

 DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY SENATE POLICY FOR FACULTY REVIEWS OF ACADEMIC PROGRAMS	<i>Policy Sponsor:</i> <i>Senate</i>	<i>Approval Date:</i> Senate: December 10, 2018 Board of Governors: February 12, 2019
	<i>Responsible Unit: Provost, Faculties</i>	<i>Revisions:</i> Senate: Board:

A. Background and Purpose

This policy is intended to ensure that each Academic Program at Dalhousie University is reviewed on a cyclical basis, and that such reviews are conducted in accordance with overarching minimum expectations. The components and assessment criteria laid out in this policy are in support of Dalhousie’s long-term goals and are consistent with the Maritime Provinces Higher Education Commission’s (MPHEC) Quality Assurance Framework.

This policy is based on the following principles:

- Evidence-based reviews of Academic Programs are a crucial component of Dalhousie’s quality assurance activities.
- Faculty-based reviews of Academic Programs support strategic academic program planning, excellence and continuous improvement.
- Reviews of Academic Programs are one means by which Faculties demonstrate responsibility and transparency to their communities and critically assess progress towards its own goals.

Related Policies:

- Senate Reviews of Faculties Policy and Procedures

B. Application

This policy governs Faculty reviews of all credit-bearing Academic Programs at Dalhousie University. ¹

¹ Also governs reviews of graduate programs offered jointly-with the University of King's College, and FASS reviews of joint undergraduate programs with King’s

C. Definitions

1. "Academic Program," means a program, including, but not limited to, majors, honors, minors, diplomas and certificates, and variations thereof (including options, co-op, streams, concentrations, etc.)
2. "Faculty" means all Faculties delivering Academic Programs, which includes, for the purposes of this policy, the Schulich School of Law, and the College of Sustainability.
3. "Program Director" means the academic leader of the program under review.
4. "Dean" means the Dean (or delegate) of the Faculty which delivers the Academic Program under review.
5. "Review Committee" means an internal review committee, appointed as per Appendix A.
6. "Program goals" are broad statements of what it is anticipated that learners will accomplish in their course of study, consistent with the mission of the program.

D. Policy Statements

1. All Academic Programs must be reviewed in accordance with this Policy and be subject to the same standards.
2. The results of an accreditation review shall normally substitute for some or all of the requirements in this Policy (see Procedures).
3. Reviews of Academic Programs within a Faculty are the responsibility of the Dean. Reviews of graduate-level Academic Programs are a joint responsibility of the Dean and the Faculty of Graduate Studies (FGS).
4. Faculty reviews of Academic Programs take place on a cyclical basis, typically every 5-7 years; however, newly-established programs are to be reviewed within 2 years after the first cohort has graduated.
5. On a cyclical basis, as part of the Senate Review of the Faculty, the Faculty will also consider the totality of its Academic Program offerings. This includes assessing whether there is a clear, evidence-based rationale for the current portfolio of programs offered entirely within the Faculty or in collaboration with others.
6. Faculty reviews of academic programs provide an assessment, with evidence, of the following:
 - a. **Program Rationale and Structure.** All Dalhousie programs should have clear justification for their intellectual content and programmatic structure.
 - b. **Program Renewal and Characteristics.** Programs should consider, on a cyclical basis, their defining characteristics and opportunities for renewal.
 - c. **Program Goals and Assessment.** Clarity of program goals and methods of assessment tied to those goals are a beneficial practice in higher education.
 - d. **Program Delivery.** On site and online program delivery methods should show evidence of a strong support for learners.
 - e. **Student Success Indicators.** Program design and delivery should support student success.

- f. **Relationships and collaborations.** Students benefit from engagement and learning opportunities outside of the classroom.
- g. **Learning Supports.** Programs require strong resources beyond the classroom.
- h. **Culture of Respect and Inclusivity.** Dalhousie seeks to increase diversity and inclusion through program design and delivery.
- i. **Program Management.** A program's success requires effective and efficient leadership and management.
- j. **Regulations.** Programs are required to adhere to university and faculty academic regulations.

