**Self-Study Template for the Cyclical Review**

**of**

***Program Name***

**Submitted to the  
Senate Subcommittee on Program Review – Undergraduate**

**Western University**

***Date***

Table of Contents

Introduction to [the Self-Study 3](#_Toc112659271)

**Volume 1**

1.0 [Introduction](#INTRODUCTION)

1.1 [Overview of the Program](#OverviewofProgram)  [5](#_Toc112659272)

1.2 [Method for the Self-Study 5](#MethodforSelfStudy)

2.0 [Description of the Program](#DescriptionofProgram)

[2.1 Program Objectives 5](#ProgramObjectives)

[2.2 Program Requirements 6](#ProgramRequirements)

[2.3 Admission Requirements 7](#AdmissionRequirements)

[2.4 Assessment of Teaching and Learning 7](#AssessmentofTeachingandLearning)

[2.5 Program Resources 8](#ProgramResources)

[3.0 Recommendations from the Previous Review and Actions Taken 8](#ConcernsPreviousReviews)

[4.0 Program Changes Being Considered and Specific Questions for Reviewers 8](#Changes)

[5.0 Quality and Other Indicators 9](#Quality)

[6.0 Employment/Graduate Outcomes and Survey Results 10](#Employment)

Self-Study Sign Off   
  
[**Volume 2**](#VOLUME2)

[Curricula Vitae of the Program Members 12](#CurriculaVitae)

[**Volume 3**](#VOLUME3)

[Proposed External Reviewers 14](#_Toc112659286)

[Appendix 20](#appendicies)


**The Program Self-Study**

The purpose of the self-study is to undertake a broad, reflective, critical, and forward-looking analysis of the program based on pertinent qualitative and quantitative data. The process aims to foster increased dialogue and collaboration within and among academic and service units regarding student learning and program improvement. The self-study is equally an opportunity to outline prospective program changes and improvements for continuous enhancement between review cycles.

To be done efficiently and effectively, the program self-study process requires a participatory and transparent approach, involving program faculty, staff, and students, documentation of how diverse voices and perspectives were obtained, and how they were taken into account in the development of the resulting report. It is expected that academic units will plan in advance to independently gather stakeholder data from multiple sources such as:

* Survey data
* Focus group data
* Interview data
* Involvement of elected student representatives
* Departmental and institutional data, or data from other externally validated instruments
* Review of the self-study by a broad representation of the program community

Support with the collection of data, the development of the self-study process, and the resulting report can be procured through the Office of Academic Quality and Enhancement (OAQE) and/or the Centre for Teaching and Learning (CTL). Below is a typical timeline that highlights the key milestones of the self-study phase of an undergraduate program review.



This template package contains three volumes (Volume 1 – Self-Study; Volume 2 – Faculty CVs; Volume 3 – Proposed External Reviewers). The package is followed by a short Appendix that contains helpful definitions of key terms. Once a draft of the self-study is completed by the program, please ensure that it is reviewed by the Office of the Dean before submitting to the OAQE. The deadline for the submission of the self-study to the OAQE is the end of October.

Any questions can be directed to the OAQE at: [OAQE@uwo.ca](mailto:OAQE@uwo.ca)

**VOLUME 1**

As on page two, please include a table of contents for the self-study to aid in the navigation of the final document. Consider embedding hyperlinks to each heading.

* 1. **Introduction**
  2. **Overview of Program**

Provide a short overview of the history and contextual background of the program. As part of an introduction to the undergraduate program that is part of the review, describe each module offered by the program: Honors Specialization, Specialization, Major, Minor and relevant Certificates. Equally list any joint or collaborative offerings that fall in the scope of this review (and which you would like the external reviewers to comment on). In an appendix, include Academic Calendar copy for each module. Include links to the program’s website and other relevant webpages.

* 1. **Method for Self-Study**

Describe how the self-study was conducted and how faculty, staff, students, and alumni were included in the self-study.

Each program can devise the best way in which to do its self-study. It is strongly recommended that the self-study include information gathered through focus groups, surveys, interviews, meetings, and retreats with all program members. Academic services, or campus groups, that contribute to the quality of the program should be described in the self-study. For any joint or collaborative offerings included in the scope of this review, relevant partners (leaders, faculty, staff, students) associated with the joint offering should be consulted and/or contribute to the associated parts of the self-study. In addition, the self-study can include comparison of program-specific performance data/evidence with provincial, national, and/or professional standards. Comparisons to U15 data, such as the National Student Satisfaction Survey data, may also be included in the self-study. Should the program seek any data from Western’s Office of Institutional Planning & Budgeting or the Office of the Registrar as part of this self-study, please make the request directly to the Office of Academic Quality and Enhancement (OAQE).

