

**UNIVERSITY OF WATERLOO
INSTITUTIONAL QUALITY ASSURANCE FRAMEWORK**

Effective July 1 2011

**Office of the Associate Vice President, Academic Programs
And Graduate Studies Office
University of Waterloo
Waterloo, Ontario N2L 3G1**

May23, 2011

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A. PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF REVIEWS.....	3
B. CYCLICAL REVIEWS OF EXISTING ACADEMIC PROGRAMS	5
1. REVIEWS OF EXISTING ACADEMIC PROGRAMS NOT RELATED TO PROFESSIONAL ACCREDITATION	5
THE QUALITY COUNCIL EVALUATION CRITERIA.....	6
GUIDELINES FOR SITE VISITS.....	9
2. REVIEWS OF EXISTING ACADEMIC PROGRAMS RELATIVE TO PROFESSIONAL ACCREDITATION	14
3. COMBINED REVIEWS OF UNDERGRADUATE AND GRADUATE PROGRAMS.....	15
4. REVIEWS OF MULTI- OR INTER-DISCIPLINARY PROGRAMS.....	15
5. REVIEWS OF PROGRAMS JOINT WITH OTHER UNIVERSITIES	15
6. REVIEWS INVOLVING PROGRAMS AT THE FEDERATED OR AFFILIATED INSTITUTIONS	16
7. REVIEWS OF FOR-CREDIT DIPLOMA AND CERTIFICATE PROGRAMS.....	16
C. REVIEWS OF NEW PROGRAMS	17
D. MAJOR MODIFICATIONS OF EXISTING PROGRAMS	22
E. AUDIT PROCESS	24
F. REFERENCES	24
APPENDIX 1: ONTARIO COUNCIL OF ACADEMIC VICE PRESIDENTS' (OCAV) UNDERGRADUATE AND GRADUATE DEGREE-LEVEL EXPECTATIONS.....	25
APPENDIX 2: GUIDELINES FOR SELF STUDY REPORTS.....	29
APPENDIX 3: CORE AND NON-CORE UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS (MTCU).....	32
APPENDIX 4: INFORMATION THE UNIVERSITY SHOULD CONSIDER IN CERTIFYING CRITERIA HAVE BEEN MET (MTCU CRITERIA).....	34

A. Purpose and Scope of Reviews

Consistent with good educational practice, the University of Waterloo (UW) regularly reviews its academic programs. This Institutional Quality Assurance framework is consistent with recommendations of the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (the Quality Council), and are effective July 1 2011. This framework replaces the previous guidelines, namely guidelines for undergraduate programs (originally approved by Senate February 1997), and those for graduate programs (the Ontario Council for Graduate Studies – OCGS – guidelines originally implemented in 1982). Any changes to this framework are subject to approval by Senate and by the Quality Council.

The review processes are subject to regular audit by the Quality Council, on a schedule determined by the Quality Council. The threshold framework for degree expectations are the University of Waterloo Guidelines for University Undergraduate Degree Level Expectations (UUDLES: adopted by Senate 2008), and the University of Waterloo Guidelines for University Graduate Degree Level Expectations (adopted by Senate 2010). These in turn conform to the Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents (OCAV) Guidelines for Degree Level Expectations (adopted by OCAV in 2005: Appendix 1).

In addition to the UUDLEs, the University of Waterloo intends its graduating students at the Bachelor's level to be able to articulate their learning from experiential or applied opportunities, and to demonstrate an understanding of the intellectual, social, cultural, and political diversity of the world in which we live.

The OCAV framework for degree expectations, together with the University of Waterloo enhancements, will support departments and academic units in planning or revising curricula and in communicating program goals and outcomes to students and stakeholders. As of July 2011, departments and faculties engaged in program review shall use these guidelines as base expectations while retaining the flexibility to add objectives unique to their specialties.

The Quality Council *Framework* (2010) defines a degree program as “(a)n identified set and sequence of courses, and/or other units of study, research and practice within an area of disciplinary or interdisciplinary study, which is completed in full or partial fulfilment of the requirements for the awarding of a degree, and is recorded on the graduate's academic record”. Programs are not necessarily congruent with academic organizational units, and provision should be made to include joint programs and multi- or inter-disciplinary programs in a way appropriate for the institution. (Note that while University of Waterloo student information system often uses the term “plan” to refer to a program, the term “program” will be used throughout this document to avoid confusion).

Following the Quality Council *Framework* (2010), the scope of academic reviews at University of Waterloo covers “new and continuing undergraduate and graduate degree/diploma programs whether offered in full, in part, or conjointly by any institutions federated and affiliated with the university.” This also extends “to programs offered in partnership, collaboration or other such arrangement with other postsecondary institutions including colleges, universities, or institutes, including Institutes of Technology and Advanced Learning...”

At UW, the fundamental purposes of the review process are to help (1) each program to achieve and maintain the highest possible standards of academic excellence, through systematically reflecting on its strengths and weaknesses, and looking forward to determine what actions would further enhance quality in the program; (2) assess the quality of the program relative to counterpart programs in Ontario, Canada and internationally, and (3) meet public accountability expectations through a credible, transparent, and action-oriented review process.

Another key purpose is to create an institutional culture which understands and values the benefits of program reviews, while recognizing the significant workload implications of preparing a Self Study, hosting a site visit, and providing a Two-year Progress Report.

At the University of Waterloo, the responsibility for undergraduate academic reviews rests with the position of Associate Vice President Academic Programs, created in 1998. The responsibility for graduate academic reviews rests with the Associate Provost, Graduate Studies. Responsibility for specific augmented reviews is allocated to one of these two individuals. These are the sole contacts with the Quality Council.

Policy since 1998 has been that: (1) the reviews would be treated as “whole of Program reviews” in the belief that undergraduate and graduate programs should be considered together, (2) Interdisciplinary Options and Minors are reviewed under the same arrangement as for single-discipline reviews except for the composition of the Review Committee (which consists of three reviewers from other Faculties, but internal to the university; there can also be a student from another program as a fourth member of the panel), and (3) review processes for professional accreditation would be examined to determine if they met the UW and the Quality Council requirements for a Program Review. The design of the Program Review process is intended to be as streamlined as possible, while ensuring its accessibility and transparency to the UW community.

At the University of Waterloo, many students complete their degrees in the Faculty rather than in a Department or School. Faculty-based programs are treated similarly to Department or unit-based reviews.

A schedule for Undergraduate Program Reviews based on a seven year cycle is being used, and has been organized to place undergraduate program reviews in the same year as, or one year before or after, the scheduled Graduate Program Reviews, in order to allow information from one review to be used in the other review. Units are also encouraged where desired and appropriate to undertake combined undergraduate and graduate reviews (i.e. augmented reviews). However, it also is recognized that accreditation for professional programs more often occurs on a five year cycle. In the latter case, the UW schedule of reviews has been modified to allow the UW Program Review to occur simultaneously with the professional accreditation review. The schedule for Undergraduate and Graduate Program Reviews 2011/12 to 2017/18 can be found in the University’s “Manual for Academic Reviews” (hereafter, the Manual). Units are encouraged to combine reviews of undergraduate and graduate programs, and may do so by moving the dates for review, subject to the interval between reviews of individual programs not exceeding eight years.

The Self Study process is started during the preceding academic year with a joint meeting called by the Associate Vice President Academic Programs – AVPA - (undergraduate reviews) and the Associate Provost Graduate Studies – APGS - (graduate reviews). The AVPA and APGS meet with the chairs/directors and administrative assistants of the Programs scheduled to submit their Self Study the following June, so that the Site Visit could be scheduled for either the following fall or winter term. In cases where the academic unit chooses to submit an augmented review, either the AVPA or APGS is assigned primary responsibility for overseeing the particular review (allocation is made in such a way as to share workload appropriately). At the first meeting, the nature of the review process is discussed, and opportunity is provided for questions. After that first meeting, the AVPA/APGS is available to meet with faculty and staff in each Program beginning its Self Study, to discuss matters particular to that Program. Data for the review are provided primarily by Institutional Analysis and Planning, which is responsible for the integrity of the data. These data are not publicly available. For details of data to be provided, and timelines, see the Manual.

The following Sections outline the expectations for Program Reviews, and indicate how the University of Waterloo deals with them. Throughout the UW guidelines, summaries/explanations/suggestions are written in *italics*.

B. Cyclical Reviews of Existing Academic Programs

1. Reviews of Existing Academic Programs not related to Professional Accreditation

The Quality Council Framework (2010) specifies the key elements for the Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP). These are identified below, followed by the UW approach to each. After discussing the basic process, information is provided regarding the processes for the Self Study and Site Visits.