E. Administrative Structure

1. Authority: This policy is administered by the Provost Office and the Faculties (including FGS).
2. Record-keeping: The Dean's Office is responsible for maintaining all files associated with reviews of Academic Programs, in accordance with the Dalhousie's Records Management Policy and associated guidelines.
3. Administrative and budgetary support for review: The Dean's office will ensure administrative support and required budget, where needed, is provided to the Program Review Committee and External Reviewers.
4. Policy Review: This Policy will be reviewed no later than by the end of the fifth year of its operation.
5. Policy Modifications: Any modifications to the Policy shall be approved by Senate. Modifications to the Procedures in Appendix A shall be approved by the Senate Academic Programs and Research Committee, on behalf of Senate. Modifications to the forms in Appendices B through D shall be approved by the Office of the Provost and Vice-President Academic and the Faculty of Graduate Studies, jointly, and reported to the Senate Academic Programs and Research Committee

Appendix A: Procedures

for Senate Policy for Faculty Reviews of Academic Programs

Programs Subject to Accreditation

The results of an accreditation review shall normally substitute for some or all of the requirements in the Policy (factors identified in section D.6.).

While preparing for an accreditation site visit (self-study phase), the Program Director or designate shall arrange a meeting with the Associate Vice-President Academic (undergraduate programs) or Associate Dean of Graduate Studies (graduate programs). The purpose of the meeting will be to determine which factors may not be sufficiently assessed through the accreditation review and to agree upon necessary actions to address the gap. For information requirements in lieu of A. through F. in these Procedures, see Appendix B.

A. Schedule and Review Committee

1. Schedule: On the recommendation of Program Directors, Deans shall provide their rolling schedule of reviews of Academic Programs for submission to Faculty Council and the Office of the Provost and Vice-President Academic. Schedules for reviews of graduate Academic Programs shall be communicated to FGS and be mutually agreed upon.
2. At the discretion of the Dean, two or more Academic Programs may be reviewed together, or as part of a unit review. Certificates should be reviewed alongside cognate programs.
3. Appointment of the Review Committee: The Review Committee shall be established prior to the commencement of a review according to the Faculty’s own policies and procedures. The Review Committee shall include students and designated group members to the extent possible. If the review includes one or more graduate programs, the review committees must include at least one representative selected by FGS.
4. In order to ensure engagement with students, reviews will normally take place in the fall and winter terms, although in appropriate circumstances, they may also take place in the spring and summer terms.
5. Reviews of Academic Programs should proceed in a timely manner, and follow a general timeline that allows the entire review process to be completed within an academic year.

Table A: Exemplar Timeline for Faculty Reviews of Academic Programs

	Self-Study Preparation (B.)	Review Committee Process (C.)	External Reviewers (D.)	Review Committee Report (E.)	Response to the Report (F.)
Model #1	June-August	September-November	November	November-December	January (1. - 4.), April (5. - 6.)
Model #2	September-December	January-March	March	March-April	May (1. - 4.), September (5. - 6.)
Model #3	January-March	April-July	July	July-August	September (1. - 4.), January (5. - 6.)

B. Self-Study

In keeping with the schedule of reviews, the Dean shall provide the policy to, and in consultation with FGS (graduate programs only), set a deadline for the Program Director to submit a self-study, which is both descriptive and analytical. The self-study shall:

1. Provide an assessment of, with evidence, the factors in D.6. in the *Senate Policy for Faculty Reviews of Academic Programs* (an exemplar self-study shall be clearly organized by these assessment criteria) and consider the related questions. The questions are meant to be interpreted broadly, and within the context of the discipline/program/faculty under review. Each question presents an opportunity for thoughtful reflection and should be given consideration in the self-study.
 - a. **Program Rationale and Structure.** All Dalhousie programs should have clear justification for their intellectual content and programmatic structure.
 - i. Is there a robust, evidence-based rationale for the program's structure and pathway to graduation, curriculum objectives and program goals? If not, what plans are in place to develop such a rationale?
 - ii. How well is the program achieving what it set out to accomplish?
 - iii. How closely aligned are the program goals with that of the unit? The Faculty?
 - b. **Program Renewal and Characteristics.** Programs should consider, on a cyclical basis, their defining characteristics and opportunities for renewal.
 - i. What are the defining characteristics of the academic program (e.g., differentiating characteristics, evidence of learner centered programming, etc.)?
 - ii. What types of experiential learning are embedded within the program (e.g., undergraduate research, work integrated learning, study abroad, simulations, innovation and entrepreneurship, etc.)?
 - iii. What strategies have been used to integrate academic and career development?
 - iv. What is the extent and outcome of curriculum renewal and academic program modifications since the last review?
 - v. If this is a recently introduced program, has the program unfolded as proposed?
 - c. **Program goals and Assessment.** Clarity of program goals and methods of assessment tied to those goals are a beneficial practice in higher education.
 - i. Are there clearly stated program-level student-centred program goals relating to disciplinary knowledge and skills (e.g., collaborative problem solving, critical thinking, creativity, academic literacies¹ and reflective practice) that successful students will have acquired upon graduation? If not, what progress has been made towards developing goals?
 - ii. What program gaps or deficiencies does an assessment of the relationship between curricular components and program goals reveal (if any)?
 - iii. What measures are used to assess the performance of students relative to these program goals? How well are the students achieving these goals?

