

## Periodic Appraisal of Existing Graduate Programs (Requires External Consultants)

### Schedule of Reviews:

Graduate Program reviews will be synchronized with Undergraduate Program reviews and, where possible, with accreditation reviews

- An attempt will be made to conduct all reviews (undergraduate, graduate and, where required, accreditation) in the same review year
- Separate reviews with separate External Consultants will be conducted for graduate and undergraduate programs to ensure detailed attention to both programs
- Documentation relevant to both reviews will be shared to reduce duplication

### Contents of the Brief:

**(based on former OCGS Brief Template)**

Self-Study (SGPS will provide the data for many of the quality indicators. Refer to the template for the review of an existing program for details.)

- Must be broad-based, reflective, forward-looking and include critical analysis
- Must address:
- Consistency of learning outcomes with institutional mission and "**Graduate Degree Level Expectations**"
  - Opportunities for improvements / enhancements to the program
  - Program-related data and measures of performance (including provincial, national and professional standards, where available)
  - Integrity of the data
  - Concerns and recommendations raised in previous review
  - Areas identified through self-study as needing improvement
  - Areas identified for enhancement
  - Academic services that contribute to the quality of the program
  - Participation of faculty, staff and students in the self-study
- Could use data collected in the G13 Graduate Student Satisfaction Survey
- Could administer questions from the Graduate Student Satisfaction Survey to students currently in the program

Objectives of the program

- Fit with University's mission and academic plan
- Appropriateness of requirements and learning outcomes in relation "**Graduate Degree Level Expectations**"

Admission requirements

- Additional requirements (e.g., additional languages, portfolios, auditions)

Curriculum - Structure and regulations

- Course requirements
- Description of the fields, if the programs has previously approved fields
- Progression requirements
- Timeline for milestones
- Rationale for program length

Curriculum - Program content

|   |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Courses</li> <li>○ Milestone requirements</li> <li>○ Explain how the proposed curriculum addresses the current state of the discipline or area of study</li> <li>○ Unique or innovative aspects</li> <li>○ Nature and appropriateness of research requirements</li> <li>○ Evidence that 2/3 of course content is clearly at the graduate level</li> </ul>  |
| <p>Mode of delivery</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Appropriate for Degree Level Expectations</li> </ul>   |
| <p>Assessment of teaching &amp; learning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Assessing achievement of Degree Level Expectations</li> </ul>   |
| <p>Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Adequacy of unit's human, physical and financial resources</li> <li>○ Commitment to support the program</li> <li>○ Participation of sufficient qualified faculty members</li> <li>○ If the program has previously identified fields, evidence of sufficient expertise and supervisory capacity for fields</li> <li>○ Evidence of sufficient funding to support students and research</li> <li>○ Evidence of how supervisory loads will be distributed</li> <li>○ Evidence of how qualifications to supervise will be determined and evidence of the supervisory levels of the faculty members</li> <li>○ Evidence of appropriate library resources</li> <li>○ Evidence of appropriate lab/research facilities/resources</li> </ul>  |
| <p>Quality Indicators</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Qualifications of faculty <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Research funding</li> <li>● Awards and honors</li> <li>● Commitment to student mentoring</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Quality and availability of supervision</li> <li>○ Evidence of funding to support students</li> <li>○ Evidence of program structure and faculty research to ensure intellectual quality of the student experience</li> <li>○ Availability of sufficient graduate level courses to meet requirements (with 2/3 of courses at the graduate level)</li> <li>○ Quality of the students and student experiences <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Applications and registrations</li> <li>● Grade level at admission</li> <li>● Attrition rates</li> <li>● Time-to-completion</li> <li>● Graduation rates</li> <li>● Academic awards and scholarships (success rates in competitions)</li> <li>● Publications and scholarly achievements of students (scholarly output)</li> <li>● Professional and transferable skills</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Graduates</li> </ul> |

- Employment following graduation (6 months, 2 years)
- Post-graduate study
- Alumni reports on program quality

#### Quality Enhancements

- Initiatives to enhance the quality of the program and/or enrich the experiences of students
- Innovative aspects of the program