According to the Quality Council, the institutional review policy should:

- (1) include a self-appraisal by professors, staff and students participating in the program. (*UW: A Self Study for an undergraduate program will be reviewed and approved by the Associate Vice President Academic Programs. A Self Study for a graduate program will be reviewed and approved by the Associate Provost, Graduate Studies. A Self Study for an augmented program will be reviewed and approved by either the Associate Vice President Academic Programs or the Associate Provost, Graduate Studies. The guidelines for those reports are provided in the Manual.*)
- (2) have an evaluation, including a site visit by at least two external reviewers including one from universities outside Ontario. One internal reviewer is also mandated, from outside the discipline under review (*UW: each Site Visit involves two external reviewers, at arm's length [not collaborators from the past seven years, supervisors or supervisees, relatives, etc.] from the program under review, normally with one from a university in*

Ontario and one from a university from outside Ontario. Reviewers should be Associate or Full Professors or equivalent, preferably with some experience of program management). Each Site Visit Team also involves one internal UW reviewer, chosen by the AVPA/APGS from a different Faculty than the one in which the program under review is located). Guidelines for Site Visits are provided below.

- (3) describe the process of assessment of the Self Study and review within the university, and describe how a Final Assessment Report will be drafted, including an implementation plan for recommendations. *(UW: the Program Chair/Director, in collaboration with the Faculty Dean, submits a Chair/Director's Report to the AVPA/APGS, indicating actions to be taken as a result of what has been learned from the Self Study and the Site Visit. The AVPA/APGS writes a Final Assessment Report, summarizing information from the Self Study, the Review Team Report, and the response from the Program and the Dean as well as the implementation plan. Two years after the entire review process is complete, a Two-year Progress Report is submitted to the AVPA/APGS in which progress is documented regarding actions taken by the Program, the Faculty and the University. Both the Final Assessment Report and the Two-year Progress Report are commented on and evaluated by Senate Undergraduate Council (undergraduate reviews) or Senate Graduate and Research Council (graduate reviews). Any comments and/or concerns raised by Senate Undergraduate Council/Senate Graduate and Research Council, together with the program's response, will be incorporated into the Final Assessment Report or the Two-year Progress Report prior to it being presented to Senate. The AVPA/APGS subsequently reports to Senate, and provides a one-page summary for all programs which the Provost uses for reporting to the Board. At the time of the next Program Review, the Program is accountable for commitments made in response to the previous Program Review).*
- (4) describe reporting requirements *(UW: the Final Assessment Report is presented at Senate, and hence available publicly on the web in the Senate Minutes; a copy is also sent to the Quality Council. Similarly the Two-year Progress Report is presented to Senate and hence available publicly in the Senate Minutes: links to these documents are also available from <http://www.uwaterloo.ca/accountability>)*
- (5) Provide an institutional manual *(UW: Manual for Academic Reviews. Maintained by AVPA/APGS: individual items are updated regularly and sent to Senate Undergraduate Council/Senate Graduate and Research Council for information; available online at <http://grad.uwaterloo.ca/faculty/review.html>)*

The Quality Council Evaluation Criteria

The curricular content, admission requirements, mode of delivery, bases of evaluation of student performance, commitment of resources and overall quality of any program and its courses are all necessarily related to its goals, learning objectives and learning outcomes. Goals

provide an overview for students, instructors and program/course evaluators of what the program or course aims to accomplish. Learning objectives are an expression of what the instructor(s) intends that the student should have learned or achieved by the end of the program or course. Learning outcomes are what the student has actually learned or achieved in the program or course.

The Quality Assurance Framework (2010) specifies that the review of existing programs should use the following criteria (quoted directly from Quality Council, 2010, pp 23-24):

1 Objectives

- a) Program is consistent with the institution's mission and academic plans.
- b) Program requirements and learning outcomes are clear, appropriate and align with the institution's statement of the undergraduate and/or graduate Degree Level Expectations.

2 Admission requirements

Admission requirements are appropriately aligned with the learning outcomes established for completion of the program.

3 Curriculum

- a) The curriculum reflects the current state of the discipline or area of study.
- b) Evidence of any significant innovation or creativity in the content and/or delivery of the program relative to other such programs.
- c) Mode(s) of delivery to meet the program's identified learning outcomes are appropriate and effective.

4 Teaching and assessment

- a) Methods for assessing student achievement of the defined learning outcomes and degree learning expectations are appropriate and effective.
- b) Appropriateness and effectiveness of the means of assessment, especially in the students' final year of the program, in clearly demonstrating achievement of the program learning objectives and the institution's statement of Degree Level Expectations.

5 Resources

Appropriateness and effectiveness of the academic unit's use of existing human, physical and financial resources in delivering its program(s). In making this assessment, reviewers must recognize the institution's autonomy to determine priorities for funding, space, and faculty allocation.

6 Quality indicators

- a) **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;
- b) **Students:** applications and registrations; attrition rates; time-to-completion; final-year academic achievement; graduation rates; academic awards; student in-course reports on teaching; and

c) **Graduates:** rates of graduation, employment six months and two years after graduation, post-graduate 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). Auditors will be instructed that these items may not be available and applicable to all programs.

7 Quality enhancement

Initiatives taken to enhance the quality of the program and the associated learning and teaching environment.

8 Additional graduate program criteria

- a) Evidence that students' time-to-completion is both monitored and managed in relation to the program's defined length and program requirements.
- b) Quality and availability of graduate supervision.
- c) Definition and application of indicators that provide evidence of faculty, student and program quality, for example:
 - i) Faculty: funding, honours and awards, and commitment to student mentoring;
 - ii) Students: grade-level for admission, scholarly output, success rates in provincial and national scholarships, competitions, awards and commitment to professional and transferable skills;
 - iii) Program: evidence of a program structure and faculty research that will ensure the intellectual quality of the student experience;
 - iv) Sufficient graduate level courses that students will be able to meet the requirement that two-thirds of their course requirements be met through courses at this level.

The templates at UW for the Self Study (see Manual) have been arranged to reflect the points identified by the Quality Council Framework. The UW templates note major headings involving self assessment, of the past and the future, the organization and the people involved, research, service, teaching (with special attention to co-operative education and online learning), the students and the support available (human, physical and financial).

The UW guidelines are broad in scope, so that each Program can emphasize those aspects which are most relevant. The review will cover the last seven fiscal years (spring/fall/winter), with emphasis on the last several. The UW Office of Institutional Analysis and Planning (IAP) will provide most of the historical data to each Program and ensure its integrity.

Under each heading in the UW guidelines are suggested areas that could be discussed and critically examined. In some cases, a topic may fit just as well under another heading. It is not necessary to repeat information in several sections, and generally it will be up to the Program to decide where information should be included in the Self Study. The self-study should be broad-based, reflective, forward-looking and include critical analysis.

The self-study should address and document the:

1. Consistency of the program's learning outcomes with the institution's mission and Degree Level Expectations, and how its graduates achieve those outcomes;
2. Program-related data and measures of performance, including applicable provincial, national and professional standards (where available);
3. Integrity of the data;

4. Review criteria and quality indicators identified above;
5. Concerns and recommendations raised in previous reviews;
6. Areas identified through the conduct of the self-study as requiring improvement;
7. Areas that hold promise for enhancement;
8. Academic services that directly contribute to the academic quality of each program under review;
9. Participation of program faculty, staff, and students in the self-study

All faculty members should be provided the opportunity to participate in the self-appraisal process and to comment on the Self Study. Faculty from the UW Colleges and part-time faculty who regularly teach in the program are to be given this opportunity. If there are differing views among the faculty these should be noted. Also all faculty members should have the opportunity to participate in the program's response to the Review Team Report. Again the response should note differing views if there is no consensus among faculty. It is also essential to include staff and student participation in the self-appraisal process, and to inform staff and students (for example at a Town Hall meeting) of the Review Team's findings.

Guidelines for Site Visits

The following guidelines have been prepared to assist Departments/Schools in making arrangements for the Site Visit related to their Program Reviews.

The Program under review will have the lead role in making arrangements for the schedule for the Site Visit. However, arrangements should be prepared in consultation with the Office of the AVPA or the Graduate Studies Office as appropriate. For augmented reviews (reviews combining both undergraduate and graduate offices), one Office will be assigned primary responsibility, and consultation with the other will occur as needed. Contact the relevant Administrative Assistant.

The schedule for the Site Visit should be prepared at least one month in advance of the visit, so that the Review Team can see the schedule, and have an opportunity to suggest changes.

