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Senate Policy on the Review of Academic Programs

In response to the Maritime Provinces Higher Education Council (MPHEC) Policy on Quality Assurance (2005), Saint Mary’s Senate Committee and sub-committee, Academic Planning Committee, updated the Senate Policy on the Review of both Undergraduate and Graduate Programs at Saint Mary’s University in 2009-2010.

Program Review is a process of internal, formative self-evaluation combined with and guided by peer review. It is aimed at monitoring and improving student learning and the many facets that support that learning. The Program Review Process is outlined in this document.

Statement of Objectives

- Encourages continuous program improvement through a process of self-evaluation
- Enables programs to maintain currency and academic credibility through the peer review process
- Promotes high-quality programs that are responsive to student needs, societal priorities, and the public good
- Enables programs to ensure that program goals are consistent with the University’s mission and Academic Plan
- Assists a program in planning for future program development
- Informs institutional decision making and resource allocation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Program Review Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notification</strong> March - May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs under review in the next Review Cycle will receive notification from APC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offices providing data (Library, Institutional Analysis) will receive notification from the CAID Associate of upcoming Self-Studies (provided to programs in September)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Study</strong> March - May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program establishes a Self-Study Committee and the Committee Chair notifies CAID indicating names of committee members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Study Committee participates in a session with the Dean(s) and CAID Associate to review the Program Review process - timelines, information to be presented in the Self-Study, follow-up, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preparation for Site Visit</strong> March – May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program submits a list of external nominees (with Self-Study Report)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Planning Committee discusses and approves list of external reviewers (in order to be invited) and an internal chair for the site visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dates for Site Visit approved in consultation with the VPAR, Dean(s), and Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APC Chair invites nominees to serve as members of the Program Review Committee (PRC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMUport folder is set up for each program with membership given to all Program Faculty (FT) and the Program Review Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Visit Itinerary is drafted by CAID Associate and finalized in consultation with Dean(s) and Program Chair (2-day visit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Review Committee</strong> September - December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Review Committee completes a 2-day visit at Saint Mary’s University (Fall)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writes a draft Report which is reviewed by the Internal Chair then submitted to the CAID Associate (6-8 weeks following the visit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report is forwarded to Self-Study Committee Chair for formal response (1-month) – report should be circulated to program faculty for input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both PRC Report and the Program’s Response to the Report are forwarded to the Dean(s) for formal response (1-month)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All program review documents are placed on SMUport for electronic distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Planning Committee Review</strong> January - March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APC discusses the Program Review Committee Report and formal responses from the Program and the Dean(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Planning Committee makes recommendations to Senate – memo from APC Chair to Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Senate</strong> April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate discusses APC recommendations and reviews all documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate makes recommendations to the Program – memo to Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Follow-Up</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Action Plan is submitted by the Program to APC 60-days following the Senate recommendations (See Action Plan Template)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 1-Year Follow-up Report is submitted by the Program to APC one year following the Senate recommendations, which is forwarded to Senate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Program Review – Document Flow
The Self-Study

As a starting point for systematic program review, the academic unit responsible for the delivery of the program is responsible for preparing a self-study. The self-study has descriptive, explanatory, evaluative and formative functions. To enable a Program Review Committee to determine whether the program is meeting its objectives and the criteria as described in Senate Policy for the Review of Academic Programs, it is essential that the self-study be reflective and analytical, and that it actively involve both faculty and students in the process. (Undergraduate policy approved by Senate, March 3, 2010; Graduate policy on May 10, 2010).

The aim of the self-study is to provide the academic unit with an opportunity to assess whether its program meets the educational and career needs of students, the community and the University and to document this information for the Program Review Committee. It allows the program to:

- evaluate itself in the context of the University’s Mission, Academic Plan, and the Senate Policy on the Review of Academic Programs;
- evaluate itself according to the conventions of the discipline;
- reflect on the current program in light of the original program proposal purposes and/or past program reviews;
- identify areas of strength, weakness, opportunities, and improvement;
- articulate plans for future development and provide the evidence on which recommendations for the program will be based; and
- gain feedback from the peer review process.

The self-study will cover the period since the last review, or, in the case of a first program review, the last five years.

