DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY SENATE POLICY FOR FACULTY REVIEWS OF ACADEMIC PROGRAMS	*Policy Sponsor:* *Senate*	*Approval Date:* Senate: December 10, 2018 Board of Governors: February 12, 2019
	Responsible Unit: Provost, Faculties	*Revisions:* Senate: Board: Modifications to Appendices B and D: May 2024

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 literacies[1] 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 include 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. <u>Review Committee Process</u>

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 Daft 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*

1. Background and Purpose

The Maritime Provinces Higher Education Commission (MPHEC) and Dalhousie's *Senate Policy for Faculty Reviews of Academic Programs* require that all academic programs be reviewed on a cyclical basis (every 5-7 years). An accreditation review may substitute for some of or all this requirement providing the accreditation review covers core components outlined in the policy and a comparably rigorous assessment of the academic program.

The activities outlined under **2. Procedures** are expected to be undertaken during the year of an accreditation site-visit—for efficiency, we recommend that this document be completed concurrently with the preparation of the accreditation submission.

2. Procedures

The tables below are designed to help Faculties demonstrate the extent to which their accreditation review satisfies the MPHEC/Senate requirements for a program review. For each section, indicate how the accreditation process fulfills the requirement or assessment criteria, noting any gaps that exist. Please note it is only necessary to confirm (Y/N) and briefly describe how the requirement has been met (e.g., cite a specific criterion and the corresponding assessment activity). You are **not** required to reproduce segments of your accreditation submission or discuss the performance of the program in the most recent cycle of accreditation. Sample responses are provided throughout to demonstrate the required level of detail.

You may use a single form for multiple programs (understanding that it is typical for multiple programs/levels to undergo accreditation simultaneously) i**f the accreditation requirements and process are the same.** Please note that although multiple programs or levels of program (i.e., graduate and undergraduate) may undergo accreditation simultaneously, each criterion should be met and demonstrated for **each individual program** and **group of students**. In all instances, please clearly distinguish which program/programs you are referencing when completing the table (add or duplicate rows as needed.

a. Program and Submission Information

Program or Program(s): Click or tap here to enter text.
Date of accreditation/site-visit: Click or tap here to enter text.
Date of completion of Appendix B: Click or tap here to enter text.
Form completed by (name and position): Click or tap here to enter text.

Completed forms should be submitted to the following contacts for either undergraduate or graduate programs by the Dean or Associate Dean Academic.*

For undergraduate programs	**For graduate programs**
Courtney Sutton, Academic Quality Assurance Manager, Office of the Provost courtney.sutton@dal.ca	Lori Lawton Graduate Academic Quality Assurance Coordinator fgs.curriculum@dal.ca

*If you are using a single Appendix B form for an undergraduate and a graduate program, please submit to both contacts above.

b. Core Components

Using the table below, please confirm that the accreditation review for this program includes the following components/activities.

MPHEC/Senate requirement	**Corresponding accreditation activity**
Defined assessment criteria (may also be referred to as standards, metrics, KPIs, etc.)	
e.g., Defined assessment criteria	*e.g., Yes – the accreditation by CIPS uses defined assessment criteria (section 4. through 8. in the Accreditation Criteria for Computer Science, Software Engineering and Interdisciplinary Programs) in their evaluation of the program.*
Preparation of self-study (i.e., a self-assessment or evaluation submission prepared in advance of the site-visit)	
e.g., Preparation of self-study	*e.g., Yes – the accreditation requires that the program produce a self-study following a structured outline based on the assessment criteria.*
External review component	
e.g., External review component	*e.g., Yes – the site-visit consists of a 2-day on-site visit by a visiting team with a minimum of 4 representative members.*
Participation of students*	
e.g., Participation of students	*e.g., Yes—student feedback was incorporated into the self-study (surveys and SLEQs) and students participated in consultations during the site-visit*
Participation of faculty	
e.g., Participation of faculty	*e.g., Yes—faculty feedback was incorporated into the self-study (evidence from facilitated session and survey) and faculty members participated in consultations (group and individual) during the site-visit.*
Participation of the wider stakeholder network	
e.g., Participation of the wider stakeholder network (where applicable)	*e.g., Yes – in addition to student, faculty and staff directly involved in the program, the site-visit schedule includes alumni, employers, representatives of the regulatory body, representatives from other units in the university, etc.*
Defined follow-up mechanism	
e.g., Defined follow-up mechanism on the status of recommendations	*e.g., Yes-the program was required to respond to the recommendations from the visiting team with an implementation plan and provide progress reports on actions after one and three years.*
Established assessment cycle (not normally exceeding seven years)	
e.g., Established assessment cycle not normally exceeding seven years	*e.g., Yes – accreditation review takes place on a cyclical basis, with 6 years being the maximum possible award.*