1. Prior to the Site Visit

- 1.1 The Chair/Director of the Program under review arranges for completion of a Self Study with input from the Dean, faculty members, staff and students, and in consultation with the Dean of the Faculty, develops a proposed list of reviewers (including phone numbers and email addresses and a brief biography) which is submitted to the AVPA/APGS. Two External Reviewers and one Internal Reviewer are required. Five names should be proposed, and ranked in order of preference, for each of (1) an External Reviewer who will normally come from a university in Ontario; (2) an External Reviewer who will normally come from a university outside Ontario but at the undergraduate level usually within Canada. One External Reviewer may be a non-university appointee (e.g. someone from government or the private sector), provided that she/he has appropriate qualifications to fulfill the Reviewer

- role. An Internal Reviewer, who will come from UW but from outside the home Faculty, will be selected by the AVPA/APGS.
- 1.2 The proposed Reviewers should be at arm's length from the program, meaning not relatives, collaborators, supervisors/supervisees, etc. The AVPA/APGS will make the final choice of members for the Review Team.
 - 1.3 The Chair/Director identifies several two-day blocks suitable to the Program under review for the Site Visit, and provides those to the AVPA/APGS.
 - 1.4 The Office of the AVPA/the Graduate Studies Office contacts the proposed External and Internal Reviewers, to invite them to serve as Reviewers.
 - 1.5 The Office of the AVPA/the Graduate Studies Office confirms the time and arrangements for the Site Visit with the Reviewers, and obtains the Social Insurance Numbers from the External Reviewers.
 - 1.6 The Office of the AVPA/Graduate Studies Office co-ordinates arrangements for travel and accommodation for the External Reviewers.
 - 1.7 The Office of the AVPA/Graduate Studies Office sends a copy of the Self Study to the External Reviewers at least one month prior to the visit.

2. The Site Visit

- 2.1 The External Reviewers arrive by not later than the evening before the Site Visit activities are to begin.
- 2.2 An initial meeting with the AVPA/APGS is held at the start of the visit. The AVPA typically hosts a meeting on the evening before the Site Visit activities begin, for the two External Reviewers and the Internal Reviewer, as well as the Undergraduate Chair/Director of the Program under review and the Dean of the Faculty (or his or her delegate) in which the Program is based. The APGS similarly has an initial meeting with Reviewers at the beginning of the site visit. The purpose of the meeting is (quoting the Quality Council 2010 p21) to ensure that the reviewers:
 - Understand their role and obligations;
 - Identify and commend the program's notably strong and creative attributes;
 - Describe the program's respective strengths, areas for improvement, and opportunities for enhancement;
 - Recommend specific steps to be taken to improve the program, distinguishing between those the program can itself take and those that require external action;
 - Recognize the institution's autonomy to determine priorities for funding, space, and faculty allocation;
 - Respect the confidentiality required for all aspects of the review process.
- 2.3 The Review Team will have two days to meet with key participants in the Program under review. The Chair/Director should make arrangements for the Review Team to meet at a minimum with the:
 - 2.3.1 Dean and Associate Dean(s) (subject to availability) relevant to the Program under review.
 - 2.3.2 Chair/Director and Associate Chairs.

- 2.3.3 Faculty (including adjuncts and Federated University and Affiliated University Colleges' faculty where applicable), in groups, or, if feasible, individuals when that is requested.
- 2.3.4 Staff.
- 2.3.5 The relevant Librarian.
- 2.3.6 Department of Co-operative Education and Career Services (if there is a Co-op stream).
- 2.3.7 Undergraduate students (recommended more than one time slot be identified for undergraduates to ensure that adequate opportunity is provided to meet with the Review Team). These meetings should be arranged without faculty present, to facilitate frank and open discussion. It is good practice to ask the Departmental/School Undergraduate Student Association (where one exists) to invite students to participate in this meeting.
- 2.3.8 Graduate students, with particular attention to ensuring Teaching Assistants are well represented. As with the undergraduates, these meetings should be arranged without faculty present, and it is good practice to ask the Departmental/School Graduate Student Association (where one exists) to invite students to participate in this meeting.
- 2.3.9 Vice President Academic and Provost (subject to his/her availability).
- 2.3.10 Graduate reviews will conclude with a second meeting with the Associate Provost Graduate Studies; undergraduate reviews will include the Associate Vice President Academic.
- 2.4 If possible, the Review Team should be provided by the Program under review with an office in which the Reviewers can leave their belongings, and have discussions among themselves.
- 2.5 The host Program should discuss with the Review Team if, over lunch periods, the Review Team would like to be by itself, in order to discuss what has been learned, or whether it would appreciate the opportunity to meet with other people.
- 2.6 The Program should allocate time in the evening after the first day of the Site Visit, and in the latter part of the second day, for the Review Team members to discuss among themselves what they have been learning, how they will structure their report, and how they will divide the tasks for writing the report. UW expects that the Review Team will submit its report within two weeks of the Site Visit. Thus, the Review Team members must be given sufficient time to make arrangements for the preparation of the report before they finish the Site Visit and depart from UW.

3. Guidelines for the Report from the Review Team

1. The Review Team will prepare a report with separate sections for each program (undergraduate and graduate) evaluated, which should be submitted to the AVPA/APGS within two weeks of the completion of the Site Visit. There is no fixed format for the report, provided that it covers the evaluation criteria identified in the Quality Council (2010) Framework, listed above. A suggested template is provided in the Manual. It is recommended that the report should include at least the following:

Part 1: The Review Process

- time of visit.
- documents reviewed.
- individuals and groups met.
- adequacy of Site Visit arrangements.

Part 2: Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations

In preparing its report, the Review Team should be aware that the Quality Council (2010) Framework specifies that a review of Programs should address the review criteria 1 through 8, reproduced on pages 7-8 previously. The Review Team is welcome to add other topics as long as attention is given to the points highlighted above.

The most useful report for UW will be one which is “constructively critical”, identifying strengths which should be protected and enhanced, weaknesses that deserve attention, and new opportunities. When weaknesses are identified, the report will be more helpful if suggestions are presented regarding how the weaknesses could be addressed.

The Review Team Report will lose credibility within UW if it is perceived primarily to be a “booster report” for a discipline or profession, and only recommends providing more funding to the Program. A more helpful report will consider what could be done by the Program, by itself or in collaboration with its Faculty and UW, in using limited resources more efficiently and effectively, along with considering where new resources would represent a strategic investment to allow a Program to grow with quality.

The Review Team Report, if necessary, may include a confidential letter of transmittal to cover personnel issues. This letter would only be available to the Dean, AVPA/APGS, and the Vice President Academic and Provost.

4 After the Site Visit

1. The Review Team Report is submitted to the AVPA/APGS, and then copies are distributed to the Vice President Academic and Provost, the Dean of the Faculty, and the Chair/Director of the Program.
2. The external Review Team members submit their travel and accommodation expense claims to the Office of the Associate Vice President Academic/Office of Graduate Studies. The honoraria for the External Reviewers will be paid after the final report from the Review Team has been received.
3. The Program under review is invited to provide comments, verbally or in writing, regarding the experience with the Site Visit, and especially to identify aspects of the Site Visit which could be modified to make the experience more productive. It is important that students also have an opportunity to provide comments related to the Site Visit. Such comments should be sent to the AVPA/APGS.
4. The Chair/Director and the faculty members of the Department/School have an opportunity to provide comments on factual errors in the Review Team Report.

- Comments should be sent to the AVPA/APGS within four weeks of receiving a copy of the Report. If no comments are received within that time period, unless other arrangements have been made it will be concluded that the Program has no initial comments to make about the Report.
5. The Chair/Director, in consultation with the Faculty Dean, will submit a report to the AVPA/APGS outlining their responses to each of the following:
 - The plans and recommendations proposed in the Self Study report;
 - The recommendations advanced by the Review Team in its report;
 - The program's response to the Review Team's Report;And will describe;
 - Any changes in organization, policy or governance that would be necessary to meet the recommendations;
 - The resources, financial and otherwise, that would be provided in supporting the implementation of selected recommendations; and
 - A proposed timeline for the implementation of any of those recommendations.The Chair's/Director's Report should be submitted within 10 weeks of the Program receiving its copy of the Review Team Report.
 6. The AVPA/APGS will provide a Final Assessment Report to the Vice President Academic and Provost, outlining the nature of the review process, the main findings, conclusions and recommendations from the Review Team Report, and the main conclusions and proposed actions proposed and prioritized by the Program. These actions will include any changes in organization, policy or governance that are necessary, the resources (financial or otherwise) that would be needed, and a proposed timeline. This report will be submitted within four weeks of receiving the Chair's/Director's Report described in 4.5 above. The Final Assessment Report will be presented to Senate Undergraduate Council/Senate Graduate and Research Council for approval.
 7. The AVPA/APGS will report to Senate that the Program Review has been completed, and highlight main findings and conclusions. The AVPA/APGS will submit a copy of the Final Assessment Report to the Quality Council. The Provost will report to the Board once a year as to which programs were reviewed the previous academic year. The Final Assessment Report referred to in Section 4.6 above is made available publicly in the Minutes of Senate as well as in an academic review website (reachable from <http://uwaterloo.ca/accountability>). Note that other documents (Self Study, Review Team Report, Chair/Director's Report) are not public.
 8. The Vice President Academic and Provost, or designate, will have responsibility for ensuring that all recommendations and issues arising from the reviews are dealt with in a manner that brings closure to the process, including provision of necessary resources.
 9. It is good practice for the Chair/Director to arrange a town hall meeting with staff and students to provide feedback on the review findings.
 10. The Chair/Director is responsible for a Two-year Progress Report which is presented to Senate Undergraduate Council/Senate Graduate and Research Council (for approval) and Senate (for information), on steps taken to follow up from the Review.
 11. The AVPA/APGS will submit a copy of the Two-year Progress Report to the Quality Council.

