

Cyclical Program Review Policy and Procedures			
Policy Type	Academic	Initially Approved:	September 2016
Policy Sponsor	Vice-President, Academic Affairs	Last Revised:	November 2021 December 2022 February 2023
Administrative Responsibility	Assessment and Planning	Review Scheduled:	November 2025
Approver	General Faculties Council		

Cyclical Program Reviews

General Overview

The following policy and procedures applies to program level reviews conducted for the Association of Biblical Higher Education (ABHE), the Association of Theological Schools (ATS), or the Campus Alberta Quality Council (CAQC).

Cyclical program review is integral to maintaining program quality and relevance within advanced education. Periodic review links the soundness of an academic program to system-wide standards of measure, and further identifies competencies and deficiencies of discipline content and sequence, teaching and learning strategies relative to other programs within the institution, to similar programs at other postsecondary institutions, and to marketplace standards that employ program graduates.

Cyclical program review includes an assessment of program quality. Reviews of Alberta Advanced Education approved programs will include two external discipline specialists to examine the program self-study document and conduct a site visit to assess program content and operation and submit a report of their findings and recommendations.

The policy, procedures, and self-study template presented here are intended to guide a program area through a review process, from initial data gathering and reflective analysis on current program outcomes, structure, and effectiveness, through research into the state of the academic discipline(s) represented in the program, to an action plan, with initiatives for future sustainability and growth. The primary focus of a review is summed up in three related questions:

1. How does the program align with the Ambrose mission and with institutional priorities?
2. In what ways does the program meet the current needs of learners, thereby ensuring their success?
3. What elements of content and delivery require innovation or re-design in order for the program to remain relevant and competitive?

Looking forward, a plan for long-term viability acknowledges that change and adaptation are necessary to ensure continued program relevance and learner success. The critical components of a successful review include (but are not limited to):

- Alignment with the priorities of the Master Academic Plan (MAP) and the mandates of government and accrediting bodies;
- Currency of subject content and modes of delivery;
- Demonstrated proof of instructional quality and faculty competency (including active programs of scholarship and professional development plans).

Programs are to be evaluated using standard data sets, which will be provided by the Office of Planning and Assessment at the outset of the review process.

Cyclical Program Policy

All Ambrose programs will be reviewed on a seven-year cycle. Reviews should be completed in one year (April to April) and implementation of an action plan will normally begin in the fall of the subsequent academic year.

The schedule for reviews will be maintained by the Office of the Provost and revised periodically as new programs are added and reviews of existing programs are completed.

Components of Reviews

Cyclical program reviews will have the following components.

- Preparation of a program self-study document;
- Review of the self-study document by external academic experts (CAQC programs);
- Review and response to the report of the external academic experts (CAQC programs);
- Development of an action plan to address any issues raised by the self-study and/or external experts;
- Presentation of these elements to the appropriate Academic Affairs Committee (AAC), Faculty Council, and the Academic Policy and Planning Committee (APPC), with final approval by the General Faculties Council (GFC); and,
- Submission of all elements of the review, including an executive summary, to the appropriate accrediting body.

Role of the Provost/ Vice President of Academic Affairs

The Provost/Vice President of Academic Affairs (VPAA) will ensure that the policy and procedures are followed, the action plans are implemented, and progress is reported to ABHE, ATS, or CAQC as appropriate.

Role of the Dean

The Dean, in consultation with the Chair of the program under review, will ensure that appropriate appointments are made to a Steering Committee established to undertake the self-study and will

monitor progress throughout the review process. For CAQC approved programs, the Dean will work with the Steering Committee to identify and appoint qualified external reviewers and will assist in managing logistics for the site visit. The Dean will advise in the development of an action plan to implement key recommendations of the review.

Role of Department or Program Chair

Department and Program Chairs will be responsible for guiding review processes, producing self-study documents, hosting the site visits of external reviewers (CAQC programs) and meeting all deadlines as set out in the Cyclical Program Review Procedures.

Program Steering Committees

Program steering committees will assist the Chair with the review process. The Steering Committee will consist of:

Program faculty

All full-time continuing program faculty will be involved in the review process as assigned by the Chair. Sessional and adjunct faculty will normally be consulted and may be more substantially involved in the review process, if appropriate for the program.

Program student

One student member of the Steering Committee will provide a student perspective to the analysis of program-related data and the development of the action plan.

