



OFFICE OF THE PROVOST

Memorandum

TO: Executive Committee of Academic Council
FROM: Richard Marceau
RE: Undergraduate Program Reviews 2007-08
DATE: August 20, 2008

Attached you will find for your review my summary report on the Undergraduate Program Reviews that were undertaken in the last academic year. The UPR policies and procedures state:

Executive Committee action on the report will depend, in part, on the nature of the report and 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 Academic Council.

Undergraduate program reviews were conducted in three programs over the 2007-08 academic year, Biological Science, Criminology and Justice, and Medical Laboratory Science. Staff and faculty in these programs are to be commended for their valuable input into the process. The reports from the three programs highlight a number of recommendations and specific action items to be undertaken that will lead to improvements in the curriculum and student outcomes over time and as resources allow. Some issues relating to procedures and documentation remain and my office will work with the programs to address these over the coming year.

I therefore would like to recommend that the report be referred to Academic Council for its information at the upcoming meeting.

Encl.



Provost's Report: Undergraduate Program Reviews – 2007/08

**Biological Science
Faculty of Science**

**Criminology and Justice
Faculty of Criminology, Justice and Policy Studies**

**Medical Laboratory Science
Faculty of Health Sciences**

August 28, 2008

Introduction

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 "institutional mechanisms for review of existing undergraduate programs and for the implementation of new undergraduate programs" are audited. As such, the intent of the periodic review process at UOIT is to assess the quality of undergraduate programs in all areas of study.

UOIT's first Undergraduate Program Reviews (UPR) were conducted in 2007. The programs reviewed were the Medical Laboratory Science program in the Faculty of Health Sciences, the Criminology and Justice Program (all specializations) in the Faculty of Criminology, Justice and Policy Studies and the Biology Program (all specializations) in the Faculty of Science. The intent of this report is to comment on the logistics, experiences and lessons learned during UOIT's initial effort to implement its UPR policies and procedures and will also provide the required summary of the recommendations and action plans for the individual programs reviewed.

UOIT's First Experience with Undergraduate Program Review (UPR)

In order to comply with Ministry mandated scheduling requirements for UPR's, it was necessary for UOIT to begin its cycle of reviews in 2007/08. While all of the programs under review had completed a full curriculum cycle, given the timing of the UPRs, there were very few graduates to provide substantive evidence of the student experience or success after completion. As a result, information which could be used in reflection and analysis of program quality was limited. For future UPR's we expect it will be easier to provide evidence of critical reflection and analysis of quality in our programs because most, if not all, will have a larger cohort of graduate students and will have been through a full curriculum cycle.

All in all, the UPR process yielded valuable results. Internal review teams are commended for undertaking this assignment in addition to an already challenging workload. All reviews were completed within reasonable timelines, and efforts were made to closely adhere to the university's policies and procedures. Participants in the process benefited from the opportunity to critically reflect on and analyze their programs, and especially in the Criminology and Justice Program, led to a crystalization of the strengths and expertise within the faculty and a full-scale revision of the program. In other cases where such critical analysis was less apparent, we have gathered helpful strategies and procedures that will inform the conduct of the reviews in future years. Similarly, the process

of selecting consultants and their subsequent preparation of the task at hand will be examined to identify ways to use their visits at the university to best effect.

The following pages provide a summary of the recommendations and action plans for the reviews that were conducted in 2007-08:

- Biological Science Program, Faculty of Science
- Criminology and Justice Program, Faculty of Criminology, Justice and Policy Studies
- Medical Laboratory Science Program, Faculty of Health Sciences

**Undergraduate Program Review – BSc (Hons) Biology
Summary for Provost's Report
Date: March 12, 2008**

Dean: Dr. William Smith
Review Team Chair: Dr. Douglas Holdway

Consultants:
Dr. Laura Frost, University of Alberta,
Dr. Chris Metcalfe, Trent University

Provost's Comments

The Faculty of Science Biology Program was the first program in UOIT's short history to be subject to the UPR process and the faculty and contributors to the process should be congratulated for their efforts.

After reviewing Biology's self-study, it is evident that the Faculty of Science has been quite diligent in making quality improvements to all of the Biology programs on an on-going, as-needed basis. The Faculty demonstrates a keen awareness of the gaps in its program and has offered constructive solutions for closing them.