**2.0** **Description of the Program**

**2.1**  **Program Objectives**

Provide a description of the program and its consistency with Western’s mission, values, and strategic priorities, as articulated in the University’s Strategic Plan.

2.1.1 Describe how the program is consistent with the Academic Plans of the Faculty and Department/School. Add any relevant Faculty planning documents as an appendix.

2.1.2 Describe the specific features of the program (e.g., participation in collaborative, experiential, high impact, or other unique learning opportunities for students; program partnerships; mobility pathways).

**2.2** **Program Requirements**

2.2.1 Describe the program specific learning outcomes and the appropriateness of the program’s structure and requirements to meet its objectives and the program learning   
outcomes[](#learningoutcomes).

* + 1. Describe the appropriateness of the program’s structure, requirements, and associated learning outcomes in relation to the Western Degree Outcomes[](https://teaching.uwo.ca/curriculum/wdo.html). Please include the Learning Outcome Table located in the appendix to indicate the alignment of institutional and program outcomes and how the program supports and evidences the achievement of each outcome.
       1. Include a curriculum map[](#AppendixCurriculumMapping) that demonstrates how courses map onto learning outcomes for the program (see appendix for greater detail.)
    2. Describe how the program currently embeds the principles below into its design, learning outcomes, procedures and operations.[](#glossary)
* Equity, Diversity, Inclusion and Antiracism;
* Decolonization and Indigenization; and
* Accessibility

2.2.3.1 Describe the ways in which the program plans to build on the responses listed above to further action Western’s commitment to Equity, Diversity, Inclusion (EDI), Antiracism, Decolonization and Indigenization, and Accessibility over the next several years.

* + 1. Describe the ways in which the curriculum addresses the current state of the discipline or area of study.
    2. Describe the appropriateness and effectiveness of the mode(s) of delivery (e.g., classroom format, online, blended, community-engaged learning, problem-based, compressed part-time, multi-campus, inter-institutional) to facilitate students’ successful completion of the program-level learning outcomes.
    3. As applicable, provide an account of how the program and its courses contribute to other academic programs at Western, and/or how other academic programs contribute to the delivery of this program.
    4. Comment on how the undergraduate program compares with similar, leading programs, departments, or schools in Canada and abroad. Provide the basis for comparison. What distinct aspects of the program differentiate it from similar ones at other institutions?

*NOTE: The Quality Assurance Framework requires a clear distinction between program objectives, program-level learning outcomes, and* [*Degree Level Expectations*](https://oucqa.ca/framework/definitions/)*. Please see the Guidance on* [*Program Objectives and Program-level Learning Outcomes*](https://oucqa.ca/guide/program-objectives-and-program-level-learning-outcomes/) *for details on the distinction.*

**2.3 Admission Requirements**[](#AdmissionRequirements)

2.3.1 Comment on the appropriateness of the program’s admission requirements given the program’s objectives, program-level learning outcomes and strategic direction of the program.

2.3.2 Provide an explanation of additional or alternative requirements, if applicable, for admission (e.g., minimum grade point average, additional languages, or portfolios, and how the program recognizes prior work or learning experience).

2.3.3 What type of enrolment profile is the program working toward (e.g., gender, international/domestic, ethnicity, indigeneity, first-generation university student)? What does diversity look like in your program?

Comment specifically on data regarding admissions, transfers, enrolment, and retention in the program. Are there any areas of concern that should be focused on?

**2.4** **Assessment of Teaching and Learning**

2.4.1 Comment on the appropriateness and effectiveness of the methods for assessing student achievement of the program-level learning outcomes and the Western Degree Outcomes. Complete the relevant column in the Learning Outcome Table introduced in section 2.2.2.1.

2.4.2 Comment on how the program monitors and assesses:

i. the overall quality of the program;

ii. whether the program continues to achieve in practice its objectives;

iii. whether its students are achieving the program-level learning outcomes and the Western Degree Outcomes; and

iv. the methods used to document and subsequently use feedback to inform continuous program improvement.

2.4.3 In what ways has Universal Instructional Design been used to support the accessibility and inclusion of the program’s curriculum?

