

**QUALITY ASSURANCE: CYCLICAL UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM REVIEW –
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH
(February 2013)**

Executive Summary

In accordance with the Lakehead University Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP), the Department of English submitted a Self-Study (October 2011). Volume 1 presented the program descriptions & outcomes, an analytical assessment of their programs, and program data including the data collected from a student survey along with institutional information and statistical data. Volume 2 and 3 provided a collection of the program course outlines and the CVs for each full-time member in the Department.

Two external reviewers and one internal reviewer, selected by the Senate Academic Committee Quality Assurance (SAC-QA) from a set of proposed reviewers, examined the materials and completed a day and a half site visit on March 1-2, 2012. The visit included interviews with the Provost and Vice-President (Academic), Deputy Provost, Dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities (SSH), the Chair of the Department of English, the Librarian, and meetings with full-time teaching faculty, contract lecturers, graduate assistants, and support staff on the Thunder Bay campus. The Reviewers were connected by video-conference to faculty on the Orillia campus. The Review Team also had an opportunity to meet with a group of undergraduate students, and to visit classroom facilities and the library commons.

In their report, submitted May 2012, the Review Team provided feedback that describes how the English programs meet the Quality Assurance Framework evaluation criteria and are consistent with the University's mission and academic priorities. They reported that the program requirements and learning outcomes set out in the self-study are clear, appropriate and in alignment with the institution's statement of undergraduate degree level expectations. The admission standards, curriculum structure and delivery, and teaching and assessment methods are consistent with those of other undergraduate English programs in Canada and are effective in preparing graduates to meet defined outcomes and the degree level expectations. The Review Team stated that they were impressed with the strength of the English Department's faculty members in both teaching and research. The large number of teaching awards and research grants won by members of the department is testimony to their quality.

The Review Team provided feedback around specific themes and included suggestions with accompanying rationale. A number of recommendations related to faculty resources and possible strategies to increase the number of full time instructors in specific areas were provided. They indicated support for a curriculum review and highlighted some observations for the department's consideration. Several recommendations focused on the links between the two campuses and the delivery of the English curriculum. Fifteen recommendations were provided at the end of the report.

The Chair of the Department of English, in consultation with the Dean of the Faculty, submitted a response to the Reviewers' Report (December 2012). The Chair stated that the Department plans to complete a curriculum review over the next two years.

Clarifications and corrections were presented followed by a response to each of the recommendations.

A Final Assessment Report has been prepared to provide a synthesis of the external evaluation and internal response and assessments of the undergraduate programs delivered by the Department of English. This report identifies the significant strengths of the program, the opportunities for program improvement and enhancement, and sets out and prioritizes the recommendations that have been selected for implementation. The report includes an Implementation Plan that identifies who will be responsible for approving the recommendations set out in the Final Assessment Report; who will be responsible for providing any resources made necessary by those recommendations; any changes in organization, policy or governance that will be necessary to meet the recommendations; who will be responsible for acting on those recommendations; and timelines for acting on and monitoring the implementation of those recommendations.