Undergraduate Program Review Process

Introduction

In keeping with the mission and values of the University, these policies and procedures have been developed in order to establish, maintain and enhance the academic quality of its programs. Guidelines are outlined for:

- approval process for the introduction of new programs
- review process for existing programs
- processes and procedures for program review that will be available for audit

The Academic Council of the University is responsible for establishing and overseeing both policy and procedural aspects related to approval of new programs, and program review. Established protocols will be carried out by the Provost, and the appropriate Dean.

I. Approval Process for New Undergraduate Programs

1. Policy

The Dean of each Faculty shall plan, with appropriate staff, for ongoing development of new program initiatives. New programs and substantive changes to existing programs shall be prepared and reviewed by the Faculty curriculum committee and Faculty Council. (These bodies are established by Academic Council. See http://www.uoit.ca/EN/main2/11246/13525/15629/faculty_councils.html). Once approval at this level is obtained, a detailed proposal shall be submitted to the Curriculum and Program Review Committee (CPRC). The elements for this submission are outlined in the committee's requirements entitled *Documentation Required for New Program Submissions or Major program Revisions* (see Appendix C). Once approved by CPRC, the proposal will be sent to the Executive Committee of Academic Council, and subsequently to the Academic Council for review and approval.

The submission to CPRC will provide evidence which indicates:

- Consistency of the program with the vision, mission and values of the University and with the standards, educational goals and learning outcomes of the degree

- Appropriateness of the admission requirements, e.g., achievement and preparation for the objectives of the University and the program;

- Appropriateness of the program's structure and curriculum for its learning outcomes;

- Appropriateness of the modes of delivery (including, where applicable, distance or on-line delivery) to meet the program's learning outcomes;

- Appropriateness of the methods used for the evaluation of student progress;

- Appropriateness of the utilization of the existing human/physical/financial resources;

- A plan to ensure a sufficient number of faculty including full-time appointments, with evidence of their quality and academic expertise in the area of the proposed program.

2. Requirements for Ministerial Consent to Offer New Programs

As a new university UOIT is currently required to submit new program proposals to the Postsecondary Education Quality Assessment Board (PEQAB), in order to obtain ministerial consent. UOIT's submissions for new programs comply with the PEQAB guidelines which can be found at:

http://peqab.edu.gov.on.ca/public.html

The PEQAB handbook is available at:

http://peqab.edu.gov.on.ca/pdf/PublicHandbook2004.pdf

The submission guidelines are at:

http://peqab.edu.gov.on.ca/pdf/PublicGuide2004.pdf

II. Review Process for Existing Programs

1. Background

The undergraduate program review (UPR) process is based on the principles that:

- provision of academic programs, scholarship and research of the highest quality is an important goal;
- academic endeavours should be consistent with the equity goals of the University;
- academic programs should make the best use of the resources available to them;
- empirical evidence is a necessary precursor to informed judgement;
- informed judgments of academic quality are a reasonable basis for meaningful decisions, including decisions about resource issues.

Review of undergraduate academic programs is mandated by the Council of Ontario Universities (COU) through the Undergraduate Program Review Audit Committee (UPRAC) of the Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents (OCAV). This process provides a means by which by which "institutional mechanisms for review of existing

undergraduate programs and for the implementation of new undergraduate programs" are audited. UPRAC was set up in response to a directive from the Minister of Education and Training in September 1993 which stated that universities "will be required to set institutional quality standards, develop program review procedures, and undertake reviews of all undergraduate programs at least once every ten years". [1] COU subsequently undertook to conduct audits to meet the accountability requirements of the Ministry. The results of the audits are reported every year to the Ministry.

2. Objectives

The intent of the periodic review process at UOIT is to assess the quality of undergraduate programs in all areas of study. The following operational definitions apply for the purposes of this review:

Program: A sequence of courses or other units of study prescribed by an institution for the fulfillment of the requirements of a particular degree.

