



Senate Academic Committee

TO: Karen Roche, Secretary of Senate

FROM: Dr. Douglas Ivison
Chair, Senate Academic Committee

DATE: February 12, 2015

SUBJECT: **Senate Academic Committee Report– February 23, 2015 – Part 2**

The Senate Academic Committee (SAC) met on January 21 and February 9, 2015.

1. **SAC Quality Assurance Sub-Committee**

- 1.1 SAC QA reviewed and approved the Final Assessment Report and Implementation Plan for the BA and BSc General programs and reported to SAC. SAC passed a motion to accept the Final Assessment Report and Implementation Plan of the Cyclical Review of the BA and BSc General programs and forward the Executive Summary to Senate as an item of information.
- 1.2 SAC QA reviewed and approved the Final Assessment Report and Implementation Plan for the Faculty of Health and Behavioural Sciences, Masters of Public Health graduate program and reported to SAC. SAC passed a motion to accept the Final Assessment Report and Implementation Plan of the Cyclical Review of the Faculty of Health and Behavioural Sciences, Masters of Public Health graduate program and forward the Executive Summary to Senate as an item of information.
- 1.3 SAC QA reviewed and approved the Final Assessment Report and Implementation Plan for the Faculty of Science and Environmental Studies, Masters of Science in Physics graduate program and reported to SAC. SAC passed a motion to accept the Final Assessment Report and Implementation Plan for the Faculty of Science and Environmental Studies, Masters of Science in Physics graduate program and forward the Executive Summary to Senate as an item of information.

Respectfully submitted,

Dr. Douglas Ivison
Chair, Senate Academic Committee

Attachments

/cr



QUALITY ASSURANCE - CYCLICAL UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM REVIEW

BACHELOR OF ARTS (GENERAL), FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES AND HUMANITIES
AND

BACHELOR OF SCIENCE (GENERAL), FACULTY OF SCIENCE AND ENVIRONMENTAL
STUDIES

NOVEMBER 2014

In accordance with the Lakehead University Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP) the Deans of the two Faculties submitted a self-study for the Bachelor of Arts (General) and the Bachelor of Science (General) programs in May 2013. Volume 1 presented the program descriptions and outcomes, an analytical assessment of the program and the program descriptors including results from a student survey along with institutional information and statistical data. Volume 2 and 3, respectively, would normally provide a collection of the program course outlines and the CVs for each full-time and adjunct faculty member involved in the programs. However, given the nature of these two programs and the wide range of courses that students can take, these volumes were not required.

Two external reviewers and one internal reviewer, selected by the Senate Academic Quality Assurance Sub-committee (SAC-QA) from a set of proposed reviewers, examined the materials and completed a site visit on 10-11 June 2013. The visit included interviews with the Deputy Provost, Deans of the Faculties of SES and SSH, University Librarian, Director of Continuing Education and Distributed Learning, Director of the Student Success Centre, Director of Admission and Recruitment and Registrar, Directors of the Writing and Mathematics Assistance Centres and students in both programs.

In their report, submitted November 2013, the Review Team provided feedback that describes how the two programs meet the Quality Assurance Framework evaluation criteria and are consistent with the University's mission and academic priorities. They reported that the admission standards, curriculum structure and delivery, and teaching and assessment methods are appropriate and are effective in preparing graduates to meet defined outcomes and the University's Undergraduate Degree Level Expectations (DLE's).

The Review Team noted the following program strengths:

- The flexibility of the programs is an important feature and is enhanced by a wide range of online courses. Faculty members have been extraordinarily active in developing these online courses.
- The pathway to a university degree fills an important need for College graduates; this is particularly important for the BA General. The transition to a BSc program for College students is more challenging, primarily due to the lack of foundational quantitative courses (e.g. in mathematics) in College programs.
- The "fallback" purpose of both programs fills a need in providing a pathway for students who originally enrolled in other Lakehead programs and who would not otherwise graduate.
- The Deans are keen to enhance the quality of the programs and also to think creatively about the ways in which the programs could be reimagined and possibly expanded by repackaging some of the courses (e.g. certificates) and recruiting from a wider audience.

- Staff in the Writing and Math Assistance Centres, Library and CEDL are continually working to improve the services available to students and are very open to considering ways to better support BA and BSc General program students in particular.
- Lakehead has a welcoming culture and is not as overwhelmingly complex and intimidating as some universities. Students seem to find the support they need informally, often within their departments.

