

DEGREE PROGRAM REVIEW PROCEDURES

CONTENTS

DEFINITIONS.....	1
INTENT	2
SUMMARY	2
DEFINITIONS AND ROLES	2
PROCESS OVERVIEW	3
TIMING	4
COORDINATION AND SUPPORT.....	4
TIMELINES AND SCHEDULES OF REVIEWS.....	5
SELF-STUDY.....	6
REVIEWERS.....	6
EXTERNAL REVIEWER’S SITE VISIT / TELECONFERENCE	7
THE REVIEWERS’ REPORT	8
PROGRAM COUNCIL RESPONSE REPORT.....	8
Appendix 1: Process Summary	9
Appendix 2: Data Collection – Sample Plan	11
Appendix 3: CAQC’s Recommendations Concerning Academic Experts.....	12
Appendix 4: Self-Study Outline– Requirements & Sample Tables of Contents	13
Appendix 5: Curriculum Vitae Template	23
Appendix 6: External Review Team Terms of Reference	26

Associated documents:

- Degree Program Review Policy

DEFINITIONS

APPSC	Academic Planning, Policy and Standards Committee
OVPA	Office of the Vice-President, Academic
CAQC	Campus Alberta Quality Council
GFC	General Faculties Council

INTENT

These procedures are associated with Athabasca University's Degree Program Review Policy. They may be updated from time-to-time as participant feedback is obtained. These procedures are intended to complement annual training for Deans, Associate Deans, and Program Directors as appropriate. While the contents are applicable across programs, it is expected that Faculty-specific templates will be developed for self-studies, responses to reports, and annual updates.

SUMMARY

The components of the program review are:

- The production of a self-study by the members of the Program Council and approval of the self-study by the Dean;
- A site visit and report by a team of external reviewers;
- The production of a subsequent response report by the Program Council. The response report will include:
 - key issues;
 - implementation activities and associated timelines; and
 - measures to assess the success of those activities.
- Annual reporting of the above, to indicate how the results of those measures are informing continuous improvement.

DEFINITIONS AND ROLES

Academic Planning, Policy and Standards Committee (APPSC): This committee is a sub-committee of General Faculties Council (GFC). The mandate of the APPSC includes responsibility for the oversight of the program review process.

Coordinator, Academic Services: The Coordinator, Academic Services, is the Office of the VPA designate responsible for facilitating program reviews and providing overall coordination and support.

External Review Team: The team is normally composed of three to four external reviewers who review the self-study, make a site visit and write a report of their findings. For reviews of professional programs, at least one member of the team will be a practicing expert from outside of academia. Additionally, the Dean will appoint a participant observer from outside of the program for all reviews. This participant observer offers insights and contexts to the Athabasca University (the University) environment, but does not actively contribute to discussions or to the formulation of the external report. The participant observer may be included in working sessions as determined by other members of the External Review Team.

Program Council: Each program has a Program Council made up of constituent contributing members as defined by the Program Council Terms of Reference.

Program Council Chair: Usually the Program Director, this person is identified by the Program Council to be responsible for leading the review, liaising with the Coordinator, Academic Services, and making presentations to the APPSC. Usually, this person is responsible for coordinating the development and production of the self-study, organizing meetings of the Council, and recruiting faculty, tutor, student, alumni and industry participation in the site visit. These tasks may be delegated elsewhere within the Faculty.

PROCESS OVERVIEW

Athabasca University's Degree Program Review process is a quality assurance exercise that facilitates continuous improvement. It is designed to ensure that the University continues to provide relevant programs that meet provincial and national expectations for efficacy and rigor. The process is faculty-driven via the Program Council, is student-focused and academically relevant.¹

In the first stage of the review, the Program Council conducts a self-study. The resulting document is a critical reflection of the issues and challenges facing the program and identifies its strengths and unique attributes. The self-study should consider the student profile and enrollment data, existing program design, curricular infrastructure and learning environment, and it should consider future directions. It may cite opportunities for potential growth (see [Appendix 4, Self-Study Outline](#)). The completed self-study must be approved by the Dean.