Table 1. Summary of timelines for reviews of current programs

Fall, previous academic year	Meeting of those responsible in Department/School, with AVPA, APGS and resource persons; final decision as to whether review will be augmented or only undergraduate/only graduate
July 1	Self Study submitted
Fall/Winter	Site Visit occurs
2 weeks after visit	Review Team submits Report
4 weeks after Review Team Report received	Chair/Director submits comments on factual errors/issues in Review Team Report to AVPA/APGS
10 weeks after Review Team Report received	Chair/Director's Report submitted on what was learned from Self Study and Review Team Report, and plans for future
4 weeks after Chair/Director's Report received	AVPA/APGS submits Final Assessment Report to Senate Undergraduate Council/Senate Graduate and Research Council for approval, and then to Senate for information. Copy of Final Assessment Report sent to the Quality Council
February of subsequent academic year	Provost reports to Board names of all programs reviewed in previous academic year cycle
2 years after Site Visit	Two-year Progress Report submitted by Department/School to Senate Undergraduate Council/Senate Graduate and Research Council for approval, and Senate for information

2. Reviews of Existing Academic Programs Relative to Professional Accreditation

The Quality Council (2010) Framework (section 4.2.7) states that “The Institutional Quality Assurance Process may allow for and specify the substitution or addition of documents or processes associated with the accreditation of a program, for components of the institutional program review process, when it is fully consistent with the requirements established in this framework. A record of substitution or addition, and the grounds on which it was made, will be eligible for audit by the Quality Council.”

The AVPA/APGS as relevant reviews the guidelines for the accreditation process, meets with the person(s) at UW responsible for the professional accreditation together with the Director of the Program, to review the guidelines for the accreditation and UW reviews, and to determine what additional information, if any, is required for the UW review. Such discussions occur at the time when work begins by a Program to prepare for the accreditation process, and a memo is filed determining the decision taken. If necessary, the Program under review will be asked to provide supplemental information to meet the needs of the UW review process.

When the Review Team is appointed by an accreditation organization, UW will seek to have a UW faculty member included as a member of the Review Team. If this is not possible, then UW may arrange to have a UW faculty member conduct interviews and examine documents related to the UW program review process to provide his or her perspective, and prepare a

written report to supplement the accreditation Review Team Report. For master's programs which are subject to accreditation reviews, it is usually necessary to review the research components of the program. These aspects can be reviewed in conjunction with a review of the PhD program (if one exists) or research master's in the same unit (if one exists). If the only graduate program in the unit is a professional master's subject to accreditation, then a separate review of the research components is required.

3. Combined Reviews of Undergraduate and Graduate Programs

UW encourages combined reviews (augmented reviews). Augmented reviews can be more efficient and also have academic merit, since there are frequently interactions between the undergraduate and graduate programs. Academic units proposing an augmented review should indicate their intention to the AVPA/APGS in good time (prior to the end of the previous calendar year). The AVPA/APGS will then allocate one of their two Offices as having primary responsibility for the logistics of the review. The review will then follow the normal process appropriate to that Office. Augmented reviews will be presented both at Senate Undergraduate and Senate Graduate and Research Councils. The Chair/Director will be invited to both meetings to respond to questions, the AVPA will be invited to Senate Graduate and Research Council, and the APGS to Senate Undergraduate Council, to ensure coherence in the response to the reviews of the undergraduate and graduate components.

4. Reviews of Multi- or Inter-disciplinary Programs

Reviews of inter-disciplinary programs which lead to a degree should follow the same procedures as those for single discipline programs described above. The review of an inter-disciplinary program (including collaborative graduate programs) can be, where appropriate, combined with the review of a larger program. One of the considerations in such combined reviews is whether a Review Team can be assembled which has expertise in both disciplinary and inter-disciplinary programs. Separate report sections must also be written for each program.

Where the inter-disciplinary undergraduate program does not lead to a separate degree (for example undergraduate options), the composition of the Review Committee is different. The Committee is composed of two University of Waterloo faculty members and one external reviewer. The Director of the inter-disciplinary program and the Dean who provide oversight of the program will be invited to suggest individuals to serve on the review committee. The composition of the review committee will be determined by the AVPA.

The process of the Review follows the same arrangement as for single-discipline reviews.

5. Reviews of Programs Joint with other Universities

For programs offered jointly with another/other Ontario universities, the procedure is that one individual (normally the Director or equivalent of the joint program) will prepare a Self Study following the template of his/her university, in consultation with faculty, staff and students at the other institution(s). The review team will be chosen in consultation with both/all partners, and the "internal" reviewer can come from each partner, or be chosen to represent all partners. The review visit will include both/all campuses. The response to the review can be written by

the Director of the joint program in consultation with the appropriate Chairs and Deans at both/all participating institutions, and then sent through the regular process at both/all universities. If deemed more appropriate, separate responses could be prepared, one for each participating institution, to follow the normal process at each university.

For programs joint with other universities outside Ontario, UW will follow the review process for Ontario universities. This would not necessarily require a site visit to the other university, provided that the Quality Council has determined that the partner university is also subject to an appropriate quality review process in its own jurisdiction. However UW would obtain information about the components of the program completed outside Ontario as appropriate, and include this in the review within Ontario.

If, in future, UW develops partnerships to offer degree or diploma programs with other institutions such as colleges or institutes, the present document will be modified to include such programs.

6. Reviews Involving Programs at the Federated or Affiliated Institutions

The University of Waterloo has one Federated University (St. Jerome's) and three Affiliated University Colleges (Conrad Grebel, Renison, St. Paul's). UW has made arrangements with the colleges to ensure that Program reviews are completed in a coordinated manner. Two major considerations are being addressed. First, when a Program is primarily based within one of the university colleges, the lead role for the Program review is taken by the University College, with the Self Study submitted to the Associate Vice President Academic at UW. Second, during their Program reviews, academic departments at UW are directed to identify when there are complementary disciplinary or program activities at one or more of the University Colleges, to ensure that such activities are considered in the Self Study.

The Colleges may opt to have the program reviews considered at the relevant College Council, in parallel to consideration at Senate Undergraduate Council/Senate Graduate and Research Council.

7. Reviews of For-Credit Diploma and Certificate Programs

Diplomas and certificates, where offered for credit, are reviewed on the same cycle as other programs. They will usually be reviewed in conjunction with a related degree program. Only graduate diplomas (certificates) are reported to the Quality Council.

C. Reviews of New Programs

At University of Waterloo, reviews of new programs follow a similar procedure to reviews of existing programs, with appropriate modifications to the program proposal documentation and the external review (for example, there are no current students to interview or for whom to provide statistics). See Manual for a template.

For new undergraduate programs, the AVPA has responsibility for the review, while for new graduate programs it is the APGS.

The steps for approval for new programs are similar to those for review of current programs.

1. An initial proposal document is developed, addressing the topics outlined in the Quality Council criteria. This proposal goes to the appropriate Department/School and Faculty committees for discussion and approval. If the program includes co-op experience, a report from Co-op and Career Services is required. The proposal specifies if the program is full cost-recovery or not.
2. If an external consultant review with site visit is required, this occurs following Faculty approval, and the unit concerned has the opportunity to respond to the review comments.
3. The proposal (modified if appropriate following the review) then goes to either Senate Undergraduate Council, or Senate Graduate and Research Council, and then Senate, for approval.
4. At this point the proposal is sent to the Quality Council for approval, if approval is required, or for information if required (new undergraduate minors and options do not require notification to the Quality Council).
5. The Board receives information once a year about programs approved to commence in the previous year (along with information on completed reviews of existing programs).
6. If MTCU approval of funding is required, a submission is made to MTCU (see table 2).
7. As is the case for reviews of existing programs, a Two-year Progress Report is required also for new programs. The purpose of the Two-year Progress Report is to provide initial data on student progress and implementation of the program, and to respond to any issues raised by consultants. Copies of the Two-Year Progress Report are sent to the Quality Council for information (or, if required, for decision).
8. Thereafter the program enters into the regular review cycle.

