

University of New Brunswick

**Quality Assurance Policies and
Procedures**

Revised May 2008

Office of the Vice President Fredericton (Academic)
The University of New Brunswick- Fredericton
3 Bailey Drive, Sir Howard Douglas Hall,
Fredericton, New Brunswick,

Requirement for a Quality Assurance Program

A program of quality assurance reviews of academic and academic support programs is a critical component of ensuring a quality learning and research environment. To establish and deliver successful programs at UNB, and ensure continued success, it is important to monitor and periodically review all aspects of each program. For our purposes, the term **quality assurance** “relates to the achievement of educational program standards established by institutions, professional organizations, government and/or standard-setting bodies established by government” (as defined by Canadian Information Centre for International Credentials). This means that the processes and outcomes related to UNB Academic Program Reviews must be coordinated, and must be integrated with many other institutional activities, such as: planning and budgeting cycles; selection processes for senior administrators; and, planning decisions regarding the enhancement of our teaching and learning environment.

The Vice-President Fredericton (Academic) serves as the University’s Chief Quality Assurance Officer.

Table of Contents

1. GUIDELINES FOR THE APPRAISAL OF FACULTIES AND DEPARTMENTS	1
A. Introduction and Overview	1
B. Documentation Required for a Program Review	1
C. Faculty/Department Self-Study	3
D. The External Review Process	3
E. Reporting Process and Follow-up	6
F. Involvement of the Program Review Committee (PRC)	6
G. Timeline of Review Process	6
2. UNIVERSITY OF NEW BRUNSWICK PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE (PRC): ROLE AND RESPONSIBILITIES	8
3. EXTERNAL REVIEWERS' GUIDELINES FOR THE APPRAISAL OF A FACULTY/DEPARTMENT	10
4. SELF-STUDY OF A FACULTY/DEPARTMENT	13
APPENDIX A – MPHEC Maritime Degree Level Qualifications Framework	14

GUIDELINES FOR THE APPRAISAL OF FACULTIES AND DEPARTMENTS

These guidelines are intended to provide a general overview of all aspects of Program Reviews for Faculties and Departments.

A. Introduction and Overview

- i. The Faculty or Department review is comprehensive and includes a consideration of all graduate and undergraduate programs, research and scholarship, non-academic support and other resources. Faculty reviews include their Graduate Academic Units (GAUs) and hence the School of Graduate Studies' role with those GAUs. Each unit being reviewed will compile relevant documentation, described in Section B, and complete a self-study, described in Section C.

Reviews of Departmentalized Faculties should include information on the overall organizational structure and governance of the Faculty that supports its academic and collegial functions. As well, the self study for Departmentalized Faculties must include summary reports of the department reviews that have been completed prior to the Faculty review, which should be appended to the self study report.

- ii. Faculties and Departments scheduled for review must be identified and informed in a timely fashion, at least one year prior to review. This will enable the Unit undergoing review to prepare the necessary documents.
- iii. The Program Review Committee (PRC) will participate in all reviews where academic programs are involved. Through the Dean of the School of Graduate Studies, the School of Graduate Studies will participate in reviews involving academic units offering graduate programs.
- iv. Two or three External Reviewers will be invited to undertake reviews. In the case of Faculties, the Vice President Fredericton (Academic) will invite the reviewers, and in case of Departments the Dean will invite them. The Vice President Fredericton (Academic) and/or Dean will determine the number and identity of External Reviewers in consultation with the Program Review Committee; where appropriate, these activities will occur in consultation with Vice President (Saint John).
- v. Once a Program Review process has been initiated, the Program Review Committee will designate an individual from among its membership, not affiliated with the program under review, to be responsible for the PRC involvement with the review, serving as the Liaison.

B. Documentation Required for a Program Review

The following documentation will be prepared by the unit under review and provided to:

1. the Dean to aid in the Faculty and/or Department self-study (see section C below);
2. the External Reviewers (see section D below); and,
3. the PRC as identified in their roles and responsibilities (see Section F below).