Non-program faculty member

One non-program faculty member with experience in the review process will normally provide a broader institutional perspective to the analysis of data and the development of the action plan.

Student and non-program faculty appointments are to be made in consultation with the appropriate Dean.

Self-study Document

Led by the Chair, the Steering Committee will prepare a program self-study document. The self-study will follow the Template for the Self-study Document (see below) and have the following characteristics. It will demonstrate:

- How the program contributes to the Ambrose mission, goals, and Master Academic Plan;
- Achievement of the program's stated goals and standards by students/graduates;
- Program learning outcomes and their assessment as well as a curriculum map showing how the program learning outcomes are achieved in each course;
- Alignment with the Canadian Degree Qualifications Framework, Campus Alberta Quality Council, Association of Theological School or Association for Biblical Higher Education program standards, and any disciple specific standards;
- Student flows including application activity, enrollment, retention, and graduation trends;

- Provides assessment of graduate employment rates, graduate satisfaction level, student satisfaction level, and graduate rate;
- Indications of employer satisfaction for professional programs;
- Sufficient and effective use of resources (physical, technological, financial and human);
- Effectiveness of the methods used for evaluating student progress and achievement; and
- Indicators of faculty performance including the quality of teaching and scholarship.

An important aspect of the self-study is a critical self-reflection on all the elements of the program.

External Review (CAQC Programs)

When the program self-study is complete and has been reviewed by the Dean and the Director of Planning and Assessment, it will be sent to two external reviewers. Reviewers are to be recommended by the Steering Committee and appointed by the Dean. Selection considerations for external reviews can be found in Appendix B.

Reviewers will consider the analysis conducted in the program self-study, compare it for alignment with the Canadian Degree Qualifications Framework, Campus Alberta Quality Council program standards and the Ambrose mission and Educational Principles. Sample terms of reference for external reviewers can be found in Appendix C.

Reviewers will conduct a campus visit and have access to relevant faculty, students, and administrators. The Dean will ensure that external reviewers have access to all the resources they need, are aware of the expectations for their review, and understand the process for the site visit. The Chair will act as guide and interpreter of Ambrose academic culture. A sample on-campus visit schedule can be found in Appendix D.

Approval and Submission of the Review

The program self-study, report of the external reviewers, the response of the Steering Committee, and the action plan for addressing recommendations will be presented to the appropriate Academic Affairs Committee (AAC), the Faculty Council, and APPC for review, with final institutional approval by GFC. Reviews of programs approved by CAQC are submitted to the CAQC for its review. The offices of the Dean and the VPAA will help schedule the internal approval process.

Transparency and Monitoring

An appropriately constructed public report (based on the preamble and action plan), as well as the institution's cyclical review policy and procedures, will be made available on the Ambrose website.

The Dean will provide an annual update to APPC regarding progress made on the Action plan.

Cyclical Program Review Procedures

The Office of Planning and Assessment will provide advice and support throughout the review process.

Program Review Timeline

Ideally program reviews should be completed within a single year. The following sample schedule would apply to the review process for CAQC programs:

March-April	Initial meeting of the Chair and Dean to discuss the review process, timeline, and appointment of student and non-program faculty members to the Steering Committee. Surveying of current students and alumni.
April-May	Receipt of survey and NSSE data from the Office of Planning and Assessment.
August-November	Self-study conducted following the template provided.
November-December	Review of findings including reflection on data and consultation with external stakeholders.
December-January	Steering Committee produces a self-study document.
By December 31	Select reviewers and establish a date for site visit.
By January 31	Self-study document reviewed by the Dean, the VPAA, and the Director of Planning and Assessment, presented to UCC and the appropriate Faculty Council(s) for information. Self-study forwarded to external reviewers.
February	Site visit of external reviewers.
March	Review of the report of the external reviewers and development of the response and action plan in light of the recommendations and findings of the external reviewers.
March-April	Presentation to AAC, the appropriate Faculty Council, and APPC for review, with final institutional approval by GFC.
April	Submission to CAQC as appropriate
Following fall	Begin implementation of the action plan

Data Sets for Analysis

Enrolment data

Includes:

- Program enrolment by head and FLE since last review;
- Entering grades;
- Completion rates;
- Time to completion; and
- Course offerings and class size.

Current Student Survey

A standard set of questions has been developed and this should be supplemented by program-specific questions that allow assessment of unique program components.

