



Academic Program Review

Procedures for Academic Units

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 - BACKGROUND	3
2.0 - PURPOSE	3
3.0 - QUALITY ASSESSMENT STANDARDS	3
4.0 - ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES	6
5.0 - REVIEW DOCUMENTS	7
6.0 - REVIEW PROCEDURES	8
6.1 INITIATE REVIEW PROCESS.....	8
6.2 INITIAL MEETING WITH INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING AND ASSESSMENT	8
6.3 SELECT SELF-STUDY COMMITTEE	8
6.4 NOMINATE REVIEWERS	8
6.5 GATHER RESOURCES FOR SELF-STUDY REPORT	9
6.6 APPOINT REVIEWERS	9
6.7 SITE VISIT DATES CONFIRMED	10
6.8 SELF-STUDY REPORT COMPLETED	10
6.9 SITE VISIT TAKES PLACE.....	10
6.10 EXTERNAL REVIEW REPORT RECEIVED	10
6.11 DEPARTMENTAL RESPONSE.....	10
6.12 DEAN’S RESPONSE	11
6.13 CLOSING MEMO	11
6.14 SUPPORT FOR PLAN OF ACTION.....	11
6.15 IMPLEMENTATION AND FOLLOW-UP.....	11
APPENDIX 1 – SELF-STUDY CONTENT	12
APPENDIX 2 – EXTERNAL REVIEW REPORT CONTENT	14
APPENDIX 3 – SAMPLE IN-PERSON SITE VISIT AGENDA	17

1.0 - BACKGROUND

Academic Program Review is an instrument to assess and improve the quality of academic programs. This process places the review of academic programs as a priority for assessment at the University of Saskatchewan. Building on the lessons learned from Systematic Program Review (1999-2005) and Graduate Program Review (2010-2018), Academic Program Review ensures that USask students are provided with the best possible student experience and learning environment. This commitment to systematic review is aligned with the standard presented by the Saskatchewan Higher Education Quality Assurance Board to “implement a periodic external program review and assessment process to ensure the ongoing currency of the program and the quality of its learning outcomes” (Quality Assurance Review Process: Program Review Standards and Criteria, 2014).

Systematic review of academic programs is a key strategy that will help the University of Saskatchewan achieve the goals set out in University Plan.

2.0 - PURPOSE

The primary purpose of Academic Program Review is to ensure that USask students are provided with the best possible learning experience in a robust learning environment. Reviews will provide an opportunity for program teams to critically reflect and engage in a clear and transparent process of assessment of a program’s strengths and weaknesses that will result in valuable recommendations for quality improvement. Review outcomes will inform program revision, renewal, and strategic planning decisions. The review process will demonstrate the University’s accountability to program quality to a wide variety of key stakeholders, including Governments, the University’s governing bodies and the general public.

Academic Program Review will provide a range of benefits to the University, including:

- Predictable intervals to examine the quality of all programs offered by the University
- Feedback and quality improvement recommendations from external academic leaders
- Identification of areas of strength in each program
- Provision of valuable program information, including student and alumni feedback, to each Department/College/School for internal decision making and planning
- Opportunities for Deans/Directors to address resource and planning needs related to academic programs
- Evidence of accountability to program quality for Governments and other stakeholders
- Improved student learning experiences through a focus on the quality enhancement of teaching and learning

3.0 - QUALITY ASSESSMENT STANDARDS

Academic Program Review utilizes the following six quality assessment standards as guidance for the review. The standards are derived from the detailed degree level standards for undergraduate and graduate programs, articulated by the [Council of Ministers of Education, Canada](#). External reviewers will be provided with a set of questions intended to guide their assessment. Academic units will have an opportunity to contribute additional guiding questions.

- 1 Program Administration** – A quality program incorporates effective systems and procedures in the areas of recruitment and admissions, program management, and in the allocation of awards and scholarships to students.

Program leadership anticipates the ongoing evolution of their discipline, which is reflected in evolving program delivery and program planning activities. There is an anticipation and analysis of how future trends may impact the recruitment and selection of students, the content and quality of program delivery, the understanding of how students learn in the discipline and the student experience. Administrative structures (committees, etc.) facilitate ongoing quality enhancement of teaching and learning and frequent review of program and course learning outcomes.

The strategic vision of the program is aligned with the broader integrated planning environment at the university.