¹ May includes attributes such as information literacy, digital literacy, data literacy and numerical literacy

- d. **Program Delivery.** On-site and online program delivery methods should show evidence of a strong support for learners.
 - i. How effective is the delivery of the program with regards to supporting students' achievement of the stated program goals and in meeting the demands of current and anticipated enrollments?
 - ii. How does the performance of the faculty members (including the quality of teaching and supervision, research, scholarship, professional and creative activity) contribute to the program under review, in relation to the program goals?

- e. **Student Success Indicators.** Program design and delivery should support student success.
 - i. What does the evidence indicate about the program's attractiveness to students (e.g., enrolment trends, student diversity, program capacity, etc.)?
 - ii. To what extent do enrolled students succeed academically (e.g., retention, time to completion, graduation rates, etc.)?
 - iii. Are there identified barriers to student success in the program (e.g., curricular content, academic regulations, etc.)? How is the program resolving any barriers?
 - iv. What measures of student satisfaction and engagement are regularly reviewed (e.g., using surveys, student society participation rates, SRIs, etc.)? How do these measures impact program renewal?
 - v. What evidence is used to assess the success of the program's graduates?
 - vi. How do the success indicators compare to the last program review?

- f. **Relationships and collaborations.** Students benefit from engagement and learning opportunities outside of the classroom.
 - i. What factors characterize program relationships with other Dalhousie programs and units (e.g., combined or joint programs)?
 - ii. What opportunities does the program offer for students to contribute and engage outside of the classroom, the university and the country?

- g. **Learning Supports.** Programs require strong resources beyond the classroom.
 - i. What academic advising structure is in place for students in the program, and does evidence indicate it provides appropriate and adequate support?
 - ii. How appropriate and adequate are the supports provided to the learning environment (e.g., library and learning resources; student services; physical; technological; human, physical and financial resources, etc.)?
 - iii. What annual processes are in place to review these resources?

- h. **Culture of Respect and Inclusivity.** Dalhousie seeks to increase diversity and inclusion through program design and delivery.
 - i. How does the program ensure inclusive content, design and teaching practices that include different ways of learning and knowing, intercultural and international perspectives?
 - ii. If the program controls its own recruitment and admissions, how does the program contribute to access and pathways for historically underserved student populations?
 - iii. How diverse is the faculty complement delivering the program as measured by the categories in the Dalhousie Census? [aggregate data to be provided by Human Resources]. What plans are in place to maintain or increase the diversity?

- i. **Program Management.** Program success requires effective and efficient leadership and management.

- i. How effective and efficient are the management, organization and decision-making structures for the program, including human resource and budgetary management?
 - ii. Is the program sustainable, from staffing, student enrolment, and resource perspectives?
 - iii. How does admissions and recruitment for the program align with program and Faculty-level planning and strategic enrollment management?
 - j. **Regulations.** Programs are required to adhere to university and faculty academic regulations.
 - i. How effective are the academic policies and regulations (including admission, promotion and graduation requirements; requests for transfer credit and advanced standing; and appeals) that govern the program?
 - ii. How are these regulations applied (including relationships with other units; e.g., Registrar's Office, Faculty of Graduate Studies, etc.)?
 - iii. Are relevant regulations, and processes such as those for appeals and waivers, communicated to students in an effective and timely manner (e.g., website content, handbooks and academic calendars, etc.)?
2. Involve faculty and students participating in the program, and be shared with the Program's governing body for input.
 3. Include assessment of the response to recommendations from previous reviews.
 4. Be informed by data; a program review data package shall be prepared within the Faculty, using the Dal Analytics data dashboard and any other relevant data and information. Upon request and consultation, and to the extent possible, Dal Analytics may also provide customized reporting for the Program under review.
 5. Upon completion, be submitted by the Program Director to the Dean, who shall ensure it meets the requirements of this policy, and who will then forward the self-study to the Review Committee and FGS (graduate programs only).