The second stage of the process is the site visit, where external peer reviewers are invited to confirm the information contained in the self-study. They subsequently meet in person (or by teleconference) with the VPA, Dean(s), the Program Director, faculty and tutors or Academic Experts, staff, students and alumni. The External Review Team then composes a report which evaluates the program with respect to the CAQC's Quality Assessment Standards; Additional Quality Assessment Standards for Programs Delivered in Blended, Distributed or Distance Modes; and the Council of Ministers of Education Canada Degree Level Expectations. The report will also provide recommendations pertaining to issues raised in the self-study, to identify areas of strength to be preserved and areas where improvements may be cultivated.

The following stage of the process is a Program Council Response Report, authored by the Program Council, approved by the Dean and presented to the APPSC for discussion. This report is the culmination of observations and ideas from both the self-study and the External Review Team's report. It is an overview of activities planned for the remainder of that review cycle along with timelines for implementation and strategies for measuring the effectiveness of those activities over time. The report will be presented to APPSC for information in the Annual Program Update to provide evidence of continuous improvement.

¹ Hannover Research, 2010

TIMING

Reviews are normally organized on a five-year cycle and are commissioned by the VPA. The timing of the review is approved by the Dean in consultation with the VPA. The size and complexity of the program, the availability of external reviewers and the placement of the summer months in the sequence may influence the schedule.

Reviews are usually timed to align with external program accreditation reviews. In such cases, wherever possible, there will be no duplication of documentation or process; however, it is incumbent on the University to assure quality over its own programming and not delegate that authority to an external organization. In the case of externally-accredited programs, information required in Appendix 4 must be provided, and a University-determined external reviewer or review team may undertake a site visit, teleconference or desk review, at the discretion of the VPA. A Program Council Response Report will be presented to APPSC for discussion. Annual updates will be provided for information on a schedule established by the VPA in consultation with Deans and approved by APPSC.

COORDINATION AND SUPPORT

The Office of the Vice-President, Academic, will hold official copies of all Program Review materials in accordance with the [Alberta Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act](#) (FOIPPA) and the University's Classification and Retention Schedule. Document portfolios will also be provided to the relevant Deans and Program Council Chairs.

The OVPA will provide the resources necessary to complete program reviews. Normally the expenses covered by the OVPA are:

- Self-study writer contract (not to exceed \$7,000) arranged by the Faculty and submitted to the OVPA for oversight and payment;
- External Review Team honoraria (administered by the OVPA);
- External Review Team travel, accommodation and meal expenses (administered by the OVPA) and;
- Travel costs to bring the Dean, Program Council Chair, and Program Council members on site (administered by the OVPA).

Faculties are responsible for: faculty travel costs and meals, software to support the self-study, any honorarium for participant observers and incentives for tutor or student participation.

Costs incurred by the Office of Institutional Studies (OIS) for program reviews will be charged to the OIS budget.

As a general principle, the Coordinator, Academic Services, will act as the liaison to External Review Teams, including Participant Observers, for the duration of their engagements.

The Coordinator, Academic Services, will liaise with the Program Council Chair to develop a site visit agenda and will be responsible for hosting arrangements of External Review Teams. The Chair of the Program Council is required to invite faculty, tutors, staff, industry representatives where appropriate, and students and alumni to their designated sessions. Wherever possible, students should be selected from among their peers with assistance from the Athabasca University Students' Union and the Athabasca University Graduate Students' Association.

The Coordinator, Academic Services, is responsible for coordinating an annual reporting schedule for the APPSC. The schedule is determined in consultation with the Deans and the VPA for programs operating outside of the academic faculty structure.

TIMELINES AND SCHEDULES OF REVIEWS

The schedule of program reviews is approved by the APPSC. Normally, the review process is expected to take approximately 12 to 16 months from the establishment of the writing contract until the Program Council Response Report is provided to the APPSC.

COMPONENT	MAJOR RESPONSIBILITY	TIMELINE
Data collection	Program Director, OIS	The OIS (and Faculty of Graduate Studies for graduate programs) will work with the Program Council Chair to establish a schedule of expectations and timelines concerning data collection and reporting.
Self-study	Program Council with Dean approval	4 to 8 months depending on the complexity of the review.
External Reviewer Visit & External Report	External Reviewer Visit: Coordinator Academic Services and Program Council Chair invite students, staff, industry and faculty participants and arrange course demonstrations; External Report: Coordinator Academic Services serves as liaison for this report.	1.5 to 3 days for site visit (in person or virtual); Report expected within 45 days of site visit.