To assist with the self-study, data and support will be provided to the Self-Study Committee by a number of university offices:

- Office of Enrolment Management/Institutional Research
- Patrick Power Library
- Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
- Centre for Academic and Instructional Development
- Other (as identified by the Self-Study Committee)
Self-Study Committee
The Program will establish a Self-Study Committee to produce a Report within the timeframe identified.

a) The Self-Study Committee shall consist of all full-time faculty or a representative number of members of the program (long-serving and newer faculty, disciplinary specialities, etc.)

b) The Self-Study Committee (including the Department Chair/Program Director/Coordinator if not already a member of the Committee) will consult with the Dean during the writing of the draft Report.

c) The Self-Study Report shall be approved by a majority of tenured/tenure track faculty. Program faculty will have access to the final Self-Study Report.

d) The Self-Study Committee will submit a final Report to the Dean with a copy to the Centre for Academic and Instructional Development (CAID) Associate. The Dean(s) will write a response to the Self-Study and submit to CAID Associate.

e) Along with the Self-Study Report, a proposed list of external reviewers (maximum of six) should be submitted including contact information (see External Nomination Template). 

NOTE: This information should not be obtained from the nominee.

- Name, rank, position, institutional address, telephone number and email address
- Degrees held, including granting institutions
- Area(s) of specialization
- Administrative or professional experience or expertise relevant to the program
- Evidence of recent, relevant scholarly activity (reference three to five publications)
- Details of previous affiliation with the University and/or faculty member(s) of the program within the past ten years which could be seen as a conflict of interest (e.g. collaborator, past present or future; provided letter of support, research supervisor or graduate student, organizational affiliation; friend)
- Rationale for nomination as an external reviewer.

f) After the Academic Planning Committee has approved members of the Program Review Committee based on recommendations from the program, Dean(s) and/or VPAR, the APC Chair will send letters of invitation to approved external reviewers and internal chair.
Preparation of the Self-Study

It is the responsibility of the Chair or Program Coordinator to ensure that a broad range of consultation occurs in the preparation of the Self-Study.

a) All full-time faculty, including those on sabbatical and special leave, shall be made aware of the review and have an opportunity to participate in the program review process.
b) The self-study shall ensure student participation through focus groups, surveys, alumni feedback or by any other means of gathering student information on the program. Students will also be invited to participate in the site visit.
c) The self-study shall involve consultation with long serving part-time faculty, internal or external advisory committees, and/or community groups with links to the program.

Outline of the Self-Study

Section A: Critical Analysis

A critical analysis addressing the key areas outlined in Sections 6 and 7 of the Senate Policy (approximately 20-25 pages). The questions in these sections are intended as guidelines. They are not meant to suggest a question/answer format.

Section B: Development Plan

A proposed development plan, or a summary, for the next 1 – 3 years in response to strengths/weaknesses/opportunities identified through the Self-Study and/or identification of any specific areas/questions/issues the Program would like the Review Committee to consider.

Section C: Appendices

▪ CVs of all full-time faculty, and, if relevant, long-serving part-time faculty
▪ A PDF of course syllabi for the core courses in the program
▪ Library Report (See Outline of Format for Library Response)
▪ Institutional Analysis (See Items Provided by Institutional Analysis)
▪ Other relevant appendices referenced in the Self-Study Report (i.e. MOU or Affiliation Agreements, Program Strategic Plans, Committee Terms of Reference)
Centre for Academic and Instructional Development

Working in consultation with the Academic Planning Committee and the Senate Office, CAID will provide support and guidance to programs throughout the review process. Specifically, the CAID Associate will:

a) assist the Self-Study Committee in the program review process and provide support as needed in consultation with the committee chair (i.e. developing a student survey, analyzing survey results, document management)
b) draft an itinerary for Site Visit drafted and reviewed with Dean and Program Chair
c) establish a SMUport Groups site for electronic collection and eventual dissemination of all program review and university documents to Program Review Committee and program faculty.

SMUport Groups site set up for collection of all program review:

- **Files**
  - Self-Study Report
  - Dean(s) Response to Self-Study
  - Program Review Committee (PRC) Report
  - Department/Program Response to PRC Report
  - Dean(s) Response to PRC Report
  - Appendices
    - Library
    - Institutional Data
    - Faculty CV's
    - Course Outlines
    - Other documents

- **Links**
  - Program Website (Feature Link)
  - Senate Policy on Program Review
  - Academic Strategic Plan
  - Academic Calendar
  - Full-Time Faculty Collective Agreement
  - Part-Time Faculty Collective Agreement

d) accept final report on behalf of the Program Review Committee and forward copies to the Program Chair/Director and the Dean(s) of the Faculty

For assistance with questions on policy or process, development of information gathering (i.e. student surveys) and/or other requests please contact:

Michelle Malloy, MEd
CAID Associate (Curriculum & Program Review)
902-491-6473
michelle.malloy@smu.ca
Program Review Committee

The Academic Planning Committee shall appoint a Program Review Committee for each program to be reviewed.