The source of information is indicated in parentheses beside each item:

- i. Undergraduate Program:
 - Previous 3-5 years enrolment data: class and section sizes (Registrar)

- Illustrative examples of current course outlines, final examinations, assignment structures and requirements, and grade distributions (Faculty/Department)
 - Exit and alumni surveys of student satisfaction (where available within Unit)
 - Most recent accreditation or professional association reviews, as appropriate (Faculty/Department)
- ii. Graduate Program:
- Previous 3-5 years enrolment profile by program, area, year in program, recent history of dates-to-completion and placement (Dean of the Graduate programs)
 - Graduate program regulations, requirements, coursework and supervision structures, qualifying and comprehensive examinations, thesis requirements (SGS)
 - External examiners for Doctoral theses (Dean or SGS)
 - Three to Five year listing of graduate theses and supervisors (Faculty/Department and SGS)
 - Three to Five year record of student financial support (Faculty/Department and SGS)
 - Exit and alumni surveys of student satisfaction (SGS)
- iii. Faculty:
- Teaching commitments and teaching evaluations (including Student Opinion Surveys) (Faculty/Department)
 - Faculty curricula vitae, with identification of teaching, research, graduate supervision, and administrative commitments (Faculty/Department)
 - Three to Five year history of research rankings with specific examples of projects, grants, and awards (Faculty/Department)
- iv. Relevant complementary materials for Faculties/Departments that actively pursue activities such as:
- Outreach activities to high schools and teachers at the local, provincial, and national levels
 - Recruitment activities to ensure that they attract the best students
 - Placement activities on behalf of graduates
 - Community service
 - Professional consulting
 - Co-op programs or other experiential learning opportunities
 - International activity

When preparing the Faculty/Department self-study special consideration should be given to the nature and scope of these other activities. Do they contribute to the teaching and research missions of the Faculty/Department? Do they allow for a balance in the effective discharge of University duties by faculty members?

- v. Resources:
- Assessment of facilities and equipment, including special assets or needs (Faculty/Department)
 - Assessment of library and computing support (Faculty/Department and Libraries)
- vi. Documentation for Departmentalized Faculty Reviews:
- Include summary reports of the department reviews with self study.

- Include information on the overall organizational structure and functioning of the faculty which supports its academic and collegial role.

C. Faculty/Department Self-Study

A self-study (evaluation) by the Faculty/Department is one of the most important elements of the periodic review. The self-study report (coordinated by the Dean/Chair) should be initiated in a timely fashion so that the results are available to the External Reviewers, and should also involve faculty, staff, and students. The Self-Study document should be treated as a confidential document, for use by members of the unit under review, the External Reviewers, and the members of the Program Review Committee. The self-study must include but need not be limited to:

- An outline of the Faculty/Department's structure, priorities, and aspirations. This information often takes the form of a 3 or 5 year plan for the Faculty/Department.
- A brief description of the program and course offerings, together with academic requirements and pertinent regulations; a rationale for the number and range of offerings and the shape of the program. This description should include an assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the programs and their relation to the resources of the Faculty/Department, with particular attention given to the full and part-time members of faculty and graduate teaching assistants supporting the program.
- Assessments of the quality of the programs and the learning experiences they provide to students. As much as possible, this should include first-hand reports from students through surveys and/or interviews of representative groups of students in the undergraduate and graduate programs offered by the Faculty/Department.

The Faculty/Department conducting the self-study should have access to and take into account all of the same information available to the External Reviewers, as listed in Section B, and should address the same issues as those outlined for the Reviewers, as described in section D and in the External Reviewer's Guidelines for the Appraisal of a Faculty.

Although each Faculty/Department may wish to develop its own specific approach to a self-study, the Maritime Provinces Higher Education Commission (MPHEC) (April 2006) have developed a set of common competencies for graduates of undergraduate and graduate programs (see Appendix A). These guidelines capture comprehensively the intention of the self-study. Some Faculties/Departments may choose to use them to structure their own self-study or as a starting point in constructing their own guidelines.

D. The External Review Process

- Criteria for choosing reviewers:
 - Balance of size and location of home units relative to UNB unit;
 - Gender balance
 - Knowledge, background, breadth of experience, graduate program experience where relevant
 - Ability to engage in site visit and complete External Reviewers' Report within three weeks.