Program Council Response Report	Program Council with Dean Approval	Present to APPSC within three months, depending on meeting schedules.
Annual update reports	Program Council Chair with Dean approval	The schedule is established by the OVPA in consultation with Deans and approved by the APPSC.

SELF-STUDY

The self-study provides an opportunity for the Program Council to review its processes, identify successes, seek resolutions to challenges and consider new opportunities. It should present program activities as they align with the Faculty Strategic Plan.

Programs should report on their reflections in a manner and sequence most appropriate for the discipline. Appendix 4 contains core requirements in addition to sample tables of contents that indicate diverse approaches to this exercise. The self-study document is normally no longer than 30 pages, excluding appendices, which should only include information that is essential to the report.

The self-study, once approved by the Dean, Program Council, and Faculty Council (if required as determined by Faculty Council Terms of Reference), will be submitted to the VPA in advance of distribution to the External Review Team. As materials are expected to be provided to the External Review Team (including the participant observer) one month prior to the site visit, the VPA will normally receive the report within six weeks of the site visit.

The self-study report and associated documents are posted to a password-protected website on the University program review page at <http://ovpa.athabasca.ca/program-review/program-review.php>

REVIEWERS

The External Review Team is normally composed of three external members and one internal participant observer. The reviewers' commitment is essential to the quality of commentary provided in the External Review Team's report. Every effort should be made to identify reviewers who have excellent academic qualifications and credentials in relation to the program area and online learning. External Review Teams for professional programs should include at least one expert from outside of academia. The CAQC expresses comments concerning academic experts in Appendix 3.

With the Dean's approval, the Program Council Chair submits a ranked list of four to six potential reviewers to the Coordinator, Academic Services. Reviewers will normally be from Canadian universities unless a case can be made for the engagement of an international scholar and the associated travel costs are reasonable. For each recommendation, a brief rationale should be provided and any indications of conflict of interest should be disclosed. As required by the University's [Conflict of Interest Policy](#), the candidate should not have been in a co-author/presenter, supervisory, mentoring or external examiner relationship in the last five years with any member of the Program Council. Any other known relationships or affiliations with the University should also be disclosed.

To maintain the integrity of the process, on no account should Council members approach potential reviewers. The external reviewers should not be asked to provide presentations or give seminars or performances at the University as part of their participation in the review.

EXTERNAL REVIEWER'S SITE VISIT / TELECONFERENCE

An agenda for the External Review Team's site visit or teleconference is developed collaboratively between the Coordinator, Academic Services, the Dean and the Program Council Chair. The site visit will normally open with a meeting of the External Review Team (including the participant observer), the VPA and the Dean (and Dean of Graduate Studies, if applicable). The purpose of this meeting is to answer any general questions about the University and to reiterate the purpose and structure of the program review process and the role of the participants. Reviewers subsequently meet with the Program Council Chair and the Dean together, with the Program Director individually, and with Program Council members.

Over the course of the one-and-a-half to three-day period, there should be an opportunity for the External Review Team to review core course materials either online or through a presentation by University faculty or staff. Meetings with the broader program community, including faculty, tutors, Academic Experts, students and alumni, professionals and administrative support staff, as appropriate, must also occur. The Program Council Chair is responsible for ensuring the availability of course materials, assessed capstone or other significant assignments (with students' permission) and for recruiting meeting participants. Student participants should be selected by peers, in consultation with the Athabasca University Students' Union or with the Athabasca University Graduate Students' Association, as appropriate.

The reviewers are expected to manage their own time when they are not in scheduled meetings.

At the end of the visit the reviewers should have an opportunity to meet with the VPA and Dean to discuss the process and present an initial verbal report.

THE REVIEWERS' REPORT

The reviewers are asked to address the program's compliance with the CAQC's Quality Assessment Standards; Additional Quality Assessment Standards for Programs Delivered in Blended, Distributed or Distance Modes; and the Council of Ministers of Education Canada Degree Level Expectations. The report should also address questions raised by the Program Council in the self-study and offer commendations and recommendations as the External Review Team deems appropriate.

The report is not expected to be more than 10 pages. It is normally due to the Vice-President, Academic, within 45 days of the site visit at which time it will be provided to the Dean for distribution to the Program Council Chair, Program Council members and faculty as determined by the Dean.