C. Review Committee Process

1. Before commencing the review, the Review Committee shall consult with the Dean, FGS (graduate programs only), relevant Program Director, and Faculty Council to identify any specific issues which should be addressed in the review.
2. The Review Committee shall communicate as openly and regularly as possible with the Program Director and Dean throughout the process.
3. The Review Committee shall widely communicate its existence to faculty, staff and students within the program under review and within the Faculty generally, to indicate its purpose and encourage input into the review process through individual and group meetings, and written submissions.
4. The Review Committee shall work with the Dean and Program Director to facilitate meeting arrangements; communications; provision of additional data as requested; enabling the participation of a wider network of stakeholders, such as graduates, professional associations, etc.; and enable the participation of students.

5. The Review Committee will meet with the Dean; faculty; staff; students; and where applicable, external stakeholders.
6. In addition to the information provided in the self-study, including standard data package, the Review Committee shall collect other pertinent information, including written and oral input from individuals and groups within, and where appropriate, outside the Program/Unit/Faculty.
7. The Review Committee shall identify any factors over and above those listed in section D.6. in the *Senate Policy for Faculty Reviews of Academic Programs* that it would like the external reviewers to consider.
8. The Review Committee shall prepare a confidential report as set out in section F.

D. External Reviewers

1. In consultation with the Program Director, the Dean shall provide the Review Committee with a list of potential external reviewers from outside the University. The Review Committee may make additions to the list. The Review Committee shall confirm that proposed reviewers comply with [MPHEC Guidelines for Selection of External Program Assessors](#), and shall select two external experts, at least one of whom will be from outside Atlantic Canada, in consultation with the Program Director and FGS (graduate programs only). If the Review Committee and the Program Director are unable to reach an agreement on external reviewers, the Senate Academic Program and Research Committee (SAPRC) will select reviewers by names proposed separately by the Program Director and the Review Committee.
2. The external reviewers shall undertake a review of the program, taking into consideration the assessment criteria in D.6. of the *Senate Policy for Faculty Reviews of Academic Programs*, as well any additional criteria identified by the Review Committee, as above.
3. The external reviewers shall conduct a sufficiently comprehensive site visit (normally 1-2 business days), during which they will interview individuals and groups, and tour facilities.
4. Within two weeks of the site visit, the external reviewers shall submit to the Review Committee Chair a single, written report based on the interviews, tour and review of materials. The report is to provide commentary and explicit recommendations concerning the program under review.
5. External reviewers will be paid an honorarium and reimbursed travel expenses from the Dean, as per the University travel policy.

E. Review Committee Report

1. Based upon review of the self-study, the external reviewer's report, data provided by Dal Analytics, and the oral and written submissions and other materials it has received, the Review Committee shall prepare a confidential Draft Report. The Draft Report shall:
 - a. Address all matters identified in section B;
 - b. Contain explicit recommendations to the Program Director, Unit, Dean, and Faculty as appropriate;
 - c. Exclude statements by or about named individuals, with the exception of academic leaders;
 - d. Attach the external reviewers' report as an Appendix;
 - e. Include a table of contents; and
 - f. Include an executive summary of recommendations.