As might be expected at this early stage in the development of UOIT, almost all of the recommendations offered by the consultant's report were quite generic and could apply to the Faculty of Science or to the university as a whole rather than specifically to the Biology programs. The recommendations tended to focus largely on resource issues as opposed to specific program improvement issues. While many or most of the recommendation are valid in a generic way, very few of the recommendations provide any real insight into the kinds of improvements required specifically within the Biology programs.

While the Biology programs face a few challenges, none are insurmountable and I believe the Faculty is in a good position to continue to address those over time. In summary, I concur with the Dr. Smith's comments that the Biology programs offered by the Faculty of Science are of high quality, student focused and technologically relevant.

Faculty Summary

Dean William Smith provided the summary and chart on the following pages outlining areas of concern identified by the internal review team self study report. Following this chart, is another chart with recommendations and action plans that was prepared after the consultants' report.

“The Biology Undergraduate Program Review Team thanks the external reviewers for their insights and thoughtful recommendations. Their report confirms that the Faculty of

Science's Biological Science Program is of high quality, student focused and highly technologically relevant. The favorable report directly reflects the quality of the present core and complementary faculty. In order to maintain and enhance this excellence, we strongly advocate that the suggestions of the reviewers be implemented by the University in a timely fashion."

UPR Biology: The following chart is a summary of the areas of concern identified in the self study by the internal review team

Area(s) of concern	Detail/ example/evidence/reference in self-study materials	Recommendation(s)	Action Plan
Lack of sufficient core faculty to teach all of the upper year biological science courses.	Some criticism of the quality of teaching in a few upper year courses taught by sessional instructors.	Hire an additional core faculty in biological sciences in the quantitative environmental toxicology area to teach remaining upper year courses.	<i>Hiring plan to implement this recommendation is in place for a July 1, 2008 hire</i>
Lower “quality of relationships with other students” than other UOIT students or Ontario University peers.	NSSE results for first year Biological Science students regarding relationships with other students (see <i>Figure 11, Appendix 1</i>)	Engage more students in extracurricular activities and encourage active participation in the Science Club and other student-run organizations.	<i>Undergraduate Biology Program Director to ensure implementation beginning in 2008-2009</i>
Lower quality of bottom end students presents problems with ability of students to perform and complete their degrees.	Many more students in the first couple of years intake were at the cut-off minimum (see <i>Appendix 6</i>).	Continue our active Faculty Student Recruitment actions to increase the academic quality of our incoming students. Continue to offer remedial tutorials and assistance to raise the academic standing of present students.	<i>Implement increased grade cutoffs for entering students insofar as possible; this must be done on a UOIT-wide basis, since all Science and Engineering students take similar first-year courses.</i>
Students experience difficulty with our third year core courses, specifically in the areas of laboratory skill and conceptual integration.	Overall student marks and success appear to drop in the third year courses.	Improve the quality and laboratory instruction in our second year courses to ensure students are adequately prepared for third year.	<i>Increase quality of entering students (see above recommendation). Implement standards to ensure that second-year students are prepared to continue in the program; provide summer courses to maintain progress.</i>

Undergraduate Program Review-Summary for Provost's Report
Program: Biology

Date: March 12, 2008

	1.Area(s) of concern	2.Recommendation(s) following consultation	3.Action Plan	4. Decision/ Follow up
1	Reduce the teaching load of professors to 3 courses a year, in return for emphasizing graduate student supervision, and increasing expectations for success in obtaining external grant support.	In order to remain an expanding research intensive university with associated graduate student supervisory responsibilities, the undergraduate course teaching load must be reduced. Currently, the Biology faculty members teach 2 courses per semester (4 per year) PLUS contribute to courses such as Directed Studies, Undergraduate Theses, Advanced Topics in Pharmaceutical Biotechnology, and Science in Context. Thus, the Committee fully supports this key recommendation.	Implement a teaching load formula that accounts for the teaching of team-taught courses, and the supervision of graduate students and undergraduate thesis students within the overall total of "4 courses".	Discussion to be held University-wide.
2	Continue with plans to hire tenure-track professors in aquatic toxicology and biological chemistry.	These positions have been approved and are currently being advertised for recruitment and hiring by July 1, 2008	Hire candidates in the indicated areas.	As funding allows.
3	Maintain or reduce the present ratio between the numbers of Complementary and Tenured Faculty.	The Committee fully supports this recommendation and endorses a target of 75% of undergraduate courses being taught by core faculty.	Implement the target within faculty hiring plans.	As funding allows.
4	Provide better mentoring of new faculty and consider a one year extension of the pre-tenure period for the faculty who did so much to get UOIT up and running.	The hiring of additional senior faculty, along with expanding experience of the present faculty, should assist in future mentoring of new junior faculty. The Committee supports the recommendation of offering a one-year extension of the pre-tenure period for those faculty who believe they would benefit from	Hire senior faculty as appropriate. Consider implementing a one-year extension of tenure consideration in limited circumstances and for a limited time.	UOIT continues to hire the best faculty available. A one-year extension of the pre-tenure period contravenes current University policy.