- ii. The external review will focus on three issues:
 - the overall academic health of the Faculty/Department, with emphasis on the undergraduate and graduate programs and on the structures and resources within the unit to support them;
 - the appropriateness of the mix and delivery of programs with respect to existing resources;
 - the effectiveness of the Unit's administration with respect to effective program delivery.
- ii. For situations in which a Dean's Search is scheduled for the Faculty under review, it is useful for the review be completed in the Fall term so that the External Review Report can inform the Search process. This requires the timetable for those reviews to be accelerated.
- iii. Invitation and Guidelines for External Reviewers
 - An initial letter of invitation will be sent to each External Reviewer, by the Vice President Fredericton (Academic) for Faculty reviews or the appropriate Dean for Department reviews. This letter will include the basic terms of reference of the review, with regard to reviews of both undergraduate and graduate programs where relevant. It will also include specific instructions pertaining to the disclosure of any real or perceived conflicts of interest relating from association with the Faculty/Department or its members and will outline the confidentiality of the review process. If the Reviewer accepts the invitation to serve, subsequent correspondence will confirm the dates for a site visit.
 - The External Reviewer's Guidelines will accompany the letter of invitation. This document details specific questions to be addressed in the areas of:
 - 1) the academic programs;
 - 2) scholarly activities within the Faculty/Department;
 - 3) other activities beyond the teaching and research mandate of the Faculty;
 - 4) the nature and role of administration within the Faculty/Department; and,
 - 5) correlation of the Unit's mission to the objectives and mission of the Department(s), School(s), Faculty, and the University.

Reviewers are also invited to comment on any other aspect of the Faculty/Department under review which might have value to the relevant campus Vice President, the PRC, the Vice-President Research, the Dean of Graduate Studies, or the Dean receiving the report and its recommendations.

- The support of scholarship within the Faculty/Department through library, computing, and other academic and physical resources will be a part of the assessment provided by the Reviewers, as will integration and "fit" with related areas within the University and the broader scholarly community.
- As Faculty reviews may occur prior to the search process for appointment or re-appointment of a Dean, in such cases the terms of reference of the Dean's Search Committee and any other of the University's pertinent terms and conditions will be provided to the External Reviewers. Reviewers might provide specific comment regarding the relative advisability of searching for a candidate from within or from outside the University.
- External Reviewers are encouraged to review programs in relation to current resource levels; recommendations on what changes might be appropriate to deliver effective and innovative programs within existing or similar levels of resources will be helpful. As well, advantages that would be realized with specific additional resources may be considered.

- iv. As noted above, the External Reviewer’s Guidelines will accompany the letter of invitation from the Vice President Fredericton (Academic) or Dean to the External Reviewers. The following material shall follow the letter of invitation in a timely manner:
 - All material listed in Section B above
 - The documentation resulting from the Faculty/Department self-study (section C above)
 - Tentative schedule of meetings
 - University Mission Statement and any relevant Campus Plans
 - Faculty composition, structure, rules, procedures
 - Undergraduate and graduate calendars, as appropriate, and relevant brochures
 - Terms of reference, Dean’s Search Committee (where appropriate)
 - UNB Facts and reference to the University website: www.unb.ca
- v. The University’s preference is to have the External Reviewers carry out their site visit together, however, individual site visits are allowed where necessary. The Vice President Fredericton (Academic) or appropriate Dean will ensure that comments from the general University community in response to the Review-generated invitation for input are available to the Reviewers. Visits by External Reviewers will generally be two or three days, and should include:
 - Meetings with the campus Vice President, Dean of Graduate Studies, Dean of the Faculty, Chairs, and Directors, as appropriate to the review.
 - Meeting with faculty members from within the Faculty and from across the University, by invitation and specific arrangement and by “drop-in”. Groups with defined academic interests should be urged to speak with the Reviewers; the confidentiality of those meetings should be guaranteed.
 - Meetings with students, support staff, and graduates of the program, according to the same conditions established for faculty, as above, and with assurance that faculty and administrators will not be present.
 - Meetings with representatives of the profession, allied industries, or other training programs, as appropriate.
- vi. Reviewers will have access to all information pertinent to the assessment of the Faculty/Department under review, and will be free to consult with anyone they choose.
- vii. As part of the Review process, the Quality Assurance Coordinator will serve general notice to the University community that a program review is in progress, calling for submissions reflecting all groups and elements of the review.
- viii. At the end of their visit, the External Reviewers will be asked to give a preliminary oral report of their initial impressions to the appropriate administrator VP or Dean pending later submission of a formal written report. If the External Reviewers’ observations contain specific criticisms or recommendations with regard to the undergraduate and/or graduate program under consideration, these should, in the first instance, be referred for comment to the Dean and/or Chair responsible for the program.
- ix. The External Reviewers’ written report(s) will be due within three weeks of the site visit. These reports will be submitted to the Vice President Fredericton (Academic), and where appropriate, also to Vice President (Saint John), or Dean (for Department Reviews), as well as the Dean of Graduate Studies and Vice President Research when graduate studies and research are involved. The report(s) will consist of:
 - An appraisal of the Faculty/Department, with emphasis on the quality, structure, and effectiveness of the Faculty/Department. Undergraduate and graduate program reviews should be prepared in separable formats for separate consideration. The report may