*NOTE: In this section, the Self-study should ensure that the plans for monitoring and assessing student achievement provide an assessment of students currently enrolled as well as post-graduation metrics. Please see* [*Guidance on Assessment of Teaching and Learning*](https://oucqa.ca/guide/assessment-of-teaching-and-learning-2-1-4-1-and-5-1-3-1-4/) *for further details and examples of measures for assessing teaching and learning that meet the requirements of the Quality Assurance Framework.*

**2.5** **Program Resources**[](#ProgramResources)

Given the program’s class sizes and cohorts as well as its program-level learning outcomes, comment on:

2.5.1 Participation of a sufficient number of qualified core faculty members[](#corefacultymembers)who are

competent to teach and/or supervise in the program to achieve its goals and foster the appropriate academic environment.

2.5.2 The role and approximate percentage of limited term, limited duties and adjunct faculty used in the delivery of the program and the associated plans to ensure the sustainability of the program and quality of the student experience.

2.5.3 If applicable, provision of supervision of experiential learning opportunities (e.g., Internships, community-engaged learning, capstone projects or theses).

2.5.4 Adequacy of resources and of the academic unit’s utilization of existing human, physical, technology, and financial resources to support the program.

2.5.5 Evidence that there are adequate resources to sustain the quality of scholarship and research activities produced by students,[](#progresappendicies) including library support, information technology support, and laboratory access.

**3.0****Recommendations from the Previous Review and Actions Taken**

3.1 Address concerns expressed in the previous review’s Final Assessment Report. Identify each concern and the action taken to address it. If no concerns were expressed, note this in this section.

**4.0** **Program Changes Being Considered and Specific Questions for Reviewers**

4.1 Describe the most significant takeaways from this program self-study.

4.2 Describe any changes to the program that are being considered as part of this review process. Explain the rationale for any changes to the program and indicate how these changes improve or enhance the program.

4.2.1 Thinking of the reviewers as prospective sounding boards in support of program enhancement, identify any specific questions, issues or proposed changes that you would like the external reviewers to comment on.

**5.0** **Quality and other Indicators**

5.1 Provide evidence of the quality of the faculty (e.g., qualifications, funding, honours, awards, research, innovation, and scholarly record; appropriateness of collective faculty expertise to contribute substantively to the program and commitment to student mentoring).

5.2 As applicable, describe other means by which the program and faculty ensure the intellectual quality of the student experience.

5.3 For students, as applicable and available, provide grade-level for admission, data on scholarly output, success rates in provincial and national scholarships, competitions and awards, and evidence for commitment to professional and transferable skills.

Data provided by the Office of Institutional Planning & Budgeting and the Office of the Registrar cannot be altered; however, the program is strongly encouraged to use these data, as relevant, to comment on trends, gaps or other pertinent points in the self-study brief. An example of data exhibits shared with Western campus programs is provided below. Equivalent data for University College affiliate programs can be provided with the support of the affiliate Provost’s Office.

Data Exhibit

1A Faculty Complement

1B Staff Complement

1C Program Enrolment

1D Teaching Activity

1E Cross-Unit Undergraduate Teaching

1F Undergraduate Class Size Distribution

1G Undergraduate Grade Distribution

2A Summary of Undergraduate Course and Instructor Evaluations

2B-1 Summary of Undergraduate Course and Instructor Evaluations (subject =)

2C-11 Summary of Undergraduate Course and Instructor Evaluations (subject,level = 1000)

2C-12 Summary of Undergraduate Course and Instructor Evaluations (subject, level = 2000)

2C-13 Summary of Undergraduate Course and Instructor Evaluations (subject, level = 3000)

2C-14 Summary of Undergraduate Course and Instructor Evaluations (subject, level = 4000)

3A General University Information

4A Survey of Graduating Students: Ratings of Teaching and Learning Experiences

4B Survey of Graduating Students: Overall Satisfaction

4C Survey of Graduating Students: Areas of Academic and Personal Improvement

4D Survey of Graduating Students: Would You Recommend Western to A Friend

**6.0** **Employment/Graduate Outcomes and Survey Results**

The intent of this section is to provide information about the career paths of students who have graduated from the program. It is important to provide evidence of career outcomes to assist in evaluating whether the program is meeting its objectives.