Definition of a New Program:

The Quality Council defines a new [degree] program as “Any degree, degree program, or program of specialization, currently approved by Senate or equivalent governing body, which has not been previously approved for that institution by the Quality Council, its predecessors, or any intra-institutional approval processes that previously applied. A change of name, only, does

not constitute a new program; nor does the inclusion of a new program of specialization where another with the same designation already exists (e.g., a new honours program where a major with the same designation already exists).” The Quality Council further clarifies that “a ‘new program’ is brand-new: that is to say, the program has substantially different program requirements and substantially different learning outcomes from those of any existing approved programs offered by the institution”.

Depending on the type of program, the levels at which approvals are required differ, as in Table 2 below. All new programs require internal approval (up to the Senate level), and depending on whether Quality Council and/or MTCU approval is also required, additional approval steps are needed.

Table 2. Level of approval required for new programs and major modifications¹

Program Type	Senate	External consultants	Quality Council	MTCU
Undergrad minor or option	Yes	No	No	No
Undergrad major or specialization	Yes	Yes if “brand-new” ²	Yes if “brand-new” ²	Yes, in non-core areas
Undergraduate degree	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes, in non-core areas
Undergrad certificate or diploma	Yes	No	No	Yes, if stand-alone
Graduate field ³	Yes	No	No	No
Graduate collab. program	Yes	No	Yes ⁴	Yes
New graduate degree	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Graduate Diploma	Yes	No	Yes ⁴	Yes, if stand-alone
Major change to existing program	Yes	No	No (but notification required)	No
Minor change to existing program	No	No	No	No (include in annual Program Development Report)

¹Major modifications are defined in section D below

²See definition of new program above table; notification is required if the change is a major modification but not “brand-new”

³If graduate programs wish to advertize that a field has been approved by the Quality Council, it must be submitted for Expedited Approval

⁴Follows Expedited Approval process defined by the Quality Council.

Aims:

The procedures for assessing proposals for new programs should ensure:

- the program achieves UW's academic excellence goals;
- the program name is appropriate to the content and recognizable to employers;
- the program reflects UW distinctiveness, is technologically current, is creative and innovative in its curriculum content and delivery, and entrepreneurial and appropriately inter-disciplinary in perspective;
- the program has the potential to be one of the best in Canada and at least among the top quarter of similar programs in North America;
- the program has the potential to attract excellent students;
- the program has sufficient resources committed to it.

Planning

Wherever the origins of the idea of a new program, the detailed planning process takes place in the academic unit which will implement it. This planning is done in consultation with various groups, some of which are: the Registrar's Office; the Office of Institutional Analysis and Planning; other relevant academic Departments in the University; Co-operative Education and Career Services (CECS) (if a co-op plan is being proposed); the Offices of the Dean and Associate Dean (Undergraduate/Graduate as appropriate) of the Faculty. In addition it is the unit's responsibility to meet the degree level expectations approved by the University (see Manual) and by MTCU, for non-core programs undergraduate and all graduate programs which are requesting approval for specific funding for BIU entitlement (see Manual).

Program Proposal

A program proposal document is required. A template for new graduate programs is provided in the Manual, and a similar template for new undergraduate programs will shortly be available also in the Manual.

Criteria:

Any proposed new program will be reviewed using the Quality Council (2010) criteria for new programs, quoted directly from pp8-11, as follows:

(1) Objectives

- a) Consistency of the program with the institution's mission and academic plans.
- b) Clarity and appropriateness of the program's requirements and associated learning outcomes in addressing the institution's own undergraduate or graduate Degree Level Expectations
- c) Appropriateness of degree nomenclature

(2) Admission requirements

- a) Appropriateness of the program's admission requirements for the learning outcomes established for completion of the program.
- b) Sufficient explanation of alternative requirements, if any, for admission into a graduate, second-entry or undergraduate program, such as minimum grade point average, additional languages or portfolios, along with how the program recognizes prior work or learning experience.

(3) Structure

- a) Appropriateness of the program's structure and regulations to meet specified program learning outcomes and degree level expectations.
- b) For graduate programs, a clear rationale for program length that ensures that the program requirements can be reasonably completed within the proposed time period.

(4) Program content

- a) Ways in which the curriculum reflects the current state of the discipline or area of study.
- b) Identification of any unique curriculum or program innovations or creative components.
- c) For research-focused graduate programs, clear indication of the nature and suitability of the major research requirements for degree completion.
- d) Evidence that each graduate student in the program is required to take a minimum of two-thirds of the course requirements from among graduate level courses.

(5) Mode of delivery.

Appropriateness of the proposed methods for the assessment of student achievement of the intended program learning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations.

(6) Assessment of teaching and learning

- a) Appropriateness of the proposed methods for the assessment of student achievement of the intended program learning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations.
- b) Completeness of plans for documenting and demonstrating the level of performance of students, consistent with the institution's statement of its Degree Level Expectations.

(7) Resources for all programs

- a) Adequacy of the administrative unit's planned utilization of existing human, physical and financial resources, and any institutional commitment to supplement those resources, to support the program.
- b) Participation of a sufficient number and quality of faculty who are competent to teach and/or supervise in the program.
- c) Evidence that there are adequate resources to sustain the quality of scholarship produced by undergraduate students as well as graduate students' scholarship and research activities, including library support, information technology support, and laboratory access.

(8) Resources for graduate programs only

- a) Evidence that faculty have the recent research or professional/clinical expertise needed to sustain the program, promote innovation and foster an appropriate intellectual climate.

- b) Where appropriate to the program, evidence that financial assistance for students will be sufficient to ensure adequate quality and numbers of students.
- c) Evidence of how supervisory loads will be distributed, and the qualifications and appointment status of faculty who will provide instruction and supervision.

(9) Resources for undergraduate programs only

Evidence of and planning for adequate numbers and quality of: (a) faculty and staff to achieve the goals of the program; or (b) of plans and the commitment to provide the necessary resources in step with the implementation of the program; (c) planned/anticipated class sizes; (d) provision of supervision of experiential learning opportunities (if required); and (e) the role of adjunct and part-time faculty.

(10) Quality and other indicators

- a) Definition and use of indicators that provide evidence of quality of the faculty (e.g. qualifications, research, innovation and scholarly record; appropriateness of collective faculty expertise to contribute substantively to the proposed program).
- b) Evidence of a program structure and faculty research that will ensure the intellectual quality of the student experience.

Approval Process:

The normal approval process is as follows (with some variations according to the organization of the academic unit, and whether one or more academic units are involved):

- approval by Departmental/School Curriculum Committee(s);
- approval by Department/School as a whole at a Department/School meeting;
- approval by Provost of financial plan and proposed tuition fees
- approval by the appropriate Faculty(ies) Undergraduate/Graduate Council(s);
- approval by the appropriate Faculty Council(s);
- site visit by external consultants (if required);
- Departments/School response to consultants and modifications of proposal (if required);
- approval by Senate Undergraduate Council or Senate Graduate and Research Council;
- approval by Senate; programs may be advertized once Senate approval has been granted and the proposal has been sent to the Quality Council, but should clearly state “subject to approval by the Quality Council”;
- reports sent to the Quality Council for approval or information, whichever is appropriate;
- approval of funding by MTCU, if required;
- after a new program is approved to commence by the Quality Council, the program will begin within 36 months of the date of approval, otherwise the approval will lapse;
- report to Board on new degrees/certificates/diplomas approved in previous year;
- Two-year Progress Report to Senate Undergraduate Council/Senate Graduate and Research Council and Senate, for new degrees, diplomas and certificates: should respond to any questions posed by initial reviewers and provide preliminary information on student numbers and progress;
- Two-year Progress Report to the Quality Council, if requested.

Site Visit (if required):

The guidelines for the site visit for current programs should be used. The main difference is that there are no existing students who can be interviewed. However, it may be appropriate (for some new programs) to invite current students who are interested in the new program, to meet with reviewers. This can include students who are interested in transferring into the new program (at the undergraduate level) or applying for the new program (current undergraduates interested in applying to a new graduate program).