contain specific recommendations, criticisms, suggestions, and comments within the scope of the invited review, and should include a Summary that can be extracted. This appraisal section of the Report will be made available to the Faculties, Departments, and Schools concerned and the PRC, if appropriate; hence, while not a public document, it is not confidential. The Summary of the External Reviewers' Report along with the unit's formal Response will become the Final Program Review Report.

- When sensitive matters require it, an optional separate confidential report for the consideration of the appropriate VP or Dean only.

The External Reviewers should consider whether the Unit will be able to post or publish excerpts from their final submitted report or not. That decision remains with the Reviewers.

E. Reporting Process and Follow-up

- i. The Unit will prepare a Self-Study Report (confidential document)
- ii. The External Reviewers will prepare an External Reviewers' Report, with a Summary of findings and recommendations (non-confidential)
- iii. The External Reviewers may prepare a separate confidential report for the appropriate administrator(s).
- iv. The appropriate VP or Dean reviews the non-confidential report with the relevant Dean or Chair and discuss a course of action.
- v. The Unit will prepare their Response for the VP or Dean, which together with the External Reviewer's Summary will become the Final Program Review (PR) Report.
- vi. The Program Review Committee reviews the Final PR Report to ensure process is being followed and is effective. Once approved at PRC, the Report goes to UNBF Senate Academic Planning or UNBSJ Senate Academic Planning and Resources for approval and on to the appropriate Senate.
- vii. Once approved at the Senate level, the Final PR Report is posted on the Program Review web site.
- viii. The PR Report is monitored at regular intervals by the appropriate VP and Dean or Dean and Chair to ensure continual improvement. An annual update on progress related to the Report recommendations is part of the Annual Planning and Budgeting Process.

F. Involvement of the Program Review Committee (PRC)

- i. The Program Review Committee will receive the Summary of the External Reviewers' reports, along with the Unit's response. (If there are questions, PRC members may review the full External Reviewers' Report.) These will be discussed within the PRC Committee with a focus on process and will then be transmitted to the Senates through the appropriate Senate Committees (and eventually Board of Governors) by the Vice President Fredericton (Academic).

G. Timeline of Review Process (dates may vary with circumstance)

- i. At least six months prior to the Departmental or Faculty review (where possible, a Faculty will be reviewed near to the final year of a dean's term):
 - The Faculty/Department should be reminded of the need to complete a Self-Study (having been informed at least one year in advance)

- Senate Nominating Committee should fill any outstanding vacancies in membership of the Program Review Committee
 - PRC should meet and identify External Reviewers, based on solicited suggestions and justification from the Unit
 - Invitation to comment on Unit as part of the Review process should be made to the general University community
 - PRC Liaison person should be designated
 - External Reviewers should be selected and site visit arranged
 - Visit by External Reviewers should occur.
- ii. During the review year, and often early in that year in the case of a Faculty Review at the conclusion of a dean's term:
- Report of External Reviewers distributed to the Faculty/Department
 - Dean's Search Committee may be informed by the Report Summary
 - Unit forms its Response
 - Chair/Dean meets with Dean/VP to discuss Report and Unit Response and agree to action items and associated timeline
 - Discussion of Program Review by PRC
 - Progress on action items will be monitored through the annual planning and budgeting process; continuing follow-up is essential
 - Formal review of undergraduate and graduate programs are sent to Senate Academic Planning Committee (Fredericton) or Senate Academic Planning and Resources Committee (Saint John) for actions/recommendations on process, and then to Senate and Board, including any recommendations.
-

University of New Brunswick

Role and Responsibilities of the Program Review Committee

The Committee's Terms of Reference – approved by Fredericton Senate on Sept. 23, 2003 and by Saint John Senate on Nov. 26, 2003; revisions approved by Saint John Senate and Fredericton Senate on May 27, 2008.

Committee Responsibilities

This Committee (PRC) is charged with monitoring the **process** of academic program reviews, and to that end is responsible for ensuring that each undergraduate and graduate academic program review done at UNB in conjunction with the review of a Department, School, or Faculty conforms to the requirements of the process as set out by the Senate(s) and MPHEC.

