



# CORRECTED (NOV 18TH) Review Committee Member: Ron Samson- Lead Org: Carleton University

Assessment Form: Targeted Call 2021

Email: [ron.samson@ryerson.ca](mailto:ron.samson@ryerson.ca)

Phone Number:

Project Name: FUSION

Lead Organization: Carleton  
University

Link to reviewer packet: [Carleton Reviewer Packet](#)

---

## Conflict of Interest Verification

*Conflict of Interest Verification : I have acknowledged and agreed to follow FSC-CCF's Confidentiality and Conflict of Interest Policy and I have no Conflict with this grant application.*

## A. Relevance

Project aligns with FSC's priorities, addresses recognized systemic challenges about future skills in Canada, and demonstrates demand for service.

### A1: Alignment with FSC's strategic priorities

- |  |  |   |  |
|--|--|---|--|
| <input type="radio"/> Displays little or no alignment with FSC's Strategic Priorities. | <input type="radio"/> Pursues FSC's Strategic Priorities, but alignment lacks clarity. | <input checked="" type="radio"/> Adequately aligns with FSC's Strategic Priorities. | <input type="radio"/> Presents outstanding alignment with FSC's Strategic Priorities in a way that demonstrates that FSC should not miss the opportunity to partner with this project. |
|--|--|---|--|

\*[FSC's Strategic Plan](#) for your reference

### A2: Addressing systemic challenges

- Shows little or no scope to address recognized systemic challenges about future skills in Canada.
- Presents general but limited scope to address systemic challenges about future skills in Canada.
- Presents clear and relevant scope to address recognized systemic challenges about future skills in Canada.
- Demonstrates outstanding potential to address recognized systemic challenges about future skills in Canada with a strong and well-defined scope that sets this project aside from other initiatives.

### A3: Demand for service

- Demonstration of the demand for this service is irrelevant or poorly articulated.
  - Demonstrates that there is some demand for this service but explanation lacks clarity.
  - Clearly demonstrates that there are high levels of demand for this service and explains how the project adequately fulfills this demand.
  - Articulates a deep understanding of the high levels of demand for this service and makes a strong case for how providing this service is timely.
- 

## B. Innovation and Evidence

Project pursues a new way of doing things that can advance knowledge and/or is an evidence-informed model.

### B1: Innovative nature

- It is not innovative, seeks funding for business as usual and, if applicable, is not informed by evidence.
- While it is a departure from business as usual, interventions proposed are not particularly novel and, if applicable, are only vaguely informed by evidence.
- Proposes clearly innovative solutions and, if applicable, articulates how the novel interventions are innovative and, if applicable, makes a strong case for how the interventions are grounded on evidence that is relevant and applied in a novel way.

### B2: Evidence generation and new knowledge

- Presents unclear or no plan to generate insights or to advance knowledge.
- Demonstrates intent to generate insights and advance knowledge that can benefit the skills ecosystem but the plan lacks clarity.
- Presents a clear and adequate plan to generate insights and advance knowledge that will clearly benefit the skills ecosystem at large.
- There are strong and well-designed strategies in place to generate insights and advance knowledge in a way that sets this project aside from other initiatives.

## C. Learning

Project has already generated learning that informed the additional scope and identifies concrete problem statements and learning questions to address in the next phase.

### C1: Application of learnings from current project

- |   |   |  |   |
|---|---|--|---|
| <input type="radio"/> Does not demonstrate how learning generated from the current project informed additional scope. | <input type="radio"/> Presents general but limited connection between learning generated from the current project and additional scope. | <input type="radio"/> Presents a clear and relevant connection between learning generated from the current project and additional scope. | <input type="radio"/> Makes an outstanding case for how the additional scope is grounded on learning generated from the current project and expertly demonstrates ability to continue to pursue learning. |
|---|---|--|---|

### C2: Problem statements and additional learning questions

- |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
| <input type="radio"/> Presents vague or no concrete additional learning questions. | <input type="radio"/> Somewhat defines concrete and additional learning questions but the connection between questions and the problem statements lacks clarity. | <input type="radio"/> Clearly identifies additional learning questions that are concrete and relevant to address the problem statements. | <input type="radio"/> Articulates well-defined and concrete learning questions that will without a doubt contribute to addressing the problem statements within and beyond the scope of the project. |
|--|--|--|--|

---

## D. Equity, diversity, and inclusion (EDI)

Project incorporates the perspectives of end-users and other stakeholders, particularly groups facing barriers, in the design and execution of the project, presents practices grounded in EDI principles, and shows potential to further EDI.

### D1: Incorporation of the perspectives of end-users and other stakeholders

- |   |   |   |  |
|---|---|---|--|
| <input type="radio"/> Does not incorporate the perspectives of end-users and other stakeholders in the design and execution of the project. | <input type="radio"/> Shows that end-users and other stakeholders are somewhat involved in the design and execution of the project, but lacks clarity around the effective incorporation of their perspectives. | <input type="radio"/> Presents clear evidence that end-users and other stakeholders are involved in the design and execution of the project in effective and relevant ways. | <input type="radio"/> There are strong and well-designed strategies in place to involve end-users and other stakeholders, demonstrating an outstanding commitment to incorporating their perspectives at every stage of the project. |
|---|---|---|--|