Unit of Review: A Faculty or School. Programs will be reviewed under the leadership of the dean of a particular unit. Where a program involves faculty and courses from more than one unit, the deans involved will collaborate and confirm to the Provost the unit which will hold the locus of responsibility for the review. The Provost will ensure that as part of the continuing development of the university, the schedule for reviews is updated to ensure that every degree program is subjected to thorough review within the seven-year cycle.

The following pages outline the policies, process and procedural details which will guide the regularly scheduled periodic review of existing programs. These policies and procedures will be reviewed and revised if necessary, every two years, under the direction of Academic Council. Academic Council is responsible for amendments to and approval of this document.

3. Policy

The dean of each Faculty shall plan a schedule and process for review of all programs in the Faculty, and in consultation with the Provost, a university- wide schedule will be established to ensure that each program is reviewed at least once every seven years. Under special circumstances the dean may schedule additional program reviews to meet particular requirements. The process for program review will include at least the following elements:

1. Coordination of the process and compilation of report directed by a Review Team appointed by the Provost (see p. 5 for details);
2. Self study with involvement of program professors, adjunct faculty, and students;
3. Site visit normally involving two experts from other universities who are at arm's-length from the program under review;

[1] Constitution of the Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents (OCAV). Bylaw 1: Responsibilities and Procedures of the Undergraduate Program Review Audit Committee (UPRAC). 16/5/1996

4. Assessment by professors from the University who are not directly involved in the program under review;
5. Consultation with external stakeholders such as employers and professional bodies where appropriate; and
6. Other specific protocols deemed appropriate such as those which are required by or contribute to, program reviews needed for professional accreditation (e.g., Education, Engineering and Nursing).

The dean will ensure that all administrative units involved in the delivery of the program will be included in the review. For cross disciplinary programs, the dean of the unit which has primary responsibility for administering the program will assume leadership for the review.

The dean will plan for the compilation and analysis of information collected through the review procedures and will distribute and discuss the reports and recommendations from the Review Team, and develop a plan for action, in consultation with program faculty. Within 30 days following this collaboration, a summative report which includes recommendations and the plan for actions to be taken as a result, will be provided to the Provost who will prepare a final report for the Executive Committee.

The basis for the undergraduate program review process is the self-study prepared by the program or academic unit under the leadership of the dean. The Review Team, appointed by the Provost then prepares a report based on the self-study, the appraisal of an external consultant or consultants including a site visit, comment from the broader University and - if appropriate - external stakeholders, and such other information as is available. This report is submitted to the dean who will forward it to the Provost. The Provost will review it and make his/her own report to Executive Committee including a summary of the program or unit review; a statement of the strengths and weaknesses of the program or unit, the action to be taken and the dean's response. Annually, summaries of the reviews, including the major conclusions and recommendations, are reported to the Academic Council and published to the UOIT community.

4. Process

Structure of Internal Academic Reviews

Timing
UPRAC requires that programs be reviewed on a maximum of a ten- year cycle; OCGS mandates a seven year cycle; professional programs are reviewed on anything from a three to a six year cycle. Consequently, the Provost must ensure that programs are reviewed at least once every seven years.

Where the UPR takes place in conjunction with another review process, (for example, professional accreditation) it is important that the objectives of both review processes be met. In particular, the self-study documents should address all the relevant issues.

Role of the Provost
The Provost has overall responsibility for the application of policies related to the review process. While the Review Team has the specific responsibility for compiling the report on the programs or academic units being assessed, the Provost must review that report

in light of the broader University perspective and, specifically, may edit the executive summary of the report before its transmission to Executive Committee and Academic Council and publication to the UOIT community. The terms of reference and membership of the Executive Committee are determined by Academic Council. Up-to-date details may be found on the UOIT website (http://www.uoit.ca/EN/main2/11246/13525/15629/council_committees_2004-05.html).

Self-Study

The self-study is the starting point and the basis for the review process. It allows the program or unit to:

- define the indicators of quality, that is the criteria, against which it wishes to be judged: this element should include consideration of the University's vision, mission and values;
- provide the evidence on which judgments about program quality will be based; and
- evaluate itself in light of the above standards and evidence and indicate how it supports the University vision, mission and values, and the intended outcomes of the program under review.