#### Process:

##### Internal

- Program member with primary responsibility for preparation of the brief meets with the Vice-Provost (Graduate & Postdoctoral Studies) and/or the Co-Chairs of SUPR-G to discuss preparation of the brief and the process for appraisal
- Brief is submitted to SUPR-G
- SUPR-G determines Internal Reviewers
- Internal Reviewers review the brief
- Co-Chairs of SUPR-G and the Vice-Provost (Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies), select two external consultants (see the document "***Nomination and Selection of External Consultants for Graduate Program Reviews***" for criteria)
- On-site visit of the external consultants, accompanied by the Internal Reviewers takes place
- The External Consultants submit a joint report to SUPR-G; the report is sent to the program, Department/School Chair/Director, and Dean with the request for a response
  - The program and department/school are required to submit a response (it can be a joint response or separate responses); the Dean may choose to submit a response.
- Internal Reviewers receive the External Consultants' report, along with the program/department/school and Dean's response to the report
- Internal Reviewers prepare a summary report, including prioritized recommendations
- SUPR-G will prepare a summary of the review and recommendations and make one of the following recommended ratings to SCAPA:
  - Good Quality (Approval to continue)
  - Good Quality (Approval to continue), with report
  - Unacceptable, Not approved to continue
- In addition to the recommendation, SUPR-G will provide SCAPA with the brief, the consultants' report, the responses to the consultants' report, and SUPR-G's summary and recommendations
- Simultaneously, SUPR-G provides the program with its summary and recommendations
- SCAPA reviews the documentation from SUPR-G and makes an evaluation recommendation to Senate
- Prior to making a recommendation, SCAPA may invite a representative from the program (e.g., the Department Chair, the Dean) to attend a meeting of SCAPA to provide additional information

- Senate receives the recommendation
- The Provost reviews the budgetary implications of the program recommendations
- The outcome of the review is made public via the University's website
- Annually, SUPR-G provides the GEC with a report of all graduate program reviews and their outcomes

#### External

- University, through the Provost, submits the summary, recommendations and evaluation outcome to the Quality Council

#### Process for "With Report" Appraisals

- The report is submitted to SUPR-G
- SUPR-G makes one of the following recommended ratings to SCAPA:
  - Approved to continue without condition
  - Approved to continue, but additional information and report required
  - Required to suspend admissions for a minimum of two years; specified conditions must be met before admissions can resume
- SCAPA, prior to making its recommendation, may invite a representative of the program to a meeting of SCAPA to provide more information or clarification
- SCAPA reports to Senate the outcome and recommendations following the review of the program's report [reports will need to be submitted to SCAPA two months before they are due to the Quality Council to allow sufficient time for SCAPA to review the report and convey the outcome to Senate]

The next periodic appraisal of the program must occur within 8 years following this review.

#### **Summary of Steps:**

##### Internal University Process

- 1) Develop brief for periodic appraisal of the program
- 2) Submit brief to SUPR-G
- 3) SUPR-G assigns the brief to an Internal Reviewers
- 4) SUPR-G Co-Chairs and Vice-Provost appoint two external consultants
- 5) The external consultants review the brief, conduct an onsite visit accompanied by internal reviewers, and submit a joint written report
- 6) The program, Chair and Dean submit a response to the consultants' report to SUPR-G
- 7) The Internal Reviewers submit a summary, including prioritized recommendations, to SUPR-G
- 8) SUPR-G reviews the summary and makes a recommendation to SCAPA
- 9) SCAPA makes a recommendation to Senate and submits the final report to the program
- 10) The Provost reviews the budgetary implications of the program recommendations
- 11) The Provost conveys the outcome to the Quality Council
- 12) The University posts the outcome of the review on its website
- 13) The Dean reports on the recommendations in the final report through the annual planning process
- 14) The next periodic appraisal of the program is conducted within 8 years.

Copies of all briefs, communication and documents related to the programs reviews, and the

recommendations related to all reviews are stored in the office of the Vice-Provost,  
Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies

- Dean's and Department/Program Chairs will have access to these documents
- Senate will receive the executive summary of the review, including prioritized recommendations, from SCAPA
- The summary, prioritized recommendations and evaluation rating will be posted publicly