Alumni Survey

A standard set of questions has been developed to measure overall outcomes, including employment and further education. Program-specific questions can be added to this.

NSSE National Data (Undergraduate Programs)

Ambrose has participated in the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) annually since 2010. These surveys have provided good institutional-level data which is regularly used to make decisions to improve the student experience. Because our institutional sample size was small when we attempted to analyze this data by program, the sample sizes were too small to be meaningful. In 2017 and 2020, Ambrose was invited to participate in the NSSE National Data Project spearheaded by the Institutional Research Department at Queen's University. This project is intended to repeat every three years and provides program level data by CIP codes for institutions participating in NSSE across Canada. This project allows 3 years of NSSE data to be compiled to create a significant sample size for program reviews. For the purposes of comparison, we use the data for Canadian universities with comparable programs participating in the NSSE National Data Project.

Graduating Student Questionnaire

Ambrose Seminary participates annually in standard ATS survey that provide data the compares with ATS institutions. Response levels have typically been low. However, by compiling several years' worth of results, useable data sets can be constructed on graduating students' satisfaction with teaching and program design.

Complete Review Package

Preamble

This will include:

- overview of the review process (components and timelines);
- the membership of the steering committee including their role in relation to the program
- the rationale for the selection of the external reviewers, as well as their CVs (see appendix);
- the site visit schedule; and
- executive summary of key findings and Action Plan.

Dean's Review

This will include:

- how the Review has moved through the internal governance processes; and
- institutional commitment to implement the action plan.

Self-Study Document

Report of External Reviewers

Ambrose Review Committee's Response to the Report of External Reviewers

Appendices

This will include:

- CVs of External Reviewers; and
- Cyclical review policy and procedures.

Public Report

An appropriately constructed public report (based on the preamble and action plan, as well as the institution's cyclical review policy and procedures, will be made available on the Ambrose website.

Template for the Self-study document (CAQC Programs)

The self-study should not be more than 50 pages. Considering moving lists of courses and teaching rotations in appendices. The self-study should focus on analysis supported by appropriate evidence.

Four considerations to help move toward critical self-assessment: the document should begin with objectives, then move through description to implementation and assessment.

Objectives: what the program is for (2 and 3)

Description: what the program is like (4 and 5)

Implementation: how the program works (6 to 9)

Assessment: does the program do what it is supposed to (10 and 11)

Forward plan: based on analysis of above what plans are there for the future (12 and 13)

Items appearing in boxes will be provided by the Office of Planning and Assessment.

1. Introduction and Progress since Last Review

Information regarding the last cyclical review (including an assessment of the implementation of that review's action plan)

Key developments since the last review

An overview of the data sets being used for this analysis

2. Contribution to Ambrose Mission

Narrative description of what the program brings to Ambrose

3. Program Objectives

The profile of a graduating student in this program

Align program objectives with overall Ambrose Educational Principles and Arts and Science Learning Outcomes

4. Program Content

Demonstrate how learning outcomes for the program are addressed by the curriculum structure

Curriculum structure and required courses

A curriculum map showing how the program learning outcomes are achieved in courses offered

ACAT agreements

Special program components: travel study, HIPs, experiential and work-integrated learning.

Level of participation in special components – NSSE National and Current Student Survey

The review of program content should ensure alignment with Ambrose Curriculum Committee standards:

- All Course Descriptions observe Curriculum Committee guidelines (see Appendix G)
- Revisions to course frequency, prerequisites, etc. made as necessary
- All courses no longer taught deleted from calendar

- Identification and elimination of unnecessary overlap with other departments in course offerings
- ACAT agreements are current (not more than five years old)
- Old ACAT agreements (more than five years) reviewed for continued accuracy and a current syllabus provided to the registrar

Reference Curriculum Committee’s “Guidelines for Writing Course Description” (Appendix H)

5. Program Structure

This section ensures compliance with CAQC requirements, the Canadian Degree Qualifications Framework, any discipline standards and other comparable programs.