2. The reports, recommendations, and follow up from Academic Program reviews will inform Senate reviews of Faculties, particularly in relation to Policy statements D.2. (f.) and (g.) in the *Senate Reviews of Faculties Policy and Procedures*.
3. The Review Committee Chair, on behalf of the Program Review Committee, shall transmit its Draft Report to the Dean and FGS (graduate programs only), who shall coordinate with the Program Director to ensure any errors of fact are corrected, that personal references are removed and that the Draft Report meets the requirements of this policy. The Draft Report shall be re-submitted to the Chair within two-weeks.
4. Once fact checked, the Review Committee Report will be made broadly available to all participants in the program under review, for information.
5. Within two weeks of receiving the Program Director's comments, the Review Committee shall finalize the report and submit the Review Committee Report to the Dean and FGS (graduate programs only). The Dean and FGS (graduate programs only) shall ensure that the final Review Committee Report meets the requirements of this policy, and shall then forward the final report to the Program Director along with an implementation plan form (Appendix D to this policy) which will provide the structure and mechanism for the response to the Final Report.

F. Response to the Report

1. Within four weeks from the date of receipt of the Review Committee Report and implementation plan form, the Program Director will submit a draft Response and Implementation Plan to the Dean and FGS (graduate programs only)
2. Following discussion with the Dean and FGS (graduate programs only), the Program Director shall submit a final Response and Implementation Plan to both.
3. The Dean will share the Review Committee Report, Response and Implementation Plan with faculty-level academic committees (when applicable) to discuss any Faculty wide implications in the context of strategic, academic program planning.
4. For undergraduate programs, the Dean shall submit the Review Committee Report, Response and Implementation Plan to the Provost and Vice-President Academic.
5. For graduate programs, the Dean shall submit the Review Committee Report, Response and Implementation Plan following faculty-level discussion to the Associate Dean (FGS), who will coordinate distribution and consideration at FGS Faculty Council. Recommendations arising from FGS Faculty Council may require revisions to the implementation plan in consultation with the Dean and the appropriate program and/or faculty-level committees. Following consideration by FGS Faculty Council, FGS shall submit the Review Committee Report, Response and Implementation plan, and FGS Faculty Council recommendations to the Provost and Vice-President Academic.
6. Normally twelve months following the last discussion of the Review Committee Report at Faculty Council (FGS Faculty Council for graduate programs), the Program Director shall provide a status update to the Dean and to FGS Faculty Council (when requested for graduate programs) on actions taken based on the recommendations.

G. Reporting

1. Deans will provide an annual summary report to the Provost and Vice-President Academic on program reviews undertaken, program reviews planned for the next academic year, and on responses to recommendations contained in previous reviews.²
2. The Provost and Vice-President Academic will provide a comprehensive annual summary report to SAPRC.
3. The Senate Vice-Chair (Academic Programs) shall inform Senate.

² For programs subject to accreditation, please provide to the office of the AVP Academic, on a yearly basis or as they become available, official results, status updates, and self-study documentation.

Appendix B: Information Requirements for Programs Subject to Accreditation for *Senate Policy for Faculty Reviews of Academic Programs*

Rationale and Procedures

Dalhousie's Senate Policy for Faculty Reviews of Programs (draft) aims to address gaps in accreditation process (if any) and to ensure the same standards are applied across all programs. This is consistent with the *guidelines* of the Maritime Provinces Higher Education Commission (MPHEC).¹

This form is intended to provide a template for Program directors to compare elements of the accreditation assessment against the requirements of Program reviews. For each section, provide a brief description of how the accreditation process fulfills the requirement, specifically noting any areas where a gap may exist.

The Program Director or designate shall arrange a meeting with the Associate Vice-President Academic (undergraduate programs) or Associate Dean of Graduate Studies (graduate programs), in advance of an accreditation site visit (or immediately thereafter). The purpose of the meeting will be to discuss this completed form and to agree upon necessary actions to address gaps (if any).

Please supplement this form by ensuring that your up-to-date accreditation documentation is submitted to Courtney Sutton, Academic Quality Assurance Manager, Office of the Provost (902) 448-1916

Information Requirements

Program(s): Click or tap here to enter text.

School/Unit: Click or tap here to enter text.

Faculty: Click or tap here to enter text.

Program Director or Designate: Click or tap here to enter text.

Assessment Date (site visit): Click or tap here to enter text.

1. Central components. Please demonstrate briefly, including examples or reference to guidelines where appropriate, how your forthcoming (or most recent) accreditation assessment incorporates the following components.

a. Defined assessment criteria

Click or tap here to enter text.

b. Preparation of self-study

i. Involves faculty and students participating in the program. Note that for multiple programs, indicate if faculty and students have participated from each program reviewed.

ii. Structured according to the assessment criteria.

iii. Focused on student experience.

iv. Informed by data.

v. Descriptive and analytical.