The Review Team provided feedback and recommendations for the Deans identifying the following opportunities for improvement:

- Enhanced coordination between the Orillia and Thunder Bay campuses and CEDL could improve program delivery.
- Student advising at upper year levels is not centralized (except through the Offices of the Deans); enhanced advising capacity (e.g. thru the Assistant Deans) especially for “fallback” students could assist with retention and graduation.

Drs. Dean and Siddall, Deans of the two Faculties (SES and SSH, respectively), submitted a response to the Reviewers’ Report (August 2014). Specific recommendations were discussed, and clarifications and corrections presented.

A Final Assessment Report (FAR) has been prepared to provide a synthesis of the external evaluation and internal response to the recommendations. 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.

Programs covered by this Cyclical Review:

Bachelor of Arts (General)

Bachelor of Science (General)



QUALITY ASSURANCE - CYCLICAL GRADUATE PROGRAM REVIEW

MASTERS OF PUBLIC HEALTH

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SCIENCES,
FACULTY OF HEALTH AND BEHAVIOURAL SCIENCES

DECEMBER 2014

In accordance with the Lakehead University Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP) the Department of Health Sciences submitted a self-study in November 2013. Volume 1 presented the program description and outcomes, an analytical assessment of the program and the program descriptors including results from a student survey along with institutional information and statistical data. Volumes 2 and 3, respectively, provided a collection of the program course outlines and the CV's for each full-time and adjunct faculty member involved in the program.

Two external reviewers and one internal reviewer, selected by the Senate Academic Quality Assurance Sub-committee (SAC-QA) from a set of proposed reviewers, examined the materials and completed a site visit on 9-10 April 2014. The visit included interviews with the Provost and Vice-President (Academic), Dean of the Faculty of Health and Behavioural Sciences, Chair of the Department of Health Sciences, Graduate Coordinator for the program, Dean of the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Manager – Graduate Studies, Associate Dean (Research, Economic Development and Innovation), full-time and adjunct faculty, students in the program (2 of which joined by WebEx), the Head Librarian, and the Administrative Coordinator for the program. The Review Team visited the classrooms, laboratories, research assistant space, faculty and administrative offices as well as the University Library.

In their report (May 2014), the Review Team provided feedback that describes how the Masters in Public Health program meets the Quality Assurance Framework evaluation criteria and is consistent with the University's mission and academic priorities. The Review Team reported that the admission standards, curriculum structure and delivery, and teaching and assessment methods are appropriate, reflect the current state of the discipline and are effective in preparing graduates to meet defined outcomes and the University's Graduate Degree Level Expectations.

The Review Team noted the following program strengths:

- Largest graduate program on campus therefore makes an important contribution to maintaining student enrolment and supporting the academic plan.
- A flexible program together with the distance learning option has attracted applicants from across the country and from a variety of disciplines.
- Including professional experience as part of applicant review has resulted in a diversity of perspectives in each class.
- The design and delivery of the practicum ensures that students have a valuable experience that encourages development of job-ready skills. Hosting organizations also benefit.
- The "Flex-time" delivery model is a significant innovation resulting in high demand and top quality applicants.

- Course content and structure (e.g. streams in Gerontology and Epidemiology) are innovative.
- Use of technology for delivery and interaction by teaching staff is effective and evolving.
- Student retention rates are high and times to completion, including within the flex option, are on target.
- Faculty members have strong research profiles and productivity with diverse disciplinary backgrounds.

The Review Team provided feedback and recommendations for the Department identifying the following opportunities for improvement:

- Institute regular review of course syllabi to ensure consistency and currency especially with respect to Learner Outcomes.
- Consider more deliberate inclusion of Aboriginal and International health issues
- Consider opportunities for a version of the program designed to accommodate International students.
- Ensure training of teaching staff to take full advantage of available web-conferencing/teaching technology.
- Determine cost-effective strategy to retain WebEx (or another visual) meeting software.
- Increasing numbers of practicum placements may lead to operational challenges with their management; need to manage human resources to support this important task.
- Consider holding an in-person, on-campus orientation for all students.
- Foster development of relationships among incoming students to support future learning by enhancing opportunities for online and/or in-person discussions/meetings.