- 2 Program Structure** - A quality program has clearly stated program and course learning outcomes that are appropriate to the level of degree offered, the academic context of the discipline, and/or the expectations of the profession. Program and course learning outcomes, and their connection to the USask Learning Charter¹ and College of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies policies,² should be clearly articulated. Course learning outcomes should also be clearly articulated and connected to program learning outcomes. The sequence and timing of courses and their respective course learning outcomes should provide repeated opportunity for students to build capacity in achieving program learning outcomes.

The program curriculum achieves course and program learning outcomes at the level of degree offered. It is current, and addresses all aspects of the discipline including opportunities for specialization to cultivate further conceptual depth or breadth. Student learning success is assessed through written, oral, and observational evidence of knowledge and skills in all aspects of the discipline. Indigenous knowledges and experiences, grounded in Indigenous worldviews, are incorporated into the program³. Interdisciplinary collaborations provide opportunities for the acquisition, synthesis, application and integration of knowledge, cultivating the intellectual development of students.

Quality assessment practices, both formative and summative, utilized during course learning experiences have been shown to improve student learning success. Course-based assessments support both teaching and learning and are used in determining the success of students in achieving course and program learning outcomes.

Quality assessment practices include:

- explicit connections to course and/or program learning outcomes
- clearly communicated criteria
- authentic assessments from/of a variety of student learning experiences and contexts
- the inclusion of written, oral and observational assessments
- the utilization of a diversity of assessors (self, peer, instructor, and others)
- regular reporting of individual and aggregate achievement of program learning outcomes to students and to other critical stakeholders

- 3 Program Enrolment and Student Funding** - A quality program has the profile and reputation to attract and retain a viable number of high caliber students, who will have local, national and/or international backgrounds. The students entering the program have the capacity and preparation

¹ University of Saskatchewan Learning Charter <http://teaching.usask.ca/about/policies/learning-charter.php#OurLearningVision>

² CGPS Degree-Level Learning Outcomes <https://cgps.usask.ca/policy-and-procedure/governance-membership/degree-level-learning-outcomes.php>

³ Indigenization within the Curriculum <https://teaching.usask.ca/curriculum/indigenization.php#EldersMessage>

necessary to meet the challenges of the program and to successfully complete their degree. Students are supported in applying for scholarships, awards and research grants.

- 4 Learning Environment** - Students have access to appropriate learning and information resources (such as library, databases, computers, classroom equipment, and laboratory facilities) and to an appropriate range of support services. Course instruction uses state of the art modalities and processes that enhance the student learning experience. Students have access to relevant experiential learning opportunities, which may include research, field-based instruction, community-engaged learning, study abroad, clinical placement, practicum, internship and coop placement. The learning environment supports the program's stated learning outcomes.

A quality student experience at the graduate level is built on strong interactions with faculty. Students are regularly advised, informed and guided by meetings with their graduate supervisor. The learning environment provides a range of opportunities for students to participate in intellectually and professionally challenging activities.

- 5 Faculty Profile** – A quality program has a distinguished faculty with a national and international reputation for scholarly work. Faculty members are credited with a suitable number and quality of discipline-specific publications, awards, research grants/contracts and conference invitations, all indicative of the breadth and level of their engagement in scholarly work. Faculty members have the knowledge and skills required to teach in their discipline. All instructors exemplify learning, teach effectively, assess fairly, and solicit feedback.

Professional programs have appropriately qualified faculty involved heavily in teaching and learning activities. Graduate programs are supported by highly engaged faculty with a commitment to supervision and mentorship.

- 6 Student Progression and Success** - Undergraduate students acquire a basic knowledge and critical understanding of the range of fields within a discipline. They demonstrate the ability to gather, review, evaluate, interpret and critically analyze information relevant to the discipline and to compare the merits of alternative hypotheses. Undergraduate students have the capacity to engage in independent or supervised research, and are able to apply learning from one or more areas outside the discipline.

Graduate students acquire a systematic knowledge of the discipline and are being suitably prepared for professional practice and for research and inquiry. Masters students engage in independent research or practice in a supervised context and demonstrate critical thinking and analytical skills. Doctoral students show a high degree of intellectual autonomy, an ability to conceptualize, design and complete projects, and generate knowledge through original research or creative activity. Graduate students participate in seminars and conferences; they present their research findings through posters and published papers; and have opportunities to develop professional skills through experiences as teaching assistants and research assistants. Graduate students are credited with a suitable number and quality of achievement awards and conference invitations.