Reference CAQC Handbook 4.3.3 CAQC EXPECTATIONS FOR DESIGN AND STRUCTURE OF UNDERGRADUATE DEGREES (Appendix E) and Canadian Degree Qualifications Framework (Appendix F)

Show alignment with degree expectations from CAQC Handbook

Show alignment with Canadian Degree Qualifications Framework

Show alignment with any discipline specific standards

Compare program structure with other relevant programs

6. Faculty

Demonstrate that faculty have the required academic/professional qualifications, including active programs of scholarship, and that there are sufficient faculty to comply with CAQC requirements and to effectively offer the courses required

Reference CAQC Handbook 4.3.4 STANDARDS ON ACADEMIC STAFF FOR BACCALAUREATE PROGRAMS (Appendix G)

Faculty qualifications

Faculty teaching loads

Teaching rotations which demonstrate ability to cover curriculum

Faculty Scholarship

Current faculty CV will be available from the appropriate Deans Office

Student-Faculty Interaction – NSSE National and Alumni Survey

7. Program Delivery

Demonstrates that the program is being efficiently and effectively delivered

Program enrolment by head and FLE since last review

Entering grades

Completion rates

Time to completion

Class size

8. Teaching

Describe teaching and learning methods utilized in the program

Measures of Academic challenge – NSSE National Data for Engagement Indicators: Higher Order Learning, Collaborative Learning and Reflective and Integrative Learning.
Student satisfaction with teaching – NSSE National Data for Effective Teaching Practices, Student Faculty Interaction, Learning Strategies and Alumni Survey

9. Resources

Evaluate availability and adequacy of resources needed

Library

IT support

Labs or specialized facilities

Specialized equipment

10. Student Outcomes

Demonstrate that program learning outcomes are being achieved

Learning Outcomes – Alumni Survey
Student participation in scholarship – ARC, publications
Perceived gains in knowledge, skills, personal development – NSSE National and Alumni Survey
Student Satisfaction with program– Alumni Survey
Student employment outcomes – Alumni Survey
Student participation in subsequent degree programs – Alumni Survey

11. Survey of Best Practices

Provide a summary of the state of the discipline and current knowledge of effective teaching and learning practices in the discipline, including elements like a review of the literature, reports from appropriate educational bodies, and a discussion of leading programs in the discipline

12. Review of Findings

An internal review allowing faculty to reflect on the findings of the self-study in light of the survey of best practices, which will normally include consultation with sessional instructors and other departments as appropriate

A review of the findings of the self-study in light of the survey of best practices with key stakeholders, including advisory committees, practicum or work-integrated learning partners, and potential employers

13. Future Plans

On the basis of the evidence and consultation in this process, specific actions for improving program quality

Note: After the external review these actions and any recommended will be developed into a response, including an action plan with assigned responsibilities and proposed dates for completion

Template for the Self-study document (Faculty of Theology Programs)

1. Program Demographics

Student profile in the program including:

- denomination
- age and gender
- geography
- part-time/ full-time
- former degree location/type

2. Internal Review

- 2.1 Program description including program outcomes from the Calendar
- 2.2 Review of core courses and assessment of Program Learning Outcomes (curriculum map)
- 2.3 Demonstrate compliance with the curricular standards of the appropriate accrediting body
- 2.4 Analysis of student satisfaction from NSSE/GSQ data and qualitative material from annual Program Review Panels
- 2.5 Analysis of program quality from annual faculty Year-end Reviews
- 2.6 Consideration of special issues for this program (Chinese language, chaplaincy)

3. Program delivery

- 3.1 Review of enrolment patterns including:
 - retention
 - time to completion
 - completion rate
 - class size
- 3.2 Review of program resources:
 - Library
 - IT support
- 3.3 Faculty
Demonstrate that faculty have the required academic/professional qualifications, including active programs of scholarship, and that there are sufficient faculty to effectively offer the courses required

4. External Context

- 4.1 Comparison to similar programs elsewhere
Include as appropriate attention to: Credit hours, Program Goals, Delivery Flexibility, Formation, distribution of credit hours, macro assessment, field education, credit hours before internship, tuition.
- 4.2 Alumni Satisfaction, including employment and/or further education
- 4.3 Consultation with external stakeholders, denominational leadership and employers

4.4 Review of best practices literature

5. Future Plans

Based on the evidence and consultation in this process suggest specific actions for improving program quality, assigning responsibility and timelines for each action.