Click or tap here to enter text.

¹ Guidelines for Maritime Universities' Quality Assurance Frameworks (2016)

- c. External review component
 - i. Comprehensive site visit.
 - ii. Written report.
 - iii. Conducted by at least two experts, with at least one coming from outside of Atlantic Canada.

Click or tap here to enter text.

- d. Participation of students. In the case of multiple programs, clearly describe participation by students within each program.

Click or tap here to enter text.

- e. Participation of faculty not directly involved in the program under review.

Click or tap here to enter text.

- f. Enable the participation of the wider network of stakeholders.

Click or tap here to enter text.

- g. Defined follow-up mechanisms.

Click or tap here to enter text.

- h. Established assessment cycle, not normally exceeding seven years.

Click or tap here to enter text.

2. Policy Statements. Below are the minimum criteria for assessment of programs at Dalhousie. Please describe the degree to which your forthcoming (or most recent) accreditation review includes an assessment, with evidence, of the following factors.

- a. **Program Rationale and Structure.** All Dalhousie programs should have clear justification for their intellectual content and programmatic structure.
 - i. Is there a robust evidence-based rationale for the program's structure and pathway to graduation, curriculum objectives and program goals? If not, what plans are in place to develop such a rationale?
 - ii. How well is the program achieving what it set out to accomplish?
 - iii. How closely aligned are the program goals with that of the unit? The Faculty?

Click or tap here to enter text.

- b. **Program Renewal and Characteristics.** Programs should consider, on a cyclical basis, their defining characteristics and opportunities for renewal.
 - i. What are the defining characteristics of the academic program (e.g., differentiating characteristics, evidence of learner centered programming, etc.)?
 - ii. What types of experiential learning are embedded within the program (e.g., undergraduate research, work integrated learning, study abroad, simulations, innovation and entrepreneurship, etc.)?
 - iii. What strategies have been used to integrate academic and career development?

- iv. What is the extent and outcome of curriculum renewal and academic program modifications since the last review?
 - v. If this is a recently introduced program, has the program unfolded as proposed?
Click or tap here to enter text.
- c. **Program goals and Assessment.** Clarity of program goals and methods of assessment tied to those goals are a beneficial practice in higher education.
- i. Are there clearly stated program-level student-centred program goals relating to disciplinary knowledge and skills (e.g., collaborative problem solving, critical thinking, creativity, academic literacies and reflective practice) that successful students will have acquired upon graduation)? If not, what progress has been made towards developing goals?
 - ii. What program gaps or deficiencies does an assessment of the relationship between curricular components and program goals reveal (if any)?
 - iii. What measures are used to assess the performance of students relative to these program goals? How well are the students achieving these goals?
Click or tap here to enter text.
- d. **Program Delivery.** On-site and online program delivery methods should show evidence of a strong support for learners.
- i. How effective is the delivery of the program with regards to supporting students' achievement of the stated program goals and in meeting the demands of current and anticipated enrollments?
 - ii. How does the performance of the faculty members (including the quality of teaching and supervision, research, scholarship, professional and creative activity) contribute to the program under review, in relation to the program goals?
Click or tap here to enter text.
- e. **Student Success Indicators.** Program design and delivery should support student success.
- i. What does the evidence indicate about the program's attractiveness to students (e.g., enrolment trends, student diversity, program capacity, etc.)?
 - ii. To what extent do enrolled students succeed academically (e.g., retention, time to completion, graduation rates, etc.)?
 - iii. Are there identified barriers to student success in the program (e.g., curricular content, academic regulations, etc.)? How is the program resolving any barriers?
 - iv. What measures of student satisfaction and engagement are regularly reviewed (e.g., using surveys, student society participation rates, SRIs, etc.)? How do these measures impact program renewal?
 - v. What evidence is used to assess the success of the program's graduates?
 - vi. How do the success indicators compare to the last program review?
Click or tap here to enter text.
- f. **Relationships and collaborations.** Students benefit from engagement and learning opportunities outside of the classroom.
- i. What factors characterize program relationships with other Dalhousie programs and units?
 - ii. What opportunities does the program offer for students to contribute and engage outside of the classroom, the university and the country?
Click or tap here to enter text.

