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# I. Introduction to the Self-Study

As per Lakehead University’s Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP), and Ontario’s [Quality Assurance Framework](http://oucqa.ca/resources-publications/quality-assurance-framework/) (QAF 2010), the Cyclical Review of Existing Programs is used to secure the academic standards of existing undergraduate and graduate degree programs and for-credit graduate diploma programs, and to assure their ongoing improvement.

Degree Level Expectations, combined with the expert judgment of external disciplinary scholars, provide the benchmarks for assessing a program’s standards and quality.

The Self-Study is the heart of the review process and is intended to provide an opportunity for a reflective and analytical assessment of past achievements, present strengths and weaknesses, and future plans associated with the program(s). The Self-Study provides the opportunity to direct conscious attention to the expected Learning Outcomes of the program, the curriculum, the teaching and learning methodologies employed, and the relevance of testing and other assessments of student performance in determining whether students have achieved what was intended.

All faculty members shall be provided with the opportunity to participate in the self-appraisal process, and to provide feedback on a final draft of the Self- Study. Employing meaningful ways to involve staff and students in the process is also required. The input of others deemed to be relevant and useful, such as graduates of the program, representatives of industry, the associated professions, practical training programs, and employers may be solicited and included. This process must be described as part of the Self-Study.

The Self-Study must include three volumes and provides the internal program perspective in that it:

1. discusses the consistency of the program’s Learning Outcomes with the University’s mission and DLE’s and how our graduates achieve those outcomes,
2. presents program-related data and measures of performance, including applicable provincial, national and professional standards (where available),
3. confirms the integrity of the data,
4. reviews criteria and quality indicators identified in the QAF Section 4.3,
5. addresses concerns and recommendations raised in previous reviews,
6. identifies areas as requiring improvement,
7. identifies areas that hold promise for enhancement,
8. identifies academic services that directly contribute to the academic quality of each program under review, and
9. describes the participation of program faculty, staff and students in the production of the Self-Study and how their views were obtained and taken into account.

The information to be contained in each volume is listed below.

**Volume One: Description and Analysis of the Program(s)**

This volume includes three parts;

Part 1: Program Description and Outcomes,

Part 2. Analytical and Reflective Assessment of the Program, and

Part 3: Program Related Data (Appendices).

Section 4.2 of the Quality Assurance Framework (QAF) identifies the minimum requirements for a Self-Study; the University’s IQAP and this guide are based on these requirements.

The External Review Team uses the same criteria in their assessment of the program(s).

**Volume Two: Course Outlines**

This volume includes the most recent course outline for each of the courses listed in the calendar for each of the programs being reviewed. A summary table that indicates the last term in which each course was taught, the instructor and the enrolment should be included.

There should be a Table of Contents and the course outlines should be presented sequentially by code and number.

**Volume Three: Curriculum Vitae (CV)**

This volume includes a current CV for each full-time member of the academic unit, using the CV format found on Provost’s QA webpage. The CVs of part-time faculty members and adjuncts who contribute to the teaching and/or thesis supervision in the academic unit should also be included. ONLY THE PAST SEVEN YEARS SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN EACH CV.

There should be a Table of Contents (indicating the order of the CV’s whether alphabetic or alphabetic by rank) and the pages should be sequentially numbered.

In cases where the cyclical program review involves different program levels (for example, graduate and undergraduate), program modes, or programs offered at different locations, Volumes One, Two and Three may include separate chapters for each discrete program.

**Note –** each Volume should include a title page citing the Department/School, Faculty and author and date of the submission and any re-submissions (if applicable).

**E.g. [Insert Date]**

**[Insert Author and Review Coordinator]**

**[Insert Department/School and Faculty]**

**Note 2** - All documents must be AODA compliant, including using size 12, *sans serif* font. The template created for use is AODA compliant.

This Guide to Developing a Self-Study for Cyclical Program Reviews provides direction for Academic Units on:

a) the conduct of rigorous, objective and searching self-studies that benefit the students, academic units and University as a whole and

b) the format required for the Self-Study.

Academic units are encouraged to refer to the Provost’s QA webpage and to other literature that describes the benefits that can accrue from such an internal review.

Close coordination with the Deputy Provost and Dean(s), starting with the development of the Self-Study, helps to ensure the effectiveness of the entire cyclical review process.

Mandatory institutional data and outcomes measures will be provided by the Office of Institutional Planning and Analysis, the University Librarian and the Director, Technology Services Centre. All such requests should be made well in advance (i.e. several months) of the time of the submission of the Self-Study by the Academic Unit.

