ONTARIO UNIVERSITIES
COUNCIL on QUALITY ASSURANCE

REPORT ON THE QUALITY ASSURANCE AUDIT OF WESTERN UNIVERSITY

JUNE 2014

Table of Contents

Introduction

The Western University of London Ontario opened its doors in 1881. At that time, it had four faculties – Arts, Divinity, Law and Medicine. Today, Western University has 12 Faculties and, together with its three affiliated university colleges (Brescia University College, Huron University College, and Kings University College), it offers more than 400 different specializations, majors and minors at the undergraduate level. Western University also offers a full slate of undergraduate, graduate and professional programs. Reported enrolment numbers in 2012 were approximately 25,350 undergraduate and 7,200 graduate students. The University's modular degree structure allows students to explore their interests and customize their degrees in many of its faculties as well as in its Continuing Studies and its School of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies. International students come from more than 100 countries and share in classroom experiences that broaden personal perspectives and understanding.

Western University is one of three universities to be audited in the second year of this first cycle of quality assurance audits under the new Quality Assurance Framework (QAF). The University had been audited during the first year of audits under the Undergraduate Program Review Audit Committee (UPRAC) in 1998; with its second UPRAC audit taking place in 2004. The timetable for audits under the QAF was based on the timetable in place for UPRAC.

The auditors wish to express their appreciation for the commitment Western University showed prior to, during and after the audit process. The University practiced extraordinary diligence in supplying all relevant documents and in following up on queries the Audit Team had prior to the site visit. During the site visit, Administrators, Faculty members, students and staff were forthcoming in supplying additional information concerning both the general and particular aspects of the IQAP process, and the Audit Team were impressed by the enthusiasm and commitment of all those involved in meetings. All members of Western University were proud of their successes and forthcoming on the current progress of a number of important program initiatives. Moreover, the Senior Administrative team demonstrated extraordinary commitment to incorporating the QAF and to supporting the development of the resources needed to support the evolution of the QAF as an integrated dimension of the academic enterprise at Western University. The auditors were particularly impressed with the ongoing work on a data management system, designed to track all steps in the quality assurance processes and to make the documentation easily available to all those involved in the proposal of new programs, the cyclical review of existing programs and the ongoing audit of quality assurance across the University.

The auditors wish to thank all those involved in the audit process itself. From members of Senior Administration to the Deans and Associate Deans, Department Heads, Departmental Officers, and Department members to students and staff, all involved in the audit provided essential information, informed opinion and helpful comments to make the audit process run smoothly. The staff members in the Provost's Office are

worthy of special mention since they managed and coordinated the front line of queries from the Audit Team with a wide variety of groups on the Western University campus.

AUDIT PROCESS

The QAF specifies that each university in Ontario will be audited once every eight years with the objective of determining whether or not the institution, since the last audit, has complied with the provisions of its Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP) for Cyclical Program Reviews as ratified by the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (Quality Council).

The Quality Council establishes a panel of auditors in collaboration with the Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents (OCAV) (QAF 5.1).

A. Assignment of no fewer than three auditors

The first step in the audit process is the assignment of no fewer than three auditors, by the Executive Director of the Quality Council, to conduct the institutional audit (QAF 5.2.1). The auditors selected are at arm's length from the institution that is undergoing the audit. They are accompanied on the audit visit by member(s) of the Quality Assurance Secretariat. The following comprised the audit team for the Western University audit (see brief biographical information in Appendix A).

- Dr. Caroline Andrew
- Dr. John ApSimon
- Dr. John Pierce
- Dr. Donna Woolcott, Quality Council Secretariat support
- Ms. Cindy Robinson, Quality Council Secretariat support

B. Auditors' independent selection of programs for audit

The next step in the audit process (QAF 5.2.2) involves the auditors independently selecting programs for audit, typically four undergraduate and four graduate cyclical program reviews. At least one of the undergraduate programs and one of the graduate programs will be a New Program or Major Modifications to an Existing Program approved within the period since the previous audit.

The Executive Director of the Quality Council authorizes the proposed selection, assuring, for example, a reasonable program mix. Specific programs may be added to the sample when an immediately previous audit has documented causes for concern, and when so directed in accordance with QAF 5.2.5 b. When the institution itself so requests, specific programs may also be audited. The auditors may consider, in addition to the required documentation, any other elements and related documentation stipulated by the institution in its IQAP.

_____

The auditors selected the following Western University programs for audit:

Cyclical Program Reviews:
- Environmental Science: BSc
- History: BA; BAH, Huron University College
- French: MA; PhD
- Geology/Geophysics: MSc; PhD

New Programs:
- Chemical Engineering: BESc, Dual Degree offered with Zhejiang University
- Master's of Public Health: MPH

Expedited Review:
- Transitional Justice and Post-Conflict Resolution: Collaborative program at the Master's and Doctoral levels

Major Modifications:
- Medical Biophysics: Clinical Physics Concentration

C. Desk audit of institutional practices

Step 3 involves a desk audit of the institutional quality assurance practices (QAF 5.2.3). Using the institution's records of the sampled cyclical program reviews and associated documents, this audit tests whether the institution's practice conforms to its own IQAP, as ratified by the Quality Council.[1] It is essential that the auditors have access to all relevant documents and information to ensure a clear understanding of the institution's practices. The desk audit serves to raise specific issues and questions to be pursued during the on-site visit and to facilitate the conduct of an effective and efficient on-site visit. The documentation to be submitted for the programs selected for audit includes all documents and other information associated with each step of the institution's IQAP, as ratified by the Quality Council and the record of any revisions of the institution's IQAP, as ratified by the Quality Council. Institutions may provide any additional documents at their discretion.

During the desk audit, the auditors will also determine whether or not the institution's web-based publication of the executive summaries of the Final Assessment Reports, and subsequent reports on the implementation of the review recommendations for the programs included in the current audit, meet the requirements of QAF 4.2.6. The auditors undertake to preserve the confidentiality required for all documentation and

---

[1] Changes to the institution's process and practices within the eight-year cycle are to be expected. The test of the conformity of practice with process will always be made against the ratified Institutional Quality Assurance Process that applies at the time the review is conducted.

communications and meet all applicable requirements of the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (FIPPA).* A list of the documents reviewed by the audit team is included in Appendix B.

D. On-site visit at institution

The auditors conducted an on-site visit with Western University from November 18 to 20, 2013. The site visit schedule is included in Appendix C. The purpose of the on-site visit is for the university to answer the auditors' questions and to address information gaps that may have arisen during the desk audit. The visit allows the auditors to get "a sufficiently complete and accurate understanding of the institution's application of its IQAP so that they can meet their audit responsibilities" (QAF 5.2.4).

E. Preparation of audit report

The audit report is produced following the site visit. As per QAF 5.2.5, the audit report provides a status report on the programs selected for audit. The status report will note the degree of compliance with the institution's IQAP as well as any notably effective policies or practices revealed in the course of the audit. Where appropriate, the report will make suggestions and recommendations and identify any causes for concern, as defined in QAF 5.2.5:

- **Suggestions** will be forward-looking, and are made by auditors when they identify opportunities for the institution to strengthen its quality assurance practices. Suggestions do not convey any mandatory obligations and sometimes are the means for conveying the auditors' province-wide experience in identifying good and, even on occasion, best practices. Institutions are under no obligation to implement or otherwise respond to the auditors' suggestions, though they are encouraged to do so.

- **Recommendations** are recorded in the auditors' report when they have identified failures to comply with the IQAP. These failures indicate discrepancies that weaken the integrity of academic standards or are necessary for effective quality assurance. The institution must address these recommendations.

- **Causes for concern** are potential structural weaknesses in quality assurance practices that auditors may identify (for example, when, in two or more instances, the auditors identify inadequate follow-up monitoring; a failure to make the relevant implementation reports to the appropriate statutory authorities; or the absence of the Manual).

The auditors prepare a draft report and a summary of the principal findings suitable for publication. The Quality Council Secretariat forwards a copy of both to the institution for comment. This consultation is intended to ensure that the report and associated summary do not contain errors or omissions of fact. The institution submits a response to the draft report and associated summary within 60 days. The auditors may use this

response to revise their report and/or associated summary before submitting them to the Executive Director of the Quality Council who presents them to the Audit Committee. The Audit Committee reviews the report and associated summary and recommends approval to the Quality Council (QAF 5.2.6).

The approved report and associated summary are forwarded by the Quality Council Secretariat to the institution, and to the Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents (OCAV), the Council of Ontario Universities (COU) and the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities (MTCU) for information (QAF 5.2.7). The approved summary of the overall findings, together with a record of the recommendations, are posted on the website of the Quality Council. These are also forwarded to the institution for them to post on their website (QAF 5.2.8).

Within a year of the publication of the final audit report, the institution will inform the auditors, through the Secretariat, of the steps it has taken to address the recommendations. The auditors will draft a response commenting on the scope and adequacy of the institution's response, together with a draft summary of their commentary, suitable for publication. The auditors' response and summary are then submitted to the Audit Committee, which considers them and makes a recommendation to the Quality Council regarding the acceptability of the institutional one-year follow-up response (QAF 5.2.9). The auditors' summary of the scope and adequacy of the institution's response is posted on the Quality Council website and a copy is sent to the institution for publication on its website; copies are also sent to OCAV, COU and MTCU for information (QAF 5.2.10).

Status Report on Programs Reviewed

This section of the report provides details of the audit results for each of the sampled program reviews. In each case, the report identifies any gaps in compliance with Western University's Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP) as well as examples of notably effective policies and practices. The report on each review contains suggestions and recommendations, as appropriate. Western University's IQAP came into effect after it was ratified by the Quality Council in April 2011, with a revised IQAP ratified in September 2012.

CYCLICAL PROGRAM REVIEWS

1. Environmental Science: Undergraduate

a. Introduction

Environmental Sciences began at Western University in 1991 with a three-year degree in Environmental Science and several four-year honors degrees evolved and were comprised of mandatory common courses plus selections from Biology, Chemistry, Geology and Geography. In 2004, the University moved to a four-year program as the standard degree, although students are still able to graduate after three years if they so choose. The revised undergraduate program was based on modules. The current undergraduate programs in Environmental Science include a Minor, Major, Specialization and Honors Specialization module. Undergraduate Science students who have an interest in the Environment may choose modules, as can students from other faculties who wish to switch disciplines and focus on their environmental interests. A reciprocal agreement exists to allow students who have completed the Environmental Technology program at Fanshawe College or modules in Environmental Science at Western University to coordinate the completion requirements of the other program. Students in the modules graduate with a BSc with a label showing the minor, major, specialization, or honors specialization in Environmental Science. Teaching staff of or associated with the Centre for Environment and Sustainability offer six courses.

The cyclical program review was slated to begin three years prior to its actual initiation in 2011-12. It then followed the process outlined in section 4 of the Western University IQAP. The self-study was submitted 15 February 2012 and the external consultants' site visit took place on 6 March 2012.

RECOMMENDATION 1: Western University must ensure that every program is reviewed at least once every eight years.

b. The Self-Study

The self-study included a clear description of the history of the program and its emergence from a series of courses in Chemistry, Earth Sciences, and Biology. The self-study also made strong connections with larger initiatives in pursuing the study of sustainability and presented a clear articulation of the connection of this set of programs with the Faculty and University Strategic Plans. Those engaged in producing the self-study are to be commended for the additional relevant data they collected and for utilizing the services of the Alumni Office to obtain useful information related to activities undertaken by students after completing the program.