PROGRAM COUNCIL RESPONSE REPORT

Once the Program Council has discussed the external report and revisited the self-study, it will develop a response to the reports. This response report will summarize major themes from both the self-study and the External Review Team's report. It will indicate the activities envisaged for the remainder of that review cycle, along with timelines for implementation and strategies for measuring the effectiveness of those activities over time. Once approved by the Dean, Program Council and Faculty Council (if required as determined by the Faculty Council Terms of Reference), the response report will be submitted, by the Dean, to the VPA for discussion by the APPSC, ideally within three months.

It is the responsibility of the Dean to determine whether a summary of the response report will be shared with the External Review Team, and when.

Each year, the Program Council Chair will be asked to indicate to the APPSC, by way of an annual update, any progress on the implementation of action items raised in the response report, the measures on the effectiveness of those activities and how those results were used to improve recruitment and retention, curriculum, the learning environment or other program dimensions. Such updates must be approved by the Dean prior to submission to APPSC.

Appendix 1: Process Summary

Developing the Self-Study

1. The Program Council Chair and others, as s/he determines, hold an orientation discussion with the Coordinator, Academic Services.
2. The Program Chair and Program Council and others, as they determine, meet with the Director of Institutional Studies (and Dean, FGS for graduate programs) to create a data collection plan.
 - Course and survey items are provided by a Program Council representative to the OIS, if applicable.
 - Survey Instruments are reviewed by OIS, the Program Council Chair and the Research Ethics Board.
 - The Program Director requests faculty participation in the staff survey and tutor participation in the tutor survey, if applicable.
3. The self-study writer is confirmed, and contracted if necessary, by the Program Council through the OVPA.
4. Self-study development begins.
5. The Program Council Chair proposes reviewers to the VPA with approval from the Dean via the Coordinator, Academic Services. The Coordinator, Academic Services is notified of the Dean's choice for participant observers. Invitations are sent by the OVPA.
6. External Review Team members and site visit dates are confirmed. The self-study and other relevant information is posted to the review's password-protected web site at least four weeks prior to the site visit.

Site Visit

1. The agenda is developed collaboratively with the Program Council Chair, the Dean and the Coordinator, Academic Services.
2. The Program Council Chair is available for the duration of the site visit.

Post-visit

1. The External Review Team provides its report to the VPA within 45 days.
2. The report is forwarded to the Dean for distribution.
3. Honorariums and expenses are administered by the OVPA.
4. The Program Council meets with the Dean for discussion of the self-study and external report.
5. The Program Council prepares a response to the External Review Team's report, for approval by the Dean, Program Council, and Faculty Council if appropriate.
6. Through the Dean, the Program Council Chair provides the response to the external report to the APPSC, ideally within three months of receiving the external report.

Post-Review

1. The Coordinator, Academic Services, requests feedback on the review process from the Program Council Chair and the Dean.
2. The Program Council Chair provides an annual update, approved by the Dean, to the APPSC that demonstrates continuous improvement by indicating actions taken as a result of the review and providing evidence of their effectiveness.

Appendix 2: Data Collection – Sample Plan

To be completed in consultation with Institutional Studies.*

Institutional Studies:

- Provides statistical summaries of enrolment, demographic and completion trends;
- Generates course evaluation summaries;
- Facilitates student and graduate input; and
- Facilitates faculty, staff and key stakeholder input.

Roles and responsibilities are as follows:

Tasks/Activities/Data to be gathered	Responsibility	Date Expected	Notes/ Comments
Statistical overview of enrolment trends in the programs (includes retention, graduation rates, demographics etc.)			
Visiting student data concerning course-taking behavior.			
Summary of course evaluation data for the core courses.			
Survey of program graduates (includes employment outcomes)			
Survey of program students (greater than 15 credits earned)			
Survey of program leavers			
Survey of instructors, tutors, staff and partner or collaborating institutions			
Transfer credit patterns			
Other			

*The Dean of the Faculty of Graduate Studies should be contacted for additional data relevant to graduate programs.

[Appendix 3: CAQC's Recommendations Concerning Academic Experts](#)

(Excerpts)

“Independent academic experts also play a pivotal role in the cyclical review of an institution’s programs, the general purpose of which is to monitor the quality of approved degree programs on a continuing basis.