In order to obtain an external perspective, academic units will be required to provide the names of qualified, arm’s length reviewers that will participate in a site visit and draft a report summarizing their experience, observations and recommendations. See Section 3.3 of the IQAP for guidance regarding the choice of reviewers.

Guidance for the Review Team report can be found on the Provost’s QA webpage.

Programs are normally reviewed on an eight-year cycle; the current schedule can be found on the Provost’s QA webpage.

A template for the Department/School’s cyclical program review has been created, and is included in this document, that is AODA compliant.



**UNDERGRADUATE CYCLICAL PROGRAM REVIEW**

for the [Undergraduate][Department/School] Programs

[Department of…]or [Program Reviewed]

[Faculty of… ]

Submitted by: [name, title]

Submission date: [day month year]

**Volume One: Description and Analysis of the Program(s)**

*Although the information listed below is required for each undergraduate program, it is understood that there is no single “best” way to present the evidence required to support the narrative provided by the self-study. However, templates for tables for New Undergraduate Program Proposal Briefs can be found on the Provost’s QA webpage and may be helpful. Input from the Deputy Provost is strongly encouraged.*

## **Part 1. Program Description and Outcomes**

This section must include

* 1. A brief history of the Academic Unit delivering the program(s) under review including the major academic achievements of the unit as they relate to program development and delivery.
	2. A mission statement for the Academic Unit and program(s) being reviewed including a summary highlighting recent or proposed changes in the mission of the Academic Unit
	3. A brief description of the degree program(s) under review. A summary table is often helpful here (contact the Office of the Deputy Provost for an example). When there are only a few programs under review (i.e. 3-5), it is appropriate to include the calendar entries in the main body of the text. If there are more programs, it is recommended that they be collated into an appendix to Volume 1.
	4. A brief statement related to the appropriateness of degree nomenclature (i.e. compare and contrast to other similar programs elsewhere).
	5. A set of learner outcomes for each academic degree program being reviewed (Table 1).

Table 1 – Program Learning Outcomes

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| # | Undergraduate Program Learner Outcomes – After completing this program, students will be able to: |
| i | Write an academic paper that presents a coherent, supported argument |
| ii | Demonstrate correct citation of literature |
| iii | Display quantitative information correctly in tabular and graphical form |
| iv | Demonstrate competence choosing, applying and interpreting qualitative analytical methods |
| v | Describe the appropriate scope of practice for a recent graduate in this field |
| vi | Successfully complete a Community Service Learning opportunity including submitting a journal or reflection. |
| Etc. |  |

* 1. A description of the consonance of each program and its learner outcomes with the general framework of the University’s Mission and Strategic, Academic, and Research Plans.
	2. A discussion of the clarity and appropriateness of the program requirements and associated learning outcomes in addressing Lakehead University’s Undergraduate or Graduate Degree Level Expectations (Table 2).

Table 2 – Mapping the links from Program LO’s to Lakehead University’s Undergraduate Degree Level Expectations (DLE’s)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Lakehead University Undergraduate DLE’s | PLO’s (#s from Table 1) |
| 1. Depth and breadth of knowledge
 | i, (normally there would be multiple PLO’s addressing each DLE) |
| 1. Knowledge of Methodologies
 | ii, |
| 1. Application of Knowledge
 | iii. iv |
| 1. Communication Skills
 | i., iii,  |
| 1. Awareness of Limits of Knowledge
 | v. |
| 1. Autonomy and Professional Capacity
 | v. |

* 1. Although specific data is presented in Part 2 (under Resources) and Part 3 (Data pack), there is an opportunity in this section of Part 1 to highlight particularly appropriate evidence of the indicators that illustrate and confirm the quality of the program. Outcome measures of student performance and achievement are of particular interest, but there are also important input and process measures known to have a strong association with quality outcomes. These often include, but are not limited to, descriptors of faculty, students and graduates. The following are examples of indicators that **may** be included.
		1. **Faculty**: qualifications, research and scholarly record; class sizes; percentage of classes taught by permanent or non-permanent (contractual) faculty; numbers, assignments and qualifications of part time or temporary faculty;
		2. **Students**: applications and registrations; attrition rates; time-to-completion; final-year academic achievement; graduation rates; academic awards; student in-course reports on teaching; and
		3. **Graduates**: rates of graduation, employment six months and two years after graduation, postgraduate study, "skills match" and alumni reports on program quality when available and when permitted by the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (FIPPA).
		Note - Reviewers will be instructed that these items may not be available and applicable to all programs.
	2. A summary of the evidence of program structure and faculty research that ensures the intellectual quality of the student experience.
	3. A summary of Reports of recent accreditation or professional reviews (if applicable or appropriate).
	4. A description of the accomplishments and employment opportunities of past graduates.
	5. A summary of the process used to prepare the **Self Study**, including the role of the faculty and staff (full-time and part-time), students, and alumni. The **Self Study** should be a team effort. Student perspectives could be included through focus groups and/or representation on the team preparing the self-study report. Alumni input could be obtained by means of a survey of past graduates. Where appropriate, input of others, such as representatives of industry, professional and practical training programs should be considered.
	6. An Overview of Program Support (more detail is provided in Part 2 but this is an opportunity to highlight particular strengths or opportunities for the Academic Unit/program(s))**:**
1. Summary of number and type of full-time, part-time, and adjunct appointments
2. Listing of current faculty members and credentials (Table 3)