The self-study also includes a number of strategic academic plans, including the Western Strategic Plan, and while this does show the submission to be inclusive—one might say almost to a fault—some of these documents do not add substantially to the submission and might be removed.

The self-study also does not consistently address all aspects of the evaluation criteria set out in the IQAP, section 4.3. While the learning outcomes are indicated in chart form on page 20, they are not extended into a discursive explanation of how the UDLES are manifest in specific learning outcomes for each of the programs. Since the UDLES vary between Honors and non-Honors programs, the learning outcomes would vary as well. While the learning outcomes are presented on each course syllabus, the consolidation of these into program-wide outcomes would help define the programs more fully and ensure conformity with the IQAP. The self-study does a good job of indicating the "Fundamentals of Environmental Science" and the document could go further in stating how the individual programs may emphasize different topics, objectives and learning outcomes. In addition, there are useful outlines of the specific program modules, and additional information could be added to supplement these outlines based on section 4.3.3 of the evaluation criteria in the IQAP. Matters such as how "the curriculum addresses the current state of the discipline or field of study" (section 4.3.3 a) or how the "mode(s) of delivery … meet the program's identified learning outcomes" (section 4.3.3 c) would bring the self-study into fuller conformity with the IQAP protocols.

The Quality Assurance Framework (QAF) allows for a single omnibus report to be written for a program which has several components (or locations, modes of delivery, etc.) but requires "distinctive attributes of each discrete program are reviewed and reported on by the reviewers." (QAF p.18) The documentation reviewed by the auditors including the self-study and the external consultants' report did not appear to meet this expectation as specific reference was not made to all program components that were the subject of this review.

RECOMMENDATION 2: Western University must ensure that all sub-programs are included in the self-study documentation and reviewed by external consultants as part of cyclical program reviews.

The self-study does not address the IQAP requirement to identify the role of faculty, staff and students involved in the preparation of the self-study. At the site visit the auditors learned that the self-study was prepared by two authors. The auditors met with a student who indicated that he had been invited to meetings about the review and the preparation of the self-study. He was not sure what his role was at the outset and did not receive a copy of the self-study. The University might consider developing guidance for students who are involved in quality assurance activities.

RECOMMENDATION 3: Western University must ensure the inclusion of a methodology section outlining the role of faculty, staff and students in preparation of the self-study for cyclical program reviews.

SUGGESTION 1: Western University should consider developing a student's guide about their role in quality assurance activities as outlined in the IQAP.

The auditors are not certain about how the review and approval of the self-study was undertaken in the case of this program review. The IQAP specifies that, "The Vice-Provost (Academic Programs and Students), or his/her delegate, will review and approve the self-study report for undergraduate programs undergoing cyclical reviews. The Vice-Provost (Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies), or his/her delegate, will review and approve the self-study report for graduate programs undergoing cyclical review." The program representatives who met with the Audit Team indicated that the self-study had gone to the Provost's Office but did not recall having any feedback on its contents.

RECOMMENDATION 4: Western University's identified authorities who approve the self-study must ensure the content of the self-study includes all the relevant information required by the IQAP.

SUGGESTION 2: Western University should consider developing a formal review protocol designed to ensure greater consistency between the information provided in the self-study and the IQAP requirements.

The auditors learned that the Teaching Support Centre (TSC) provided some assistance to the program as it prepared for review. Reference was made to "Western Guide to Curriculum Review" as a useful document for departments undertaking program reviews. The auditors were provided with a copy of the publication and met with members of the TSC and saw a demonstration of a high level of enthusiasm from TSC staff to providing assistance. The auditors noted that the Guide referred to above was published before the new QAF was implemented and does not appear to refer explicitly to the IQAP. Learning outcomes are integral to the new IQAP yet appear to be a secondary consideration in the Guide.

SUGGESTION 3: Western University should update its Guide to Curriculum Review to ensure that it is consistent with the IQAP and provides more focus on learning outcomes and the relationship to IQAP requirements.

c. The External Review

The auditors learned both from the documentation and their discussions with the departmental representatives that there were a number of issues and challenges with the review. The auditors were not certain about how the external review team was chosen and how it was instructed on its review role and responsibilities. The consultants' report did not address all of the evaluation criteria in the IQAP and did not comment on all of the program options that were being reviewed. The external consultants made some strong recommendations concerning leadership, resources and issues of accreditation for the programs. A detailed response from members of the program indicated some concern with the recommendations themselves and a desire to discuss the implications of these recommendations more fully. Indeed, the faculty members the auditors met with indicated that some of the recommendations were surprising, particularly since they did not come up in the meetings held during the site visit. The draft Final Assessment Report produced by the internal reviewer (for SUPR-U dated 13 June 2012) carries forward recommendations about the directorship, rejoining the Canadian Universities Environmental Science Network and seeking accreditation, but the Responsibility and Resource sections of the Report are left blank, perhaps indicating some uncertainty about the implementation of these recommendations. The follow-up report on 22 May 2013 includes a very full commentary on the accreditation issue, demonstrating why this might not be appropriate in this instance. The auditors speculate that there perhaps should have been more avenues of communication open between the program members and Senior Administration concerning the external consultants' report earlier on and a method of expressing greater concern about the nature of their report. Moreover, while the report addressed the issues of resources and accreditation very thoroughly, it did not offer detailed discussion of the program structure and curriculum (4.3.3), the assessment of teaching and learning (4.3.4) or a number of factors under quality and other indicators section (4.3.8).

The IQAP does not explicitly require the external consultants to use the evaluation criteria listed in IQAP section 4.3. The Quality Assurance Framework stipulates that universities will evaluate programs using the criteria it specifies (and universities are allowed to add to these criteria if they so wish). The auditors reviewed the instructions provided to review team members for graduate programs and saw the template for the external consultants' report. The auditors were not provided with the instructions given to the Environmental Science programs. A review of the instructions provided by SGPS for graduate programs indicated that these were not consistent with the requirements of the Quality Assurance Framework (see section 4.2.4 c extracted below):

> "The Review Committee's evaluation and report(s) (preferably one joint report, where circumstances permit) should address the substance of both the self-study report and the evaluation criteria set out in Framework Section 4.3."

SUGGESTION 4: Western University should review its IQAP to seek ways in which it may be made clearer and more user-friendly as a means of ensuring it is consistent with the Quality Assurance Framework.

RECOMMENDATION 5: Western University must enhance the methods of briefing the external consultants on the requirement to address all the evaluation criteria set out in the University's IQAP.

SUGGESTION 5: The use of templates, guidelines, formalized verbal instructions and review with the Review Team should all be strengthened to ensure consistency with the IQAP and the Quality Assurance Framework.

SUGGESTION 6: Western University should consider implementing a process for dealing with external consultants' reports that do not meet the requirements of the IQAP.

d. Approval Processes

The auditors' review of the Final Assessment Report[2] indicates it addresses very briefly a very few high level results of the review. Because the review did not include all of the program components and because many of the evaluation criteria could not be assessed because the self-study and external consultants' report did not contain relevant analysis, the Final Assessment Report reflects these shortcomings. The auditors noted that, in this particular instance, the Final Assessment Report does not identify who is responsible for ensuring recommendations are implemented nor for providing resources required. The University might find the guidance recently added to the Guide to the Quality Assurance Framework on Best Practice Advice on Preparing Final Assessment Reports to be of assistance in addressing the gaps in the preparation of the Final Assessment Report.

RECOMMENDATION 6: Western University must ensure that Final Assessment Reports and Implementation Plans contain all of the required elements, as identified in the IQAP.

As the cyclical program review documents moved through the approval process, the entire review documentation package (external consultants' report, Dean's response and Final Assessment Report) was recommended by SUPR-U on 13 June 2012 as "Good Quality with Report" and moved on to SCAPA 12 September 2012 where it was recommended to Senate which received and approved the report on 21 September 2012. The review documentation then went on for information to the Committee on Program Review, the Provost, the Vice-Provost Undergraduate and the Board of Governors. The Final Assessment Report was also shared with the relevant Dean to be

---

[2] Western University refers to this as "Internal Reviewers' Summary" in the IQAP

used as part of the Annual Planning Process. The Final Assessment Report was received by the Quality Council in October 2012. The package of materials the auditors reviewed also included the follow-up report of 22 May 2013 produced by the Department which was received by SUPR-U on 13 June 2012 which changed the evaluation of the program to "Good Quality."

2. History BA, BAH Programs: Undergraduate

a. Introduction

The undergraduate History programs offered through Huron University College assessed in this review include the Honours Specialization in History (9.0 courses), the Specialization in History (9.0 courses), the Major in History (6.0 courses), and the Minor in History (4.0 courses). As an academic unit in an affiliated College, the Department of History offers its courses and degree programs which are independent from but complementary to the History offerings at Western University. There are some shared courses, and students from Huron may take courses at Western University and vice versa (subject to timetable and space constraints). Regular consultation, both formal and informal, ensures the two programs are complementary and not conflicting or competing.

The cyclical program review for the Department of History at Huron University College was among the first undertaken under the IQAP. Discussions about program review began as early as 2009 with general notice from the Dean at the time that a review process would begin in the near future, and a considerable amount of work on the mapping of degree level expectations and surveying of students was well underway before the formal review began. Workshops on preparing for and undertaking the review were also available in these early stages. The auditors noted that the Dean at an affiliated college takes on a significantly more intensive role in the process of the review than the Deans on the main campus.

SUGGESTION 7: **The IQAP should include a description of the role of the Dean of affiliated colleges in cyclical program reviews.**

The program review proper began with a distribution of the self-study in December 2011 followed by an external consultant's site visit on 19 January 2012. The review was approved at SUPR-U on 13 June 2012 as Good Quality with Report in One Year. The review then went on to SCAPA on 12 September 2012 and to Senate for final approval on 21 September 2012. The final stages of the process saw a summary report move on for information to the Board of Governors, the Committee on Program Review, the Vice Provost Undergraduate and the Provost. A Final Assessment Report was received by the Quality Council in October 2012.

b. The Self-Study

Overall, the cyclical program review for the History Department at Huron University College clearly sets out the connection of the programs to the Mission and Strategic Plan of the College and to the Academic Plan for Faculty of Arts and Social Science. The self-study is particularly strong in setting out distinct learning outcomes for each of the undergraduate programs and maps each History course on a matching set of UDLES. The meticulous concern for these learning outcomes and for undergraduate teaching is further demonstrated in Table 1 on page 32 where a detailed list of the alignment of methods of teaching is set against a wide range of pedagogical styles, including inquiry-based, research-based and problem-solving learning (to mention just a few).