The Quality Assurance Coordinator in the VP Fredericton (Academic)'s Office coordinates the review process and serves as Secretary to the Committee

To oversee the process for undergraduate program and graduate program reviews, the Committee will undertake responsibility for activities such as:

1. Appointing a PRC member to serve as Liaison for each Program Review; the PRC Liaison will interact with the Unit being reviewed, the appropriate VP or Dean, the QA Coordinator, and the External Reviewers during the site visit to facilitate the smooth running of the review process.
2. Submitting through the Vice President Fredericton (Academic) a report summary to the Senate(s) and the Board of Governors (*an annual report of the PRC will be sent through SAPC/SAPRC to Senate and the Board each year*).
3. Monitoring action as related to process and reporting these to the Senate(s) and Board.

The PRC summary reports will be consolidated annually and submitted through the Senate Committee on Academic Planning to Senate (Fredericton) and the Senate Academic Planning and Resources Committee (Saint John) and then be forwarded by Senate(s) to the Board of Governors to fulfill the institutional accountability requirements of the MPHEC.

Specific recommendations for subsequent and remedial action arising from undergraduate and graduate program reviews will be monitored and reported by the Vice President Fredericton (Academic), and Vice President (Saint John), where appropriate, on behalf of PRC in subsequent annual reports of the committee.

The PRC's engagement in the review process should reflect the following approximate time-line:

Pre-Review Phase- starting approximately one year prior to a scheduled review of a Unit

- Programs to be reviewed identified
- External reviewers chosen and PRC Liaison designated
- Orientation meeting: PRC, and Deans/Directors/Chairs of units to be reviewed (discussing the review process, documentation, role of PRC Liaison)
- University community invited by Dean or Vice President Fredericton (Academic) to submit comment
- External reviewers selected and site visit arranged.

Post-Review Phase

- External reviewers' report received by Unit and the Vice President Academic Fredericton (Academic) and Vice President (Saint John), where appropriate.
- The Faculty's (or department's) response to the reviewers' report is submitted to the Dean and/or VP(s).
- The Summary report is compiled by the Quality Assurance Coordinator and submitted to PRC.

Membership:

The Committee shall be composed of:

1. Vice-President Fredericton (or designate) - Chair
2. Vice President Saint John (or designate)
3. Dean, School of Graduate Studies (or designate)
4. Four students appointed by Senate (2 from UNBF and 2 from UNBSJ)
5. Ten (10) members appointed by Senate (4 from UNBSJ and 6 from UNBF (of which 1 representative from each of UNBF and UNBSJ must be Senators)

Role and Responsibilities of the PRC Liaison

For each Review, a member of the Committee is appointed as the PRC Liaison, to act on the PRC's behalf to:

- Serve as contact person for the Unit being reviewed
- Serve as initial point of contact for External Reviewers, providing an orientation of the process.

It is the responsibility of the PRC Liaison to act as a contact between the external reviewers and the Programme Review Committee if the external reviewers have special requests while they are on campus or subsequent to their site visit. The initial contact between the PRC Liaison and the external reviewers should be timetabled to take place at the very beginning of the external reviewers' site visit.

Related Roles and Responsibilities

1. To ensure that undergraduate and graduate program reviews are carried out in accordance with the requirements of the Maritime Province Higher Education Commission (MPHEC) mandate, the outcomes of the completed process for all program reviews will be reviewed and approved by PRC and submitted to the Senate Academic Planning Committee (Fredericton campus) and the Senate Academic Planning and Resources Committee (Saint John campus) for eventual approval by the Senates. In all cases a program review must occur for each unit within a seven year period.
2. The Vice President Fredericton (Academic), as Chair of PRC, is responsible to maintain records and to provide Senate(s) and Board with access to documents and information as required under the MPHEC mandate.

The University of New Brunswick

Guidelines for External Reviewers

These guidelines have been prepared to assist External Reviewers in reviewing a Faculty or Department. The University's practice is to invite two or three Reviewers to undertake a joint review, or separate if necessary by circumstance.

In some cases, the Faculty review will be the basis of an evaluation of undergraduate programs. This will be the case in non-departmentalized Faculties or where the undergraduate program is Faculty-based. In these cases, the portion of the report dealing with the undergraduate program will be provided to the Program Review Committee (PRC), which will integrate the report into its evaluation of the program.