### D2: EDI practices & activities

- |   |  |   |   |
|---|--|---|---|
| <input type="radio"/> Project practices and activities do not directly support and are not explicitly grounded in EDI principles. | <input type="radio"/> Project practices and activities somewhat support but are only loosely grounded in EDI principles. | <input type="radio"/> Project is clearly grounded in EDI policies, practices or activities. | <input type="radio"/> Project is clearly grounded in EDI policies, practices or activities and clearly demonstrates commitment to EDI and potential to be a leader in promoting EDI in the skills |
|---|--|---|---|

<b>D3: Impact on furthering EDI</b>	<input type="radio"/> Anticipated impact on furthering EDI under the project scope is irrelevant or vague.	<input type="radio"/> Demonstrates intent to further EDI under the project scope, but rationale lacks clarity.	<input type="radio"/> Anticipated impact on furthering EDI under the project scope is clear and relevant.	<input type="radio"/> Presents promising and strong strategies to further EDI in the field or sector with potential to impact the skills ecosystem at large.
-------------------------------------	--	--	---	--

## E. Capacity

The lead organization (and partners if applicable) have the skills, experience and resources to execute the project successfully and hold a good track record with FSC.

### E1: Skills, experience & resources

<input type="radio"/> Project team lacks skills, experience and resources needed to execute the project.	<input type="radio"/> Project team has some of the skills, experience and resources needed to execute the project.	<input type="radio"/> Project team clearly demonstrates adequate skills, experience and resources to execute the project.	<input type="radio"/> Project team demonstrates strong skills, experience and resources to succeed in the project and to be a leader who influences the skills ecosystem.
--	--	---	---

### E2: FSC track record

<input type="radio"/> Presents little or no evidence of a good track record with FSC and of addressing challenges faced during the current project, indicating that the organization may struggle to manage the new project effectively and responsibly.	<input type="radio"/> Presents somewhat adequate evidence of a good track record with FSC and of addressing challenges faced during the current project, indicating that the organization may have limited capacity to manage the new project effectively and responsibly.	<input type="radio"/> Presents adequate evidence of a good track record with FSC and of addressing challenges faced during the current project, indicating that the organization will manage the new project effectively and responsibly.	<input type="radio"/> Shows clear evidence of an impeccable track record with FSC and has expertly addressed challenges faced during the current project, indicating that the organization has strong project and risk management systems in place to take on the new project.
--	--	---	--

## F. Coherence

Project displays a logical connection between proposed activities and project objectives with a work plan and a budget that are reasonable, appropriate and aligned.

### F1: Connection between activities & objectives

<input type="radio"/> Lacks logical connection between	<input type="radio"/> Activities and objectives are somewhat connected, logical connection between activities and	<input type="radio"/> Presents a clear and logical connection between activities and objectives.	<input type="radio"/> Activities and objectives are without a doubt strongly connected in a
--	---	--	---

activities and objectives. but the link lacks clarity. objectives. thoughtful way.

## F2: Budget

- |  |   |  |   |
|--|---|--|---|
| <input type="radio"/> Budget is not reasonable, appropriate or reasonable and aligned with workplan. | <input checked="" type="radio"/> Budget is somewhat appropriate, but is only loosely aligned with workplan. | <input type="radio"/> Budget is clearly reasonable, appropriate and aligned with workplan. | <input type="radio"/> Presents an outstanding value for money and strong alignment with workplan. |
|--|---|--|---|

## Reviewer overall recommendation

Considering the proposal as a whole, do you think FSC should fund this project as a worthwhile contribution to the skills ecosystem?

### Overall Recommendation:

- I recommend this project for funding
- I recommend this project for funding conditional on changes and/or more information
- I do not recommend this project for funding

### Explain your reasoning for this recommendation.

This is an extremely ambitious project with a lot of curriculum development that builds off of an existing project with a university network. It is innovative and addresses FSC's priorities of responsive career pathways, and what works and seems scalable. However, it may only serve those who need this type of intervention the least as it is focused on University Co-op students who are more likely to be in professional programs where they will already gain access to experiential co-op opportunities.

### What do you think are the strongest aspects of this project?

Innovation approach, number of students served, scalability, university network and past success in demonstrating skill gains. Note I have not seen the external evaluation and the evidence written in the proposal does not include any data.

### Where do you think the project has gaps or challenges?

A critical issue is the eligibility and targeted demographic to participate in the program. On the website, it says "FUSION course is currently open to graduate co-op students and undergraduates that have completed the COOP 1000 course and are going to start a co-op placement in the fall term. Any Carleton students can participate in the FUSION curriculum if they are registered in a course that is using FUSION as part of its experiential learning component." My understanding of this program is that it will only benefit university students who are in WIL programs. Based on my knowledge of WIL programs, these are students who are less likely to be from underrepresented groups, are in professional programs, are more likely to come from higher-income families and will already receive work placements, which may only make training opportunities more unequal for those in non-WIL programs and those who are not in university. Another key issue are the new models and that there is really no mention of what they will entail or why they are needed. Also, there is an inconsistency between the number of modules that are written in the proposal (18, they have 3 existing so they will develop 15 yet the work plan states 12). Furthermore, I don't know how these will be validated by industry as they mention industry roundtables but there is no information on which industries they will target, how they will be engaged or their validation process for the credentials. Also, in the proposal, there is little mention of what they specifically do as it relates to EDI. This includes both the involvement of diverse perspectives and how they will serve underrepresented groups. Also, one major weakness in the evaluation is that there is little mentioning of the impact of employment. Given the amount of money requested, I believe a lot of these items should be clarified.

### Comments

A very large amount of money requested and I don't know if the design of this intervention really serves those that have unequal access to training opportunities.

Please share any other comments.