While the treatment of the UDLES and the connection of these to the individual courses and to methods of pedagogy offer a potential model for other cyclical program reviews, there is still room for improvement on overall treatment of the evaluation criteria set out in section 4.3 of the Western University IQAP. Discussion of matters connected to Program Structure and Curriculum (IQAP 4.3.3.) including such matters as "how the curriculum addresses the current state of the discipline or field of study" and the connection of the well-developed UDLES with the assessment of Teaching and Learning criteria in section 4.3.4 would enhance the excellent work present in the CPR. Moreover, the various criteria outlined under "Quality and Other Indicators" (IQAP 4.3.8) could be addressed more fully. The current cyclical program review gives clear indications of the research and scholarly records of the Faculty, their qualifications and their commitment to student mentoring. However, more detail on class sizes, graduation rates and other related criteria from this section could be further explored. **See RECOMMENDATION 4.**

At the meeting of the auditors with those involved in compiling the self-study report, there was some discussion of the process of obtaining data for the self-study. It is understandable that there were some difficulties in assembling the desired data. However, in the discussion, it became clear that, while there has been a move to standardize the data supplied to all Western University programs undergoing a CPR through the Office of Institutional Planning and Budgeting (IBP), there is no formal arrangement for the affiliated Colleges to receive standardized data. Currently the affiliated Colleges compile their own data in consultation with the College Registrar. The auditors are concerned about the integrity of data compiled in this way. The development and distribution of standardized data by the institution for all its constituent members is essential to the integrity of the data and the consistency of standards developed from that data. The auditors heard concerns expressed by the affiliated colleges that extra costs might be incurred in order to obtain data from IBP. It is hoped this would not be an impediment to the use of standardized data.

SUGGESTION 8: To ensure data integrity, all academic units at Western University and its affiliated colleges should receive appropriate data for use in the self-study for cyclical program reviews.

An additional critical piece of information missing from the self-study is reference to the last review undertaken for this program. The QAF states that "Concerns and recommendations raised in previous reviews" should be addressed as part of the self-study (4.2.3 c. 5). During the site visit, the auditors determined that the concerns raised in the last review had been addressed, but it is important that information about the last review and the steps taken to address any recommendations form a starting point for the self-study.

RECOMMENDATION 7: **Western University must ensure that concerns and recommendations raised in previous reviews are taken into account as part of the subsequent self-study as specified in the IQAP.**

The IQAP indicates that "The Vice-Provost (Academic Programs and Students), or his/her delegate will approve the self-study report for undergraduate programs undergoing cyclical review" (4.2.2). The IQAP should be clearer about when this approval takes place. The auditors learned that the self-study goes to the Educational Policy Committee for review and that these Committees may also request changes. After it is "approved" by the Educational Policy Committee, the Dean's Office sends it to the external consultants. The role of the Educational Policy Committee in relation to the cyclical program reviews is not stated in the IQAP.

SUGGESTION 9: **Western University should clarify in the IQAP who approves the self-study and at what stage(s) in the process.**

SUGGESTION 10: **Western University should consider including a description of the role of Educational Policy Committees in the cyclical program review process as part of its IQAP.**

c. The External Review

The external review process faced some challenges associated with early stages in implementation of the cyclical review process under the new IQAP. As a result, the review went ahead with one external consultant instead of two required in IQAP (4.2.3.1), and it proved impossible to find an undergraduate student to form part of the review team (also stipulated in 4.2.3.1). It is clear to the auditors that these challenges have been subsequently remedied with clearer processes developed to ensure the selection of appropriate membership for the review team consistent with IQAP.

The report by the external consultant demonstrates careful attention to several aspects of the self-study and adds comment based on full discussions with departmental faculty members and students. However, the review itself does not seem to take full account of the range of evaluation criteria set out in IQAP section 4.3. Although the exact correspondence with the external consultant could not be located, the auditors did receive a document of "Instructions to External Reviewer(s)" which set out a list of evaluation criteria parallel to those in IQAP section 4.3. It is unclear from the audit

whether the manner of instruction to the external consultant needs to be more fully developed or whether concern resides with the failure of the consultant to discuss more fully all aspects of the evaluation criteria. The department expressed general satisfaction with the external review; however, there was also some acknowledgement that the external review did not provide new insights for enhancement of the content or delivery of the academic programs. **See RECOMMENDATION 5 and SUGGESTION 5**.

d. Approval Processes

As the cyclical program review documents moved through the approval process, the steps through SUPR-U, SCAPA and Senate were clearly documented. However, while there was a response from the Departmental Chair in the documentation, no response from the "relevant Dean" was included (as per IQAP 4.2.3.3). In the auditors' meetings during the site visit, the Dean indicated that he had not been invited to respond, which was in violation of the IQAP. Deans often play an important role in responding to these reports because they generally hold resource allocation and policy responsibilities.

SUGGESTION 11: Western University should consider strengthening its IQAP by requiring and clarifying the role of the Dean in responding to the external consultants' report in cyclical program reviews.

In addition, while it was clear in the course of the site visit that the Vice-Provost (Academic Programs and Students) was aware of the documents, adherence to the process outlined in IQAP, section 4.2.3.3, would be more transparent if there were some formal mechanism for indicating the Vice-Provost's approval.

SUGGESTION 12: Western University should consider establishing a stage in the process at which the Vice-Provost has seen and accepted the content and findings of the Review before the documents move on to Senate Committees.

The auditors heard that the program did not fully understand why there was a recommendation of "Good Quality with Report."

SUGGESTION 13: Programs should be informed about the reasons for "with Report" status assigned by SUPR-U or SUPR-G.

A review of the Final Assessment Report indicates it addresses very briefly a very few high level results of the review. All of the program components and many of the evaluation criteria could not be assessed because the self-study and external consultants' report did not contain relevant analysis. Action by the program to address concerns is limited when the Final Assessment Report is not as comprehensive as defined in the IQAP. **See RECOMMENDATION 6**.

3. French MA and PhD Programs: Graduate

a. Introduction

The audit of the cyclical program review for the Department of French at Western University included the following graduate programs:

A 1-year MA program comes in three variants (in both the linguistics and literature streams):

 i. MA without thesis, with course work only
 ii. MA with a short thesis (*mémoire*)
 iii. MA with thesis

A 4-year PhD (in both the linguistics and literature streams):

The cyclical program review was among the first undertaken at the University under the new IQAP.

The external consultants' site visit was undertaken on the first and second of March 2012. The review documents (external consultants' report, the Chair's response, and the draft Final Assessment Report) then went on to SUPR-G on 14 June 2012. The Final Assessment Report went to SCAPA on 12 September 2012 and finally to Senate on 21 September 2012. The review was approved by all three bodies. The documents were also submitted for information to the Graduate Education Council (after approval by SUPR-G) and to the Board of Governors (September 2013) and the Committee on Program Review. The review also was seen by the Provost for final budgetary review and by the Vice-Provost Graduate, who shares the reports with the relevant Dean or Deans so that information from the review can be used in the Annual Planning Process. The Final Assessment Report was received by the Quality Council on 31 July 2013.

b. The Self-Study

The self-study delivers a full sense of the graduate programs in French at Western University, and gives a picture of a department fully engaged with teaching, research and service to the discipline generally, especially in its presentation of and participation in conferences. The introductory sections on "Goals and Objectives of the programme in Relation to Graduate Degree Level Expectations" (section 1.2) shows the department engaged in developing detailed learning outcomes for each of its programs. The learning outcomes also include commentary on how particular aspects of the programs (for instance the *mémoire*) fit into these outcomes (under Level of Application of Knowledge, p. 3).

The self-study contains a brief section on the methodology used for the self-study (1.3, p. 6). The methodology demonstrates the department's careful attention to process and the inclusion of faculty, students and staff in production of the self-study, in conformity

with the IQAP. The way in which this self-study included this information might become a model for other programs preparing their self-studies.

The auditors found some areas where improvements could be made to the self-study. Challenges arose in the area of data availability and use. There appear to have been some institutional delays in providing data, and the Department did, in some instances, attempt to create its own data to facilitate the completion of the self-study. It does appear that a more standardized approach to the production and distribution of data has been undertaken by the institution as a whole. However, there may need to be some consideration of a balance between summary data provided by the University and the potential need for occasional individualized data required in assessing unique components of departmental academic activities (such as the *mémoire* and its effectiveness in the French program).

In some other areas, the self-study could address more directly the IQAP evaluation criteria (section 4.3). For instance, section 4.3.3. of the evaluation criteria indicates that the self-study indicates "how the curriculum addresses the current state of the discipline or field of study." This broad-based and important question was not discussed directly. Such points of discussion become increasingly important in the educational field and can also aid a Department in addressing strengths and areas for improvement, as well as giving the Department a sense of what areas are not wise to pursue in an increasingly resource-limited environment.

While the self-study did not contain full discussion of some aspects of the evaluation criteria, it did tend to present almost an overabundance of material in other areas. The Faculty qualifications and research and scholarly records were fully represented (as they should be), but it is not necessary to include the full programs from a range of conferences to indicate the vibrant involvement of all Faculty members in scholarly activities. The CVs from each Faculty member indicate this adequately. **See RECOMMENDATION 4.**

The QAF (section 4.2.3 c. 5) indicates that cyclical program reviews should address "concerns and recommendations raised in previous reviews." The self-study did not mention previous reviews. Inclusion of some discussion of the recommendations from previous reviews and the action on them would be instrumental in showing the progression of the Department and its programs**. See RECOMMENDATION 7.**

Finally, it is clear that in the instance of this Department, coherence between the Undergraduate and Graduate Programs could lead to the possibility of undertaking a Review of both programs at the same time. The auditors heard this suggestion from program representatives at the audit site visit.

c. The External Review

The process for selecting the external consultants and ensuring they fulfilled the condition of being at arm's length from the Department was in conformity with the Western University IQAP. However, the consultants' report did not fully address the evaluation criteria set out in IQAP section 4.3. In particular, assessment of the learning outcomes in relation to "Program Structure and Curriculum" (4.3.3) and "Assessment of Teaching and Learning" (4.3.4)—sections of increasing importance in a cyclical program review—were not discussed or assessed. It is difficult to determine fully the nature of the instruction the consultants received, and after the report was submitted, it is not clear what redress there may be for limitations in the report itself. Interviews with Department members revealed that the impacts of the external review were somewhat limited. The external report pointed out issues the Department was well aware of but did not highlight new directions for enhancement of the existing practices. At the site visit, the auditors were provided with a copy of the instructions that were provided to the external consultants, including a template for their report. The template did not reflect the evaluation criteria included in Section 4.3 of Western University's IQAP, except at a highly rolled up level. There is no mention of learning outcomes in either the instructions or external consultants' template, for example. Indeed, there was some opinion among departmental members that the review at this point seemed much like the OCGS process, and it did seem to the auditors that the self-study and external review did not take full advantage of the new opportunities offered in a consideration of learning outcomes in relation to admission requirements, program structure and curriculum, assessment of teaching and learning and other areas contained in the evaluation criteria (section 4.3). **See RECOMMENDATION 5 and SUGGESTION 5**.

d. The Approval Process

As an early program under review, the experiences of the French Department may not be typical of those which have followed. It appears an Associate Dean was not directly involved in the process (as is the case currently). There did not appear to be a formal response to the Review by the Dean or Vice-Provost, but the other stages of the process seemed consistently followed. **See SUGGESTIONS 11 and 12.**

The Final Assessment Report was approved by SUPR-G (June 14, 2012) and SCAPA (September 12, 2012), Senate (September 21, 2012) and submitted to the Quality Council on July 31, 2013.

The auditors found that the Final Assessment Report does not meet the requirements of the IQAP because it does not contain sufficient detail about any elements of the review, nor the distinct programs involved. The University might find the Best Practice Advice on Preparing Final Assessment Reports now available on the Quality Council's website to be of assistance in preparing Final Assessment Reports that meet the requirements of the Quality Assurance Framework and the IQAP. **See RECOMMENDATION 6**.