1. The Academic Programs

The Reviewers are asked to address the nature and quality of both the undergraduate and graduate programs, as appropriate. The Maritime Provinces Higher Education Commission (MPHEC - April 2006) has developed a set of common competencies for graduates of undergraduate and graduate degree programs - including interdisciplinary and multi-disciplinary offerings, the details of which are discussed in Appendix A. In reviewing academic programs, the MPHEC competencies should be considered in conjunction with the following questions:

- a. Are the educational objectives of the Faculty/Department and its programs consistent with the general objectives of the University's mission and academic planning?
- b. Are the admission, progression, and graduation requirements for the Faculty/Department's program(s) appropriate to the education objectives of each program?
- c. Are the structure and curriculum of each program appropriate for its educational objectives?
- d. Is each program being delivered effectively within existing resources?
- e. Are appropriate modes of delivery and evaluation methods used in each program?
- f. Is there an appropriate utilization of the Faculty/Department's existing human, physical, and financial resources in support of each program?
- g. Are there important expectations or interests which the programs do not adequately meet?
- h. Are there future program developments which the Faculty/Department should be pursuing?
- i. Are there particular strengths or weaknesses in the Faculty/Department's programs?
- j. Are the programmatic plans of the Faculty/Department adequate to maintain the strengths and overcome the weaknesses in the present program?
- k. Are there specific concerns which should be addressed?
- l. Do the planning indicators provide evidence of quality of faculty, of students, and of the outcomes of each program?

Scholarly Activities

Each Faculty in the University of New Brunswick is expected to place particular emphasis on the development of scholarly research or creative activity. The appropriateness and nature of the scholarly direction of the Faculty/Department require consideration.

- a. What is the overall assessment of the research activity, as defined by the UNB research ranking, within the Faculty/Department?
- b. What areas and types of research and scholarship are particular strengths and/or weaknesses?
- c. Is the Faculty/Department aware of those strengths and weaknesses, and is it responding appropriately?
- d. Are there particular research initiatives which might be pursued?
- e. What principles and objectives should guide the Faculty/Department in its scholarly work over the next decade?

3. Other Faculty Activities

Some Faculties/Departments actively pursue other activities in addition to teaching and research, ranging from community service in clinical settings to professional consultancy. In such cases, Reviewers should examine the nature and scope of those other activities. In particular:

- a. Do they contribute directly to the teaching and research programs of the Faculty/Department?
- b. Do they enhance or impair the effective performance of University duties by members of the Faculty/Department?

4. Administration

The nature and role of the Faculty/Department's administration should be examined. Reviewers' advice on the following issues is particularly apposite:

- a. Is the administrative structure of the Faculty/Department appropriate to its needs and academic profile?
- b. Are the roles and activities of the Chair, Dean, Associate/Assistant Deans, Faculty Committees, and the Faculty Council clear and appropriate?
- c. Are the administrative officers, governing bodies, and Committees of the University aware of the nature and mission of the Faculty/Department? Do members of the Faculty/Department have an appropriate sense of their place within the University?
- d. Are there specific suggestions for improvement?

5. Other Issues

Reviewers should feel free to comment on any other aspect of the Faculty/Department which might assist the Vice-Presidents (Fredericton or Saint John), Dean, the Faculty and Department at large, and, typically in the case of Faculties, its new Dean or reappointed Dean.

To assist each Reviewer in preparing for the review, a set of pertinent reference materials will be provided. Any other relevant data requested by the Reviewers will be assembled. Each Reviewer is expected to spend 2-3 days at the University as part of the review process. Prior to the visit, a full schedule of meetings will be arranged.

6. External Reviewers' Report

- a. In general terms, the review and the Reviewers' report should focus on three issues:
 - i. the overall academic health of the Faculty/Department with particular emphasis on the academic programs (graduate, undergraduate, and interdisciplinary)
 - ii. the Unit's success in delivering programs given practical resource expectations
 - iii. and, the administration in the Unit with respect to program delivery.
- b. The Reviewers' written report will be due within approximately two weeks of the site visit. For faculty Reviews, this report will be submitted to the VP Fredericton (Academic) and VP (Saint John), where appropriate; for Department Reviews the report will be submitted to the Dean. The report will consist of:
 - A non-confidential appraisal of the Faculty/Department, with emphasis on the quality, structure, and effectiveness of the Faculty/Department. Undergraduate and graduate program reviews should be prepared in separable formats. The report may contain specific recommendations, criticisms, suggestions, and comments within the scope of the invited review, and should include a Summary that can be extracted. This non-confidential section of the Report will be made available to the Faculties, Departments, and Schools concerned and the PRC, if appropriate. The Summary of the External Reviewers' Report along with the unit's formal Response will become the Final Program Review Report
 - In the case of a Faculty Review where the Reviewers may provide input on the leadership of an incumbent Dean, these comments will be made available in confidence to the Deans' Search Committee.
- c. When there are sensitive matters to be communicated more formally than through the site visit debriefing, a confidential report may be submitted to the appropriate Dean or Vice president in addition to the main report

