Procedure Number:	**5001P**
Procedure Title:	**Program Review**
Approved by:	**Senate**
Approval date:	**February 5, 2014**
Effective date:	**February 5, 2014**
Review date:	**June 1, 2023**
Next review date:	**June 2026**

1. Purpose

1. 1. This Procedure supports the Program Review Policy.

1.2. The Office of the Vice-President Academic (VPA) and the Office of the Institutional Accountability maintain the schedule for cyclical program reviews. This information is made public on the University's website, along with Summary Reports from past cyclical program reviews.

2. Procedures for the Self-Study

2.1. The Vice-President Academic initiates program reviews and, in consultation with the appropriate Department Chair(s) (Undergraduate or Graduate Programs), identifies timeframes and resource requirements for the completion of the self-study and external review. Program reviews will be anticipated and budgeted for, with costs expensed to the appropriate budget centre.

2.2. The Department Chair(s) responsible for the program(s) under review will distribute the templates and supporting documentation (based on standards set by the Degree Quality Assessment Board, other relevant accreditation bodies and best practices in quality assurance for academic programs). The designated Department Chair(s) assembles a Self-Study Committee comprised of a combination of four to seven (4-7) continuing faculty who teach within the program(s) under review.

2.3. The Self-Study Committee uses the approved templates that outline the criteria, processes and timelines for completion of the Self-Study Report. Criteria for assessment are aligned with DQAB guidelines, or quality assurance and compliance standards as well as standards for any accreditation body for which UCW has received, or is applying for, accreditation. The Self-Study Committee develops a work plan specifying collective and individual duties and delivery dates.

2.4. The Office of Institutional Accountability supplies the Self-Study Committee with the data from staff and appropriate departments to support the analysis and reporting requirements.

2.5. The Department Chair(s) and Committee uses appropriate methods for gathering and analyzing input from the relevant faculty members, staff, students and the Program Advisory Committee (PAC), with the appropriate support from the Office of Institutional Accountability.

2.6. A draft of the Self-Study Report with initial key findings is reviewed by the VP Academic prior to the writing of the final report providing an opportunity for review and clarification of the findings and recommendations.

2.7. The Self-Study Committee produces a comprehensive and clearly written Self-Study Report identifying program strengths, areas for short and longer-term improvements, and opportunities for new course or program development.

2.8. The Self-Study Committee submits the final Report to the VP Academic who commissions qualified external reviewers to assess and report on program operations and deliverables. The Self-Study Committee may recommend appropriate reviewers to be considered for appointment by the VP Academic.

2.9. The VP Academic (or Designate) provides the Self-Study Report to the external reviewers, assists the reviewers to plan and coordinate site visits and access to information required by the reviewers.se

3. Procedures for the External Review

3.1. The VP Academic or Designate appoints an External Review Panel comprised of two to five (2-4) qualified individuals (depending on the size of the program). External reviewers will be reimbursed for expenses (travel, accommodation, meals, honoraria).

3.2. The primary focus of the External Program Review Panel is on academic quality, curriculum and program learning outcomes. The External Program Review Panel considers the Self-Study Report for the program(s) and any documentation regarding University policies, procedures, the Academic Calendar and website, detailed course outlines, and data on student and faculty performance.

> 3.2.1. The Office for Institutional Accountability prepares an agenda for the panel's site visit.

> 3.2.2. The agenda is reviewed by the VP Academic or Designate and the Review Panel members to ensure availability of participants to meet with the External Review Panel.

3.3. At the end of the site visit, the External Review Panel provides preliminary feedback to the VP Academic and the Chair(s).

3.4. External reviewers compile a draft report identifying program strengths and areas for further development. The report is forwarded to the Program Chair(s), within two weeks of site visit. External Reviewers may ask for additional clarifications during this time through the Office of Institutional Accountability.

3.5. The Program Chair(s) compile a Program Response with responses to each of the recommendations, new initiative or actions that will be taken to address them and a timeline for implementation.

3.6. The VP Academic, in consultation with the Department Chair(s) (Graduate or Undergraduate), the Self-Study Committee, the Office of Institutional Accountability, the President, the Registrar or other senior leadership staff (where applicable) has two weeks in which to compile the Program Review Summary Report.

4. Follow-up Reporting

4.1. VP Academic (or Designate) presents the Summary Report to the Quality Assurance Committee of the Senate normally at the meeting immediately following receipt of the Final Report.

4.2. The Summary Report is presented to the Senate for approval.

4.3. The Summary Report is made public on the University's website.

5. Implementation of Recommendations

5.1. The Program Chair and the VPA will work together to ensure that the new program proposal or the application for renewal of consent (as appropriate) is submitted in a timely manner for consideration by DQAB. This submission should reflect the proposed changes to address the recommendations from the Final Report.

5.2. The Program Chair will submit an annual report to the Quality Assurance Committee (after the completion of the cyclical program review) outlining progress made to implement the recommendations from the final report and the next steps to address the remaining recommendations.