4. Geology/Geophysics: Graduate

a. Introduction

This cyclical program review included the graduate programs in the Geology and Geophysics streams of in the Department of Earth Sciences. For both the Geology and Geophysics programs, the Master's program leads to the degree of Master of Science (MSc) and the Doctoral programs lead to the degree of PhD.

The graduate degrees in Geology offered include the following:

- MSc in Geology (thesis based);
- MSc in Geology (course-based);
- PhD in Geology (thesis-based only).

In addition, the Geology Program offers the following joint degrees:

- Collaborative Program in Environmental Science (MSc and PhD);
- Collaborative Program in Planetary Science (MSc and PhD);
- Collaborative Program in "Mining Law" (joint degree of MSc in Geology and JD in the Faculty of Law).

The graduate degrees in Geophysics are:

- MSc in Geophysics (thesis based);
- MSc in Geophysics (course-based);
- PhD in Geophysics (thesis-based only).

In addition, the Geophysics Program offers the following joint degrees:

- Collaborative Program in Environmental Science (MSc and PhD);
- Collaborative Program in Planetary Science (MSc and PhD);
- Collaborative Program in "Mining Law" (joint degree of MSc in Geophysics and JD in Faculty of Law).

The Program Review followed the protocol outlined in IQAP section 4. The external consultants made their on-site visit on 17-18 April 2012. The cyclical program review documentation (the external consultants' report, the response of the program, and the draft Final Assessment Report) was recommended for approval at SUPR-G on 20 September 2012. The Final Assessment Report went to SCAPA on 3 October 2012, and received final University approval by Senate on 19 October 2012. Information concerning the approval went on to the Provost, Vice-Provost Graduate, the Committee on Program Review, and the Board of Governors (on its September 2013 agenda). The Final Assessment Report was also shared with the relevant Dean to be addressed in the Annual Planning Process after all approvals were obtained. Finally, the Final Assessment Report was received by the Quality Council in August 2013.

b. The Self-Study

There was no indication in the documentation provided as to the initiation by the University authorities of the cyclical review although the IQAP indicates that the Provost is responsible for cyclical program reviews.

SUGGESTION 14: Western University should institute a formal notification system to signal the start of the cyclical program review. Such a notification system would help in tracking the time taken to complete a review.

The requirements for the self-study are described in the IQAP in Sections 4.2.2.1 and 4.2.2. The auditors did not find evidence that the involvement of faculty, staff and students (from the description in the briefs, and in particular in the sections on "Method Used for the Self-Study,") met the requirements in the IQAP. It was written by one person with major input from the Graduate Committee and indications were given that comments had been added by more professors. The self-study included lengthy descriptions of meetings held with students to get their reactions and input about the programs, but during the auditors' site visit it was made clear that the meetings with the students had been held the year before the self-study was written, something that was not clear in the written documentation.

While both the Geology and Geophysics graduate programs at a high level include full descriptions of the Graduate Degree Level Expectations, the written documentation contains no explicit discussion of learning outcomes for the programs and their sub-components. Thus it is not possible to review against relevant evaluation criteria in the IQAP. There was no information on the integrity of data (see IQAP 4.2.2). Other sections were well described in the self-studies. Commentary on the relation of assessment to outcomes and the structure of the program in relation to outcomes and objectives was also absent in the document (see IQAP 4.3.3 and 4.3.4). Resources, faculty qualifications and research activities, and student progression were very thoroughly covered in the documents. The auditors heard that the TSC provided good support for undergraduate program reviews. It may be that the School of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies would be a more appropriate source of support for graduate programs which are finding it challenging to transition to a learning outcomes approach as is required under the new QAF.

RECOMMENDATION 8: Western University must ensure that all existing programs develop and assess program level learning outcomes as part of the cyclical program review.

SUGGESTION 15: Western University should identify appropriate support for graduate programs in developing and assessing learning outcomes.

c. The External Review

Documentation related to the selection of external consultants is included in the audited materials along with the notes from the 20 September 2012 meeting of SUPR-G, but the paperwork does not include a consistent method of indicating how these individuals were chosen or how the arm's length relationship of the reviewers was assessed. Geology proposed six names with no discussion of the arm's length relationship and Geophysics proposed three names with only one with information about the arm's length relationship.

SUGGESTION 16: **Western University should develop a standardized method of indicating how external consultants were chosen and how each consultant satisfies the requirements for an "arm's-length" relationship to the department or program under review.**

The external consultants' report offers a thorough assessment of the progress of the programs since their last assessments, the adequacy of the resources required to support the programs and a variety of other areas where minor enhancements would improve the smooth operation of these graduate programs. The external review, however, did not address matters related to the outcomes of the programs, the admission requirements, program structure and curriculum criteria or assessment of teaching and learning (as set out in the evaluation criteria, IQAP section 4.3). **See RECOMMENDATION 5**.

d. The Approval Process

A letter in September 2012 to Departmental Graduate Chairs from SUPR-G co-chairs indicates that SCAPA recommended approval to continue and good quality. The recommendation was based on the SUPR-G's consideration of the program's written submissions, the external consultants' report, the Dean's and the program's response to the report and the internal reviewer's executive summary.

The Final Assessment Report was approved by SUPR-G (20 September 2012) and SCAPA (3 October 2012), Senate (19 October 2012) and submitted to the Quality Council on 31 July 2013.

As has been described in the cases of other audited program reviews, the Final Assessment Report does not meet the requirements of the IQAP. **See RECOMMENDATION 6.**

Discussions with those involved in cyclical program reviews indicated that faculty members were not always aware of the Final Assessment Report and Implementation plan approved by Senate and posted on Western University's website.

SUGGESTION 17: Western University should ensure individual academic units are notified concerning the Final Assessment Report and expected follow up, if any, on cyclical program reviews approved by Senate.

CYCLICAL PROGRAM REVIEW SCHEDULE

The Audit Team compared the list of programs offered at both the undergraduate and graduate level to its schedule for cyclical review of existing programs. It found a few examples of programs offered, but not evident on the schedule of reviews. For example, the Master of Financial Economics, the BSc joint program in Chemical Engineering, and the Physiology and Pharmacology MSc/PhD programs, although in the latter instance, the Schedule notes Pharmacology and Toxicology was reviewed in 2010/11. The Schedule of Reviews is not as comprehensive or as descriptive as might be ideal in that it does not indicate where there are multiple sites of delivery or partner institutions involved. Further, it does not indicate the date of last review, and therefore the auditors could not verify if the eight-year maximum review cycle requirement was being met. **See RECOMMENDATION 1.**

RECOMMENDATION 9: Western University must include on the Periodic Review Schedule all programs offered and indicate where there are partner institutions and multiple sites.

SUGGESTION 18: Including the date of the last review on the Periodic Review Schedule will assist the University in monitoring that it is in compliance with the eight-year cycle.

NEW PROGRAM APPROVALS

5. Chemical Engineering, BESc (Dual Degree with Zhejiang University)

a. Introduction

The new Bachelor of Engineering Science in Chemical Engineering (International Collaboration) is a dual-degree program to be offered collaboratively by Western University and Zhejiang University. Designed as a "2 + 2" program, students will take their first two years of the program at Zhejiang University before transferring to Western University for Years 3 and 4. The two universities have collaborated on the curriculum of Years 1 and 2, and two additional bridging courses will ensure that students from Zhejiang University are prepared for the final two years of the program at Western University. Courses in Years 3 and 4 of the program are the same as Western University's current Bachelor of Engineering (Chemical Engineering).

The new program was approved using the procedures outlined in Section 2 of the Western University's IQAP: New Program Approvals. The program was developed by members of the Department of Chemical and Biochemical Engineering (CBE). The "Form for Submission of New Undergraduate Program Proposals" came to SUPR-U on 7 September 2011 and 28 September 2011. The two meetings involved discussion of two issues: first, the question of whether this proposal was a Major Modification of an existing program or a New Program was discussed and the second involved questions of accreditation for the program. Minutes of the 28 September 2011 meeting of SUPR-U confirm that: the proposal was to be treated as a new program rather than as a major modification; the external consultants were selected and a site visit conducted on 10 November 2011. After preparation of the external consultants' report, the summary report by the Internal Reviewer, the proposal then moved on for approval to SUPR-U on 25 January 2012, to SCAPA on 28 February 2012 and Senate on 17 February 2012. After these formal approvals, the new program was sent for information to the Board of Governors (September 2013), the Provost, the Vice-Provost Undergraduate and the Committee on Program Review. The final Quality Council approval came on 16 April 2012 after two submissions, one on 27 February 2012 and another on 30 March 2012.

b. Program Development

This innovative joint program appears to have had strong support from the department and from upper administration at Western University. It has central innovative features in connecting Western University with Zhejiang University in China and promoting student mobility while building on accredited features of the existing Chemical Engineering program at Western University. An interesting challenge arose in the early stages of the proposal in determining whether this was to be approved as a New Program or a Major Modification of an existing program. The documents clearly show that this matter was clarified at SUPR-U in conformity with the Western University IQAP (as per section 3.3), and it was decided that the proposal should move forward as a "New Program." The notes from the SUPR-U meeting of 28 September 2011 state that the "program will be considered as a new program as students will receive a different degree from what the other CPE graduates are receiving." It might be useful for a fuller rationale to be offered for such decisions since the IQAP, in its "Definitions" section and in section 3.3, offers a general outline of some of the distinctive features of a Major Modification, but this particular proposal also has some interesting overlaps with the existing degrees. For instance, there are many overlapping courses, and many of the same CBE Western University instructors teach the same courses, and it is not clear if the learning outcomes are significantly different from the pre-existing degree programs. The QAF states that "institutions are required, within their IQAP, to provide their internal definition of what constitutes a "significant change" in the requirements" as part of the definition of "Major Modifications" (section 3.3), and it is suggested that this process of distinguishing between Major Modifications and New Programs might be more fully defined and articulated in more detail in the IQAP. The role of the section on page 9 of the "Form for Submission of New Undergraduate Program Proposals" (section D.2) in determining the need for external consultants is not entirely clear. The section reads,

"Explain why external consultants would or would not be required to assess this proposed new program before adoption." Does this section allow for the use of external consultants even in an expedited review? Is it part of the determination of whether the program is New or a Major Modification? Again, the process for distinguishing between New and Major Modifications could be articulated more fully.

The proposal itself sets out many aspects of the complex relationship between the two universities, the admission requirements and the class sizes. Additional clarifications on these matters come in the responses by the Dean and the Department to the external consultants' report. However, the statement of the learning outcomes is not as clearly articulated in a standard format as they might be. The section on "Depth and Breadth of Knowledge," for instance, indicates that the program will "equip graduates with critical thinking and broad understanding in translational problem solving skills" but this objective of the course is not really a learning outcome. The latter would indicate what specific skill or outcome a student would achieve by the end of the program. Some of these generalized statements could be replaced by statements indicating that "by the end of this program, a student will know, comprehend or apply a set of" named skills or areas of knowledge.

RECOMMENDATION 10: Western University must develop learning outcomes, mapped to degree level expectations, for all new programs and ensure these are included in the New Program Proposal.

c. The External Review

The auditors were generally pleased to find that the external review followed the IQAP process closely. In a few instances areas for clarifying expectations of consultants and for indicating exactly how some parts of the process were facilitated were identified.