		such an extension, e.g., faculty who experience significant research delay owing to university construction, or who have been involved in an unusual degree of administrative duties. This policy would be of limited duration.		
5	Continue to offer handsome start-up packages if UOIT wishes to be competitive for excellent faculty.	The Committee fully supports this recommendation, maintaining the current policy.	Maintain current policy of \$50,000/yr for 2 years + \$50,000 OTO matching funds for experimental faculty, \$30,000/yr for 2 years for other faculty.	Agreed.
6	Increase the numbers of technical, instructional and support staff as student numbers rise.	The Committee fully supports this recommendation.	Hire additional staff as undergraduate and graduate student numbers increase.	Agreed, as funding permits.
7	Encourage use of teaching equipment for research by extending the hours for usage, and find creative ways to maintain this equipment.	The Committee fully supports this recommendation. The maintenance and future replacement of scientific teaching equipment is an issue which needs to be addressed at both the Faculty and University level.	The University to undertake consultations to develop a campus-wide plan for the maintenance and replacement of scientific teaching equipment.	Office of the Provost currently working on this.
8	Budget for new equipment to avoid becoming UOIOT (University of Ontario Institute of Old Technology), and actively participate in institutional CFI opportunities.	The Committee fully supports this recommendation. The maintenance and future replacement of scientific research equipment is an important issue to be addressed at the individual Faculty member, Faculty and University level.	Research Office to form committee consisting of UOIT researchers to consider the issue and make recommendations.	See #7.
9	Initiate gathering of data on student applications, retention and outcomes for the various individual programs in the sciences (e.g. registrations, transfers, failure rates, awards, etc.).	The Committee fully supports this recommendation. It requires the Registrar's Office to maintain data regarding the Science program of Concurrent Education/Science students, and the specializations of students enrolled in Science programs.	Recommendations to Registrar's Office to collect required data.	Agreed.

10	Devise methods to improve compliance in filling out course evaluations by students.	The Committee fully supports this recommendation.	Work with Office of Teaching and Learning to develop methods to increase compliance.	Agreed.
11	Maintain good relationships with potential donors, government, business and other educational institutions in the region through invitations to visit the campus; perhaps by starting a Visitors Day.	The Committee fully supports this recommendation and notes that UOIT already has two formal open houses for prospective students and their parents.	Maintain and enhance relationships with indicated partners. Work with Office of Advancement, Research Office, and other University departments to assist.	Agreed.

Undergraduate Program Review – BA (Hons) Criminology and Justice

Summary for Provost's Report

March 19, 2008

Dean: Dr. Nawal Ammar

Review Team Chair: Dr. Barbara Perry

Consultants:

Dr. Laureen Snider, Queen's University

Dr. Chris McCormick, St. Thomas University

Provost's Comments

At the time of writing this summary, CJPS must be acknowledged and commended for having proactively taken significant steps to improve the Criminology and Justice program based on observations from their self-study and from the consultants' report. While the reviewers did provide high level recommendations for curricular redesign, their observations within the curriculum and program design section of their report seemed disconnected to the recommendations that they made. Their observations seemed to focus on logistical challenges of the program (class sizes, the Trent agreement, etc.) as opposed to substantive curricular issues. The curricular changes that have been affected by CJPS (and subsequently approved by Academic Council) seem to have been done, based on the Faculty's own self-study as opposed to any meaningful input by the consultants.