Appendices

Appendix A	
CAQC Handbook 5.2.3 ... CYCLICAL PROGRAM EVALUATIONS	14
Appendix B	
Selection Considerations for External Reviewers	18
Appendix C	
Sample Terms of Reference for External Reviewers.....	19
Appendix D	
Sample Campus Visit Schedule for External Review	20
Appendix E	
CAQC Handbook 4.3.3 CAQC EXPECTATIONS FOR DESIGN AND STRUCTURE OF UNDERGRADUATE DEGREES.....	21
Appendix F	
Canadian Degree Qualifications Framework	33
Appendix G	
CAQC Handbook 4.3.4 STANDARDS ON ACADEMIC STAFF FOR BACCALAUREATE PROGRAMS	39

Appendix A CAQC Handbook 5.3.3 INSTITUTIONAL CYCLICAL PROGRAM EVALUATIONS

5.3.3 INSTITUTIONAL CYCLICAL PROGRAM EVALUATIONS

With revisions to June 2021

One of CAQC's core principles is that Council recognizes that the primary responsibility for academic and institutional quality assurance rests with degree granting institutions themselves. Council expects an institution to accept responsibility for a self-evaluation of its organization and programs. All institutions are expected to have a cyclical program review policy and procedures. The following guidelines represent best practice:

- a. Each approved degree program is expected to be reviewed every 5-7 years. Some institutions may wish to organize their cyclical reviews so that all programs within that unit or faculty are reviewed at the same time. For example, the institution will determine whether all concentrations within a 3-year program should be reviewed together or whether a concentration should be reviewed at the time the like major in a 4-year program is being reviewed (e.g., music concentration in a 3-year BA might be reviewed at the same time as the music major in a 4-year BA program).
- b. The first step in a cyclical review is a review of the action plan resulting from the last cyclical review. This is followed by the preparation of a self-study that includes input from students, graduates, academic staff, administration, advisory committees and other relevant stakeholders involved in the unit and/or degree program under review. An important aspect of the self-study is a critical self-reflection of all the elements of the program.
- c. The development of the self-study is guided by a steering committee composed of faculty and administrators from the unit responsible for the program. Depending on the program(s) under review, institutions may choose to include an academic staff member from the institution who teach in a program that is not being reviewed, as well as an academic staff member who teach service courses for that program.
- d. The self-study will focus on the degree program's design, how the learning outcomes are mapped throughout the curriculum and how they are assessed, and other outcomes (including student and graduate satisfaction, enrolment flow, completion rates, employment rates of graduates, numbers of graduates who go on to further education, etc.). The self-study shall include program specific information as opposed to primarily institution wide information, where applicable (e.g., program specific student satisfaction vs. institution wide survey results). Including common data sets from a central data repository is a high priority for all program reviews.
- e. One element of the self-study is a self-reflective and evidence-based assessment of the teaching

effectiveness by faculty teaching in the program. This can include the professional development undertaken by the faculty to strengthen their teaching. For CAQC's evidence-based guiding principles with respect to assessing teaching effectiveness, see s. 4.3.4.7.

Added December 2019 With revisions to June 2021

- f. Another element of a self-study is a review of the scholarly activity of each academic staff in the program who has an expectation to engage in scholarship as part of their work. This includes the currency, quality and amount, and an overall self-reflective narrative on the scholarship within the program. Internal and external grants, and engagement of students in scholarly activity should also be reported.
- g. To inform the changes and improvements in the program, provide a summary of the state of the discipline and current knowledge of effective teaching and learning practices in the discipline. This could include a review of the literature, reports from appropriate educational bodies, and an environmental scan/discussion of leading programs in the discipline.

Added June 2021

- h. A minimum of two qualified external reviewers (Independent Academic Experts, Appendix G) are expected to evaluate the self-study, visit the campus and conduct on-site interviews, and prepare a single report identifying program strengths and weaknesses, and make recommendations for enhancing program quality.
- i. As currency of documentation and information contribute to the quality of the review and its outcome, it is important that program reviews be completed as expeditiously as possible so that the data remain current and the review does not detract from other important work taking place in the unit. In many cases it may be possible to complete the full review in 12 months but in some institutions, additional time will be required to complete the full program review cycle.
- j. An essential element of the review is an action plan outlining the steps and processes proposed by the institution to improve the program and to respond to the reviewers' suggestions and recommendations. Timelines and persons accountable for each step shall be included. As a best practice, the action plan is monitored and reported on an annual basis to ensure that the unit is meeting its commitments.
- k. The final results of cyclical reviews shall move through the appropriate governance processes of the institution, which is normally to the institution's academic governing body.