- g. **Learning Supports.** Programs require strong resources beyond the classroom.
- i. What academic advising structure is in place for students in the program, and does evidence indicate it provides appropriate and adequate support?
 - ii. How appropriate and adequate are the supports provided to the learning environment (e.g., library and learning resources; student services; physical; technological; human, physical and financial resources, etc.)?
 - iii. What annual processes are in place to review these resources?
Click or tap here to enter text.
- h. **Culture of Respect and Inclusivity.** Dalhousie seeks to increase diversity and inclusion through program design and delivery.
- i. How does the program ensure inclusive content, design and teaching practices that include different ways of learning and knowing, intercultural and international perspectives?
 - ii. If the program controls its own recruitment and admissions, how does the program contribute to access and pathways for historically underserved student populations?
 - iii. How diverse is the faculty complement delivering the program as measured by the categories in the Dalhousie Census? [aggregate data to be provided by Human Resources]. What plans are in place to maintain or increase the diversity?
Click or tap here to enter text.
- i. **Program Management.** Program success requires effective and efficient leadership and management.
- i. How effective and efficient are the management, organization and decision-making structures for the program, including human resource and budgetary management?
 - ii. Is the program sustainable, from staffing, student enrolment, and resource perspectives?
Click or tap here to enter text.
- j. **Regulations.** Programs are required to adhere to university and faculty academic regulations.
- i. How effective are the academic policies and regulations (including admission, promotion and graduation requirements; requests for transfer credit and advanced standing; and appeals) that govern the program?
 - ii. How are these regulations applied (including relationships with other units; e.g., Registrar's Office, Faculty of Graduate Studies, etc.)?
 - iii. Are relevant regulations, and processes such as those for appeals and waivers, communicated to students in an effective and timely manner (e.g., website content, handbooks and academic calendars, etc.)?
Click or tap here to enter text.

Program Director (Signature)

Date: Click or tap here to enter text.

Dean or Associate Dean Academic (Signature)

Date: Click or tap here to enter text.

Associate Dean, Faculty of Graduate Studies (for graduate programs)

Date: Click or tap here to enter text.

Associate Vice-President Academic

Date: Click or tap here to enter text.

Appendix C: 'Implementation Plan'
for Senate Policy for Faculty Reviews of Academic Programs

Name of Academic Program:

Unit/Department:

Faculty:

Date of Review Committee Report:

Recommendation	Implementation Plan (steps)	Outcome Measure	Time Frame	Responsibility
Recommendation	Implementation Plan (steps)	Outcome Measure	Time Frame	Responsibility
Recommendation	Implementation Plan (steps)	Outcome Measure	Time Frame	Responsibility

Appendix D: Self-Study Template
For *Senate Policy for Faculty Reviews of Academic Programs*



SELF-STUDY FOR... (PROGRAM NAME(S), UNIT, FACULTY)

Date:

The self-study was completed in [year] and followed the Senate Policy for Reviews of Academic Programs (2018).

Respectfully Submitted,

_____ (Program Director)

Contents

Introduction	2
Program Rationale and Structure	2
Program Renewal and Characteristics	2
Program goals and Assessment.	3
Program Delivery.....	3
Student Success Indicators.....	3
Relationships and collaborations	4
Learning Supports	4
Culture of Respect and Inclusivity.....	4
Program Management	4
Regulations.....	5
Appendix A: Data Package	5

Introduction

Program Rationale and Structure

- i. All Dalhousie programs should have clear justification for their intellectual content and programmatic structure.
- ii. Is there a robust evidence-based rationale for the program's structure and pathway to graduation, curriculum objectives and program goals? If not, what plans are in place to develop such a rationale? How well is the program achieving what it set out to accomplish?
- iii. How closely aligned are the program outc with that of the unit? The Faculty?

[RESPONSE/CONTENT]

Program Renewal and Characteristics

Programs should consider, on a cyclical basis, their defining characteristics and opportunities for renewal.

- i. What are the defining characteristics of the academic program (e.g., differentiating characteristics, evidence of learner centered programming, etc.)?
- ii. What types of experiential learning are embedded within the program (e.g., undergraduate research, work integrated learning, study abroad, simulations, innovation and entrepreneurship, etc.)?