A quality program demonstrates that its students, at each phase of the program, are progressing towards achieving program and course learning outcomes. Graduates successfully achieve the defined program learning outcomes, complete their degree requirements in a timely manner, and can access a variety of career paths post-graduation. Students perceive their program to be supporting their learning and achievement of program learning outcomes.

4.0 - ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Institutional Planning and Assessment will be responsible for facilitating the Academic Program Review process and for ensuring that following responsibilities are fulfilled:

ROLE	RESPONSIBILITIES
Deputy Provost	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initiates reviews and maintains review schedule • Appoints external reviewers • Responds to post-review action plans, setting expectations for implementation
Dean of CGPS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meets with external review teams • Discusses post-review action plans with Deans/Directors
Dean/Director of College/School	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approves external reviewer nominations and final self-study report • Meets with external review teams • Develops action plan in response to review outcomes, consulting with program leaders and Dean of CGPS as necessary • Ensures that post-review action plans are implemented, providing an update to the Deputy Provost within two years of the review
Department Head and/or program Chair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensures action plans are implemented (with Dean's support) • Selects the Self-Study Committee • Ensures relevant stakeholders participate in the site visit
Self-Study Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides external review nominations to Dean and Department Head • Produces self-study report on behalf of the department • Develops the departmental response to the External Review Report
Institutional Planning and Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guides the academic unit through the entire review process • Coordinates supporting resources needed to produce self-study (templates, data, analysis by Teaching & Learning Enhancement, etc.) • Recruits and manages performance of external review team • Makes arrangements for site visit agenda • Manages budget for reviews • Drafts Closing Memo and provides analysis of review outcomes
Academic Programs Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Receives Closing Memo for each review • Receives periodic implementation updates • Reports annually on review activities to University Council

5.0 - REVIEW DOCUMENTS

Six documents will be produced during a program review:

DOCUMENT	PRIMARY AUTHOR	DESCRIPTION
Self-Study Report	Self-Study Committee	The Self-Study Report will contain a mixture of historical program data and commentary from various stakeholders. It is an opportunity for the academic unit to engage in critical self-reflection and planning for the future. This document will be provided to the external review team and will serve as the primary source of background information for the review. An overview of the Self-Study Report content is provided in Appendix 1 .
External Review Report	External Review Team	Provides an assessment of quality and recommendations for program enhancement. A complete description of the External Review Report is provided in Appendix 2 .
Program Response	Self-Study Committee	Response to the External Review Report, including a direct response to all recommendations made.
Dean/Director's Response	Dean/Director of College/School	Response to the three documents listed above. Includes an action plan and timeline. Development of this response requires close consultation with the Department Head, Self-Study Committee, and (where necessary) the Dean of CGPS.
Closing Memo	Institutional Planning and Assessment	Summarizes the outcomes of the review and the four documents listed above. The memo is addressed to the President and published online. Academic Programs Committee will receive the Memo and provide to University Council for Information.
Support for Action Plan	Deputy Provost	Response to the review outcomes and proposed action plan. This sets expectations for implementation and follow-up reporting.

6.0 - REVIEW PROCEDURES

A detailed description of the activities described in the Review Timeline is presented below.

6.1 Initiate Review Process

The Deputy Provost will send a letter to the Dean and Department Heads (or only Dean/Director, as applicable) informing them that the review is forthcoming. The letter will set out expectations for the academic unit and describe the support provided by Institutional Planning and Assessment (IPA). Typically undergraduate and graduate programs managed by the same academic unit will be reviewed at the same time. Where possible, university and accreditation reviews should be scheduled concurrently; this ensures that efforts to produce self-study reports can be leveraged for both types of review.

6.2 Initial Meeting with Institutional Planning and Assessment

IPA will meet with the Dean and with each Department Head (or only Dean/Director, as applicable) responsible for a program under review. The purpose of these meetings will be to discuss review procedures in detail, address any concerns raised by the academic unit, and identify immediate next steps. These meetings should be scheduled as soon as possible following the initiation of the review.