“As noted in chapter 5.2.3, after a first successful comprehensive evaluation, Council expects the institution to accept responsibility for a self-evaluation of its organization and programs. All institutions are expected to develop a systematic program evaluation plan which should be based on certain guidelines, one of which is that qualified independent academic experts should participate in the evaluation by reviewing the self-study, visiting the campus and conducting on-site interviews, and preparing a report ...

- 1) “Academic experts must have doctoral degrees (or terminal degrees in the discipline) and hold (or have held) academic appointments at the senior level.
- 2) “Academic experts should have experience in the design, delivery or administration of a similar program offered at a degree-granting institution.
- 3) “In order to avoid conflict of interest and to ensure objective assessments, any connection between an academic expert and the applicant institution must be disclosed. Institutions are wise to avoid potential and perceived conflicts by selecting experts who have no connection with the institution or faculty /administrators of the proposed program, or who are from institutions that are not affiliated with the applicant institution ...”

[CAQC Handbook: Quality Assessment and Assurance.](#)

First Edition, with revisions to April 2015

<http://www.caqc.gov.ab.ca/caqc-handbook.aspx>

Appendix 4: Self-Study Outline– Requirements & Sample Tables of Contents

Athabasca University program self-study reports are expected to reflect the unique nature of each program. Following are samples of how self-studies have been organized.

In all cases, please consider the following:

1. Extend the analysis beyond program students to include visiting students.
2. Using an evidence-based approach, consider the strengths and opportunities for the program, as well as areas for improvement.
3. Include sample maps of course activities and assessments to program learning outcomes.
4. Broaden the focus beyond course content to include course delivery.
5. Solicit input from students and sector/industry advisory committees whenever possible.
6. Include CVs of core faculty. (See Appendix 5)
7. Graduate programs: include two or three assessed assignments (students' permission must be obtained).
8. Undergraduate programs: describe any program capstone and evaluation rubric, and include sample assessed assignments (students' permission must be obtained).

Sample #1

SECTION 1.0 General Program Information

- 1.1 What are the program and major(s)/specialization(s) under review?
- 1.2 Background Summary
- 1.3 What are the Philosophy, Mission and Purpose of the program?
- 1.4 What is the focus of the program?
- 1.5 What are the objectives for the program and the desired student outcomes?
- 1.6 What are the program's special features?
- 1.7 Who is your target audience?

SECTION 2.0 The Program and Courses

- 2.1 What are the program's admission requirements?
- 2.2 What relevant post-secondary agreements and block transfer programs are in place?
- 2.3 What is the program structure and requirements?
- 2.4 What, if any, are the additional program regulations?
- 2.5 How many Athabasca University credits are awarded?
- 2.6 What are the core course requirements?
- 2.7 What are the common courses taken by students?**Error! Bookmark not defined.**
- 2.8 What are the course delivery platforms?

SECTION 3.0 Description of Current Program

- 3.1 How is program currency being maintained?
- 3.2 To what degree is the program maintaining flexibility and balance?
- 3.3 What is the breadth and depth of the program?
- 3.4 How will academic rigor be maintained?

SECTION 4.0 Context

- 4.1 What is the role of the program in employment, continuing studies and personal development?
- 4.2 What is the post-secondary context of this program?

SECTION 5.0 Student Profile

- 5.1 How many students graduate in each stream?
- 5.2 What are the demographics of program students?
- 5.3 What are the incoming transfer patterns?
- 5.4 What are the course and program retention rates?
- 5.5 What is the time to completion for this program?

SECTION 6.0 Impact

- 6.1 How does the program affect career development?
- 6.2 How does enrollment and completion of this program affect graduate employment?
- 6.3 What external feedback has been gathered regarding this program?

SECTION 7.0 Leadership, Administration and Support

- 7.1 What are the administrative arrangements for the program?
- 7.2 What student support services does Athabasca University provide?
- 7.3 What, if any, are the program-specific advising and support services?
- 7.4 What, if any, are the program specific library supports available?
- 7.5 Who are the program faculty?