- iii. What strategies have been used to integrate academic and career development?
- iv. What is the extent and outcome of curriculum renewal and academic program modifications since the last review?
- v. If this is a recently introduced program, has the program unfolded as proposed?

[RESPONSE/CONTENT]

Program goals and Assessment.

Clarity of program goals and methods of assessment tied to those goals are a beneficial practice in higher education.

- i. Are there clearly stated program-level student-centred program goals relating to disciplinary knowledge and skills (e.g., collaborative problem solving, critical thinking, creativity, academic literacies and reflective practice) that successful students will have acquired upon graduation)? If not, what progress has been made towards developing goals?
- ii. What program gaps or deficiencies does an assessment of the relationship between curricular components and program goals reveal (if any)?
- iii. What measures are used to assess the performance of students relative to these program goals? How well are the students achieving these goals?

[RESPONSE/CONTENT]

Program Delivery

On site and online program delivery methods should show evidence of a strong support for learners.

- i. How effective is the delivery of the program with regards to supporting students' achievement of the stated program goals and in meeting the demands of current and anticipated enrollments?
- ii. How does the performance of the faculty members (including the quality of teaching and supervision, research, scholarship, professional and creative activity) contribute to the program under review, in relation to the program goals?

[RESPONSE/CONTENT]

Student Success Indicators

Program design and delivery should support student success.

- i. What does the evidence indicate about the program's attractiveness to students (e.g., enrolment trends, student diversity, program capacity, etc.)?
- ii. To what extent do enrolled students succeed academically (e.g., retention, time to completion, graduation rates, etc.)?
- iii. Are there identified barriers to student success in the program (e.g., curricular content, academic regulations, etc.)? How is the program resolving any barriers?
- iv. What measures of student satisfaction and engagement are regularly reviewed (e.g., using surveys, student society participation rates, SRIs, etc.)? How do these measures impact program renewal?
- v. What evidence is used to assess the success of the program's graduates?
- vi. How do the success indicators compare to the last program review?

[RESPONSE/CONTENT]

Relationships and collaborations

Students benefit from engagement and learning opportunities outside of the classroom.

- i. What factors characterize program relationships with other Dalhousie programs and units?
- ii. What opportunities does the program offer for students to contribute and engage outside of the classroom, the university and the country?

[RESPONSE/CONTENT]

Learning Supports

Programs require strong resources beyond the classroom.

- i. What academic advising structure is in place for students in the program, and does evidence indicate it provides appropriate and adequate support?
- ii. How appropriate and adequate are the supports provided to the learning environment (e.g., library and learning resources; student services; physical; technological; human, physical and financial resources, etc.)?
- iii. What annual processes are in place to review these resources?

[RESPONSE/CONTENT]

Culture of Respect and Inclusivity

Dalhousie seeks to increase diversity and inclusion through program design and delivery.

- i. How does the program ensure inclusive content, design and teaching practices that include different ways of learning and knowing, intercultural and international perspectives?
- ii. If the program controls its own recruitment and admissions, how does the program contribute to access and pathways for historically underserved student populations?
- iii. How diverse is the faculty complement delivering the program as measured by the categories in the Dalhousie Census? [aggregate data to be provided by Human Resources]. What plans are in place to maintain or increase the diversity?

[RESPONSE/CONTENT]

Program Management

Programs successes require effective and efficient leadership and management.

- i. How effective and efficient are the management, organization and decision-making structures for the program, including human resource and budgetary management?
- ii. Is the program sustainable, from staffing, student enrolment, and resource perspectives?

[RESPONSE/CONTENT]

Regulations

Programs are required to adhere to university and faculty academic regulations.

- i. How effective are the academic policies and regulations (including admission, promotion and graduation requirements; requests for transfer credit and advanced standing; and appeals) that govern the program?
- ii. How are these regulations applied (including relationships with other units; e.g., Registrar's Office, Faculty of Graduate Studies, etc.)?
- iii. Are relevant regulations, and processes such as those for appeals and waivers, communicated to students in an effective and timely manner (e.g., website content, handbooks and academic calendars, etc.)?

[RESPONSE/CONTENT]

Appendix A: Data Package