6.3 Select Self-Study Committee

The Department Head, in consultation with the Dean and program faculty (or Dean/Director only as applicable, with program faculty), selects the Self-Study Committee. The size of the Committee varies depending on the size of the program(s) under review. The Committee should include a minimum of three members, two of which should be program faculty. Whenever possible, an administrative staff member should be included to assist the committee with data gathering, site visit scheduling and other important tasks. In some cases, it may be appropriate to include a student or a member of a professional community on the Self-Study Committee. The Committee may choose to develop a terms of reference or Committee charter to outline terms of membership, roles and responsibilities, goals and decision-making framework.

6.4 Nominate Reviewers

The review team will typically consist of **two external** reviewers and **one internal** reviewer. The Self-Study Committee, in consultation with the Department Head and Dean (or Dean/Director only, as applicable), will identify at least **six external reviewer nominees** and **three internal reviewer nominees**, ranked in order of preference. The final list of nominees must be approved by the Dean (in departmentalized college) and accompanied by a declaration that there are no known conflicts of interest. The following information, for each nominee, should be provided to the review coordinator:

- Name, appointment details, and contact information (or link to professional web page)
- Rationale for selection
- A curriculum vitae (if easily available)

The internal reviewer will serve in an advisory capacity; they are not expected to contribute content to the External Review Report, but are expected to participate fully in the site visit. They play a critical role in helping the review team understand the academic environment at USask and can share best practices from their own experience on campus. The internal reviewer will be a full professor from a College/School outside of the unit leading the review.

External reviewers will be well-respected scholars capable of rendering sound judgment on the merit of the academic program. They will typically come from other Canadian universities, but can be from international universities if travel costs are reasonable (in cases where site visits are in-person). All external reviewers must meet the following criteria:

- Attained the rank of Full Professor (or has a high level of seniority)
- Holds a Ph.D. (or terminal degree) in a field closely related to the program under review
- From a research-intensive (i.e. U15) university (at least one reviewer)
- Has an exemplary undergraduate teaching record (at least one reviewer)
- Has an exemplary graduate teaching and supervision record (at least one reviewer)
- Is uninvolved with the academic unit, so that any perception of a conflict of interest is avoided.

Potential conflicts of interest include:

- Personal relationship with a faculty member or student in the program under review
- Current or recent (within five years) research collaborations with a faculty member
- Being a recent (within five years) graduate of the program
- Being a recent (within five years) supervisor of a student in the program
- Being a former faculty member of the unit under review
- Being a recent (within five years) thesis supervisor of a faculty member

6.5 Gather Resources for Self-Study Report

IPA will provide a comprehensive self-study report template to the academic unit. IPA will work with ICT and other units to provide data on student enrolment, funding, and other aspects of the program. Institutional data definitions will be used to ensure consistency and transparency. In addition, IPA will administer student and alumni surveys designed to provide insight on program quality for the academic unit and for the external reviewers. At several points in the self-study report template, the Self-Study Committee will be prompted to provide commentary on the results of these surveys.

The Self-Study Committee should review the report template thoroughly and begin to gather information that will be needed to complete the report. While data from central information systems will be provided in advance, there will be additional data and background information required from the academic unit. Some sections of the self-study (e.g. reporting on student knowledge translation activities) may require data that the academic unit does not regularly track. If curriculum mapping (or definition) of program and course-level learning outcomes is in need of development, staff from the Teaching and Learning Enhancement team are available to support academic units.

6.6 Appoint Reviewers

IPA will support the Deputy Provost in reviewing and approving nominations. The Deputy Provost may request additional rationale or suggest a change in rankings. Once the list of nominees is approved by the Deputy Provost, IPA will assist the Deputy Provost with contacting nominees (in order of preference) to determine availability and interest in serving. The academic unit will be notified when the required number of nominees have been confirmed as participants. IPA will provide a summary of nominee appointments to the academic unit on behalf of the Deputy Provost.

6.7 Site Visit Dates Confirmed

Site visits will typically be in-person visits. IPA will work with the external reviewers and the academic unit to confirm appropriate dates for the site visit, typically two days. The choice of dates will be driven largely by external reviewer availability. Site visits would commonly take place in the Fall or Winter Terms, but preferably not scheduled during Reading Week to ensure that students and other key stakeholders will be able to participate fully.

Once site visit dates are confirmed, IPA will initiate the organization of the site visit agenda. The academic unit will support this effort by inviting and confirming the participation of key personnel.