Submission of cyclical review results

The following does not apply to institutions for which Council's monitoring mechanism is a QA process audit (see s. 5.3.5).

For institutions required to submit results of cyclical reviews to Council, the results of the review shall be submitted to Council, together with the steps to be taken to improve the delivery and outcomes of the program. Institutions are expected to provide the following information:

- overview of the review process (components and timelines);
- information regarding the last cyclical review (including an assessment of the implementation of that review's action plan);
- the membership of the steering committee including their role in relation to the program;
- the cyclical review policy and procedures (as an appendix);
- the program self-study (including who was involved in its preparation and their role in relation to the program);
 - program learning outcomes and their assessment as well as a curriculum map showing how the program learning outcomes are achieved in each course;
 - student flow and completion rate data;
 - student and graduate satisfaction data;
 - alumni employment and further education outcomes;
 - stakeholder input;
 - academic staff CVs, preferably in a common institutional format;
 - assessment of teaching and learning effectiveness, including PD opportunities completed by the teaching staff;
 - review of the status of the field and teaching of the discipline;
 - scholarly activity data as well as a critical narrative analysis (e.g., completed CAQC Table 2: Scholarly Activity by Approved Degree Program/Major for the data, accompanied by a reflective narrative analysis);
- the rationale for the selection of the external reviewers, as well as their CVs;
- the site visit schedule;
- the external reviewers' report;
- the institutional response to the reviewers' report including an action plan as noted in guideline (j) above; and
- how the results have moved through the governance processes.

Council will review the results of the program review and provide feedback to the institution regarding both the process and the outcome.

In some cases, program professional accreditation reviews can align and complement the institutions' cyclical review processes. It is important to recognize that the two review outcomes have different purposes. Professional accreditation reviews are conducted to ensure graduate outcomes are aligned with professional industry practices and cyclical reviews are conducted to ensure program academic quality and an effective student learning experience. However, it is recognized that there may be some overlap in the information needed for both reviews.

To minimize duplication of work, and with written approval of the CAQC Secretariat, an accreditation review could be used as the basis for a cyclical review if a supplementary document is provided that clearly indicates where each of the required elements from the guideline's best practices (5.3.3 bullets a through k) and the components required for a complete program review (indicated as a bulleted list above) are found in the report. Where the expected information is not covered in the accreditation review, supplementary documents must provide the required information.

For transparency, institutions are encouraged to provide information on their website regarding the timing and outcome of such reviews, such as an appropriately constructed public report, an action plan, and the institution's cyclical review policy and procedures.

Appendix B Selection Considerations for External Reviewers

From CAQC Handbook Appendix G

The following are guidelines with respect to the selection and use of independent academic experts as part of an institution's cyclical review of approved degree programs:

- Academic experts must have doctoral degrees (or terminal degrees in the discipline) and hold (or have held) academic appointments at the senior level.
- Academic experts should have experience in the design, delivery or administration of a similar program offered at a degree-granting institution.
- In order to avoid conflict of interest and to ensure objective assessments, any connection between an academic expert and the institution must be disclosed. Except in situations noted below, institutions are wise to avoid potential and perceived conflicts by selecting experts who have no connection with the institution or its faculty/administrators, or who are from institutions that are not affiliated with the institution.
- Council acknowledges in certain cases the value to institutions of selecting as a reviewer an expert who was involved in the original review of the program (either one selected by the institution during the development of the proposal or one appointed as one of CAQC's reviewers). However, Council advises institutions not to use the same reviewer more than twice.
- Given *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act* considerations, the institution should seek permission from the expert for submission to Council of the expert's resume.
- Academic experts should be provided with terms of reference, including specific issues/areas to be addressed in the review (see below for a sample that can be adapted to suit the particular institution and program being reviewed).
- Cyclical reviews for graduate programs should include a site visit to the institution by the academic experts to conduct on-site interviews and assess the student experience and learning environment (including the face-to-face experience and virtual environment) and support system, the institution's infrastructure, including library holdings and information access arrangements pertaining to the program area, as well as other physical resources such as laboratories. For cyclical reviews for undergraduate programs, a site visit is strongly encouraged.
- If an expert's cyclical review report fails to address critical elements of the program, the institution should consider engaging another expert to assist it in arriving at a rigorous program review.

Appendix C Sample Terms of Reference

From CAQC Handbook Appendix G

The following exemplifies terms of reference that an institution might give to independent academic experts who are engaged as part of a cyclical review of approved degree programs. They may be adapted to suit the institution and program being evaluated.