6.1 Provide an overview of the employment achieved by recent graduates of the program. Where possible, provide a list of the employment outcomes of graduates for the past eight years, listing the employment achieved by the year of graduation. For privacy, do not include the names of the recent graduates. Provide any survey results.

6.2 Optionally, provide an overview of the workplace and/or community demand related to the program’s area of study (e.g., occupations in demand, relevant skills in demand) and a reflection on the alignment (where applicable) of the program’s learning outcomes and curriculum in relation to the workplace demand.

**Self-Study Sign Off**

Before submitting the completed self-study to the Office of Academic Quality and Enhancement (OAQE), both Program-level and Faculty-level leaders must have fully reviewed the self-study. Once signed, the completed self-study may be submitted to the OAQE ahead of the end of October deadline.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Name** | **Signature** | **Date** |
| **Program Chair/Director** |  |  |  |
| **Dean (or designate)** |  |  |  |

**VOLUME 2**

Volume 2 should be submitted as a separate document/file.

***Curricula Vitae of the Program Members***

Include the CV of each full-time member of the program as well as any limited duties professors with a significant teaching load. Programs may use whatever format they wish with CVs ordered alphabetically. To the extent possible, CVs should be in the same format and be approximately 5 pages in length or less to reduce the sheer volume of what reviewers will be asked to look through. When preparing the CV package, please add a table of contents at the outset with embedded hyperlinks to facilitate the navigation of the CV roster.

The mandatory and optional information below should serve as a checklist of information to be included in faculty CVs for cyclical program reviews and new program submissions. The tables below are not intended as a CV template – **do not** cut and paste CV data into the boxes below.

Items in the first table must be included in each CV. Items in the second table are optional. The unit head will decide whether the CVs submitted will include these items or not. If the unit head decides an element (e.g., consulting activities) will be included, then ideally all faculty CVs submitted for review should include that element.

**Inclusion Mandatory**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1.** | Name |
| **2.** | Rank |
| **3.** | Appointment Status |
| **4.** | Academic Background (university degrees, postdoctoral or fellowship training) |
| **5.** | Work Experience (current position and other academic & non-academic position(s)) |
| **6.** | Distinctions, Awards and Credentials\* |
| **7.** | Professional Memberships |
| **8.** | Teaching and Curriculum Development (Undergraduate and Graduate) |
| **9.** | Publications (last 5 years) |
| **10.** | Research Funds - External/Internal; Current/Held in last 5 years |
| **11.** | Service and Administration – External/Internal |

\*e.g., significant recognitions received for teaching, research, scholarly or creative work or service

**Inclusion Optional (on unit-wide level)**

Decision to be taken by unit head on whether all CVs submitted will include each of the elements listed below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **12.** | Supervisory Experience (Undergraduate, Graduate and Postdoctoral) |
| **13.** | Membership on Graduate Examining, Supervisory & Advisory Committees |
| **14.** | Applied Creative, Literary and Artistic Work |
| **15.** | Consulting and Professional Activities |
| **16.** | Patents and Intellectual Property Rights |
| **17.** | Contributions to EDID in academia or professional activities |

**VOLUME 3**

Volume 3 should be submitted as a separate document/file.

The Review team conducting the site visit typically includes the following: two External Reviewers, including a member from a university outside of Ontario, a member from another Ontario university, an internal reviewer who is a Western faculty member usually a member of the Senate Subcommittee on Program Review - Undergraduate (SUPR-U), and an undergraduate student. Both the Internal Reviewer and the undergraduate student are from faculties other than the faculty in which the program resides.

Please provide a list of **five potential External Reviewers from universities outside Ontario,** and a list of **five potential External Reviewers from Ontario universities**. The Internal Reviewer and the undergraduate student will be selected by the Chair of SUPR-U.

Proposed External Reviewers should have a strong track record as academic scholars (e.g., actively publishing, teaching, supervising, holding research grants etc.), and should also have had academic administrative/management experience in such roles as Graduate Program Coordinator, Department Chair, Associate Dean, Dean, or other administrative leadership positions. This combination of experience allows a reviewer to provide the most valuable feedback on program curriculum, but equally on program operations, planning and the student experience.

In some cases, it may be important to group nominees into categories reflecting particular areas of expertise and you may request that one from each group be chosen.