In some situations, the site visit can be carried out in a virtual manner. Under these circumstances, the stakeholder meetings will typically be carried out over a three week period.

6.8 Self-Study Report Completed

The Self-Study Committee will finalize the self-study report template at least four weeks in advance of the site visit. The relevant leader(s) and program faculty will be given an opportunity to review the template before it is finalized. IPA will assist with the final production, organization, and distribution of the Self-Study Report document.

Copies of the Self-Study Report will be provided to the review team and to relevant stakeholders participating in the site visit. This includes the Deputy Provost and the Dean of CGPS.

6.9 Site Visit Takes Place

IPA will provide dedicated support for both the academic unit and the review team. All details and meeting attendees will be finalized at least one week in advance of the site visit. A sample site visit agenda for an in-person visit is provided in [Appendix 3](#). Site visit activities will typically include:

- Meeting with the Dean/Director of the College/School
- Meeting with Dean of CGPS
- Meeting with Department Head and program Chairs (as applicable)
- Tour of relevant facilities
- Meeting with faculty members
- Meetings with students
- Meeting with support staff (if necessary)
- Writing session for external reviewers
- Exit meeting with the Self-Study Committee

6.10 External Review Report Received

The external members of the review team will complete the External Review Report within 30 days of the site visit. The report will provide an assessment of program quality and recommendations for program enhancement. A copy of the report will be provided to the Dean/Director and/or Department Head responsible for the program, the Dean of CGPS, the Deputy Provost, and the Academic Programs Committee of University Council.

6.11 Departmental/Unit Response

Within 30 days of receiving the External Review Report, the Self-Study Committee will provide a written response addressing each recommendation for improvement. This response will form the basis for the action plan approved by the Dean of the program (for departmentalized units). The response will be distributed to the same stakeholders receiving the External Review Report.

6.12 Dean/Director's Response

The Dean/Director responsible for the program provides a response to the Self-Study Report, External Review Report, and Departmental/Unit Response (in situations where program is at department level). Some commentary may be offered, but the primary purpose of this document is to provide a comprehensive action plan (with specific timelines) in response to the review. Development of the Dean/Director's Response requires close consultation with the Self-Study Committee, Department Head (as applicable), program Chairs, and the Dean of CGPS. The Dean/Director will present the action plan to the Deputy Provost.

Note that Teaching and Learning Enhancement (TLE), including the Gwenna Moss Center for Teaching and Learning (GMCTL), will support the Dean/Director and the program in making enhancements related to teaching and learning (e.g. curriculum development, assessment, professional development). Financial support for program enhancement activities are available from Teaching and Learning Enhancement Strategic Funds managed by the GMCTL (e.g. curriculum innovation fund, experiential learning fund, indigenous educational initiatives fund).

6.13 Closing Memo

Academic Programs Committee will receive a Closing Memo summarizing the outcomes of the review. The Closing Memo will report highlights of the Self-Study Report, External Review Report, Departmental/Unit Response, and Dean/Director's action plan. The Closing Memo will be drafted by Institutional Planning and Assessment on behalf of the Deputy Provost. After Academic Programs Committee sends the Closing Memo to University Council for information, it will be published online at IPA's website.

6.14 Support for Plan of Action

The Deputy Provost (with the support of IPA) will provide a response to the Dean/Director of the program detailing expectations for action plan implementation. This may include requests for additional actions or consultation.

6.15 Implementation and Follow-up

The Dean and Department Head (or Dean/Director only, as applicable) are responsible for implementing the action plan. An update on implementation progress will be provided to the Deputy Provost and shared with Academic Programs Committee, typically within two years of a review. Depending on review outcomes, the Deputy Provost may request that the first update be provided within a shorter time frame.

Implementation updates will be published online as an addendum to the Closing Memo.