Table 3: Timelines for approval of new programs*

Month 1	Approval by Department
Month 2	Approval by Faculty <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Co-op report commissioned - Library report commissioned - List of consultants sent to GSO/Office of AVPA - Proposal brief prepared for consultants (allow 1 month for consultants to read document)
Month 5-6	Consultant site visit; Review Report received within 2 weeks Chair/Director ensures consultation and implementation of any changes recommended by consultants; submits revised brief
Month 6-7	Approval by Senate Undergraduate Council/Senate Graduate and Research Council
Month 7-8	Approval by Senate; advertizing permitted with qualification “subject to approval by the Quality Council”
Month 10	Approval by the Quality Council
Month 10	Submission to MTCU, if required
Two years after Site Visit	Two-year Progress Report submitted, as for current programs

*Note that not all new programs require consultant visits (for example, graduate collaborative programs, graduate diplomas); if so, timeline will be shorter: otherwise these represent the minimum time required. Also note that MTCU approval requires an additional 6-8 months.

D. Major modifications of existing programs**Definition**

The Quality Council (2010) defines a major modification as one or more of the following program changes:

- a) Requirements for the program that differ significantly from those existing at the time of the previous cyclical program review;
- b) Significant changes to the learning outcomes;
- c) Significant changes to the faculty engaged in delivering the program and/or to the essential physical resources as may occur, for example, where there have been changes to the existing mode(s) of delivery.

And provides the following examples of major modifications, which University of Waterloo has adopted as follows:

a) **Requirements that differ significantly from those existing at the time of the previous cyclical program review**

- The merger of two or more programs
- New bridging options for college diploma graduates
- Significant change in the laboratory time of an undergraduate program
- The introduction or deletion of an undergraduate thesis or capstone project
- The introduction or deletion of a work experience, co-op option, internship or practicum, or portfolio
- At the master's level, the introduction or deletion of a research project, research essay or thesis, course-only, co-op, internship or practicum option
- The creation, deletion or re-naming of a field in a graduate program
- Any change to the requirements for graduate program candidacy examinations, field studies or residence requirements
- Major changes to courses comprising a significant proportion of the program, where significant is defined as more than one-third of the courses

b) **Significant changes to the learning outcomes**

Changes to program content, other than those listed in a) above, that affect the learning outcomes, but do not meet the threshold for a 'new program'

c) **Significant changes to the faculty engaged in delivering the program and/or to the essential resources as may occur, for example, when there have been changes to the existing mode(s) of delivery (e.g. different campus, online delivery, inter-institutional collaboration)**

- Changes to the faculty delivering the program: e.g. a large proportion of the faculty retires; new hires alter the areas of research and teaching interests
- A change in the language of program delivery
- The establishment of an existing degree program at another institution or location
- The offering of an existing program substantially online where it had previously been offered in face-to-face mode, or vice versa
- Change to full- or part-time program options, or vice versa
- Changes to the essential resources, where these changes impair the delivery of the approved program

If there is uncertainty as to whether a particular change is major or minor, the AVPA and APGS will be the arbiter for undergraduate and graduate programs respectively. The Provost has the final say in this decision. The Provost has the right to choose to send a particular major modification to the Quality Council for an expedited review, as per section 3.3 of the Quality Council Framework (2010), and if so would follow procedures similar to those for a new graduate field.

Procedure

Major modifications to existing programs require normal internal approval (approval at Department/School, Faculty, Senate Undergraduate Council or Senate Graduate and Research Council, and Senate). Minor modifications follow the same process, with the exception that Senate Undergraduate Council and Senate Graduate and Research Council are empowered to approve these changes on behalf of Senate, as per Senate Bylaw 9. If an existing program is

offered in a new location, this requires notification at the Department, Faculty and Senate Undergraduate/Senate Graduate and Research Council levels.

Major modifications require reporting to the Quality Council on an annual process.

E. Audit Process

The Quality Council will audit each institution once every eight years. The objective of the audit is to determine whether or not the University, since the last review, has acted in compliance with the provisions of its Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP) for Cyclical Program reviews as ratified by the Quality Council. The Quality Council Framework (2010) indicates the means of selection of the auditors, together with the steps in the audit process.

F. References

Council of Ontario Universities, Ontario Council of Academic Vice Presidents (2005) *Guidelines for University Undergraduate Degree Level Expectations*, Toronto, Council of Ontario Universities, December 16, 3pp.

Quality Council (Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance) (2010) *Quality Assurance Framework*. Council of Ontario Universities, April, 37pp.

APPENDIX 1: Ontario Council of Academic Vice Presidents’ (OCAV) Undergraduate and Graduate Degree-Level Expectations

	<p style="text-align: center;">Baccalaureate/Bachelor’s Degree</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>This degree is awarded to students who have demonstrated:</i></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Baccalaureate/Bachelor’s Degree: Honours</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>This degree is awarded to students who have demonstrated:</i></p>
<p>1. Depth and Breadth of Knowledge</p>	<p>a) a general knowledge and understanding of many key concepts, methodologies, theoretical approaches and assumptions in a discipline</p> <p>b) a broad understanding of some of the major fields in a discipline, including, where appropriate, from an interdisciplinary perspective, and how the fields may intersect with fields in related disciplines</p> <p>c) an ability to gather, review, evaluate and interpret information relevant to one or more of the major fields in a discipline</p> <p>d) some detailed knowledge in an area of the discipline</p> <p>e) critical thinking and analytical skills inside and outside the discipline</p> <p>f) the ability to apply learning from one or more areas outside the discipline</p>	<p>a) a developed knowledge and critical understanding of the key concepts, methodologies, current advances, theoretical approaches and assumptions in a discipline overall, as well as in a specialized area of a discipline</p> <p>b) a developed understanding of many of the major fields in a discipline, including, where appropriate, from an interdisciplinary perspective, and how the fields may intersect with fields in related disciplines</p> <p>c) a developed ability to: i) gather, review, evaluate and interpret information; and ii) compare the merits of alternate hypotheses or creative options, relevant to one or more of the major fields in a discipline</p> <p>d) a developed, detailed knowledge of and experience in research in an area of the discipline</p> <p>e) developed critical thinking and analytical skills inside and outside the discipline</p> <p>f) the ability to apply learning from one or more areas outside the discipline</p>
<p>2. Knowledge of Methodologies</p>	<p>... an understanding of methods of enquiry or creative activity, or both, in their primary area of study that enables the student to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • evaluate the appropriateness of different approaches to solving problems using well established ideas and techniques; and • devise and sustain arguments or solve problems using these methods. 	<p>... an understanding of methods of enquiry or creative activity, or both, in their primary area of study that enables the student to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • evaluate the appropriateness of different approaches to solving problems using well established ideas and techniques; • devise and sustain arguments or solve problems using these methods; and describe and comment upon particular aspects of current research or equivalent advanced scholarship.

<p>3. Application of Knowledge</p>	<p>a) the ability to review, present, and interpret quantitative and qualitative information to: i) develop lines of argument; ii) make sound judgments in accordance with the major theories, concepts and methods of the subject(s) of study; and</p> <p>b) the ability to use a basic range of established techniques to: i) analyse information; ii) evaluate the appropriateness of different approaches to solving problems related to their area(s) of study; iii) propose solutions; and</p> <p>c) the ability to make use of scholarly reviews and primary sources.</p>	<p>a) the ability to review, present and critically evaluate qualitative and quantitative information to: i) develop lines of argument; ii) make sound judgments in accordance with the major theories, concepts and methods of the subject(s) of study; iii) apply underlying concepts, principles, and techniques of analysis, both within and outside the discipline; iv) where appropriate use this knowledge in the creative process; and</p> <p>b) the ability to use a range of established techniques to: i) initiate and undertake critical evaluation of arguments, assumptions, abstract concepts and information; ii) propose solutions; iii) frame appropriate questions for the purpose of solving a problem; iv) solve a problem or create a new work; and</p> <p>c) the ability to make critical use of scholarly reviews and primary sources.</p>
<p>4. Communication Skills</p>	<p>... the ability to communicate accurately and reliably, orally and in writing to a range of audiences.</p>	<p>... the ability to communicate information, arguments, and analyses accurately and reliably, orally and in writing to a range of audiences.</p>
<p>5. Awareness of Limits of Knowledge</p>	<p>... an understanding of the limits to their own knowledge and how this might influence their analyses and interpretations.</p>	<p>... an understanding of the limits to their own knowledge and ability, and an appreciation of the uncertainty, ambiguity and limits to knowledge and how this might influence analyses and interpretations.</p>
<p>6. Autonomy and Professional Capacity</p>	<p>a) qualities and transferable skills necessary for further study, employment, community involvement and other activities requiring:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the exercise of personal responsibility and decision-making; • working effectively with others; 	<p>a) qualities and transferable skills necessary for further study, employment, community involvement and other activities requiring:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the exercise of initiative, personal responsibility and accountability in both personal and group contexts; • working effectively with others; • decision-making in complex contexts;