The self-study should be the most significant and valuable phase of the program review. It is therefore vital, that all the unit's faculty, staff, and appropriate student representatives be involved in the preparation of the self-study. Responsibility for ensuring that this involvement occurs rests with the dean.

Review Team

The Review Team has the primary responsibility for compiling a report on the program being assessed.

The University community will be invited to recommend individuals to serve on the Review Team. Taking these recommendations into consideration, the Provost will then establish the Review Team, normally as follows:

- four faculty members, two of whom will be from the same Faculty as the program under review;
- two students from the program under review; and
- one staff member.

The Provost will appoint the chair from among the members of the Review Team. When a program is undergoing a subsequent UPR, a majority of the non-student Review Team members must not have participated in a previous UPR for that program.

The report of the Review Team is based on the self-study, the appraisal of the external consultant or consultants, comment from the broader University and, if appropriate, external stakeholders, and such other information as is available. The input from the external consultant(s) forms a valuable part of the information on which the report is based. The interpretation of any difference of opinion between the program and the consultant is the responsibility of the Review Team.

When the report of the Review Team is completed it is forwarded by the dean to the Provost.

External Consultants
The role of an external consultant is to provide an informed, dispassionate, and critical judgment of the quality of an academic program from the perspective of an outside observer who is also an expert on the field under review. External consultants must be at arm's-length from the programs that they are assessing. Potential conflict of interest situations include, but are not limited to, a close relative, a collaborator, a former supervisor or supervisee, or a former student. None of these relationships need, of itself, eliminate a potential consultant but possible conflicts must be identified prior to the decision to appoint an individual as a consultant. The dean and the Review Team will collaborate and review any situations where there is a potential conflict of interest with a nominated consultant and come to agreement about the suitability of the candidate.

The Provost is responsible for appointing the external consultants using the following procedure:

- The consultants will be internationally-recognized individuals in the program's discipline. When a program is undergoing a subsequent UPR, at least one of the external consultants must not have participated in a previous internal academic review of that unit or program.
- A rank ordered list of six recommendations, each with a brief biographical summary, is forwarded by the dean to Provost. Any potential conflicts of interest should be identified. The dean solicits these recommendations from the academic unit and approves the list before it is forwarded to Provost.
- When the consultants are selected, at least one will normally be chosen from the unit's list.
- Comments are solicited from the unit on the suitability of the consultant(s) chosen.
- The agreement of the consultant(s) is obtained.

Comment from the Broader University and External Communities
The broader University community and, where appropriate, the external community will be invited to provide written comment on the program to the Review Team.

Site Visit and Interviews
The purpose of the site visit is to provide an opportunity for an examination of the physical facilities and interviews with faculty, students, staff, and others who can most appropriately provide informed comment. The process should be planned within flexible parameters in order to accommodate the assessment goals for the specific unit.

The consultants should be present on campus for a minimum of two full days. The consultants should visit the campus together. The site visit and interviews should take place, if possible, together with a Review Team member or members. Their time will be spent within the unit, outside the unit, and with the Review Team, with priority being given to time spent inside the unit. The consultants should have opportunity to meet with students or other stakeholders without the presence of Review Team members, if requested. The consultants should not be invited to participate in academic or social events other than as required by their duty as consultants. If possible they will submit, at

the end of the visit, a preliminary draft of their report for the information of the Review Team.

The dean will seek advice from members of the unit and others about the interviews, and then, with assistance from the central administration, arrange for meetings between the consultants and appropriate individuals such as the following:

- dean of the Faculty;
- faculty members involved in the program;
- students from the program;
- staff in the unit;
- the Review Team;
- others from the University community who have offered comment; and
- relevant members of the external community.

Members of the Review Team and the consultants will be free to seek information from other sources and, in particular, to suggest other individuals and groups with whom to meet during the site visit.