Table 3 - A summary table of all full-time faculty regularly teaching in the undergraduate program(s). This should include Internal and External Adjuncts as well as Sessionals, depending on the nature of their involvement. Provide information that will demonstrate the quality of the teaching faculty involved in the undergraduate program(s).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Name of Faculty member | Rank/Status | Additional Information (e.g.) |
| # Refereed Journal Papers | # Refereed Conference Papers | Etc. |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

1. Listing of support staff, and their roles and responsibilities (Table 4).

Table 4 - A summary table of human resources (administrative, academic, other) in place to support the undergraduate program(s). This table should describe the roles and responsibilities of each position.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Name of Position | Roles and Responsibilities | Notes |
| Program Chair | (Provide a detailed list) | Reduced teaching load due to Administrative Responsibilities  |
| Administrative Assistant | “ | ½ time; shared with … |
| Practicum Coordinator | “ | ¼ time; shared with …. |
| Technical Staff position in xxxx |  | ½ time; shared with … |
| Etc.  |  |  |

1. Description of the availability and use of physical resources for teaching and research (Table 5).

Table 5 - A summary table of resources required to sustain the quality of scholarship at the undergraduate level. This could include a. teaching space, b. laboratory space, c. equipment, d. facilities, e. any other resources (e.g. community partnerships, dedicated scholarships/bursaries, etc.) not already noted.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Teaching space
 |
| 1. Laboratory space
 |
| 1. Equipment
 |
| 1. Facilities
 |
| 1. Financial
 |
| 1. Other
 |

1. Description of the Administrative Organization - Reporting structures/standing committees/student participation in governance, etc.

## **Part 2. Analytical Assessment of the Program**

*This component of the Self Study is meant to encourage a reflective assessment of the program(s) based, in part, on the data provided in Part 1 and Part 3 and should identify the program strengths and opportunities for improvement. This section must include:*

2.1 Admission Requirements

1. List the admission requirements.
2. Discuss the appropriateness of the program’s admission requirements for the learning outcomes established for completion of the program. Reference to the incoming admission average (as provided in the data pack) may be helpful here.
3. Provide a sufficient explanation of alternative requirements, if any, for admission such as minimum grade point average, additional languages or portfolios, along with how the program recognizes prior work or learning experience.
4. If available and for additional context, include information regarding typical feeder programs and/or institutions; proportion of domestic and international students; proportion of direct entry (i.e. high school), non-direct entry and/or transfer students; recognition of advanced standing for completion of specific college level credentials, or other related data.

2.2 Program Structure

1. Describe the structure of the program(s). For example, number of years to complete, lab vs. lecture components, proportion of required vs. elective courses, additional requirements such as cooperative education, internships, field placements, practica, etc.
2. Include the relevant program and Faculty regulations.
3. Discuss the appropriateness of the program's structure and regulations to meet specified program learner outcomes and Degree Level Expectations (Table 6).

Table 6 – Mapping the links from program structural elements and regulations to Program LO’s and Lakehead University’s Undergraduate Degree Level Expectations (DLE’s)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Program component | PLO’s (#s from Table 1 | DLE’s (#s from Table 2) |
| I. Structural element |
| a. Hands-on learning opportunities | ii, vi | 3, 4 |
| b. small class sizes | i, iv, x | 2, 4 |
| c. etc | Etc | Etc |
| II. Regulations |
| a. thesis requires 70% |  |  |
| b. minimum of three FCE’s at the third year level |  |  |
| c. etc |  |  |

d) Demonstrate links between Course Learner Outcomes and Program Learner Outcomes (Table 7).