External Reviewers must be at [arm’s length](https://uwaterloo.ca/academic-program-reviews/cyclical-reviews/choosing-arms-length-reviewers) from the program, which means they are not a close friend, or a regular and current collaborator, and have not been supervised recently by a member of the program under review. Full disclosure of all past affiliations is required to assist in the selection of External Reviewers and to ensure an arm’s-length relationship. The Chair/Director must verify that each nominated reviewer is arm’s length, personally and professionally, from the program and its personnel.

Finally, Volume III must be approved by the Dean of the Faculty, prior to sending it the OAQE.

*NOTE: Please do not contact potential reviewers – all correspondence will be through the OAQE.*

**Please delete this page prior to submission.**

**Western University Undergraduate Program Review External Reviewers Nomination Form**

**Please complete this form and return with contact information and bios to**:

Artie Harricharran, The Office of Academic Quality and Enhancement IGAB Room 1N20C, t.519-661-2111 ext. 84944 [aharric3@uwo.ca](mailto:aharric3@uwo.ca)

Program being reviewed:

Faculty/School/Affiliated University College:

Academic Unit:

Undergraduate Chair/Director:

Name and Contact Information of Program Review Coordinator:

External Reviewers should be associate or full professors, be qualified by discipline and experience to review the program and have had academic administrative experience in such roles as undergraduate program coordinators, department chair, dean, or associate dean.

External Reviewers should have a strong record of accomplishment as academic scholars, be active in their field of research and must be at arm’s length from the program under review. Reviewers who are likely, or perceived to be likely, to be predisposed to view the program or unit either positively or negatively should not be chosen. **The program is required to disclose any past affiliation or relationship that each proposed reviewer has had with the program.**

Examples of what may violate the arm’s length requirement:

* A previous member of the program or department under review (including being a visiting professor)
* Received a graduate degree from the program under review
* A regular co-author and research collaborator with a member of the program, within the past seven years, and especially if that collaboration is ongoing
* Close family/friend relationship with a member of the program
* A regular or repeated external examiner of dissertations by doctoral students in the program
* The doctoral supervisor of one or more members of the program

Contact information and short bios are required for each External Reviewer and should be submitted separately as Volume 3 of the Self-Study. In the table below, rank the proposed reviewers – reviewers will be contacted by the SUPR-U Chair in the order listed in the table. Also indicate optimal pairings of reviewers or any other notes to consider when contacting prospective reviewers; note that pairing is **not** guaranteed and based on who accepts invitations and availability.

**External Reviewers will be contacted in the ranked order indicated below:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Proposed Reviewers Affiliated to Institution  **within Ontario** | Proposed Reviewers Affiliated to Institution  **outside of Ontario** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Notes regarding possible reviewer pairings or additional comments: |

Cyclical program review site visits are typically held in-person given the opportunities for more robust rapport building, informal conversations, and tours of campus and program facilities. However, if a virtual site visit (held entirely via Zoom) would be preferred, given considerations like the physical location of ideal reviewers or implications around ease of stakeholder engagement during the site visit, please indicate this preference below.

Preferred site visit modality (either in-person or virtual): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

If a virtual site visit is preferred, please indicate the rationale supporting this modality:

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Preferred dates for the site visit** (typically in February and March)**:**

|  |
| --- |
| 1. |
| 2. |
| 3. |
| 4. |
| 5. |

**Bios of External Reviewer Nominees**Contact information and short bios are required for **each** External Reviewer

Name of Proposed Reviewer:

Rank:

Institution: (include mailing address, telephone, fax numbers and e-mail)

Link to personal webpage (if available):

Degrees: (include university, discipline and date conferred)

Area(s) of Specialization

* *Relate this to those offered by the program being appraised.*
* *List 3 to 5 recent and relevant publications or scholarly works.*

Academic administrative Experience/Expertise relevant to service as a reviewer (e.g., program director/coordinator, department chair, associate dean or associated positions).

* *Listing of academic administrative/management experience.*
* *A short statement regarding the appropriateness of the nominee as a reviewer for this program would help the committee.*

Previous affiliation with the University if any (e.g. visiting professor – give dates, internal consultant, former employee, any former professor/student relationships with faculty members).

*Full disclosure of all past affiliation is required to assist the committee in the selection and to ensure an arm’s-length relationship.*

**Verification of Arm’s Length Status:**

By signing below, I verify that all reviewers listed are at arm’s length, personally and professionally from this program and any of its personnel.

Chair/Director’s name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Faculty Approval**

By signing below, I verify that I have reviewed and approve all reviewers listed for this program.