There is not much documentation to identify the way in which the external consultants were nominated and selected and how the arm's length protocol was checked. Details on these matters are clearly set out in the IQAP (section 2.2.3), but statements about how these parts of the process were observed are mainly anecdotal. The auditors noted that the documentation provided in the MPH proposal for the selection of external consultants could serve as a model to others. **See SUGGESTION 16**.

The content and role of the external consultants' report could also be clarified. The external consultants' report offers a general assessment of the program and makes some important recommendations concerning clarity in the description of the years of study (whether it is a 2 +1 +1 program or a 2 + 2 program, for instance), the number of students in the program and the need for adequate resources to help the exchange students adjust to the movement between institutions, and these matters are well addressed by the Dean and the Department in their responses. However, the external report addresses relatively few of the evaluation criteria set out in section 1.2 of the IQAP. Learning outcomes, mode of delivery, assessment of teaching and learning are

not discussed by the external consultants. The auditors heard that templates were given to the external consultants and there was a briefing for these reviewers, but it appears additional steps must be taken to ensure a full and meaningful review of new program proposals. **See RECOMMENDATION 5**.

The Department members interviewed indicated that they did not change the proposal after receiving the external consultants' report, but they did add a Mentorship component after the submission. The Department is to be commended for this action, but this important enhancement to the program was not recorded in the documentation.

Finally, the process for the writing of the summary recommendation by the internal reviewer is itself largely undocumented in the IQAP. The internal summary appears to be the document that goes to SUPR-U, and SCAPA (Exhibit VII on 8 February 2012 Agenda). It is not clear who was involved in writing the summary or if a template exists for these reports. Indeed the specific role or roles of the internal reviewer(s) was unclear to the auditors and at least in some of the audited program cases (including those for cyclical program reviews) the internal reviewer did not always appear to be sure of the role.

RECOMMENDATION 11: Western University must clarify the role(s) of the internal reviewer in the new program approval and the cyclical program review processes in the IQAP.

d. Subsequent Institutional Process

The approval processes set out in IQAP section 2.2.1 were followed.

The auditors did not see how the monitoring of this new program was initiated. The University clarified that the Annual Planning Process, led by the Deans, is how monitoring is conducted. In this case, the auditors did not see any documentation about how this particular program is being monitored. The steps for entering this new program in the review Cycle could be set out on the website or IQAP document would make the process more transparent.

The University provided the auditors with a demonstration of an impressive new workflow system for monitoring all stages of quality assurance, including program approvals. This instrument will likely assist the University to ensure that programs are entered into the Periodic Review Schedule.

6. Master of Public Health

a. Introduction

The proposed Master of Public Health (MPH) is an inter-faculty professional degree that is awarded for studies in areas related to public health practice.

The proposed MPH degree will be offered as a one year full time program. The curriculum is aligned with the guidelines for MPH programs defined by the PHAC, PCPHN, ASPH and CEPH, and is designed to meet the international standards for graduate level public health training. The aim is to prepare public health practitioners, leaders and change agents who will be able to synthesize the knowledge and skills from a variety of disciplines to define, critically assess, evaluate and address public health concerns. The graduates will have a common educational grounding that will enable them to work effectively with a broad spectrum of public health issues such as prevention sciences, global health, social determinants of health, health promotion and behaviour, and health policy, management and equity, among others related to public health.

The approval process followed the protocols for New Programs set out in section 2 of the IQAP. The initial proposal went to SUPR-G and was approved on 20 September 2012 approval to move forward with the full program proposal. Internal Reviewers and external consultants were selected by SUPR-G, and the on-site visit took place on 29 and 30 November 2012. SUPR-G then received the full package of materials including the external consultants' report, the program and Dean's response and the Final Assessment Report on 24 January 2013 at which meeting the program was recommended for approval. The documents were also recommended for approval at SCAPA on 6 February 2013 and were ultimately approved at Senate on 15 February 2013. Information on the approval of the program went to the Provost and Vice-Provost as well as to the Graduate Education Council, the Committee on Program Review and the Board of Governors (for the 15 April 2013 meeting). The program was approved by the Quality Council on 22 March 2013.

b. Program Development

The auditors found that the proposal for a Master in Public Health was extremely well written and provided a model for best practices in following the IQAP. The opening contextualization of the new program within the contexts of the Schulich School of Medicine and Dentistry, the Western Academic Plan and the larger framework of concerns for public health in Canada provided an excellent base for describing the program itself. Further the detailed description of the degree level expectations, learning outcomes and how the program supports and evaluates the outcomes could provide a model for future New Program proposals. The extensive mapping of learning outcomes and assessment provides a transparent and clear outline of the educational mission of

the program and its benefit to students. The proposal is also thorough in its outline of resources needed and how such resources will be deployed.

c. The External Review

In addition, the processes followed conform fully to the IQAP. The inclusion of the list of nominees for external consultants, with a brief CV, followed by statements concerning the arm's-length status of the consultants makes the selection process very transparent. The external consultants' report itself follows a template modeled directly on the evaluation criteria required by the IQAP, section 2.1 and the consultants speak directly to each element of the criteria. The documentation also shows that there was a detailed and productive examination of this proposal at all levels of approval, with detailed responses to the external consultants and very full commentary in the internal reviewers' summary report.

EXPEDITED REVIEW

7. Transitional Justice and Post-Conflict Reconstruction (Collaborative Program, Master's and Doctoral Levels)

a. Introduction

The collaborative graduate program in Transitional Justice and Post-Conflict Resolution was approved as a program in the School of Graduate and Post-doctoral Studies in May 2012. It is housed in the Department of Sociology within the Faculty of Social Sciences, and was developed from the Centre for Transitional Justice and Post-Conflict Reconstruction. It brings together faculty with teaching and research interests in areas such as transitional justice, reconciliation, criminal accountability, post-colonial legacies, legal reconstruction, the environment, human rights, economic justice, healing circles, and democracy. The program is open to Master's students and Doctoral students from the Faculties of Social Science (Participating Graduate Programs: History, Political Science, Sociology), Arts and Humanities (Participating Graduate Programs: English, French, Women's Studies and Feminist Research), Law (Participating Graduate Programs: MLS, LLM), and Theology (Participating Graduate Program: Theology, Huron University College).

The program was approved under the Expedited Approvals Process outlined in IQAP section 3. The development of the proposal itself involved extensive consultation, a number of rewrites and was supported in part by the Interdisciplinary Development Initiative (IDI) which provided funding that allowed for initiation of both an undergraduate and graduate program. A bi-weekly meeting with students was initiated. In 2012-2013 10 students registered in the program and this year five PhD and two MA students are enrolled and three PhD and one MA about to enroll. At the moment participating

departments include English, French, Women's Studies and Feminist Research, History, Political Science, Psychology, Sociology, Law, Theology. The proposal was submitted to SUPR-G on 16 February 2012 where it was approved and then on to SCAPA on 7 March 2012 where it received a recommendation to Senate, and it received final approval at Senate on 23 March 2012. Notice of the approval then went on to the Provost, the Vice-Provost Graduate and the Committee on Program Review, and report of the programs approval went to the relevant Deans who address the resource needs in the Academic Planning Process. The program proposal went to the Quality Council in two submissions (letter of 30 March 2012 to Quality Council's Appraisal Committee; letter of 2 May 2012 providing a table with learning outcomes; approval letter 24 May 2012 to Director; 22 May 2012 to Provost). It was drawn to the auditors' attention that this was an early program through the IQAP process and some of the items addressed below may have now been addressed.

b. The Proposal

The proposal sets out a clear sense of the basic objective of the program and its purpose: the basic objective of the program is to allow students the opportunity to "explore aspects of societal and state transition relating to development, democracy, the environment, the economy, human rights, politics, peace agreements and justice before, at the time of, and post-transition"; the purpose of the program is "to familiarize students with the emerging debates surrounding transitional justice and post-conflict reconstruction, and to allow for real world application of theoretical constructs and explanations." The objective and purpose of the program are laudable, but it is unfortunate that these are not also contextualized within the Academic Plan of the University or the Faculties involved in supporting the program. The strong social commitment expressed through the program speaks to the interests of the Faculties, Western University and Huron College University. There may have been some missed opportunities to underline these connections.

The proposal includes the graduate degree level expectations and "Intended learning outcomes" attached to each of these. The statements attached to these "learning outcomes" are not fully consistent with the concept of learning outcomes as "a specific description of what students will know, be able to do, or otherwise gain from a program or course"[3]. In discussions with those putting together the proposal, it was evident that more significant support on the development of learning outcomes should be provided. The reworking of these outcomes based on queries from the Quality Council improved the outcomes dimension of the proposal immensely. **See RECOMMENDATION 10.**

Several other aspects of the evaluation criteria set out in IQAP section 2.1. were not included in the proposal. While the structure of the program was clearly laid out, for

---

[3] Page 24 of the *Western Guide to Curriculum Review*

instance, the appropriateness of the Admission Requirements (2.1.2) or the program Structure (2.1.3) to the learning outcomes and degree level expectations were not described. Again the auditors understand some of the shortcomings in the proposal may have been the result of the early date of the submission under the new quality assurance processes, and it does appear steps are being taken to ensure that proposals address fully the IQAP requirements.

RECOMMENDATION 12: Western University must add a section to its IQAP on the Evaluation Criteria required for Major Modifications to existing programs as per the Quality Assurance Framework.

MAJOR MODIFICATION

8. Medical Biophysics (Introduction of a new module)

a. Introduction

The Major Modification introduced by the Faculty of Science and the Schulich School of Medicine and Dentistry is a new Honours Specialization module in Medical Biophysics (Clinical Physics Concentration) leading to a Bachelor of Medical Sciences (BMSc) degree. The new module has several purposes: it satisfies the basic physics requirements for admission into graduate or residency programs requiring Commission on Accreditation of Medical Physics Educational Programs (CAMPEP) accreditation; it allows students to include other undergraduate courses (e.g. Physiology) in the module which can be used for advanced standing in other graduate programs; it allows students to integrate classroom and practical laboratory-based learning; and the new Medical Biophysics course offers students the opportunity to engage in a research project topic involving a significant clinical physics component with diagnostic or therapeutic themes. The module is constructed from existing courses with one exception—the new Medical Biophysics course (4971E)—which provides a unique research opportunity for students in the module.