5. Procedures for Undergraduate Program Reviews

Administrative Support

Academic responsibility for the preparation of the self-study and other aspects of the review process rests with academic officers of the University, including the unit head, the dean and the Director of Academic Planning. However, in order to ease the administrative burden of the review process, some support will be available from central resources. Details of this support will be available from the Director of Academic Planning. Requirements for support staff should be planned by December 1 for the reviews scheduled for the next academic year.

Schedule

October Academic Council Meeting

- Faculties recommend to Academic Council, for confirmation, the program reviews for the next academic year and the rolling schedule for the next seven years.

November 15

- The Provost notifies units of their forthcoming reviews. Faculties required to identify unit staff coordinator by December 1 to Director of Academic Planning

Jan 15

- Appointment and confirmation of Review Teams

January-March

- Confirmation of review and September 1 deadline for self-study.
- The Dean of the Faculty and the Provost will meet with the unit (faculty, students, and staff) to outline and discuss the review process, the timing, and the information to be presented in the self study.
- Review Team compiles documentation for self-study.
- Summary reports from student evaluations of courses and student satisfaction surveys from previous four years are compiled and made available for the self-study and the Review Team.
- The Provost requests nominations of consultants due May 31.

March-May

- Self-study conducted
- Solicitation of comments from internal, external and student communities
- Identification of target groups to meet with consultants during site visits.

June 15

- Appointment of external consultants and confirmation of dates of site visits.

September 15

- Final copy of self-study.

September-November

- Site visits

November 30

- Site visits, interviews and consultants' draft report completed.

December 15

- Receipt of consultant final reports. Circulate assessments to dean to check for factual accuracy and appropriateness of recommendations. Any disagreement with factual information or with recommendations should be returned, with supporting materials, to the Review Team.

January 15

- Review Team compiles comments on factual accuracy of assessments and appropriateness of recommendations and drafts Review Team report.

February 15

- The dean receives Review Team report, incorporating consultant assessments.

February 28

- Circulate Review Team report to dean/unit.

March 31

- Dean forwards report, including response from unit and draft of action plans to Provost.

April 30

- The Provost prepares and submits a report to the Executive Committee.

Fall

- The Executive Committee considers the Provost's report and makes any necessary recommendations for action.
- Report submitted to Academic Council for information. Summary of report and action plan presented for information at Fall Academic Council meeting.
- Report published broadly to UOIT community by a suitable means.

Preparation of the Self-Study

The self-study forms the basis of the review process and should involve reflective and analytical thinking by all members of a program or unit, (faculty, students and staff) in order to prepare a frank, objective and balanced appraisal of strengths and areas for improvement. The self-study report is the primary document on which the review is based and it is, therefore, important that it should be well organized, clearly written and concise. While data and statistical information are a necessary part of the document, they should be selected for their relevance rather than their volume and presented as effectively as possible and accompanied by a clear interpretive statement. Consultants and members of the Review Team should not be expected to have to carry out their own analyses or to extract the relevant information from a compendium of ill-digested information.

Appendix A contains guidelines for information that should be included in a self-study report. Depending upon the nature of the review, some categories will be more relevant than others or it may be necessary to include other relevant items. In drafting the self-study report the criteria against which it will be assessed, including those listed in Appendix B, should be utilized.

Assessment Criteria and Issues to be Addressed by the Consultants and Review Team

The central issue to be addressed by the consultant(s) and the Review Team is the quality of the programs which are being assessed. Appendix B identifies the criteria that have been approved for the assessment of academic programs.

Review Team Report
Based on the information gained from the self-study, independent submissions, interviews and meetings, and the consultants' assessment(s), the Review Team will prepare its report, which will include an executive summary and the consultants' assessment(s), and submit it to the dean. The dean will be responsible for the response.