The Chair of the Department of Health Sciences, in consultation with the Graduate Coordinator of the Masters in Public Health program, departmental colleagues and the Dean of the Faculty of Health and Behavioural Sciences, submitted a response to the Reviewers' Report (June 2014). Specific recommendations were discussed, and clarifications and corrections presented.

A Final Assessment Report (FAR) has been prepared to provide a synthesis of the external evaluation and internal response to the recommendations. 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.

Programs covered by this Cyclical Review:

Masters of Public Health



QUALITY ASSURANCE - CYCLICAL GRADUATE PROGRAM REVIEW

MASTERS OF SCIENCE IN PHYSICS, DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICS,
FACULTY OF SCIENCE AND ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES

NOVEMBER 2014

In accordance with the Lakehead University Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP) the Department of Physics submitted a self-study in Fall 2012. Volume 1 presented the program description and outcomes, an analytical assessment of the program and the program descriptors including results from a student survey along with institutional information and statistical data. Volumes 2 and 3, respectively, provided a collection of the program course outlines and the CV's for each full-time and adjunct faculty member involved in the program.

Two external reviewers and one internal reviewer, selected by the Senate Academic Quality Assurance Sub-committee (SAC-QA) from a set of proposed reviewers, examined the materials and completed a site visit on 19-20 June 2013. The visit included meetings with the Provost and Vice-President (Academic), Acting Vice-President (Research, Economic Development and Innovation), Deputy Provost, Dean of the Faculty of Science and Environmental Studies, Dean and Manager of Faculty of Graduate Studies, University Librarian, core and adjunct faculty, Department Chair and Graduate Coordinator, technical and support staff and current students. The Review Team toured University and off-campus resources including facilities at the Thunder Bay Regional Research Institute (TBRRI) and the Thunder Bay Regional Health Sciences Centre (TBRHSC).

In their report submitted August 2013, the Review Team provided feedback that describes how the MSc Physics program meets the Quality Assurance Framework evaluation criteria and is consistent with the University's mission and academic priorities. They reported that the admission standards, curriculum structure and delivery, and teaching and assessment methods are appropriate, reflect the current state of the discipline, and are effective in preparing graduates to meet defined outcomes and the University's Graduate Degree Level Expectations (DLE's).

The Review Team noted the following program strengths:

- Students appreciate the access to supervisors, high quality research equipment (both in individual and shared laboratories, e.g. LU Instrumentation Lab), computing and library facilities and excellent training opportunities.
- Students experience the transfer and assessment of research findings through both oral (minimum two presentations) and written (co-authoring peer-reviewed publications is common) formats and exposure to an external (to the University) thesis examiner.
- Faculty members publish in high quality journals and secure highly competitive funding.
- Quality indicators such as student time to completion (2 years), zero attrition rate, and experienced, tenured faculty teaching courses lead to students placing a high level of confidence in department leadership.
- Pilot project for funding international students (cost sharing and revenue return) along with strong faculty funding has begun to address this recruitment challenge.

The Review Team provided feedback and recommendations for the Department identifying the following opportunities for improvement:

- Enhanced recruitment, especially of international students, will benefit from additional funding initiatives and ensure program viability; a departmental commitment to a minimum level of funding for each student (e.g. \$20K per annum) may be helpful.
- Ensure course outlines accurately reflect student assessment plan, membership and organization of student advisory committees (e.g. frequency of meetings).
- Consider engaging adjuncts more often in teaching of existing courses and/or creation of new courses.
- Encourage faculty to investigate non-traditional funding sources.
- Consider the development of a Medical Physics program in terms of resources (e.g. library holdings, accreditation) and potential benefits.
- Explore additional ways (e.g. video-conference) to include external thesis examiners in the actual defense as well as interact with the department and students (e.g. guest lectures).

The Graduate Study Coordinator of the Department, in consultation with the Dean of Sciences and Environmental Studies, submitted a response to the Reviewers' Report (December 2013). Clarifications and corrections were presented followed by a response to each of the recommendations made by the Review Team.

While the Review Team recommended the Department consider designing and offering a degree in Medical Physics, the Department noted that they are actively offering courses and research opportunities in Medical Imaging and this is their immediate priority with respect to program development.

A Final Assessment Report (FAR) has been prepared to provide a synthesis of the external evaluation and internal response to the recommendations. 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.

Programs covered by this Cyclical Review:

Master of Science in Physics