The introduction of the Medical Biophysics program followed the Major Modification process as outlined in the IQAP section 3.3. The submission reached SUPR-U on 26 October 2011 and received a recommendation to move forward to SCAPA for its 2 November 2011 meeting and then received approval at Senate on 18 November 2011. The program then went on for information to the Provost, the Vice-Provost Undergraduate, the Committee on Program Review and the Board of Governors. The document also was shared with Deans so that the program could become part of the Annual Planning Process. The Program was reported to the Quality Council in June 2012.

b. The Proposal

The proposal sets out a clear sense of objectives for the program, framed within the Academic Plans for the University and for the Department of Medical Biophysics. The rationale for the program in preparing students for the graduate or residency programs accredited by CAMPEP is fully set out and places the module in a larger social context. The proposal also sets out "Learning *Objectives*" for the program, but does not describe the "Learning *Outcomes*" required by the IQAP process. Since the proposal for this new module began before the IQAP was fully approved, it appears that the templates and conceptual framework required were not fully developed at this point, and therefore the full range of evaluation criteria required by the QAF and now incorporated in the IQAP were not taken into account in this proposal. In addition to the missing learning outcomes, sections connecting Modes of Delivery and Assessment of Teaching and Learning with learning outcomes were not included as part of the template. Moreover, the section on admission, progression and graduation requirements (section B.1) still asks about educational objectives, and the comments on this part of the proposal does not really address these matters. However, the auditors recognize the early stage of this proposal and commend Western University on the further development of proposal templates, further education on the importance of learning outcomes and an increasing regularization of the IQAP and its associated processes.

c. Approval Processes

The approval processes were well followed even in this early module proposal. Some additional clarity might be added to the process for distinguishing between a New Program, Expedited Process, Major Modification and Minor Modification. In this instance SUPR-U determined that this module was a Major Modification because a similar form of this module existed within a parent degree. It appears as well that the developers of the module received considerable feedback prior to SUPR-U on this matter and on the development of the proposal. These additional supports are useful in aiding the development of curriculum change and such support might be identified as part of the process for determining the nature of the curricular change as early as possible (i.e., whether a New Program, Expedited Process, Major Modification or Minor Modification). Section D.2 in the documentation asks about the need for external consultants, and it is not clear how the arguments in this section are arrived at and what role the answer put forward here has in guiding SUPR-U to determine the need for External consultants or for an Expedited Review. **See RECOMMENDATION 13**.

General Observations

1. Western's Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP)

After reviewing all of the audit materials and visiting the University, the auditors offer a few comments (suggestions and recommendations appear earlier in the Audit Report) on the IQAP. While the IQAP does appear to meet the requirements of the Quality Assurance Framework, the level of detail and organization of the IQAP could be strengthened to encourage greater consistency between practice and the policy.

For example, the auditors could not find any reference in the IQAP to the evaluation criteria that are to be used to evaluate proposals for major modifications to programs. The IQAP would be strengthened if the QAF evaluation criteria (QAF section 2.1) were added to the IQAP's section 2.1. The auditors noted that "learning outcomes" were sometimes not referred to specifically in some criteria in the IQAP (e.g. IQAP 2.1.2 a and IQAP 4.3.4 b). This may explain, in part, why several audited documents did not address learning outcomes as comprehensively as required under the QAF.

The reference to evaluation criteria in the cyclical program reviews section 4 is made at the end of a long list of items to be included in the self-study. The IQAP could be made more user-friendly by moving the evaluation criteria section up to immediately follow the description of the self-study and by indicating that these are the criteria to be used by the program, external consultants and University committees to evaluate the program. On page 22 of the IQAP, instructions are listed for the review team without any reference to using the evaluation criteria. The auditors note that this list is taken directly and appropriately from the QAF but what is missing is the statement from the QAF that accompanies this list:

> "The Review Committee's evaluation and report(s) (preferably one joint report, where circumstances permit) should address the substance of both the self-study report and the evaluation criteria set out in Framework Section 4.3"

A version of this instruction appears in the IQAP but it is more than a page later in the document.

As is the case at other universities, the distinction between new, major modification and minor modification is sometimes difficult to determine. The auditors noted the definition section in the IQAP was comprehensive but the processes for distinguishing between these categories of program development and modification was sometimes not clear.

The IQAP could also be strengthened by adding more detail about the role of the internal reviewer, and student reviewer.

Terminology used in the IQAP is not always consistent with terminology used in documents associated with new program proposals and cyclical program reviews. For example, the Final Assessment Report as described in the QAF is referred to in some places as Final Summary Report (undergraduate) while the report for graduate programs is referred to as Final Assessment Report in the documentation. The IQAP refers only to "summary report" and "internal reviewers' summary".

2. The External Review Process

The auditors noted great variation in the documentation concerning the selection of the external consultants, the consultants' reports and the response to the reports.

The documentation accompanying the proposal for the Master in Public Health, for instance, included the CVs of the external consultants and a statement indicating that the arm's-length protocol was being observed. However, even in this case, there was no indication of how the full list of consultants was assessed or how the choice was made. In the other examples of program proposals or cyclical program reviews, even this degree of documentation was not included, and the auditors were only able to get a general sense of how this part of the process worked through interviews with the relevant individuals. It would be advantageous for Western University to develop a clearer and more consistent set of protocols for this part of the quality assurance process.

The external consultants' reports themselves were extremely varied in content and form. While there appears to be a template developed for the reports, it does not appear that the consultants adhered to the format of a template, nor that consultants addressed all of the critical elements in the evaluation criteria set out in the IQAP for program proposals or cyclical program reviews. In most cases, the matters left unaddressed related to learning outcomes and their relation to admission, program structure and assessment. Western University follows a process that includes meetings of the external consultants with the Provost, Vice-Provost and others, and this practice is well worth continuing. It is possible that further written instructions to the external consultants might help make the reports more consistent with the IQAP's aims and protocols, and emphasis on the importance of learning outcomes might help focus the consultants on the essential elements of the quality assurance assessment. Ensuring that the template for external consultants' report includes all of the evaluation criteria would also be helpful.

Finally, while responses were forthcoming to the external consultants' reports, the sources of these responses also varied greatly. Academic unit Chairs and Directors most consistently responded and in some cases the appropriate Dean also responded. The IQAP also allows that the Provost's Office may make a response, although responses from this level were not included in any of the documents the auditors examined. After the extensive interviews with all involved in these processes, the auditors understand that the Deans are involved, often directly through their Associate

Deans, and therefore many indirect responses to the reports and to the review take place. To enhance the transparency of the process, it would be advisable, however, to add a written acknowledgement into the stages of the process, even if that participation comes in the form of a simple signature line or brief memo indicating an awareness of the report and its recommendations, and an acknowledgement that the completed report and recommendations will become part of the Annual Planning Process.

3. Consistency in use of Degree Level Expectations, Learning Outcomes and Curriculum Mapping

The documentation for the program proposals and cyclical program reviews exhibited a wide variety of treatments. The History cyclical program review offered a very carefully worked-out connection of degree level expectations to individual courses, while the Transitional Justice and Post-Conflict Reconstruction proposal attempted to develop learning outcomes but had to rework these significantly so that the Quality Council Appraisal Committee could assess against the evaluation criteria. When it came to mapping these expectations and outcomes on to admission requirements, program structure and modes of delivery, very few of the documents made a full connection, with the exception of the Master in Public Health program proposal.

The activity of developing learning outcomes and mapping these consistently is a work in progress for most universities, and it is clear Western University has made great strides in incorporating this activity into its curriculum development. The *Western Guide to Curriculum Review* developed by the Teaching Support Centre has the potential to offer useful outlines for these important pedagogical initiatives, if brought up to date with respect to the new Quality Assurance Framework and Western University's IQAP. These kinds of documents along with the individual meetings with those involved in program development or cyclical program reviews are worth continued investment and development. The audit team suggests that the Provost's Office continue to take a leadership role in supporting endeavours designed to regularize the practices associated with developing degree level expectations, learning outcomes, and mapping curriculum. All of the documents demonstrated careful attention to the idea of degree level expectations, and the next steps would see learning outcomes and curriculum mapping regularized as part of course and program development and assessment.

4. Role of Students in Quality Assurance Process

The auditors met with a number of students who had different levels of involvement in the quality assurance processes. The students were all enthusiastic to be included in the process and stated that it was an important part of their experience at Western University. Most, however, were uncertain about the current status of the reviews they were involved in and were interested in knowing the results. While they had a very general sense of what the quality assurance process was about, it was also clear they were motivated to understand more about it and in particular the importance of the

student's role. The auditors understand that administration has taken a role in including students and in advising them about the process, and some enhancement of the communication with students would be a part of a general improvement of the program. The students themselves admitted that those involved in the review often graduate and discontinue their use of University email, and realize the challenges associated with keeping them informed over the sometimes lengthy period of a review. Still, a document with the intent of being a "student's guide" to IQAPs might be a useful item to add to give the students an overview of the processes they are involved in. **See SUGGESTION 1.**

5. Link Between Graduate and Undergraduate Cyclical Program Reviews

The IQAP process at Western University fully separates the graduate and undergraduate cyclical program reviews, and it is clear the basic committee structures with SUPR-U and SUPR-G tend to keep these reviews separate. It was argued by a number of individuals that the combined review of the two program levels takes place at the time of appointing a new Chair or Director. However, the auditors did hear questions from more than one program about the possibility of combining graduate and undergraduate reviews. While this is an institutional decision, it would be worth considering allowing the option of combining both levels of review to those academic units in which there is sufficient overlap between graduate and undergraduate programs or where a combined review might be advantageous.

6. Review of Documentation for Consistency with IQAP Requirements

As noted above, the auditors found great variation in the form and content of documentation, for cyclical program reviews, new program approvals, and expedited approvals. The auditors found significant variation among the self-studies used for cyclical program reviews. The IQAP gives a general indication that the Provost's Office is to oversee the development of documentation and the review and vetting of documents as they move forward for approval. It was not clear who approved the self-study, for instance, prior to its distribution to external reviewers. It was also not entirely clear who reviews the documents prior to their submission to Senate-level Committees (e.g., SUPR-U, SUPR-G, SCAPA, and Senate) to ensure their completeness and confirm their consistency with IQAP requirements (especially full discussion of all aspects of the evaluation criteria set out in the IQAP). The quality assurance process would be significantly improved if the Provost's Office developed a clear review process to reach greater consistency in the document packages that go forward for formal recommendation and approval.

Conclusion

In its review of the documents and its discussions with administrators, faculty members, students and staff at Western, the auditors found that there is a strong commitment to developing quality assurance practices across the academic environment at the Western main campus and its affiliated colleges. The evolution of the quality assurance process was evident in the documents reviewed demonstrating progress in enhancing the supporting services required in developing new processes and approaches to the development and review of academic programs. Committee structures have been modified, documentation has evolved and increasing attention is paid to the use of learning outcomes as the groundwork for developing academic initiatives. The auditors recognize that the institution has directed significant resources, both human and financial, towards the integration of a quality assurance framework into the academic enterprise. The auditors were impressed with the development of a large-scale database to record, track and report on the stages of proposals and reviews connected with the IQAP. This record system serves as a model of best practices and, when fully instituted, will mark an important turning point in the progress and evolution of quality assurance at Western.

The auditors commend Western for its concerted efforts in implementing the Quality Assurance Framework; however, there is more work to do. The Recommendations and Suggestions provide a framework for the next steps to address gaps which include, for example: approval process for self-study, appointment and briefing of the external consultants, external review documentation, role of students, inclusion of learning outcomes at all required stages in quality assurance, and stricter adherence to the evaluation criteria set out in the IQAP.

The following recommendations and suggestions are intended to enhance, support and develop the work that has already been undertaken during the initial phase of developing and implementing Western University's IQAP.

Recommendations and Suggestions

RECOMMENDATIONS

Western University must:

1: ensure that every program is reviewed at least once every eight years.

2: ensure that all sub-programs are included in the self-study documentation and reviewed by external consultants as part of cyclical program reviews.

3: ensure the inclusion of a methodology section outlining the role of faculty, staff and students in preparation of the self-study for cyclical program reviews.

4: ensure that identified authorities who approve the self-study check that the content of the self-study includes all the relevant information required by the IQAP.

5: enhance the methods of briefing the external consultants on the requirement to address all the evaluation criteria set out in the University's IQAP.