APPENDIX 1 – SELF-STUDY CONTENT

IPA will provide a comprehensive self-study report template to the academic unit. The following information will be requested in each section of the template:

1 Program Administration

- Brief history of the program
- Description of administrative staff roles directly supporting programs and students
- Program narrative and value proposition
- SWOT analysis of program
- Overview of the unit's strategic plan and alignment with USask strategic priorities
- Results of past reviews and implementation of recommendations
- Issues or concerns (in addition to the standard guiding questions) requiring external feedback
- Commentary on student/alumni feedback regarding program management

2 Program Structure

- Description of degree offerings (requirements, experiential learning components, etc.)
- List of courses offered
- Description of curriculum structure, outcomes, and assessment
- Commentary on student/alumni feedback regarding program structure and curriculum

3 Program Enrolment and Student Funding

- Historical enrolment in each degree offering
- Historical volume of student applications
- Student admissions, admission GPA, and origin (e.g. Saskatchewan, Canada, International)
- Enrolment forecast and future demand for the program
- Commentary on recruitment strategy
- Commentary on optimal enrolment to achieve effective and appropriate pedagogy
- Student awards/scholarships
- Commentary on student/alumni feedback regarding admissions and funding

4 Learning Environment

- Commentary on how the learning environment supports student learning
- Student-to-faculty ratio
- Graduate student supervision
- Description of library resources available to students
- Description of research equipment and facilities used by students
- Description of other student space available (office space, meeting rooms, etc.)
- Commentary on student/alumni feedback regarding the learning environment

5 Faculty Profile

- Faculty list (rank and research specializations) and curriculum vitae
- Adjunct and external faculty list

- Teaching assignments
- Research funding from internal and external sources
- Faculty awards
- Faculty knowledge translation (publications, conference presentations, etc.)
- Support for faculty professional development
- Faculty renewal planning
- Commentary on student/alumni feedback regarding faculty

6 Student Progression and Success

- Historical volume of degrees granted
- Average time-to-completion for each degree
- Historical volume of program withdrawals
- Student knowledge translation (publications, conference presentations, etc.)
- Graduate student theses and dissertations
- External honours/awards (non-scholarship) received by students
- Number of undergraduate students retained by graduate program
- Post-graduate employment rates
- Commentary on student/alumni feedback regarding program and employment

APPENDIX 2 – EXTERNAL REVIEW REPORT CONTENT

Reviewers will be given a report template and provided with guiding questions mapped to the quality assessment standards. In addition to introductory and closing remarks, the report will include the following content:

Summary Assessment

- Program strengths
- Summary of recommendations for quality enhancement
- Would you recommend that students apply to this program?

1 Program Administration

- Are the operating procedures and administrative support structures of the unit managing the program consistent with norms in the discipline?
- Does the program have a strong value proposition that effectively differentiates it from competing programs?
- Is there evidence that the unit managing the program is dealing with program and students issues effectively and efficiently?
- Does the program's leadership engage effectively in strategic planning to ensure alignment with the University's strategic priorities?
- Have the recommendations from previous program reviews been implemented effectively?
- Recommendations for quality enhancement in the area of program administration

2 Program Structure

- Do the program/course learning outcomes and the program curriculum meet the expectations of the discipline in terms of breadth, depth, and currency of content and theory? Does the program offer opportunities for meaningful specialization within the discipline?
- To what extent does the curriculum demonstrate innovation and creativity in program design?
- Are program and course learning outcomes clearly articulated?
- Are program and course learning outcomes evaluated using a diversity of assessors and artifacts (e.g. written, oral, and observational artifacts used in self, peer, and instructor assessment)?
- Does the program engage in a breadth and depth of interdisciplinary collaboration that stimulates the intellectual development of students and program faculty?
- Do students have access to relevant experiential learning opportunities, which may include research, field-based instruction, community-engaged learning, study abroad, clinical placement, practicum, internship and coop placements?
- Is the curriculum delivered efficiently and effectively? Are courses sequenced and offered such that students are able to complete their programs in a timely manner?
- Are the degree requirements appropriate in the academic context of the discipline and/or the expectations of the profession?
- Are degree offerings and curriculum design aligned with USask strategic priorities and the University Plan?
- Do administrative structures (committees, etc.) facilitate ongoing quality enhancement of teaching and learning and frequent review of program and course learning outcomes?
- Recommendations for quality enhancement in the area of program structure