University of New Brunswick

Guidelines for a Faculty/Department Self-Study

This document is offered as a guideline for the design of self-study processes for Faculties and Departments; the content and structure of such an evaluation will undoubtedly vary.

An essential element of the Program Reviews is for the Faculty/Department to undertake a self-study, including an evaluation of its undergraduate and graduate programs, incorporating appropriate interdisciplinary offerings. This self-study should involve the entire academic staff of the Faculty/Department and, to whatever extent possible, the students involved in those programs. The evaluation, among other things, will deal with the same subjects as those examined by the program's External Reviewers. The Faculty/Department will have access to the same information and material as the Reviewers. The self-evaluation will allow the parties involved to reassess and, where needed, rethink the programs under study. Finally, the self-study should lead to a document that will provide background information for the External Reviewers. In each category, the self-study should include challenges and constraints, but also opportunities.

Specific subjects to be evaluated

Without limiting the overall mandate assigned to the Faculty/Department concerned and to the External Reviewers, the following subjects are of particular interest and should be addressed with direct comments. Examples of questions related to each of these subjects can be found in the attached appendix.

1. *The specific objectives of undergraduate and graduate study programs.*
 - How students registered in these programs succeed in acquiring high-quality education in a discipline or in a professional field of study.
 - How students round out their education, i.e. how they master the language and principles of the discipline and how they increase their capacity to think logically and critically.
 - How students broaden their general culture.
2. *How undergraduate and graduate study programs meet the needs of their student clientele and how they comply with the specific objectives of the University.*
 - The ability of the Faculty/Department concerned to meet the needs of students wanting to specialize in the discipline or professional field of study for which the Faculty/Department is responsible.
 - The quality and relevance of the services provided by the Faculty/Department to other students who need to take these courses to enrich or complement their program in other disciplines or areas of study.
 - The contribution of the Faculty/Department to the attainment of University- and/or campus-wide objectives.
3. *The quality and quantity of the resources made available to the undergraduate and graduate study programs offered by the Faculty/Department.*
 - The quality and number of faculty members and their involvement in the programs, not only through excellent teaching, but also through their participation in the research activities of their disciplines.
 - The quality and relevance of the mentoring provided to undergraduate and graduate students by the Faculty/Department itself and by the University/Campus in general.
 - The physical conditions (classrooms, laboratories, libraries, etc.) in which programs are offered.

APPENDIX A

MPHEC Maritime Degree Level Qualifications Framework

The Maritime Provinces Higher Education Committee (April 2006) has developed expectations or competencies for graduates of undergraduate and graduate degree programs (<http://www2.mphec.ca/english/pdfs/DegreeLevelFrameworkEn.pdf>). These include:

1. Depth and breadth of knowledge in the field
2. Depth and breadth of knowledge outside the field
3. Conceptual and methodological awareness
4. Level of analytical skill
5. Level of application of knowledge
6. Professional capacity / autonomy
7. Level of communication skills
8. Awareness of limits of knowledge

Utilizing these 'common' competencies, as well as additional competencies unique to a particular program, may assist in addressing important questions related to the basic education of the students (for examples see #1 below) and the broadening of the general culture of students (for examples see #2 below).

Objectives of the Educational Programs

1. Regarding basic education of students.

- Are the Faculty/Department objectives in the area of training and general knowledge well articulated, and is the Faculty/Department attuned accordingly?
- Does the undergraduate and graduate curriculum encourage the development or critical perspectives in the field and in general?
- How are the students introduced to independent analysis?
- How does the Faculty/Department, including its disciplinary or professional component, stress the importance of communicating effectively?
- Do students of the Faculty have reasonable access to out-of-discipline courses, including those of a general and cultural nature?