1. Does the program continue to meet national and international quality standards for degree programs, including Council's program assessment standards?
2. Does the program demonstrate an understanding of the needs of learners in the program (including the quality of the student experience and learning environment (including the face-to-face experience and virtual environment) and support system), and provide the appropriate academic breadth and depth of knowledge as outlined in the expectations for degree level standards in the Canadian Degree Qualifications Framework (Appendix F)?

Does the program continue to offer similar learning outcomes and opportunities for vocational and educational advancement as those offered to graduates of similar programs at Canadian post-secondary institutions?

4. Does the institution have a sufficient number of appropriately qualified faculty who demonstrate evidence of scholarly activity as outlined in Council's *Standards on academic staff for baccalaureate programs*, its *Academic freedom and scholarship* policy, and its protocol on *Research and scholarship in Campus Alberta*? Has the institution maintained a culture of scholarship commensurate with its status as a Canadian degree-granting institution?
5. Does the institution have both the academic resources (e.g., supporting disciplines) and the infrastructure (e.g., classrooms, information resources, labs, offices, equipment, etc.) to sustain the program?
6. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the program? What recommendations, if any, should be made to improve the program?
7. What is the nature of the administrative support for the program (e.g., academic counseling, academic leadership)?

In order to assist academic experts with their assessments, it is recommended that they be provided with information about the monitoring of approved degree programs (in particular, sections 5.2.3 and 5.2.4 in Council's *Handbook*), the Canadian Degree Qualifications Framework (Appendix F), and Council's program assessment standards (Section 4.3.1 and 4.4.1). In the case of undergraduate degrees, the applicable guidelines with respect to staffing, degree structure and curriculum content, etc. should also be provided.

Appendix D Sample Campus Visit Schedule for External Review

External Reviewers will be on campus for a full day with an orientation meeting on the evening before the visit. The schedule below represents a typical schedule and Steering Committees are encouraged to make adjustments to align with specific program requirements

Evening before the Campus Visit

7:00 pm	Reviewers convene for dinner with Dean to discuss process, and to deal with any outstanding issues related to the self-study
---------	--

Campus Visit

8:30 am	Reviewers meet for breakfast and initial planning and preparation
9:30 am	Campus tour
10:00 am	Meeting with Program Review Steering Committee
10:30 am	Meeting with program faculty
12:00 pm	Lunch with students
1:30 pm	Meeting with the Librarian
2:00 pm	Reviewers meet to prepare comments for exit interview and report
3:30pm	Exit interview with Dean and Department Chair
4:15pm	Document preparation

Appendix G Guidelines for Writing Course Description

A course description is meant to describe clearly yet briefly the subject matter of the course. As such:

- The first sentence should clearly state the broad subject matter. Consider avoiding unnecessary words like “This course will...” and beginning simply with “A survey of...” or a “An exploration of...” After this, however, use complete sentences throughout.
- After the introductory sentence, describe the scope or range of the subject to be covered by the course.
- Finally, identify any unique elements of the course delivery format (e.g., “Instruction will consist of lecture and labs”; “This course includes a major independent research project”).
- Prospective students are your primary readers: avoid jargon or unnecessarily specialized language.

Keep descriptions to fifty words or less.

Guidelines for Writing Learning Outcomes

Learning Outcomes are statements of what a student is expected to know, understand and/or be able to demonstrate after the completion of the course. When drafting these:

- Consider the following template: *“By the end of this course, students will be able to (action verb) (the knowledge, skill or attitude).”* Examples:
 - *“Classify reactions as exothermic and endothermic.”*
 - *“Identify major landform features on topographic maps and relate them to basic geologic processes.”*
 - *“Analyze the relationship between the language of satire and literary form.”*

Generally, consider using specific verbs such as compose, design, develop, evaluate, justify, hypothesize, determine, integrate, carry out, implement, explain, interpret, classify, describe, list, define.

- Group similar outcomes of the same topic into one (eg. “Describe functions of the heart” and “Describe function of the liver” into “Describe functions of major body organs.”)
- While there is no set number, a course might average between five and eight learner outcomes. Several may be universal to your program; several should be specific to the course.

(Adapted from the University of Alberta Teaching & Learning Centre’s “Course Design” Series by Natasja Saranchuk)