6: ensure that Final Assessment Reports and Implementation Plans contain all of the required elements, as identified in the IQAP.

7: ensure that concerns and recommendations raised in previous reviews are taken into account as part of the subsequent self-study as specified in the IQAP.

8: ensure that all existing programs develop and assess program level learning outcomes as part of the cyclical program review.

9: include on the Periodic Review Schedule all programs offered and indicate where there are partner institutions and multiple sites.

10: develop learning outcomes, mapped to degree level expectations, for all new programs and ensure these are included in the New Program Proposal.

11: Western University must clarify the role(s) of the internal reviewer in the new program approval and the cyclical program review processes in the IQAP.

12: add a section to its IQAP on the Evaluation Criteria required for Major Modifications to existing programs as per the Quality Assurance Framework.

SUGGESTIONS

Western University should:

1: consider developing a student's guide about their role in quality assurance activities as outlined in the IQAP.

2: consider developing a formal review protocol designed to ensure greater consistency between the information provided in the self-study and the IQAP requirements.

3: update its Guide to Curriculum Review to ensure that it is consistent with the IQAP and provides more focus on learning outcomes and the relationship to IQAP requirements.

4: review its IQAP to seek ways in which it may be made clearer and more user-friendly as a means of ensuring it is consistent with the Quality Assurance Framework.

5: strengthen templates, guidelines, formalized verbal instructions and review with the Review Team to ensure consistency with the IQAP and the Quality Assurance Framework.

6: consider implementing a process for dealing with external consultants' reports that do not meet the requirements of the IQAP.

7: consider adding a description of the role of the Dean of affiliated colleges in cyclical program reviews to the IQAP.

8: provide appropriate data for use in the self-study for cyclical program reviews to all academic units at Western University and its affiliated colleges to ensure data integrity.

9: clarify in the IQAP who approves the self-study and at what stage(s) in the process.

10: consider including a description in the IQAP of the role of Educational Policy Committees in the cyclical program review process.

11: consider strengthening its IQAP by requiring and clarifying the role of the Dean in responding to the external consultants' report in cyclical program reviews.

12: consider establishing a stage in the process at which the Vice-Provost has seen and accepted the content and findings of the Review before the documents move on to Senate Committees.

13: inform Programs about the reasons for "with Report" status assigned by SUPR-U or SUPR-G.

14: institute a formal notification system to signal the start of the cyclical program review. Such a notification system would help in tracking the time taken to complete a review.

15: identify appropriate support for graduate programs in developing and assessing learning outcomes.

16: develop a standardized method of indicating how external consultants were chosen and how each consultant satisfies the requirements for an "arm's-length" relationship to the department or program under review.

17: ensure individual academic units are notified concerning the Final Assessment Report and expected follow up, if any, on cyclical program reviews approved by Senate.

18: include the date of the last review on the Periodic Review Schedule will assist the University in monitoring that it is in compliance with the eight-year cycle.

Appendix A: Members of the Audit Team

Dr. Caroline Andrew, Professor Emeritus at the School of Political Studies and the Director of the Centre on Governance, University of Ottawa

For over 30 years, Dr. Andrew has led an academic and professional career at the University of Ottawa. She is currently an emeritus professor at the School of Political Studies as well as the Director of the Centre on Governance. Dr. Andrew was also Dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences from 1997-2005 and she was appointed a Distinguished University Professor in 2006-2007. As Dean, Dr. Andrew oversaw the cyclical review of several undergraduate programs in the Faculty of Social Sciences, including Psychology, Women's Studies and Sociology. Over the course of the reviews, her responsibilities included working in collaboration with the program directors to submit the auto- evaluations, meeting with the external evaluators and ensuring all program recommendations were met.

Dr. Andrew played a key role in the creation of the University of Ottawa's Women's Studies program. In addition, Dr. Andrew is part of an evaluation team for Youth Futures, a program she established that offers summer employment, leadership training and exposure to post-secondary education to high school students from families with little to no experience with post-secondary education. Dr. Andrew received the Ontario Francophonie Award (Francophile) in 2011for her significant contribution to the advancement of the French language and culture in Ontario.

Dr. John ApSimon, Professor Emeritus, Department of Chemistry, Carleton University

Dr. ApSimon retired from Carleton University in 2000. He has had a long and distinguished career and his senior administrative experience includes a three-year term as Vice-President (Research and External) at Carleton University (1997-2000). Dr. ApSimon has remained very active since his retirement, including fulfilling the role of Interim Dean of the Faculty of Public Affairs from 2009 to 2011, followed by a one-year contractual appointment as Director, Corporate Relations at Carleton University. Dr. ApSimon also served as Interim Executive Director of the Canada Research Chairs program.

With specific reference to his experience in the development and operation of undergraduate and graduate programs, Dr. ApSimon was from 1990-1996 Dean of the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research at Carleton, from 2003-2007 a member of the Undergraduate Program Review Audit Committee, and from 2007-2009 Interim Executive Director of the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies. His knowledge and

understanding of the undergraduate and graduate programs of Ontario universities is thus Province-wide.

Dr. John Pierce, Professor, English Department, Queen's University

Dr. Pierce is both an accomplished scholar of Romantic literature and an award-winning teacher at Queen's University where he is Professor in the Department of English. At Queen's, Dr. Pierce has served as Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies in the Faculty of Arts and Science, 2001-2010 and 2012-13. He also held the position of Acting Associate Vice-Principal and Dean of Student Affairs, 2010-11.

Dr. Pierce has extensive experience developing and administering a range of academic programs, and has taken leadership roles in student advising and appeals, and developing and administering policies on Academic Integrity. In addition, Dr. Pierce has worked closely with the Queen's University International Programs Office to support curricular innovations and develop an academic calendar for the Bader International Study Centre in the UK. A strong asset in his auditor role is his thorough knowledge of both academic and student support services.

Appendix B: List of Documents Reviewed by Auditors

All documents were provided in electronic format, or links were provided to the appropriate web address.

- Quality Assurance Framework
- Western University's IQAP (ratified April 2011 and re-ratified June 2012)

GENERAL DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

- Annual Report on Major Modifications – 2011-2012
- Annual Report on Major Modifications – 2012-2013
- Instructions to external consultants – Huron University College – November 20, 2013
- Form for Proposal of New Programs, Modules, Diplomas & Certificates – Undergraduate
- Form for proposed external consultants - Undergraduate
- Letters from the Quality Council to the Provost and Vice-President Academic, assessing whether the University's FARS satisfactorily met the requirements of the Quality Assurance Framework – November 28, 2012, June 28, 2013, and August 7, 2013
- List of undergraduate and graduate degree programs as of June 5, 2013
- Minutes of the meetings of the Western University Audit Team – June 6, 2013, September 9, 2013, October 22, 2013, and November 11, 2013
- Provost's Memo to Affiliated University Colleges – December 1, 2011
- Report of the UPRAC Auditors on Undergraduate Program Review at Western University (Cycle 2) – November 2004
- Role of Internal Undergraduate Student Reviewer – Guidelines, November 20, 2013
- Sample invitation to internal student reviewer – Graduate Programs
- Sample of Data Supplied for Undergraduate Programs
- Sample of Data Supplied for Graduate Programs
- Sample of instructions for external consultants – Graduate Programs
- Status report on program reviews as of June 5, 2013
- Sample thank you letter to graduate internal student reviewer
- Template for external consultants' report – New Graduate Programs
- Western University's Final Assessment Reports (FARs) – 2011-2012
- Western University's Final Assessment Reports (FARs) – 2012-2013
- Western University's Schedule of Cyclical Academic Program Reviews as of June 5, 2013
- Western University's Terms of Reference for its committees: SCAPA, SUPR-U, and SUPR-G
- Western University's Calendar – New Programs and Modules

PROGRAM DOCUMENTS for Chemical Engineering

- SUPR-U agenda – September 7, 2011
- SUPR-U meeting Exhibit III plus form for submission

- SUPR-U meeting notes September 7, 2011
- SUPR-U agenda – September 28, 2011
- SUPR-U meeting notes – September 28, 2011
- Itinerary and External Reviewers' Report
- Email to COPR – December 12, 2011
- SUPR-U agenda – January 25, 2012
- Reports from review to SUPR-U
- SUPR-U meeting notes – January 25, 2012
- SCAPA agenda – February 8, 2012
- SCAPA meeting Exhibit VII
- SCAPA meeting notes – February 8, 2012
- Senate agenda – February 17, 2012
- Senate – February 17, 2012 report of SCAPA
- Senate minutes – February 17, 2012
- First submission to the Quality Council – February 27, 2012
- Second submission to the Quality Council – March 30, 2012
- Quality Council Approval Letter – April 16, 2012

PROGRAM DOCUMENTS for Environmental Science

- Program brief / self-study
- External consultants' Itinerary – March 6, 2012
- SUPR-U agenda – June 13, 2012
- SUPR-U exhibit VI
- SUPR-U meeting notes – June 13, 2012
- SCAPA agenda – September 12, 2012
- SCAPA exhibit VIII
- SCAPA exhibit VIII Appendix I
- SCAPA meeting notes – September 12, 2012
- Senate Agenda – September 21, 2012
- Senate exhibit III
- Senate exhibit III Appendix 3 p 6
- Senate meeting minutes p 4 – September 21, 2012
- Report to Quality Council – 2011-2012
- Email to COPR – June 11, 2012
- Request for follow-up report – April 12, 2013
- Response to request – April 30, 2013
- Report from Department – May 22, 2013
- Note from Dean – May 25, 2013
- SUPR-U meeting notes – May 22, 2013
- Notification of evaluation – August 14, 2013

PROGRAM DOCUMENTS for French

- Volume 1 – Program Brief
- Volume 3 – external consultants
- External consultants' itinerary

- SUPR-G agenda – June 14, 2012
- SUPR-G meeting notes – June 14, 2012
- SUPR-G exhibit IV – External consultants' report
- SCAPA – exhibit VII – SUPR-G report
- SCAPA – exhibit VII – Appendix I, SUPR-G report
- SCAPA – meeting minutes – September 12, 2012
- Senate minutes – September 21, 2012
- Senate – SCAPA report September 21, 2012
- Senate – SCAPA report Appendix 2 – September 21, 2012
- COPR year-end report – September 14, 2012
- Quality Council Year End Report

PROGRAM DOCUMENTS for Geology/Geophysics

- Volume 1 – Geology
- Volume 1 – Geophysics
- Volume 3 – Geology
- Volume 3 – Geophysics
- External consultants' itinerary
- SUPR-G agenda – September 20, 2012
- SUPR-G meeting notes – September 20, 2012
- SUPR-G exhibit I
  - External consultants' report
  - Department response
  - Summary report
- SCAPA agenda – October 3, 2012
- SCAPA exhibit VI – SUPR-G report
- SCAPA exhibit VI appendix I – SUPR-G Geology and Geophysics
- SCAPA minutes – October 3, 2012
- Senate minutes – October 19, 2012
- Senate – SCAPA Report – October 19, 2012
- Senate – SCAPA Report Appendix 2 – October 19, 2012
- COPR year-end report – June 21, 2013
- Quality Council year-end report
- Letter to SUPR-G review results – September 20, 2012

PROGRAM DOCUMENTS for History

- Program brief / self-assessment
- External consultant's itinerary
- SUPR-U agenda – June 13, 2012
- SUPR-U exhibit IV
- SUPR-U meeting notes – June 13, 2012
- SCAPA agenda – September 12, 2012
- SCAPA exhibit VIII
- Final Assessment Report Huron University College – History
- SCAPA meeting notes – September 12, 2012