2. Regarding the broadening of the general culture of undergraduate students.

- Does the Faculty/Department allow time for complementary courses in another family of disciplines?
- Have these courses in other disciplines or in other families of disciplines been designed specifically for the needs of the students registered in the Faculty/Department concerned?
- Does the Faculty/Department offer to students of another discipline courses that allow them to gain a basic knowledge of that discipline or of an aspect of this discipline of particular relevance to them?

3. Regarding the training in the discipline.

- Are the professional or subject area objectives of the Faculty/Department well articulated? What reasons underlie the selection of these objectives? Does the Faculty/Department structure match these objectives?

- How does the Faculty/Department compare with those offered at other Canadian and international universities?
- Do undergraduate and graduate course levels (in each succeeding year) indicate that students require a gradually higher level of expertise?
- Does the curriculum reflect the current state of the discipline?
- Does the Faculty/Department help students link their discipline with other disciplines in the University community?
- Are the courses appropriate to their respective undergraduate and graduate levels?
- Are there innovative features?

How the Programs Meet the Needs of the Students and Comply With the Specific Objectives of the University

1. *Regarding the needs of the student clientele registered in the study programs of the Faculty/Department concern.*
 - Where do the programs offered by the Faculty/Department lead (specific profession, graduate studies, comprehensive introduction to a particular discipline, prerequisite skill acquisition for entrance to a related program, etc.)?
 - Is the curriculum relevant to the student's future career and role in society?
2. *Regarding the needs of students from other disciplines.*
 - In which study programs are the students in the Faculty/Department's undergraduate and graduate courses registered?
 - What are the levels of aspiration and the career plans of the different students involved in the Faculty/Department's various programs?
 - What is the academic background of students from other units taking courses in the Faculty/Department concerned?
 - Do the members of the Faculty/Department's teaching staff recognize the needs of students in their course from outside the discipline?
 - To what degree are the particular needs of students from outside the discipline taken into consideration in the selection of content and the design of undergraduate and graduate study programs offered by the Faculty/Department concerned?

The Quality and Quantity of the Resources Provided for the Programs Offered

1. *Regarding the teaching staff and their involvement in the delivery of undergraduate and graduate programs.*
 - What proportion of undergraduate and graduate courses offered by the Faculty/Department are taught by regular full-time professors? How many associate and full professors teach at this level?
 - What proportion of graduate study programs offered by the Faculty/Department involve regular full-time professors who are members of the School of Graduate Studies faculty? How many assistant, associate and full professors, who are members of the School of Graduate Studies faculty, teach and supervise at this level? How many non-tenure track research-orientated Honorary Research Associates or Adjunct Professors teach and co-supervise at this level?
 - Do undergraduate and graduate students have access to various activities such as conferences, seminars and debates that can also provide enrichment in subjects

related to the study program? Do the professors of the Faculty/Department take part in these activities?

- Do faculty members share an overall view of the programs of the Faculty/Department or are they concerned only with their own courses?
- Do members of the part-time faculty bring special expertise to the department's programs?

2. *Regarding the guidance provided to undergraduate and graduate students.*

- How do the rates of graduation, withdrawal and transfer to other programs in the Faculty/Department concerned compare with those of other Faculties/Departments in the same family of disciplines (both graduate and undergraduate)?
- How are undergraduate and graduate students guided and counselled throughout the program (upon admission, for course selection, for academic problems, for career direction, on opportunities in the field, in the selection of graduate schools, etc.)?
- How is the student's (both graduate and undergraduate) progress through the program monitored? To what degree are guidance activities available also to part-time students?
- Are the goals of the Faculty/Department clearly set out for the students? Are course outlines clear and available to students when they select their courses?
- What relation can be established between the objectives of the courses and program and the evaluation methods used by the students (both undergraduate and graduate)?
- Are faculty members familiar with the various evaluation techniques and how they are used as teaching instruments as well as performance appraisal instruments?
- How do the results of the evaluation provided by students compare with those of related Faculties/Departments?

3. *Regarding the physical conditions in which the unit's programs are offered.*

- When instruction is given to larger groups simultaneously, do the resources assigned to this type of instruction, as well as the teaching methods used, respond effectively to the challenges of large group instruction?
- When instruction is given to small groups (<10), do the resources assigned to this type of instruction, as well as the teaching methods used, respond effectively to the challenges of small group instruction?
- Under what material conditions and with what resources does the Faculty/Department provide undergraduate and graduate study programs? (classroom conditions in relation to teaching needs, library collections, common or core research facilities, etc.)