The Review Committee shall consist of three members, two external to Saint Mary’s and one Saint Mary’s faculty member who will act as Chairperson of the Committee; the three Committee members will produce a draft report at the end of the site visit; the external reviewers will write the final report within six to eight weeks of site visit.

Internal Member (Chair)

The internal member will be an academic staff member at Saint Mary’s University with no connections to the program under review.

As much as is possible, in any given year, internal chairs will be identified from the programs scheduled for review in the following two academic years. This will provide an opportunity for an Internal Chair to bring this experience to their program review process. The Academic Planning Committee will approve an Internal Chair for the Program Review Committee.

The responsibility of the Internal Chair is to:

- Review the Self-Study Report including all relevant University and department documents to prepare for the site visit
- Participate in the site visit and act as guide and facilitator of the site visit itinerary
- Provide overview of Saint Mary’s University to the Program Review Committee
- Participate in preparing the draft report (at the end of the two day site visit)
- Act as a resource for external members of the Program Review Committee during the writing of the final report
- Review draft of final report before final submission to the Dean(s)/CAID
External Reviewers

The Academic Planning Committee will appoint two external reviewers from recommendations made by the Program/Department in addition to any submitted by the Dean and/or the Vice-President, Academic and Research.

External reviewers should be active professionals in the field under review from peer institutions. It would be helpful to the process if they had also held academic administrative appointments (Dean(s), Department Chair, Program Director/Coordinator).

The list of nominees will be submitted with the Self-Study Report, but may be submitted (to CAID) in advance of the Self-Study deadline to provide APC with sufficient time to identify reviewers and confirm availability.

The Self-Study Committee will include the following Information (or as much as possible) on each external reviewer recommended (SEE External Reviewer Nomination Template):

The responsibilities of the External Reviewers are to:
- Review the Self-Study Report including all relevant University and department documents in preparation for site-visit
- Book their travel ensuring adequate arrival and departure times (hotels will be booked by Saint Mary’s staff)
- Participate in a 2-day on-campus site-visit
- Submit a full draft report to the Internal Chair for review before final submission
- Submit a final report to the CAID Associate who will forward a copy to both the Self-Study Committee Chair and Dean(s)
- Submit an Expense Claim Form, provided by CAID Associate, along with original receipts
Data for the Development of Self-Study

Outline of Format for Library Response
The Patrick Power Library will provide information in the following areas to a Program Review Self-Study Committee:

- Overview of library support for the Program
- Research Infrastructure
  - Research assistance
  - Specialized resources (i.e. Data services, off campus access)
  - Document Delivery and Interlibrary Loan
- Novanet and Novanet Express
- Interlibrary loan
- Instructional Services
- Monograph Acquisitions and Budget in Support of the Program
- Serial and Electronic Resources and Budget in Support of the Program
- Additional information may be provided, if requested by the Committee.

Note: CAID will notify the Library regarding your upcoming review. A Librarian will forward a copy of the Library Report to you, copy to CAID, upon completion (Fall Term).

For further information, please contact Marie DeYoung, University Librarian marie.deyoung@smu.ca
Items provided by Institutional Analysis

NOTE: These items are currently being reviewed by a sub-committee of the Academic Planning Committee, chaired by the Dean of Science.

Institutional Analysis and Planning will provide the following information/data to a Program Review Self-Study Committee:

- Student Enrolment (number of majors, minors, honours, certificates and diplomas) by Program/Department, the associated Faculty, and the University for the previous five academic years.

- Number of degrees, diplomas and certificates awarded in the Program/Department, the associated Faculty, and the University for the last five calendar years.

- Course offerings for the last five academic years and summer sessions.
  - This information will include the actual number of courses and sections offered in the Program/Department, by term, including the actual number of registrations in each course along with a similar report for summer sessions.
  - The number of course offerings by level (100, 200, etc.) for the Program/Department, the associated Faculty, and the University for the previous five academic years.

- Grade distributions for courses offered over the last five academic years.

- List of graduates from the Program/Department for at least the last five calendar years.

Note: CAID will notify the Office of Institutional Analysis regarding your upcoming review. The most recent annual data is available each year after August 15. It may take up to six weeks for completion of data reports.