- Senate agenda – September 21, 2012
- Senate exhibit III
- Senate meeting minutes – September 21, 2012
- Report to the Quality Council – 2011-2012
- Email to COPR – June 11, 2012
- Request for follow-up report – April 12, 2013
- Report from Department
- SUPR-U meeting notes – May 22, 2013
- Notification of revised evaluation

PROGRAM DOCUMENTS for Medical Biophysics

- SUPR-U agenda – October 26, 2011
- SUPR-U exhibit II
- SUPR-U form for submission
- SCAPA agenda – November 2, 2011
- SCAPA exhibit VIII
- SCAPA meeting notes – November 2, 2011
- Senate agenda exhibit II – Recommended
- Senate minutes – November 18, 2011
- Annual Report on Major Modifications – 2011-2012
- Email to COPR – July 9, 2013

PROGRAM DOCUMENTS for Public Health

- SUPR-G agenda – September 20, 2012
- SUPR-G meeting notes – September 20, 2012
- SUPR-G submission
    - Volume 1
    - Volume 3 – external consultants
- External consultants' itinerary
- SUPR-G agenda – January 24, 2013
- SUPR-G meeting notes – January 24, 2013
- SUPR-G exhibit I
    - Final Assessment Report
    - Supplementary report by internal reviewer
    - External report
    - Faculty response
    - Program proposal brief
- SCAPA agenda – February 6, 2013
- SCAPA exhibit III appendix I – SGPS
- SCAPA exhibit III appendix II – SGPS
- SCAPA minutes – February 6, 2013
- Senate agenda – February 15, 2013
- Senate exhibit II
- Senate exhibit II appendix 2
- Senate exhibit II appendix 3

- Board minutes – April 25, 2013
- Board of Governors – April 25, 2013
- Submission to the Quality Council - February 15, 2013
  - Volume 1
  - External consultants' report
  - Program response
  - Final assessment report
- COPR year-end report – June 21, 2013
- GEC year-end report – June 21, 2013

PROGRAM DOCUMENTS for Transitional Justice and Post-Conflict Reconstruction

- SUPR-G agenda – February 16, 2012
- SUPR-G meeting notes – February 16, 2012
- SUPR-G exhibit I
- SUPR-G exhibit I appendix I
- SCAPA agenda – March 7, 2012
- SCAPA exhibit VII
- SCAPA exhibit VII appendix I
- SCAPA meeting minutes – March 7, 2012
- Senate agenda March 12, 2012
- Senate exhibit II appendix 2
- Senate minutes – March 12, 2012
- Submission one to the Quality Council
  - Volume 1
- Appraisal Committee Letter – April 217 2012
- Submission two to the Quality Council
  - Cover letter – May 2, 2012
  - Learning Outcomes
- Appraisal Committee Approval Letter – May 22, 2012
- Letter to Program – May 24, 2012
- Email to COPR – September 14, 2012

Appendix C: Schedule of Auditors' Site Visit

WESTERN UNIVERSITY: NOVEMBER 18 – 20, 2013

All meetings will be in Room 4155 Stevenson Hall

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 18, 2013	
Time	Participants
8:30-9:00am	Travel to Western University – Stevenson Hall Room 2107A
9:00-11:00am	Audit Team Planning Meeting
11:00-12:00pm	**Provost and Vice Provost Office**
	Janice Deakin, Provost and Vice-President Academic
	Carol Beynon, Acting Vice-Provost (School of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies)
	John Doerkson, Vice-Provost (Academic Programs and Students) [Registrar]
	Alan Weedon, Vice-Provost (Academic Planning, Policy and Faculty)
	Sandra Thornton, Administrative Coordinator (Undergraduate)
	Candace Loosely, Administrative Coordinator (Graduate)
12:00-12:10	Break
12:10-1:00pm	**Teaching Support Centre** Lunch meeting
	Nanda Dimitrov, Associate Director
	Debra Dawson, Director
	Wendy Crocker, Curriculum Consultant
1:00-1:15pm	Break
1:15-2:00pm	**Chemical Engineering International (BESc) program**
	Ajay Ray, Department Chair
	Kibret Mequanint, Undergraduate Chair
	Jesse Zhu, Program Director
	Lars Rehmann, Assistant Professor
2:00-2:15pm	Break

Time	Participants
2:15-3:00pm	**Master of Public Health program**
	Amardeep Thind, Acting Interim Director
	Marlene Janzen Le Ber, Associate Director
	Diana Lee, Program Coordinator
	Mark Speechley, Professor
3:00-3:30pm	Break
3:00-4:30pm	**Senate Subcommittee on Program Review – Graduate (SUPR-G)**
	Carol Beynon, Acting Vice-Provost (School of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies)
	Pam Bishop, Associate Dean, Education
	Erika Chamberlain, Associate Dean, Law
	Lorraine Davies, Co-Chair (Associate Vice-Provost, SGPS)
	Jim Dickey, Graduate Chair, Kinesiology
	Benjamin Hill, Faculty Appointed by GEC
	Jennifer Hutchinson, Grad Student appointed by GEC
	Candace Loosley, Administrative Coordinator, SGPS
	Kimi Maruoka, Manager, Student Academic Services, SGPS
	Pam McKenzie, Associate Dean, Information and Media Studies
	Margaret McGlynn, Associate Dean, Social Service
	Crystal Middaugh, Senior Data Analyst, SGPS
	Eeva Munoz, Western Libraries
	Jan Polgar, Associate Dean, Health Science
	Peter Simpson, Co-Chair, Associate Vice-Provost (SGPS)
	Andrew Watson, Associate Dean, Schulich School of Medicine and Dentistry

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 2013	
Time	Participants
8:30-9:00am	Travel to Western University – Stevenson Hall Room 2107A
9:00-9:45am	Collaborative Program in Transitional Justice and Post-Conflict Reconstruction
	Joanna Quinn, Director
	Bill Danahar, Associate Professor
	Scott Schaffer, Associate Professor
	Anna Dolidze, Assistant Professor
9:45-10:00am	Break
10:00-10:50am	**Senate Subcommittee on Program Review – Undergraduate (SUPR-U)**
	Michael Bartlett, Engineering
	Mark Blagrave, Huron University College
	Sauro Camiletti, King's University College
	Erika Chamberlain, Law
	Lorraine Davies, SGPS
	Nanda Dimitrov, Teaching Support Centre
	John Doerkson, Chair, Vice-Provost (Academic Programs & Students) [Registrar]
	Joan Finegan, Social Science
	John Hatch, Arts & Humanities
	Mary Heisz, Ivey
	Jeff Hutter, Science
	Doug Jones, Schulich
	Pam McKenzie, Information and Media Services
	Margaret McNay, Education
	Victoria Meredith, Music
	Donna Rogers, Brescia University
	Renee Soulodre-LaFrance, King's
	Sandra Thornton, Administrative Coordinator-Undergraduate

Time	Participants
	Senate Subcommittee on Program Review – Undergraduate (SUPR-U)- continued
	Glen Tigert, Associate Registrar
	Kevin Warmsley, Health Sciences
	Catherine Wilkins, Assistant University Librarian
	Mark Workentin, Vice-Chair
10:50-11:00am	Break
11:00-12:00pm	**Senate Committee on Academic Policy and Awards (SCAPA)**
	Carol Beynon, Acting Vice-Provost (School of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies)
	Mark Blagrave, Affiliated University College Observer (Huron)
	Chris Brown, Arts and Humanities, Classics
	Karen Campbell, Epidemiology and Biostatistics
	Janice Deakin, Provost and Vice-President Academic
	John Doerksen, Vice-Provost (Academic Programs and Students) [Registrar]
	Lori Gribbon, Director, Undergraduate Recruitment and Admissions
	George Knopf, Mechanical and Materials Engineering
	Catherine Nolan, Music
	Thomas Sutherland, Chemistry
	Catherine Wilkins, (for) University Librarian
	Mark Workentin, Chemistry – Vice-Chair of SCAPA
	Carolyn Young, Director, Continuing Studies
12:00-12:15pm	Break
12:15-1:00pm	**Graduate Student Participants**
	Jennifer Hutchison, Internal Reviewer
	Eric Sadowski, Internal Reviewer
	Laura Sanchz, Geology/Geophysics
	Vi Vo, Internal Reviewer

Time	Participants
	Undergraduate Student Participants
	Grace Locke, Internal Reviewer
	Stephen Marklevitz, Environmental Science (self-study)
1:00-1:30pm	Break
1:30-2:30pm	**Medical Biophysics Program**
	Jerry Battista, Chair and CAMPEP Graduate Program Co-Director
	Chris Ellis, Professor
	Tamie Poepping, Associate Professor
	Abbas Samani, Joint Professor with Medical Biophysics
	Robert Stodilka, Scientist, CAMPEP Graduate Program Co-Director
2:30-3:15pm	**French (MA/PhD)**
	David Heap
	Ileana Paul
	Marilyn Randall, Chair, Department of French Studies
	Chrisanthi Skalkos
	Daniel Vaillancourt
3:15-3:30pm	Break
3:30-4:30pm	**Deans and Affiliated University College Principals**
	Nick Dyer-Witheford, Acting Dean, Information and Media Studies
	Colleen Hanycz, Principal Brescia University College
	Andrew Hrymak, Dean, Faculty of Engineering
	Carol Jones, Associate Dean, Faculty of Science
	Doug Jones, Vice Dean, Basic Medical Sciences Schulich School of Medicine and Dentistry
	Robin Keirstead, University Archivist and Acting University Librarian
	Stephen McClatchie, Principal, Huron University College
	Michael Milde, Dean, Faculty of Arts and Humanities
	Jim Weese, Dean, Faculty of Health Science
	Betty Anne Younker, Faculty of Music

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 2013	
Time	Participants
8:30-9:00am	Travel to Western University – Stevenson Hall Room 2107A
09:00-10:00am	**Environmental Science Program**
	Greg Thorn, Chair
	Dan Shrubsole
	Christie Stewart
	Brian Branfireun
10:00-11:00	**History program (Huron University College)**
	Amy Bell
	Nina Reid-Maroney
	Mark Blagrave
	Doug Leighton
11:00-11:15-am	Break
11:15-12:00pm	**Geology/Geophysics MSc/PhD programs**
	Guy Plint, Graduate Chair
	Jisuo Jin, Acting Department Chair
	Kristy Tiampo, Associate Department Chair
	Gail Atkinson, Professor
	Bob Linnen, Associate Professor
	Rick Secco, Professor
12:00-1:00pm	**IQAP Coordinators**
	Irene Burrell, University Librarian
	Erika Hegedues, Associate University Secretary
	Candace Loosley, Administrative Coordinator
	Sandra Thornton, Administrative Coordinator
1:00-2:00pm	**Audit Team Wrap-up Meeting**
2:00-3:00pm	**Debrief with Provost and Vice-Provost Office**
	Janice Deakin, Provost and Vice-President Academic

Time	Participants
	Carol Beynon, Acting Vice-Provost (School of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies)
	John Doerksen, Vice-Provost (Academic Programs and Students) [Registrar]
	Alan Weedon, Vice-Provost (Academic Planning, Policy and Faculty)