Provost's Report
The Provost will study the Review Team report and the dean's response, consult with the unit head and others as needed, and then prepare his/her report to the Executive Committee. The Provost's report will exclude all personal information, and will include:

- a summary of the outcomes, findings and conclusions of the program review;
- a statement of the strengths and weaknesses of the program ;
- a statement of the action to be taken on the recommendations arising from the review;
- the dean's response;
- the timetable for implementation of the recommendations; and
- the individual responsible for follow-up, who will normally be the dean

6. Outcome

Executive Committee Action
Executive Committee action on the report will depend, in part, on the nature of the report and the recommendations. Possible Executive Committee action includes, but is not limited to, the following:

- acceptance of the recommendations and timetable for implementation, with or without modification;
- referral to another Academic Council committee; and
- referral to the Academic Council.

Reporting of Reviews
Annually, summaries of the reviews including major conclusions and recommendations will be submitted to the Board of Governors and published widely to the UOIT community.

Implementing Recommendations
Information gained from the reviews and the resulting recommendations will be used by the unit and the University to strengthen and facilitate the decision making processes of the institution and program unit. The Provost is responsible for discussing the review report with the dean. The dean is responsible for making arrangements for the discussion of the review report among all members of the program or involved academic unit and for implementing recommendations applicable to the program and academic unit.

The authority for directing recommendations stemming from the review to the appropriate individual or body, of confirming that the appropriate action has been taken, and of obtaining and disseminating any required report on that action rests with the Provost.

7. Compliance with Audit Requirements

UOIT will provide required documents and access to individuals and information needed for the Auditor's assessment of the University's quality assurance policies and practices.

Audits of UOIT policies and practices are anticipated to begin no earlier than 2008.

Appendix A: Self-Study Items

The following items are a guide to those that should be included in the self-study report. The self study, as the key aspect in the review process should be conducted and presented showing evidence of critical reflection and analysis of the significant elements listed below. Although the following is presented a checklist with discrete sections, participants should prepare documentation that shows the relevance and connectedness among all elements and indicates their contribution to the program's goals, learning objectives, learning outcomes and the mission, values and goals of the University. The Director of Academic Planning and appropriate support staff compile data and provide assistance to units in selecting and interpreting information relevant to the self study.

Item	Source	Status
General Description of Program/Program Identity		
Description of program including: history; structure; governance; relationship with other programs or academic units at UOIT; standards, including indicators of quality, against which the program or unit wishes to be judged together with the justification for these standards; national and international programs in same field which provide useful reference points for comparison together with the rationale for the choice; evidence of how the program is consistent with the vision, mission and values of the University and with the goals of the academic unit.	**Unit**	
Description of the University: Provide appropriate background information for the University as a whole to enable reviewers to make a comparative assessment on program quality including the quality of teaching and learning in light of the resources available.	**Unit**	
Description and evidence changes that have occurred in response to recommendations from last review or other source.	**Unit**	
Copy of relevant Strategic Plan/Staffing Plan.	**Unit**	
Curriculum		
Program goals, objectives and learning outcomes showing connections and relevance including societal context and relevance to the University mission, values and goals.	**Unit**	
Samples of program materials with analysis of the links between pro-	**Unit**	