For further information, please contact Daphne Tucker, Institutional Analysis
daphne.tucker@smu.ca
Glossary of Terms

To be developed

Academic Planning Committee
Action Plan
Centre of Academic and Instructional Development
External Reviewer(s)
Internal Chair
Institutional Analysis
MPHEC
Program Review
Program Review Committee (PRC)
Program Review Report
Self-Study
Self-Study Committee
Self-Study Report
Senate
Senate Policy
An external review is a key component of the Program Review Process. This form is intended to give programs an opportunity to suggest a peer review team as per the Senate Policy on Program Review - [http://www.smu.ca/academic/senate/policies.html](http://www.smu.ca/academic/senate/policies.html). Please ensure this form is filled in completely to avoid delays in scheduling your site visit.

*NOTE: the textboxes in this template will expand as needed*

### Proposed External Reviewer No. 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tel.</th>
<th>E-mail</th>
<th>URL (if available)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Areas of Expertise (keywords, key phrases)

**Brief explanation of the Reviewer’s suitability to conduct the review of this program and rationale for nomination.**

*For example, please provide a list of academic accomplishments, relevant experience, recent or significant scholarly contributions (if possible, provide citations).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disclosure of Saint Mary’s University Affiliations and potential conflicts of interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Indicate previous affiliation with SMU, if any (e.g., visiting professor, former employee, family/professional ties). Full disclosure of all past affiliations is required to assist in the selection and to confirm an arm’s-length relationship.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SITE VISIT ITINERARY (Sample)**

**Internal Chair:**

**External Reviewers:**

*Site Visit usually begins with dinner (Program Review Committee) the evening before Day 1.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>DAY 1</strong></th>
<th><strong>LOCATION</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:45am</td>
<td>Program Review Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00am</td>
<td>Vice-President, Academic &amp; Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 – 10:30</td>
<td>Dean (including Dean, FGSR, for a graduate program)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break</td>
<td>Department Chair/Program Director/Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program or Curriculum Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Faculty (FT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty (PT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break</td>
<td>Campus Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visit to Department (offices, classrooms, labs, etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finish approx. 4:30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>DAY 2</strong></th>
<th><strong>LOCATION</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00 AM</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Advisor – Academic Advisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break</td>
<td>Campus Administration – Registrar, Librarian, Distance Education (if applicable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Faculty Committee consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Closing Meeting/Debrief with VPAR, Dean(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finish 3-4 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Individuals/groups** include: full time faculty; long serving part-time faculty; students in the program; alumni; departmental staff (secretary, lab assistants/TAs/tutors, Academic Advisor(s), etc.); university administrators (Registrar, Librarian, etc.); community representatives (where applicable); others as identified by Department/Dean.
**ACTION PLAN (Sample)**
*Developed from Senate Recommendations*

*NOTE:* Academic Planning Committee will consider the external report and the department/program and dean(s) responses when making recommendations to Senate. Senate will consider the Academic Planning Committee’s recommendations in relation to all the aforementioned documentation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Action Plan</th>
<th>Time Line</th>
<th>1-Year Status Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. List of Senate Recommendations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The program review will cover the period since the last review; or, in the case of a first program review, the last seven years. The questions in Sections 6 and 7 of the Senate Policy (below) are intended as guidelines. They are not meant to suggest a question/answer format. (Undergraduate Policy on March 12, 2010)

**NOTE: this a “fillable” template and each textbox will expand as needed.**

Section A: Critical Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Introduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.1 Program Goals and Student Learning Outcomes

- Program goals
- Student learning outcomes
- External factors (i.e. accreditation)

6.2 Program of Study

- Content, structure and delivery
- Assessment principles and methods
- Program development

6.3 Teaching and Learning Environment

Identify and critically analyze how each of the following affects and contributes to the research and professional development environment for students in the program:

- Faculty (full-time and part-time)
- Range of pedagogical practices
- Modes of course delivery
- Teaching/learning resources (i.e. library)
- Physical infrastructure and equipment

6.4 Student Characteristics

- Enrolment patterns (are these similar to the university, faculty)
- Student admissions (profile of students entering the program)
- Retention/Graduation
- Graduate experience (what is known about the student experience after graduation)
### 6.5 Program Strengths and Challenges

- **Program Strengths**: What are the strengths of the program as it currently exists?
- **Program Goals**: To what extent is the program achieving its goals?
- **Student Learning Outcomes**: To what extent are SLO being met? Why/why not?
- **Curriculum Change**: What, if any, changes to the curriculum are planned or contemplated to better support the program’s goals and SLO?
- **Challenges**: What are the challenges, present and future, to maintaining and/or enhancing opportunities for student success in the program?