SECTION 8.0 Assessment and Outcomes

- 8.1 Student Feedback
- 8.2 Alumni Feedback
- 8.3 Course Evaluations
- 8.4 Evaluation of Tutoring and Support Services
- 8.5 Senior Student Work Assessment
- 8.6 Assessment of learning outcomes vis-à-vis objectives in Section 1.5
- 8.7 What issues are raised by the assessment and outcomes subsections?

SECTION 9.0 Internal Feedback and Plans

- 9.1 What comments have administrative staff provided to the program?
- 9.2 What comments have faculty provided to the program?
- 9.3 What are the activities and program planning documents?
- 9.4 What are the current and planned revisions?
- 9.5 Reflections

SECTION 10.0 Findings and Recommendations

- 10.1 Findings: Major Themes
- 10.2 What are the strengths of the program?
- 10.3 What are the weaknesses of the program?
- 10.4 What opportunities have been identified for the program?
- 10.5 What issues have been identified for the program?
- 10.6 What are the strategic directions and recommendations for the program?

LIST OF APPENDICES

SAMPLE #2

1.0 Introduction

2.0 General Description of the University Context

2.1 Athabasca University – Distinguishing features

2.1.1 Open University

2.1.1.1 PLAR

2.1.1.2 Challenge-for-Credit

2.1.2 Delivery Platforms

2.1.2.1 Partnership agreements

3.0 The School of Business

3.1 Location within the University and Profile

3.1.1 Internal structure

3.1.2 Mission statement

3.1.3 Strategic Vision and Goals

3.2 School of Business Programs

3.3 Program Entry Portals

3.3.1 University Certificates

3.3.2 Industry Affiliations

4.0 Academic Faculty and Staff

4.1 Faculty positions and responsibilities

4.1.1 Faculty profiles

4.2 Design, Production, Delivery, Systems, and Support Staff

5.0 Programs under Review

5.1 Post-Diploma Programs

5.2 Program Learning Outcomes

5.3 Program Structures and Requirements

5.3.1 Bachelor of Commerce Programs

5.3.2 University Certificates

5.3.3 History and Modifications to Program Requirements

5.4 Comments on Program Structure and Requirements

5.4.1 Post-Diploma Program Requirements compared to Other Programs

5.4.2 PLAR Limits

5.4.3 Residency Requirements

5.4.4. Core Courses

5.4.5 Program Flexibility

5.4.6 Program Balance

5.5 Course Content

5.5.1 Breadth and Depth

5.5.2 Competitive Analysis

5.5.3 Contextual Analysis

5.5.3.1 Recruitment Surveys
5.5.4 Technological Enhancements

6.0 Student Profile

6.1 Demographic

6.1.1 Age

6.1.2 Gender

6.1.3 Location

6.1.4 Employment Status

6.2 Mode of Instruction

6.3 Visiting Students

6.4 Completion Rates

7.0 Professional Affiliations

7.1 Existing

7.1.1 The CA Program

7.1.2 The CMA Program

7.1.3 The CGA Program

7.1.4 The CORS Program

7.2 Potential Affiliations

8.0 Student Resources

8.1 Student Advising and the Call Centre

8.2 The Library

8.3 Accommodation of Disabilities

8.4 Student Services

9.0 Assessment of Program Credibility

9.1 The Course and Program Development and Revision Process

9.1.1 The Undergraduate Review Policy

9.1.2 The Assurance Process

9.2 Evaluations and Surveys

9.2.1 Student Evaluations

9.2.2 Summary of Evaluation Results

9.2.3 Graduate Surveys

9.2.3.1 Course-related Issues

9.2.3.2. Course Delivery Issues

9.2.3.3 Career Development

9.2.3.4 Overall Experience

9.2.3.5 Open-ended Questions

9.2.3.6 Summary

9.2.4 Tutorial Services Survey

9.2.4.1 Access

9.2.4.2 Academic Assistance

9.2.4.3 Comparative Satisfaction

9.2.5 Tutoring Services Survey Summary

9.3 Promotional Material

10.0 Future Directions

10.1 Program Changes Underway

11.0 Overview

11.1 Strengths

11.2 Issues Arising from the Study

11.2.1 Internationalization

11.2.2 Program Development vs. Course Offerings

11.2.3 Attainment of Learning Outcomes

11.2.4 Residency Requirements

11.2.5 Comparative Success Rates

11.2.6 E-Commerce Major

11.2.7 University Certificates

11.2.8 Dropout and Graduation Rates

12.0 Conclusion to the Self-Study

SAMPLE #3

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of figures

SECTION 1.0 General Program Information

- 1.1 What is (are) the program(s) and major(s)/specialization(s) under review?
- 1.2 Background summary
- 1.3 What are the values, mission and vision of the program(s)?