gram goals, learning activities and resources, learning outcomes and evaluation strategies.		
Description of the use of learning technologies and the connection to program goals, learning outcomes, student success, and the mission, values and goals of the University.	**Unit**	
Provide a copy of the Calendar as an attachment.	**Unit**	
Pertinent academic regulations.	**Unit**	
Recent and anticipated program changes.	**Unit**	
Resources		
Evidence of financial resources needed to maintain the program including financial impact on other programs within and outside the unit if applicable	**Office of the Provost**	
Description and explanation of adequacy of physical facilities and space (including laboratory, classroom and other space).	**Unit**	
Description and explanation of adequacy of equipment and services.	**Unit**	
Documentation of library resources, including description of collections, services, and expenditures and connection to program goals and learning outcomes.	**Unit; Library**	
Faculty		
Curricula vitae of faculty prefaced by a summary indicating status as tenure, tenure-stream, non-renewable, special or adjunct (initial, renewable).	**Unit**	
Description of faculty resources in relation to program goals, objectives and learning outcomes.	**Unit**	
Description of faculty recruitment, resources, policies which support the equity goals of the University.	**Unit**	
Students		
Admissions policies and requirements including UOIT general admissions policies as modified by unit or program requirements.	**Unit**	
Describe, the quality of incoming students using appropriate indicators as available.	**Registrar**	
Current enrolment objectives (full-time and part-time, undergraduates and graduate) including: any anticipated changes; any restrictions on enrolment; and indicators of student demand.	**Unit**	
Program enrolments and graduations (full-time and part-time, undergraduates and graduate) since last review or for the last five years. Include: enrolments by year of program and graduations. Success rates on professional certification/licensing exams if applicable.	**Unit; Registrar**	
Documentation of student information such as admissions, success, student support, which are consistent with the equity goals of the University.	**Unit; Registrar**	
Student participation in extracurricular activities.	**Unit**	
Ways in which students participate in decision making processes, including: participation in committees; contribution to teaching evaluation.	**Unit**	
Satisfaction with learning experience based on exit surveys	**Unit, Surveys**	
Scholarships and other awards.	**Unit**	
Results of professional certification or licensing examinations.	**Unit**	
Placement after graduation (acceptance to graduate school, employment, other).	**Registrar/Placement Office**	

Item	Source	Status
Teaching		
Summary of distinctive aspects of formal, and informal teaching activities, including: a description of teaching and curriculum innovations, with evidence of resulting improvement in the quality of students; and, where applicable, a description of how research carried out by the unit informs teaching, with concrete examples	**Unit**	
Work load document including explanation of variation in loads.	**Unit**	
Comment on student-faculty ratios and reasons for variation in class size including need for sectioned classes.	**Unit**	
Service teaching undertaken by unit including enrolment by students from other units in regular courses and contractual arrangements for the provision of courses in other units.	**Unit**	
Course outlines.	**Unit**	
Methods of evaluating students.	**Unit**	
Formal examinations	**Unit**	
Teaching evaluations including Student Feedback on Course and Professor, Student Satisfaction Surveys, exit surveys and other assessments where available.	**Unit**	
Service	**Unit**	
Summarize the contributions of the program or unit (as distinct from those of individual members) to the broader scholarly, professional, and other external communities including contributions to the discipline outside the University, to the local community and to the wider community. For example, seminars, workshops and conferences sponsored or supported by the unit.	**Unit**	
Other Information	**Unit**	
Other relevant information not mentioned above.	**Unit**	
Self-Evaluation		
Brief review of the program or unit in light of previous items of the self-study, with respect to the standards identified above, identifying areas of strength and areas in which change is required.	**Unit**	

Appendix B. Criteria for Assessing the Quality of Academic Programs (to be addressed by the consultants and the Review Team)

The criteria below should be regarded as the minimum criteria for the assessment of academic programs. These indicators of program quality should be taken as a starting point for discussion by the faculty undergoing review. The faculty members, with the guidance of the dean, should expand and make explicit the categories and assessment criteria which should be examined as indicators of quality for the program under review.

The description of each criterion is intended to give an indication of its scope and the specific details to be considered are intended as examples of the type of indicators appropriate for the assessment of the criterion.

Objectives

The program should be consistent with UOIT's vision, mission and values and with the goals of the academic unit, and take into account areas of teaching and research strength and relationships to other academic units.

Program Outcomes

In assessing outcome it is important to keep in mind that, by its nature, the most important aspect of a university education is the aim of producing an educated human being. The characteristics of such a person are, of course, essential in varying degrees to a variety of occupations as well as to being an effective member of society. Within this broader context it is also appropriate to consider more specific indicators of program outcome including: graduation rate; length of studies; job placement; external scholarships and awards for graduating students; and the results of professional certification or licensing examinations.

Admission Requirements

The admission requirements should be appropriate for the program's educational outcomes and should ensure the appropriate quality of student applicants and should be consistent with the equity goals of the University. In no case should admission requirements be lower than the published minimum standards for the University. Indicators of student demand including applications, registrations, projected enrolment levels, and of the quality of students must be considered. Where admission is competitive, actual admission requirements may be higher than the published minimum standards.