A probable oversight, it must be noted that neither the self-study reviewers nor the consultants included an examination of the bridging component of the Criminology and Justice program in their assessment. The bridge program directly supports UOIT's mandate of offering programs that create opportunities for college graduates to complete a university degree. Given the relative success of this program, a critical examination of the bridge itself may provide key insights not only for strengthening this component, but also for the design of bridging programs elsewhere.

It should be noted that Dr. Ammar wrote to the consultants and asked them to modify their UPR submission based on inaccuracies in their reporting. For reasons unknown, the consultants were not inclined to do so. However, the Office of the Provost recognizes the discrepancies and accepts Dr. Ammar's suggestions for correcting these factual inaccuracies.

Overall, CJPS should be commended on their contributions to the UPR for the Criminology and Justice program and I anticipate that the Faculty will be able to act on many, if not all, of the recommendations to move this program to the next level.

Faculty Summary

The following is an update from Dean Nawal Ammar on several items subsequent to the review team's final report. A chart of recommendations and an action plan follows.

Scheduling:

The coming academic year is the first year the Faculty is able to get the scheduling that supports professors' research agendas.

Retention:

Next year we will be working (as part of the strategic plan) to develop a better system that identifies both retention figures and causes of attrition.

Curriculum revisions

We have completed the curriculum revisions as identified by the reviewers and the revisions were approved by the Academic Council, March 2008).

Revisiting Technology

Both at the Faculty and at the University level the use of technology to benefit our students and pedagogy are being revisited. In the curriculum revisions we have addressed this issue. We have also addressed this issue in our hiring of new faculty.

Faculty

We are in the process of remedying this dependency through a strategic plan hiring of 5-5-7 in the AYs 08-09, 09-10, and 10-11).

We have developed a variety of methods to ensure the quality of sessional hires including revisions of syllabi, formal interviews with the Dean, and in-class peer evaluations.

We have not been able to hire any one this year at the Associate Professor Level. However, we will make every effort next years to do so.

Space

The office of the Provost has been seriously addressing the issue of space and that we will have our needs met by September 2008.

1.Area(s) of concern	2.Recommendation(s) following consultation	4.Action Plan	5. Follow up
1. Resourcing for new hires not keeping pace with admissions	That resource funding for new hiring keep pace with admissions, or that admissions be better managed to reflect the resources available (page 5).	The Dean will negotiate with the Provost for multiple new Faculty lines in subsequent years, particularly as our MA and new undergraduate programs come on line.	Agreed.
2. CJPS has very little autonomy over class size and teaching schedules	That the CJPS program be given more autonomy over class size and teaching schedules, to reduce enrolment pressures and offer a consistent, high quality program. Faculty need more input, if not direct control, over these issues (page 5).	The hiring of a new Finance Officer should go a long way in enhancing open communication of Faculty preferences and pedagogical needs with respect to scheduling. Additional hires will also allow us to offer more, smaller sections, especially in upper year courses.	Completed.
3. Access to year over year retention rates	That retention rates from year to year be measured and made available (page 5).	We will ask our Academic Advising staff to develop a model for tracking this consistently.	Agreed.
4. Balance between demand and resources	That a transition plan be developed to secure a better balance between demand and resources (page 5).	This is part of our Strategic Planning commitment. With the Strategic Plan in place, we will be in a position to be more forward looking.	Agreed.
5. Lack of opportunity for Faculty to strategically plan as a group.	An off campus retreat would be useful to develop and review goals, set priorities, establish a process to appoint or elect committees and discuss other issues relevant to the program. A position paper should be distributed in advance outlining key issues and alternative ways to resolve them (page 6).	We have held Faculty retreats each summer. This past summer, we did engage in a process of priority setting, as outlined in the closing section of our UPR report.	(Please see Dean's memo to the Provost requesting the correction of this recommendation.)
6.	That different streams be developed within the curriculum to focus on the development of specialties, such as the current policing and corrections, but adding social policy, socio-legal	The Undergraduate Committee is currently in the process of developing a series of new specializations and minors that do, in fact, reflect our areas of expertise.	Completed