3 Program Enrolment and Student Funding

- Does the program attract a sufficient number of high quality applicants that exceed minimum admission requirements?
- Does this program have a national or international reputation as a high quality program that attracts students from outside Saskatchewan or from outside of Canada?
- Is the level of student funding available through internal scholarships, awards and teaching fellowships and other sources within the norm of what is available to comparable programs at other institutions?
- Are students successful in obtaining external funding (scholarships, awards, etc.) at a level that meets or exceeds the norms for the discipline?
- Does the program have the minimum enrolment needed to achieve effective and appropriate pedagogy? What is the theoretical maximum enrolment capacity?
- Is there evidence of strong future demand for degree offerings?
- Is the program equipped to manage the short and long-term enrolment demands in this discipline?
- Does the program's enrolment strategy support the University's goals for strategic enrolment growth?
- Recommendations for quality enhancement in the area of program enrolment and funding

4 Learning Environment

- Does the learning environment adequately support the course and program learning outcomes identified in the curriculum?
- To what extent does course instruction demonstrate innovation and use of state of the art modalities?
- Do graduate students receive high quality mentorship and guidance for scholarly and creative activities from their supervisors and advisory committees?
- Is there an appropriate ratio of students to faculty?
- Does the learning environment effectively support accessibility, health, and wellness?
- Does the program effectively engage with centralized student support services (e.g. Career Services, Student Wellness, etc.) where necessary?
- Do students and faculty have access to appropriate learning and information resources such as library resources, computers, classroom equipment and laboratory facilities?
- Does the program effectively utilize feedback about the learning environment (e.g. course evaluations) to enhance teaching and learning?
- Does the program effectively use information resources (support staff, website, handbook, etc.) to communicate with students about events, scholarship deadlines and other important topics?
- Recommendations for quality enhancement in the area of learning environment

5 Faculty Profile

- Is the quantity and quality of faculty scholarship and creative productivity within the norms for a program of this size and scope?
- Does program faculty have the knowledge, skills, and professional qualifications necessary to support students in achieving the course and program learning outcomes identified in the curriculum?
- Is the majority of teaching and supervising of graduate students being done by faculty with active and productive research programs?
- Are faculty members sufficiently involved in undergraduate teaching?
- Is there integration between scholarship and teaching? Do faculty members bring their scholarship to their teaching and mentorship?

- Is the proportion of faculty members holding research funding comparable to faculty complements in comparable programs?
- Is the faculty sufficiently engaged in research, scholarship or artistic work such that the environment created enables high quality theses and dissertations?
- Are faculty encouraged and supported in pursuing professional development related to teaching and learning effectiveness?
- Recommendations for quality enhancement in the area of faculty profile

6 Student Progression and Success

- Are completion rates and times reasonable in light of national or international standards?
- Is the number of students withdrawing from the program reasonable in light of national or international standards?
- Does the quantity and quality of student knowledge translation activity (peer-reviewed publications, conference presentations, etc.) meet or exceed expectations for the discipline?
- Are graduates from the program successful in gaining entry into advanced study (graduate or postdoctoral), academia, or professional practice?
- Are the employment prospects for graduates of the program similar or better than for graduates of comparable programs?
- Are students and alumni satisfied with their student experience and with their progress toward (or achievement of) program learning outcomes?
- Recommendations for quality enhancement in the area of student progression and success

APPENDIX 3 – SAMPLE IN-PERSON SITE VISIT AGENDA

DAY 1

Time	Event	Attendees
7:45 a.m.	Travel to University	
8:00-8:50	Welcome breakfast	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review team
9:00-10:00	Meeting with Program Leaders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Department Head or Dean/Director Program Chair(s) Self-Study Committee
10:00-11:00	Meeting with Dean(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dean(s) of program (if applicable)
11:00-12:00	Meeting with Dean of CGPS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dean of CGPS
12:00-1:15 p.m.	Working lunch	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review team
1:30 – 2:30	Facility Tour	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Program faculty/staff
2:30-4:00	Meeting with Program Faculty	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Available/Interested faculty
4:00-5:00	Reviewer conference	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review team only
5:00 p.m.	Travel back to hotel	

DAY 2

Time	Event	Attendees
7:45 a.m.	Travel to University	
8:00-8:50	Working breakfast	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review team
9:00-10:30	Meeting with Graduate Students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Available/interested students
10:30-12:00	Meeting with Undergraduate Students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Available/interested students
12:00-1:15 p.m.	Working lunch	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review team
1:30 – 3:00	Meeting with External Stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Select external stakeholders
3:00-4:30	Exit meeting with program leaders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Department Head Program Chair(s) Self-Study Committee
5:00 p.m.	Travel back to hotel and/or airport	