Dean/Associate Dean Undergraduate’s name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Appendix**

This section offers broad guidelines to aid in providing responses required as part of the self-study. For a “Glossary of Terms” used in section 2.2.3, please visit Western’s Office of EDI website by [click here](https://www.edi.uwo.ca/resources/glossary-of-terms/).

* 1. **Program Requirements**

**2.2.2** **Description and Alignment of the Learning Outcomes**

Below is a list of the learning outcomes of a program in the context of the [Western Degree Outcomes](https://teaching.uwo.ca/curriculum/wdo.html).

* Knowledge
* Literacies and Interdisciplinarity
* Communication
* Resilience and Life-Long Learning
* Global and Community Engagement
* Critical Inquiry and Creative Thinking
* Professionalism and Ethical Conduct

Under each heading above, describe the intended learning outcomes and experiences, giving specific examples, where possible; describe how the program addresses the learning objectives; for example, describe how learning objectives are met through formal course work, independent research, practicum and internship training, teaching and research assistantships, professional development workshops, etc.

Use the following Learning Outcome Table to facilitate alignment of outcomes.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Western Degree Outcomes** | **Program Learning Outcomes** | **How does the** **program support the achievement of each outcome (e.g., coursework examples, other learning experiences)** | **How does the program evaluate the achievement of each outcome (e.g., assessments, assignments, milestones)** |
| Knowledge | E.g., PLO 1; PLO 2; PLO 3. |  |  |
| Literacies and Interdisciplinarity | PLO 4 |  |  |
| Communication | PLO 5; PLO 6, etc. |  |  |
| Resilience and Life-Long Learning |  |  |  |
| Global and Community Engagement |  |  |  |
| Critical Inquiry and Creative Thinking |  |  |  |
| Professionalism and Ethical Conduct |  |  |  |

**2.2.2.1 Mapping the Curriculum**

The brief must include a curriculum map (usually in an Appendix to the self-study) that demonstrates how courses map onto learning outcomes for the program. It should also show how mastery of learning outcomes is assessed. In this section, include a narrative that comments on notable aspects of the curriculum, which might include:

* Alignment and integration of learning outcomes across courses
* Progression of learning – appropriateness of where and when students are introduced to concepts/skills, where and when these are reinforced, and then subsequently mastered.
* Distribution of student workload
* Types of assessments of student work
* Gaps identified through curriculum mapping and possible future development of the curriculum
* How the curriculum addresses the current state of the discipline
* Pedagogical innovation in the program, which might include technology-enabled learning
* How the mode(s) of delivery is appropriate and effective in meeting the program’s learning outcomes
* How EDID is incorporated in the learning experience

Identify and describe any special and unique features of the program and how they complement the learning journey of the student. For example, note if the program is accredited by a professional body; note any unique opportunities through partnerships with other departments or units; note any special training opportunities or internships available to students.

Curriculum Mapping support can be procured through the Centre for Teaching and Learning (CTL). The CTL’s curriculum team can help set up the mapping process and efficiently guide the program through the collection, analysis and interpretation of the resulting data. More information can be found at the [following dedicated webpage.](https://teaching.uwo.ca/curriculum/innovation-review/review.html#mapping)

* 1. **Admission Requirements**

In describing Admission Requirements (2.3.1), explain the alignment of requirements students must complete to progress into the module with program learning outcomes: prerequisite courses, portfolio, audition, etc.

**2.5** **Program Resources**

Indescribing**faculty resources,** explain the composition of the faculty, its appropriateness, and adequacy of faculty numbers for offering the program.

* Comment on the professional credentials of faculty members as relevant to the program. Note the number or proportion of faculty who have professional credentials or expertise relevant to the program.
* Comment on involvement of non-tenure track members in the program.
* List the faculty members in the program.

In describing **resources available to students,** refer to the section below:

* **Staff -** Describe the staff complement that supports the department/program.
* **Student Services -** Comment on Faculty- and program-based support for students, including academic advising, career or internship counseling, workshops or other professional development opportunities, etc.
* **Library Resources and Support -** Western Libraries provides a report to be included in the brief.
* **Information Technology -** Provide an overview of the technical supports and computing services and facilities available to students in the program, if applicable. Note any specific computing or technical needs of students in the program and describe how they are met.
* **Laboratory Resources -** Provide a description of the laboratory resources and equipment available to students in the program, if applicable. Provide a list of the laboratory facilities used by undergraduate students in the program and the services offered, if applicable.