	<p>b) the ability to identify and address their own learning needs in changing circumstances and to select an appropriate program of further study; and</p> <p>c) behaviour consistent with academic integrity and social responsibility.</p>	<p>b) the ability to manage their own learning in changing circumstances, both within and outside the discipline and to select an appropriate program of further study; and</p> <p>c) behaviour consistent with academic integrity and social responsibility.</p>
--	---	---

	<p>Master's Degree This degree is awarded to students who have demonstrated the following:</p>	<p>Doctoral Degree This degree extends the skills associated with the master's degree and is awarded to students who have demonstrated the following:</p>
<p>1. Depth and breadth of knowledge</p>	<p>A systematic understanding of knowledge, including, where appropriate, relevant knowledge outside the field and/or discipline, and a critical awareness of current problems and/or new insights, much of which is at, or informed by, the forefront of their academic discipline, field of study, or area of professional practice;</p>	<p>A thorough understanding of a substantial body of knowledge that is at the forefront of their academic discipline or area of professional practice including, where appropriate, relevant knowledge outside the field and/or discipline.</p>
<p>2. Research and scholarship</p>	<p>A conceptual understanding and methodological competence that</p> <p>a) Enables a working comprehension of how established techniques of research and inquiry are used to create and interpret knowledge in the discipline;</p> <p>b) Enables a critical evaluation of current research and advanced research and scholarship in the discipline or area of professional competence; and</p> <p>c) Enables a treatment of complex issues and judgments based on established principles and techniques; and,</p> <p>On the basis of that competence, has shown at least one of the following:</p> <p>a) The development and support of a sustained argument in written form; or</p> <p>b) Originality in the application of knowledge.</p>	<p>a) The ability to conceptualize, design, and implement research for the generation of new knowledge, applications, or understanding at the forefront of the discipline, and to adjust the research design or methodology in the light of unforeseen problems;</p> <p>b) The ability to make informed judgments on complex issues in specialist fields, sometimes requiring new methods; and</p> <p>c) The ability to produce original research, or other advanced scholarship, of a quality to satisfy peer review, and to merit publication.</p>
<p>3. Level of application of knowledge</p>	<p>Competence in the research process by applying an existing body of knowledge in</p>	<p>The capacity to</p>

	<p>Master’s Degree This degree is awarded to students who have demonstrated the following:</p>	<p>Doctoral Degree This degree extends the skills associated with the master’s degree and is awarded to students who have demonstrated the following:</p>
	<p>the critical analysis of a new question or of a specific problem or issue in a new setting.</p>	<p>a) Undertake pure and/or applied research at an advanced level; and b) Contribute to the development of academic or professional skills, techniques, tools, practices, ideas, theories, approaches, and/or materials.</p>
<p>4. Professional capacity/autonomy</p>	<p>The qualities and transferable skills necessary for employment requiring:</p> <p>a) The exercise of initiative and of personal responsibility and accountability; and b) Decision-making in complex situations; c) The intellectual independence required for continuing professional development; d) The ethical behavior consistent with academic integrity and the use of appropriate guidelines and procedures for responsible conduct of research; and d) The ability to appreciate the broader implications of applying knowledge to particular contexts.</p>	<p>a) The qualities and transferable skills necessary for employment requiring the exercise of personal responsibility and largely autonomous initiative in complex situations; b) The intellectual independence to be academically and professionally engaged and current; c) The ethical behavior consistent with academic integrity and the use of appropriate guidelines and procedures for responsible conduct of research; and d) The ability to evaluate the broader implications of applying knowledge to particular contexts.</p>
<p>5. Level of communications skills</p>	<p>The ability to communicate ideas, issues and conclusions clearly.</p>	<p>The ability to communicate complex and/or ambiguous ideas, issues and conclusions clearly and effectively.</p>
<p>6. Awareness of limits of knowledge</p>	<p>Cognizance of the complexity of knowledge and of the potential contributions of other interpretations, methods, and disciplines.</p>	<p>An appreciation of the limitations of one’s own work and discipline, of the complexity of knowledge, and of the potential contributions of other interpretations, methods, and disciplines.</p>

APPENDIX 2: Guidelines for Self Study Reports

*Required for undergraduate reviews only

**Required for graduate reviews only

Note that separate sections of the Self Study are required for undergraduate programs and graduate programs: information does not however need to be repeated (refer back to data provided in a previous section as appropriate).

1. Background

- 1.1 Brief listing of programs offered: degrees offered; when program started; features e.g. collaborative programs, offered in different locations.
- 1.2 Program goals: explain goals and their relationship to Faculty's/University's degree expectations, with reference to degree expectations and learning objectives.
- 1.3 Fields in the program: indicate any recent changes.**
- 1.4 Assessment relative to other departments or programs provincially/nationally/internationally as appropriate.
- 1.5 Previous Program Reviews: any concerns expressed in previous appraisal, and action taken
- 1.6 Process used to prepare Self Study: including role of students, faculty (full-time and part-time), alumni, staff, and employers (for co-op programs).
- 1.7 Special matters and innovative features: e.g. accreditation; role of Research Chairs; special research equipment, etc.

2. Human Resources

- 2.1 Administrative organization of the unit, with reporting structures, including support staff.
- 2.2 List of faculty by field: full-time faculty (change since last review), vacant positions, impact of lost positions (if any), normal retirement dates of faculty, commitment to replacement of retirements (if any), cross-appointments from other units, adjunct faculty, clinical faculty. Table 1** (Faculty members by field) from OCGS Template "Brief for the standard appraisal..." by OCGS Category (Category 1 through 6). Faculty CVs are required as a separate volume of the Self Study. No specific format is required as long as all CVs are provided in a consistent format, however departments are encouraged to use CVs in the common form as used by the Tricouncils, to minimize additional work.
- 2.3 External research funding of faculty (past seven years, by source (Table 2 from OCGS template); also by field (Table 2a, OCGS template)**.
- 2.4 Graduate supervision: completed and current, master's, doctoral and post-doctoral students, by faculty member (Table 3, OCGS template).**
- 2.5 Current teaching assignments by faculty member, showing number of courses, enrolments and administrative assignments (Table 4, OCGS template). Note that for graduate reviews, enrolments are needed for graduate classes; for undergraduate reviews, undergraduate enrolments, and augmented reviews require both.
- 2.6 Teaching evaluations for undergraduate courses, with comparison to the Faculty average.*
- 2.7 Support staff.
 - 2.7.1 Number and type of staff.
 - 2.7.2 Change in staff complement over time.
 - 2.7.3 Profile of complement positions.
 - 2.7.4 Age and normal retirement date of staff: impact on program administration.

3. Physical and Financial Resources

- 3.1 Library resources: provided by library.
- 3.2 Laboratory facilities.
- 3.3 Computer facilities.

- 3.4 Space.
- 3.5 Financial support of graduate students** (Table 5, 5a OCGS template).
- 3.6 Financial support of undergraduate students*: scholarships, teaching and research assistantships.
- 3.7 Other external sources of funding for the program.*

4 Teaching

- 4.1 The intellectual development and educational experience for the student, related to degree outcomes and program learning objectives. Suggested topics for coverage include:
 - 4.1.1 Learning community **: departmental seminars, workshops on professionalization for students, opportunities for students to present their own research;
 - 4.1.2 Internationalization and student exchanges;*
 - 4.1.3 Co-operation with other programs, with interdisciplinary programs, service teaching;*
 - 4.1.4 Student advising;*
 - 4.1.5 Co-op: experiential education is one of the defining features of UW, particularly at the undergraduate level but also in some graduate programs: a meeting should be held with the program's representative in the Department of Co-operative Education and Career Services;
 - 4.1.6 Distance education (Extended learning) (where applicable); and
 - 4.1.7 Continuing education (where applicable): programs offered, relationship of curriculum to department goals, enrolment patterns, indicators of teaching and program quality.
- 4.2 Graduate program regulations** (admission standards; degree requirements; progress reports for students primarily focusing on research; thesis evaluation procedures; language requirements).
- 4.3 Part-time studies: if program differs for part-time students, describe how delivery differs.
- 4.4 Courses offered (listing): for graduate courses**, it is required to state whether enrolment is restricted to graduate students, or also open to undergraduates, and whether there is any policy restricting the number of undergraduate courses or mixed undergraduate/graduate enrolment courses which can be taken as part of a graduate program. Table 7** (OCGS template) for graduate courses offered in past three years, with enrolments.