- 1.4 What is the focus of the program?
- 1.5 What are the objectives for the program and intended student outcomes?
- 1.6 What are the program's special features?
- 1.7 What types of students are included in your target audience?
- 1.8 How was information obtained for this review?
- 1.9 What are the demographic characteristics of the student and alumni respondents to the surveys?

SECTION 2.0 The Program and Courses

- 2.1 What are the admission requirements for the program?
- 2.2 What relevant post-secondary agreements and block transfer programs are in place?
- 2.3 What are the program's structure and course requirements?
- 2.4 What, if any, are the additional program regulations?
- 2.5 What are the course delivery platforms?

SECTION 3.0 Description of Current Program

- 3.1 How is the program currency being maintained?
- 3.2 To what degree is the program maintaining flexibility and balance?
- 3.3 What is the breadth of information covered by the required courses? In what areas do the required courses facilitate greater depth of understanding?
- 3.4 How is academic rigor and relevance maintained?
- 3.5 What is the nature of the learning environment within the CNHS graduate programs?

SECTION 4.0 Context

- 4.1 What is the role of the program in employment, continuing studies and personal development?
- 4.2 What is the post-secondary context of this program?

SECTION 5.0 Student Profile

- 5.1 How many students are enrolled and active in the program?
- 5.2 What are the demographics of program students?
- 5.3 What are the numbers of non-program and visiting students enrolling in program courses?
- 5.4 What are the course and program retention rates?
- 5.5 What is the time to completion for this program?

SECTION 6.0 Impact

- 6.1 How does the program affect career development?
- 6.2 How does enrollment and completion of this program affect graduate employment?
- 6.3 What is the impact on the Health Workplace?
- 6.4 What partnerships are in place with this program?

SECTION 7.0 Leadership, Administration and Support

- 7.1 What are the administrative arrangements for the program?
- 7.2 What student support services does AU provide?
- 7.3 What, if any, are the program-specific advising and support services?
- 7.4 What, if any, are the program specific library supports available?
- 7.5 Who are the program faculty?
- 7.6 Who are the sessional instructors for the program?

SECTION 8.0 Assessment and Outcomes

- 8.1 Student and alumni overall evaluation.
- 8.2 Student and alumni suggestions for improvement.
- 8.3 Course evaluations
- 8.4 Senior student work assessment
- 8.5 What issues are raised by the assessment and outcomes subsections?

SECTION 9.0 Internal Feedback and Plans

- 9.1 What comments have administrative staff provided to the program?
- 9.2 What comments have continuing and sessional faculty provided to the program?
- 9.3 What are the activities and program/centre planning documents?
- 9.4 What enrolment targets have been set for the program?
- 9.5 What are the current and planned revisions?
- 9.6 Reflections

SECTION 10.0 Focal Section: Findings and Recommendations

10.1 Findings: Major Themes

10.2 How can the program build on existing strengths?

10.3 How will identified limitations be addressed?

10.4 What opportunities have been identified for the program(s)?

10.5 What issues need to be addressed?

SECTION 11.0 Strategic Directions and Conclusions

11.1 What are the strategic directions and recommendations for the program?

11.2 Conclusions

SAMPLE #4

Executive Summary

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Next Steps

I. Program: Description

Program Overviews

Purpose

Targeted Student Populations

Learning Outcomes

Post-Diploma Student

Prior Learning Assessment and Recognition

Program Regulations

Laboratories

Delivery Method

Our Students

Visiting Students

Program Students' Demographic Characteristics

Enrolled Program Students by Program Type

By Gender & Program Route (Effective)

By Age (Effective)

II. Courses and Programs: An Assessment

By Course Registrations (All Students)

By Effective Program Students

Students' Academic Performance

Course-taking Behaviour and Performance (All Students)