Table 7 – Mapping Course Learning Outcomes to Program Learning Outcomes.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| PLO’s (#s from Table 1) | Course Number and Title | Course Learner Outcomes (please note that a single course can – and should – support multiple PLO’s) |
| i. write an academic paper that …. | UNIV1100 Intro to ….. | a. b. c.  |
| UNIV3350 Research methods | a.b. |
| UNIV4180 thesis | a.b.c. |
| ii. demonstrate correct citation of literature | Etc. |  |
| iii. etc. |  |  |

2.3 Curriculum

1. Describe ways in which the curriculum addresses the current state of the discipline or area of study.
2. Identify any experiential components within the curriculum.
3. Identify any unique curriculum or program innovations or creative components.
4. Discuss any recent and/or possible future curriculum changes (including strategies and schedule for future changes)
5. Describe any curricular links between undergraduate and graduate programs (if graduate programs exist within the unit)
6. Describe and discuss the mechanisms in place for curriculum review and revision

2.4 Mode of delivery

1. Discuss the appropriateness of the mode(s) of delivery to meet the program learning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations.
2. Discuss how the unit incorporates experiential teaching practices.

2.5 Assessment of teaching and learning

1. Discuss the appropriateness and effectiveness of methods used in the assessment of student achievement of program learner outcomes and Lakehead University’s Degree Level Expectations.
2. Discuss the appropriateness and effectiveness of the means of assessment, especially in the students’ final year of the program, in clearly demonstrating achievement of the program learner outcomes and Lakehead University’s Degree Level Expectations.
3. Provide evidence of the quality of teaching and advising in the Academic Unit
4. Describe the response of the Unit to the Undergraduate/Graduate Program Review Student Survey (completed by the Office of Institutional Planning and Analysis)
5. Discuss the use of innovative or unique teaching programs and techniques.

2.6 Resources for undergraduate programs

Discuss the appropriateness and effectiveness of the use of existing human, physical and financial resources in delivering the academic program(s) and associated experiential learning opportunities. Include as many of the items below as are appropriate. Throughout this section, please refer to data provided in the Appendices and elsewhere in the document

a) Faculty and Staff

* Analyze participation (number and quality) of full and part time faculty and adjunct professors who teach and/or supervise in the program.
* Provide an overview of service teaching provided for other academic units
* Provide an analysis of the roles and effectiveness of the staff in supporting the academic program(s) and learner outcomes

b) Physical & Financial Resources

* Analyze the appropriateness of the resources in relation to the implementation of the program(s) and enrolment and class size
* Discuss how the resources sustain the quality of scholarship produced by students including library support, information technology support, and laboratory access (where appropriate refer to data provided in Part 3)

2.7 Overall Quality Assessment

1. Address the question “How effectively has the Academic Unit addressed concerns and recommendations raised in previous program reviews?”
2. Describe initiatives taken to enhance the quality of the programs and the associated learning and teaching environment.

2.8 Program Regulations and Courses

1. Identify links to pertinent regulations
2. Include a list of course offerings/calendar descriptions
(Note - Volume 2 includes full course outlines)

## **Part 3. Program Related Data**

*The bulk of this information is provided by the Office of Institutional Planning and Analysis. Please use the information presented in this section to support the discussion and observations contained in Parts 1 and 2.*

1. Summarized Results of the Undergraduate Program Review Student Survey
(Note - raw student survey data, including comments, is provided by IPA to the Academic Unit.)
2. Library Report - the University Librarian provides a report on the relevant information resources for the programs under review.
3. Space Report – additional information beyond what has been provided by Office of Institutional Planning and Analysis.
4. Undergraduate Program Data Pack
* Full-time enrolment (headcount) by program for 7 years.
* Full-time equivalent (FTE) enrolment for 7 years (FTE represents the total of all full- and part- time students in the fiscal year where the study load is converted to the “normal full-time study load” for each program).
* Enrolment by gender and program as at November 1 reporting date for the University overall and for the department being reviewed.
* Enrolment in Honours and Bachelors (3- and 4-year) programs over the past 7 years, by full- and part-time load.
* Course registrations per FTE faculty member over the past 7 years.
* Average class size data for each year of the program over the past 7 years.
* Number of courses with labs or tutorials by year level – for the most recent academic year.
* Data on the average entering marks received by registered secondary school applicants.
* Average marks data for the past 7 years by department overall and by individual course.
* Data on internal and external scholarships awarded for past 7 years by department and institution.
* Degrees awarded (by calendar year) for 7 years.
* Data on time to completion for full-time students. Cohort includes full-time students registered for the first time in year one of the program.
* Data on physical space utilized by the department.
* Report on library resources as provided by the Library.
* Results of the student survey which includes data sets and comments by students.