5 Student Outcomes

- 5.1 Undergraduate:*
 - 5.1.1 For both regular and co-op streams of an undergraduate program; the applicant numbers, the first year enrolment numbers, attrition/retention rates, co-op employment rates by work term, employer evaluation of co-op students, co-op evaluation of employers, value of work term reports, graduation patterns, final year academic grades, and student employment after graduation. (Note that information on student employment should not be given by name due to FIPPA regulations);
 - 5.1.2 Academic quality of students accepted into programs: appropriateness of admission requirements (as related to learning outcomes); source of students (e.g. Ontario, other provinces, international, transfers and mature students);
 - 5.1.3 Entrance scholarships, student scholarships in upper years;
 - 5.1.4 Evaluation of students with respect to intended learning outcomes; and
 - 5.1.5 Student employment after graduation, and continued education.
- 5.2 Graduate** (master's, doctoral, certificates/diplomas separately):
 - 5.2.1 Academic quality of students accepted into the program, appropriateness of admission requirements (as related to learning outcomes), source of students (e.g. Ontario, other provinces, international, transfers and mature students, enrolments) and graduations, attrition/retention rates, time to graduate, Tables 8, 9, 10 and 11 of OCGS template (cohort analysis), entrance scholarships, student publications, student employment after graduation, projected graduate intake and enrolments etc. (Note that information on student employment cannot be given with the students' name due to FIPPA regulations);

- 5.2.2 Student publications**: proportion of graduates from doctoral and research-oriented master's programs with at least one publication (excludes abstracts) emanating from their graduate work; and
- 5.2.3 Projected graduate intake and enrolments**: were plans for past seven years fulfilled: describe targets for next seven years, and reasons for significant growth/decline in numbers.

6 Professional and Community Service of faculty members, related to discipline or professional activities*

- 6.1 Service to professional or disciplinary associations, such as elected officer, journal editor, associate editor, number of editorial boards.
- 6.2 Service as invited reviewers or committee members for national and international research competitions.
- 6.3 Service to other programs or research centres at UW or elsewhere.
- 6.4 Connection between service and teaching: e.g. service learning.
- 6.5 Other aspects of service.

7 Topics on which advice is requested

Issues on which Department/School desires advice: programs are encouraged to include up to five issues on which advice would be useful.

APPENDIX 3: Core and Non-Core Undergraduate Programs (MTCU)

Undergraduate “Core Arts and Science” Programs:

Programs that are in basic disciplines which might be expected to be offered at any university (and are) appropriate to the academic ethos and character of any university.

Biological Sciences (including Biochemistry)
English Language and Literature
French Language and Literature
General Arts and Science
Humanities (including Ancient and Classical Languages)
Mathematical Sciences and Computer Studies
Physical Sciences
Social Sciences (including Women’s Studies)
Theology

Note: “Core Arts and Science Programs” are **exempt** from the approval process.

“Non-Core” Programs:

Accounting, Accountancy
Actuarial Science
Agricultural Business
Agriculture
Area Studies
Art Education, Conservation, Art Therapy
Clothing, Textiles, Design and Fashion
Commerce
Communications
Community, Urban and Regional Planning
Criminology
Dental Surgery
Dentistry
Dietetics
Drama
Education: Primary-Junior; Junior-Intermediate; Intermediate-Senior; Technological Studies; French as a First Language
Engineering
Environmental Studies, Environmental Science
Family Studies, Family Science
Film, Cinema
Finance
Fine Art, Studio Art, Painting
Forest Technology
Forestry
Gerontology
Health Studies
Home Economics, Food Sciences
Horticulture
Industrial, Labour Relations
Journalism
Kinesiology

Labour Studies
Landscape Architecture
Language and Literature Studies
Law
Law Enforcement
Legal Studies
Library Science
Linguistics
Management, Business Management
Marketing
Medical Illustration
Medicine
Midwifery
Municipal Administration
Music
Native Studies
Nursing
Nursing Education
Occupational Therapy
Optometry
Personnel and Administrative Studies
Pharmacology
Pharmacy
Physical Therapy, Physiotherapy
Physical Education
Planning
Public Administration
Public Service Studies
Radiation Therapy
Recreation
Resource Management
Social Work
Speech pathology and Audiology
Survey Science
Systems Design
Theatre Arts
Translation, Interpretation
Urban Studies, Urbanism
Veterinary Medicine
War Studies

APPENDIX 4: Information the University Should Consider in Certifying Criteria Have Been Met (MTCU Criteria)

Criteria	Institutional Check List
1. Program Nomenclature (“Truth-in-Advertising”)	<input type="checkbox"/> the University Senate or equivalent academic body should ensure that the program name and degree designation are appropriate to program content and consistent with current usage in the discipline
2. Academic Quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate: the University should ensure that the Senate or equivalent academic body has approved the undergraduate program <input type="checkbox"/> Graduate: the University should ensure that the Dean of Graduate Studies (or equivalent) has received a letter indicating the date program passed OCGS appraisal without requiring improvements
3. Financial Viability	<input type="checkbox"/> the Board of Governors or equivalent body should ensure the university has in hand the requisite resources to introduce the program within existing funding levels and is prepared to maintain the program for a reasonable period of time (The approval of a program is not grounds for a request for additional funding from the Ministry to initiate or sustain the program) <input type="checkbox"/> where there is an increase in the minimum length of time required to complete an existing approved degree program, the institution should be able to justify the additional costs incurred to the institution, government and the student. In making these determinations, institutions should consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> the impact of the program on funding and how the institution intends to finance and staff the proposed program <input type="checkbox"/> the additional costs (capital expenditures, additional faculty, etc), and the sources of additional funds (external grants, donations, government grants) <input type="checkbox"/> how other programs will be affected (joint offerings, closure, rationalization, decreased in size, etc.), including how and whether or not any cost savings will be involved.
4. Institutional Appropriateness	<input type="checkbox"/> the university should ensure the program is related to institutional mission, academic plans, and/or departmental plans <input type="checkbox"/> the university should ensure the program fits into the broader array of program offerings, particularly areas of teaching and research strength, collateral areas of study, etc. In making these determinations, institutions should consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> notable resources available to the program demonstrating institutional appropriateness e.g. Chairs, institutes, centres; unique library collections or resources; facilities such as computer, laboratory, other acquisitions, etc. <input type="checkbox"/> external financial support demonstrating strength such as facility/equipment donations, other external donations, grants, etc.

Criteria	Institutional Check List
5. Student Demand	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> the University should ensure there is convincing evidence of student demand for the program <p>In making these determinations, institutions should consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> projected enrolment levels for the first five years of operation (If the program is in operation, use actual and projected data) <input type="checkbox"/> intended steady-state annual enrolment and steady-state total enrolment projections and the year(s) in which they will be achieved <input type="checkbox"/> evidence of student demand through application statistics, for example: number of enquiries, applications received, number of qualified applicants, use of macro-indicator data (graduate only) <input type="checkbox"/> origin of student demand (% domestic and visa students; graduate only - the undergraduate or master's programs from which students would be drawn) <input type="checkbox"/> duration of the projected demand (e.g. short, medium or long-term demand from specified sources) <input type="checkbox"/> evidence of review and comment by appropriate student organization(s)
6. Societal Need	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> the University should ensure there is convincing evidence that graduates of the program are needed in specifically identified fields (academic, public and/or private sector) <input type="checkbox"/> for professional program areas, the university should ensure congruence with current regulatory requirements of the profession <p>In making these determinations, institutions should consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> dimensions of the societal need for graduates (e.g. socio-cultural, economic, scientific, technological) <input type="checkbox"/> geographic scope of the societal need for graduates (e.g. local, regional, provincial, national) <input type="checkbox"/> trends in societal need for graduates <input type="checkbox"/> duration of the societal need (e.g. short, medium, or long-term) <p>Examples of evidence for the above would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> letters from a variety of potential employers of graduates who have seen the curriculum and commented upon the need for graduates within their organization and, more broadly, in their field of endeavour <input type="checkbox"/> professional society and/or association comments about the need for graduates based on a review of the curriculum <input type="checkbox"/> employment surveys, survey of the number of positions advertised in, for example, the CAUT Bulletin, AUCC University Affairs, etc. <input type="checkbox"/> statistics related to the number of Ontario students leaving the province to study in the same field elsewhere in Canada or abroad

Criteria	Institutional Check List
7. Duplication	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> the University should cite similar programs offered by other institutions in the Ontario university system <input type="checkbox"/> the University should provide evidence of justifiable duplication based on societal need and/or student demand in cases where there are programs in the system that are the same or similar (Comments from other institutions regarding proposed new undergraduate programs will be sought by the Ministry. Comments regarding Health Science programs will also be sought from the Ministry of Health) <input type="checkbox"/> the University should indicate innovative and distinguishing aspects of the program <input type="checkbox"/> the University should indicate why the institution is offering the program on a “stand-alone” basis rather than merging its resources with another institution in a joint program