Program Students' Behaviour and Performance

Assessment from a Course-based perspective

What Student Course Evaluations Tell Us

What Teaching Staff Course Evaluations Tell Us

Assessment from a Program Perspective
What Program Students and Alumni Say
The Faculty's Assessment

III. AU Science in Context

IV. Findings and Recommendations

Current Initiatives

Our recommendations for advancing the science programs

From a Programming Perspective

Course Development and Delivery Enhancements

Conclusion

V. Learning from the External Review

Appendix 5: Curriculum Vitae Template

NAME

[Address]
[Phone Number]
[E-mail]

COMPLETED ACADEMIC DEGREES

<u>Degree Name</u>	<u>Subject Area</u>	<u>Where Completed</u>	<u>Completion</u>
--------------------	---------------------	------------------------	-------------------

Date

ADVANCED STUDIES IN PROGRESS

<u>Degree Name</u>	<u>Subject Area</u>	<u>Where Enrolled</u>	<u>Completion</u>
--------------------	---------------------	-----------------------	-------------------

Date

ACADEMIC APPOINTMENTS

<u>Appointment Level</u>	<u>Institution</u>	<u>Dates</u>	<u>Subject Area</u>
--------------------------	--------------------	--------------	---------------------

ADMINISTRATIVE APPOINTMENTS

<u>Appointment Level</u>	<u>Institution</u>	<u>Dates</u>
--------------------------	--------------------	--------------

COURSES WRITTEN

<u>Courses Written</u>	<u>Institution</u>	<u>Dates</u>
------------------------	--------------------	--------------

COURSES TAUGHT/COORDINATED

<u>Courses Taught</u>	<u>Institution</u>	<u>Dates</u>
-----------------------	--------------------	--------------

GRADUATE STUDENT SUPERVISION

<u>Role</u>	<u>Level</u>	<u>No. of Students</u>
-------------	--------------	------------------------

[For example:

Examination Committee Member

PhD

8

Supervisor

Masters

10

SCHOLARSHIP and RESEARCH

Books Authored or Edited

Dates Activity (Name of book, publisher date)

Peer Review Journal Articles

Dates Activity (Name of journal, publisher date)

Non-Peer Review Journal Articles

Dates Activity (Name of book, publisher date)

Conference Presentations

Dates Activity

Research Grants

Dates Name of Grant

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS, QUALIFICATIONS and EXPERIENCE

Professional Memberships

Professional Qualifications

Professional Experience

SERVICE TO THE UNIVERSITY and COMMUNITY

Dates Activity/ Role

Note: this template is for use for Athabasca University program Self Studies and Campus Alberta Quality Council accreditation reviews. Reviews that involve submission to international organizations will require further discussion and approval to assess whether all of the above sections are appropriate (for privacy reasons).

Appendix 6: External Review Team Terms of Reference

Reviewers are asked to address the program's compliance with the CAQC's Quality Assessment Standards; Additional Quality Assessment Standards for Programs Delivered in Blended, Distributed or Distance Modes; and the Council of Ministers of Education Canada Degree Level Expectations. Their report should also address questions raised by the Program Council in the self-study and offer commendations and recommendations as the External Review Team deems appropriate.

The report is not expected to be more than 10 pages. It is normally due to the VPA within 45 days of the site visit at which time it will be provided to the Dean and Program Council Chair for distribution to the Program Council and faculty as determined by the Dean.

External Review Team members are asked to consider the following documents:

- 1) Athabasca University Facts and Figures
- 2) Program links
- 3) CAQC Quality Assessment Standards
http://caqc.gov.ab.ca/media/1098/quality_assessment_standards_-_program_-_december_2011.pdf or
http://caqc.gov.ab.ca/media/1095/caqc_graduate_program_standards.pdf
- 4) CAQC Additional Quality Assessment Standards for Programs Delivered in Blended, Distributed or Distance Modes
http://caqc.gov.ab.ca/media/1092/caqc_distance_program_standards.pdf
- 5) Council of Ministers of Education Canada Degree Level Expectations
<http://www.cicic.ca/docs/cmec/QA-Statement-2007.en.pdf>

A [non-staff reimbursement claim](#) will be provided to External Review Team members. Members are asked to include itemized receipts in addition to signed credit card receipts and to submit claims within 45 days of the site visit to the address indicated on the form. A schedule of maximum allowances will be provided.