a need for the university to look more strategically at international placements — specifically short-term international learning placements — within various programs across campus in a way that could both provide support to such programs and build collaborations between programs.**

This is not purely a DEVS issue.

As already noted, the consultants' report identified several sources of interdepartmental strains. In an era of tight resources, departments may seek to limit course enrollments to their own students. Consequently, "places for DEVS students are not guaranteed and are not always available in the cognate departments" (p.8). Indeed, the report goes on: "Choice is further restricted by pre-requisites... and the fact that the number of IDS-compatible courses have declined since Queen's lost its 1960s cohort through retirement. A department head further remarked that: *'Hiring is being driven by building on strength'*. As such staff appointments in cognate departments are unlikely to operate in DEVS favour" (p.10). **Ways for better coordination between DEVS and key cognate departments need to be worked out so that the students as a whole can benefit within the faculty.**

Finally, we have concerns about mounting an MA Development Studies program under existing circumstances. As stated in the consultants' report, "To achieve even modest expansion into postgraduate teaching, additional resources are clearly necessary" (p. 13).

Current resources are already stretched and undergraduate members are expected to continue to increase, especially in the recently instituted Majors program. A new graduate program would also significantly increase the administrative burden on the department as there would need to be a Graduate Director and at least a part-time graduate administrator. With the planned undergraduate growth to more than 400 students and an MA program in the offing, **the consultants conclude “it is our view that the request for two new faculty members is entirely reasonable, as is the argument that the new MA programme must have administrative as well as faculty support” (p.16). We concur with this view. In the absence of such additional support, we would express reservations about proceeding at this moment with the proposed MA program in Development Studies.**