### 6.6 Environmental Scan

- **Status of the Discipline** *(regionally, nationally, internationally)*
- **Program Need**
- **Student Demand** *(past, current, future demand for the program)*
- **Relationship to Other Programs** *(at Saint Mary’s)*
- **Relationship to Other Institutions**: *(consultations/connections)*
- **Resources** *(human, physical, and financial)*
## Section B: Development Plan

### 7.1 Conclusion – Summary Statement

*The Program Review Committee* should provide a summary statement on the evidence attesting to the quality of the program, the overall strengths and limitations of the program and the academic unit responsible for it, and future directions.
7.2 List of Recommendations

This section should include an itemized list of the recommendations made by the External Review Committee throughout the report.
## Section C: Appendices

### List of Appendices

*This section should include an itemized list of the appendices to be included with the Self-Study Report.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appendix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Analysis Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty CV's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Syllabi (CORE courses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excerpt from Academic Calendar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other documents as noted in Self-Study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW
Self-Study Report – Graduate Program

Name of Program(s):

Department(s)/School/Faculty(s)

Date(s) of Site Visit:

The program review will cover the period since the last review; or, in the case of a first program review, the last seven years. The questions in Sections 6 and 7 of the Senate Policy (below) are intended as guidelines. They are not meant to suggest a question/answer format.
(Undergraduate Policy on March 12, 2010)

NOTE: this a “fillable” template and each textbox will expand as needed.

Section A: Critical Analysis

Introduction
6.1 Program Goals and Student Learning Outcomes

- Program goals
- Student learning outcomes
- External factors (i.e. accreditation)

6.2 Program of Study

- Content, structure and delivery
- Assessment principles and methods
- Program development

6.3 Teaching and Learning Environment

*Identify and critically analyze how each of the following affects and contributes to the research and professional development environment for students in the program:*

- Faculty (full-time and part-time)
- Range of pedagogical practices
- Modes of course delivery
- Teaching/learning resources (i.e. library)
- Physical infrastructure and equipment
### 6.4 Research and Professional Development Environment

*Identify and critically analyze how each of the following affects and contributes to the research and professional development environment for students in the program:*

- Faculty expertise and research activity (in terms of capacity to supervise graduate student research)
- Research in the program, including areas of distinctive or special strength, recent accomplishments, and the external impact of research
- External and internal research funding, including aggregate amounts, sources and number of faculty applying for the number successful in grant competitions
- Research collaborations of faculty members with others outside the university including whether the program has formal or informal agreements with other programs or institutions
- Professional experience of faculty relevant to the program
- Professional development activities of faculty
- Community involvement directly related to a Faculty Member's specialty
- Membership on boards or professional associations relevant to the program
- Mentorship of students

### 6.5 Administrative/Organizational Environment

*Identify and critically analyse the program’s administrative/organization structure with respect to:*

- The appropriateness of the roles of program coordinators/directors/managers and committees within the program.
- The relationship of the program to the host department or departments (if interdisciplinary), faculty or faculties within the University, or bodies in other universities (if a joint degree).

### 6.6 Student Characteristics

- Enrolment patterns (are these similar to the university, faculty)
- Student admissions (profile of students entering the program)
- Retention/Graduation
- Graduate experience (what is known about the student experience after graduation)
### 6.7 Program Strengths and Challenges

- **Program Strengths**: What are the strengths of the program as it currently exists?
- **Program Goals**: To what extent is the program achieving its goals?
- **Student Learning Outcomes**: To what extent are SLO being met? Why/why not?
- **Curriculum Change**: What, if any, changes to the curriculum are planned or contemplated to better support the program’s goals and SLO?
- **Challenges**: What are the challenges, present and future, to maintaining and/or enhancing opportunities for student success in the program?

### 6.8 Environmental Scan

- **Status of the Discipline** *(regionally, nationally, internationally)*
- **Program Need*
- **Student Demand** *(past, current, future demand for the program)*
- **Relationship to Other Programs** *(at Saint Mary’s)*
- **Relationship to Other Institutions**: *(consultations/connections)*
- **Resources** *(human, physical, and financial)*
### 7.1 Conclusion – Summary Statement

_The Program Review Committee should provide a summary statement on the evidence attesting to the quality of the program, the overall strengths and limitations of the program and the academic unit responsible for it, and future directions._

### 7.2 List of Recommendations

_This section should include an itemized list of the recommendations made by the External Review Committee throughout the report._
## Section C: Appendices

### List of Appendices

*This section should include an itemized list of the appendices to be included with the Self-Study Report.*

- Library Report
- Institutional Analysis Report
- Faculty CV's
- Course Syllabi (CORE courses)
- Excerpt from Academic Calendar
- Other documents as noted in Self-Study