Curriculum

The structure and curriculum of the program should be appropriate for its educational outcomes.

Teaching

The mode of delivery and standards of instruction should be appropriate to the discipline and learning outcomes.

Evaluation of Student Progress

The methods used for the evaluation of student progress should be appropriate to the goals of the program and the learning outcomes.

Equity

The program should be consistent with the equity goals of the University. Programs must avoid direct, indirect and systemic discrimination, particularly against members of disadvantaged groups.

Human Resources

It should be demonstrated that the quality and experience of the faculty is sufficient to meet the demands of the program. Where appropriate, the availability and qualifications of support staff and of teaching and laboratory assistants should be indicated.

Physical and Information Resources

A summary of program-specific resources should be provided, such as: laboratories, access to computers, library facilities (including unique and special collections) and information resources.

Financial Resources

There should be evidence of sufficient resources to introduce and maintain the program for a reasonable period of time. This element should include consideration of any additional funds from internal sources and from government or other external sources. The possible financial impact of the programs on other programs, within and outside the unit, should be considered.

Societal Context

Irrespective of the specific subject of study, a university education aims to inculcate the essential attributes of an educated human being including good judgment and the capacity for critical thought. While from this perspective, specific societal need, (for example in the sense of job skill training) may not be a factor in assessing the academic worth of a program, there are situations in which it is appropriate to include a more specific focus on societal factors. In addition, in the case of professional programs, their compliance with the regulatory requirements of the profession must be assessed. In assessing student demand it may be necessary to consider the probable availability of positions on graduation, the likelihood of attracting out-of-province or international students, the equity implications of a program, or the possible duplication of the program at other institutions.

Program Outcomes

While these program outcomes are particularly apposite to the case of existing programs, they may also be relevant to the consideration of proposed new programs. In assessing outcome it is important to keep in mind that, by its nature, the most important aspect of a university education is the aim of producing an educated human being. The characteristics of such a person are, of course, essential in varying degrees to a variety of occupations as well as to being an effective member of society. Within this broader context it is also appropriate to consider more specific indicators of program outcome including: graduation rate; length of studies; job placement; external scholarships and awards for graduating students; and the results of professional certification or licensing examinations.

Appendix C: Curriculum and Program Review Committee (CPRC)

Documentation Required For New Program Submissions or Major Program Revisions

1. Background
    a. Rationale for the program
    b. Relationship of proposed program to unit academic plans
    c. Admission requirements
    d. In-course employment opportunities, if any (e.g., coop, internships)
    e. Need and demand:
        i. A description of the general need and demand for the initiative;
        ii. Five-year enrolment projections and estimates of demand for the program from Admissions;
        iii. An indication of the extent to which a proposed undergraduate program prepares students for graduate studies in the area; and
        iv. The existence of similar or complementary programs elsewhere in Ontario.

2. Degree Requirements
    a. Program maps and course descriptions
        i. Courses currently offered, with frequency of offering;
        ii. New courses; and
        iii. Required courses mounted by other units;

3. Calendar Details

4. Human and Physical Resource Requirements
    a. Faculty Members:
        i. List of faculty including appointment status, home unit, areas of teaching and research interests; and
        ii. New faculty requirements and gaps they would be expected to fill
    b. Administrative requirements including support staff
    c. Library holdings and services required
    d. Computing requirements
    e. Special equipment required
    f. Space required

5. Statement of Funding and Resource Availability (Business Plan)
    a. A summary statement of funding requirements to support resources needed, including both start-up and continuing costs. Statements attesting to the adequacy of resources to support the proposal must be included from the relevant Deans, the University Librarian, the University Registrar and the Provost.

November 2003

References

In preparing this document, the guidelines for program review from several universities were consulted. Several ideas have been adapted from the guidelines for Internal Academic Review at Queen's University which is available at http://www.queensu.ca/secretariat/senate/policies/iarrev/contents.html

This resource is gratefully acknowledged.