	topics in psychology, etc. Given faculty expertise in gender and violence, a separate specialization could be created in that area (page 7).		
7. Program needs greater coherence in its curriculum.	That a full scale curriculum review be conducted to discuss ways to create more coherence in the program. This should be part of the agenda of the retreat recommended earlier (page 7).	The Undergraduate Committee is currently in the process of overhauling the core curriculum, with an emphasis on ensuring coherence, especially in third and fourth years. This includes eliminating/changing some courses, adding new ones, and creating more flexibility for students.	Completed
8. Laptop initiative not having the intended impact.	That the use of laptop technology be revisited with a view to assessing its usefulness in traditional classes, and exploring innovative ways to utilize it. The University should consider factoring IT support costs into tuition or ancillary costs (page 8).	At an individual level, Faculty members are experimenting with learning technologies in the classroom, including the development of hybrid and online courses. We should engage in a focused and open dialogue about the desirability and pedagogical implications of these uses.	Address by creating a special Committee. IT support costs are factored into ancillary fees paid by students.
9. Lack a critical mass of senior faculty members	That the CJPS attempt to make at least one new appointment at the Associate level, to address the current imbalance between levels. The faculty may also wish to consider innovative hires, such as “promising scholar” or “post graduate fellow” positions, who could teach some courses now offered by sessionals (page 9).	Our current search includes one position at the Assistant or Associate level; one at the Associate or Full level; and one open rank position. We are also exploring the possibility of a post-doctoral position for next year.	(Hiring in 08-09)
10. Ratio of part-time to full-time instructors is too high.	That the current ratio of part-time to full-time instructors be rectified with full-time probationary, and full-time limited term hirings (page 9).		As funding allows. Hiring as indicated by Faculty strategic plan
11. Quality of sessional instruction poor at times.	The protocols be developed to assess the quality, suitability, and competence of sessional instructors	The Faculty has begun with this process, with a careful review of curriculum vitae and proposed syllabi.	All core faculty and sessional instructors are evaluated by their students. Possibly greater analysis

	(page 9).	We will also identify sessional instructors whose performance is sub-standard and refuse new contracts. For those who are marginal, we will offer peer mentoring by our core Faculty.	required. Instituted a process of interviewing all sessionals, review of syllabi and help from core faculty, and peer evaluation.
12. Limited access to and control of resources required for the program.	That access to, and control of, resources necessary to meet the needs of the program be instituted. This includes, but is not limited to: classroom scheduling, timetable scheduling, and bookstore use (page 10).	The Dean will continue to negotiate increased resource allotment with the Provost. Faculty will continue to pursue funding opportunities that include overhead that will come back to the Faculty.	Office of the Provost has provided a significant increase in resources in 0809. Will continue to work with CJPS
13. Dean lacks institutional information for decision making.	That the Deans have access to institutional information sufficient to enable long-term planning, resource allocation, and requests for new faculty (page 10).	The Dean will continue to negotiate for open access to necessary institutional data.	Access to information currently accessible from the Office of Institutional Research upon request.
14. Lack of space for expansion.	That space allocation be a requirement for expansion (page 11).	The Dean will continue to negotiate for increased space. This will be particularly crucial as we add new Faculty members, and as our MA program comes on line.	Significant research space has been provided to the Faculty in the Simcoe Building as of Fall 2008.
15. No library liaison for the faculty.	That a library liaison be established (page 11).	FCJPS currently has a library liaison.	(See Dean's memo to the Provost regarding the correction of this recommendation.)
16. Technology not having the intended impact (page 12).	That the technological emphasis of the University be reviewed (page 12).		Agreed in the context of finding ways to better use technology in the curriculum of the faculty.

Undergraduate Program Review: BHSc (Hons.)Medical Laboratory Science

Summary for Provost's Report

Dean: Dr Carolyn Byrne
Review Team Chair: Joan Laurie

Consultants:
Dr. Fiona Bamforth, University of Alberta,
Dr. Linda Miller, SUNY

Provost's Comments

In addition to undertaking the UPR for the Medical Laboratory Science program, the Faculty of Health Sciences also fulfilled accreditation requirements established by the Canadian Medical Association and achieved the Certificate of Accreditation as a result. This Certification of Accreditation is in effect until 2010. The faculty are commended for completing both the accreditation and UPR protocols within very tight timelines. In future review cycles overlap and duplication of effort for compliance with both processes will be minimized.

The program recommendations made as a result of the self-assessment and consultant's report, clearly demonstrate not only the high level of preparedness on both the faculty's and the consultant's part, but also a keen awareness of the requirements necessary to improve this program and to attract students to it. The recommendations made are insightful and provide significant guidance to the faculty in making substantive changes to improve the program going forward.

The Faculty should be congratulated on their efforts especially considering that they were concurrently fulfilling the requirements for program accreditation.

Faculty Summary

Dean Carolyn Byrne provided this summary to Review Team final report followed by the chart of recommendations and action plan.

"I am pleased to be able to submit the attached document detailing our UPR action plan based on recommendations from our consultants.

As you are aware Dr. Linda Miller and Dr. Fiona Bamforth visited UOIT on Dec 5th and 6th, 2007 and provided a comprehensive assessment of both our program and facilities. We were pleased with their positive feedback and are eager to remedy any shortcomings in the near future. It is our hope that such a rigorous process will not be required to this extent in the future with a professionally accredited program."

1.Area(s) of concern	2.Recommendation(s) following consultation	3.Action Plan	4. Decision/ Follow up
Enhance graduate survey data (page 2)	Include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Graduates who, by choice, do not enter the profession • Graduates who use their BHSc as a stepping stone to higher education 	Ensure Grad Survey includes questions to cover the 2 consultant points	Agreed. Engage Office of Institutional Research as required.
Attrition rate (page 4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess whether new curriculum has contributed to a decreased attrition rate. 	Continue PAPC meetings mid-semester to look at: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) attrition between yr levels b) determine attrition benchmark across science disciplines (anecdotal – 20% normal after year 1) c) look to see if there are specific courses that indicate student success in program d) continue to set-up early warning systems for students in difficulty Monitor registrants and retention rates fall '08 Possible Mentorship program between Yr. 2&3	Agreed. Engage Institutional Research Analyst or Registrar's Office as required.
Contribute to increasing the visibility and understanding of the MLS profession so that students are better informed about the profession (page 4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review recruitment strategy • Enhance MLS program information on the UOIT website • Take opportunities to speak about the profession to the community 	Update Faculty Website Get more interaction with guidance counselors at high school level Create a brochure on MLS profession (using CSMLS template)	Agreed. Engage Student Recruitment as required.
Decrease faculty time devoted to laboratory specimen preparation and instrumentation calibration and maintenance so that their time is	Hire a full time registered laboratory assistant (MLA)	Possible FT and PT position pending 2008/09 budget release	Completed.

more effectively utilized in educational development and innovation (page 8)			
Increase laboratory space to accommodate permanent installation of expensive instrumentation. The present system of moving instrumentation in and out of the lab is contributing to expensive (money and staff time) maintenance (page 9)	<p>One more laboratory is needed to both decompress 3095 and to allow for instrumentation to be accommodated in a permanent space.</p> <p>Although not identified by the reviewers, a significant benefit of another laboratory would be the ability to accommodate an increased class size. Presently the labs are so full of equipment that it is not possible to have 20 students in each lab. Increasing our intake to at least 45 would provide revenue and would contribute to the significant shortages of MLTs predicted and is in fact already happening.</p>	<p>Resource/Business planning – one more lab needed</p> <p>2 yr plan – investigate option of a non-level 2 classroom conversion</p> <p>10 yr plan – Diagnostic Center (Public/Private funded)</p>	HS to initiate these discussions with Office of the Provost.
Educational credentials of teaching only faculty (page 8, 11)	Continue to support faculty to obtain higher degrees. Find opportunities to accelerate the process e.g. leave time	Look to a focus for MedLab profession in the new MHSc Masters program	Agreed. HS to provide a plan for doing so.

General Comments/Recommendations on the UPR Process:

Based on UOIT's first experience with the UPR process, the Office of the Provost will be implementing a number of measures to improve the integrity of the process to ensure high quality UPR outcomes. These measures include the following:

- UOIT's policies and procedures are being reviewed and revised to clarify steps, responsibilities and logistics associated with UPR. The revised version will be presented for endorsement by Academic Council;
- A handbook to guide all participants that details each step of the review is being prepared;
- The Office of the Provost will continue to mentor and support faculties during UPR to ensure adherence to the objectives as well as to reinforce the spirit and intent of the reviews;
- We will provide staff support to streamline efforts and conserve energy and time expended by the Faculties;
- The accreditation protocols for review of programs such as Engineering, Nursing and Medical Laboratory Science will be compared with UPR requirements to identify any gaps and streamline reviews so that the goals of both are achieved with minimal duplication of effort.