**Should include students from each program under review, if applicable*

c. Program Assessment Criteria

Using the table below, please demonstrate the extent to which the accreditation review includes an assessment of the following standards or criteria.

MPHEC/Senate requirement	Corresponding assessment criteria or standard in accreditation submission	Possible supporting discussion or evidence in accreditation submission
Program Rationale and Structure All Dalhousie programs should have clear justification for their intellectual content and programmatic structure.		☐ Mission Statement ☐ Strategic Plan ☐ Program Overview/Description
e.g., Program Rationale and Structure	*e.g., Yes – the Planning Profession in Canada Accreditation Standards 2 and 3 requires the degree be offered in the field of planning as defined by CIP and a graduate degree should require the equivalent of 2 years of full-time study.*	e.g., ☐ *Mission Statement* ☐ *Strategic Plan* ✓ *Program Overview/Description*
Program Renewal and Characteristics Programs should consider, on a cyclical basis, their defining characteristics, and opportunities for renewal.		☐ Program Characteristics ☐ Experiential Learning ☐ Summary of past modifications ☐ Mechanisms for curriculum review and renewal
Program Goals and Assessment Clarity of program goals and methods of assessment tied to those goals are a beneficial practice in higher education.		☐ Program-level Learning Outcomes ☐ Assessment of LO Achievement ☐ Curriculum Map ☐ Student Feedback/surveys
e.g., Program Goals and Assessment	*e.g., Yes - criteria 3.3. Graduate attributes. The institution must demonstrate that the graduates of a program possess the twelve graduate attributes. The attributes will be interpreted in the context of candidates at the time of graduation*	*e.g.,* ✓ *Program-level Learning Outcomes* ✓ *Assessment of LO Achievement* ✓ *Curriculum Map* ✓ *Student Feedback/surveys*
Program Delivery On site and online program delivery methods should show evidence of a strong support for learners.		☐ Online/on-site learning opportunities ☐ Research activities ☐ Enrolment/achievement by course/delivery format ☐ Enrolment/achievement by course/delivery format ☐ Summary of tools and supports by Faculty ☐ Assessment of student engagement with supports
e.g., Program Delivery	*e.g., Yes – criteria 3.4.8 under evaluation of curriculum content and quality includes an evaluation of the delivery mode.*	*e.g.,* ☐ *Online/on-site learning opportunities* ☐ *Research activities* ☐ *Enrolment/achievement by course/delivery format*

		☐ *Summary of tools and supports by Faculty* ✓ *Assessment of student engagement with supports*
Student Success Indicators Program design and delivery should support student success.		☐ Student and alumni feedback ☐ Admissions and enrolment data ☐ Time-to-completion data ☐ Graduate student success rate ☐ Experiential learning placement success ☐ Summary of student funding and scholarships ☐ Exit surveys ☐ NSSE surveys ☐ SLEQ feedback
e.g., Student Success Indicators	*e.g., Yes – criteria 3.3 is focused on student performance criteria, including admissions, promotion, and graduation, supports, degree auditing, etc.*	*e.g.,* ✓ *Student and alumni feedback* ✓ *Admissions and enrolment data* ✓ *Time-to-completion data* ✓ *Graduate student success rate* ✓ *Experiential learning placement success* ☐ *Summary of student funding and scholarships* ☐ *Exit surveys* ☐ *NSSE surveys* ☐ *SLEQ feedback*
Relationships and Collaborations Students benefit from engagement and learning opportunities outside of the classroom.		☐ List of program delivery partnerships ☐ List of program-level research partners ☐ List of outreach and engagement activities ☐ Exchange and study abroad opportunities
Learning Supports Programs require strong resources beyond the classroom.		☐ Description of advising structure ☐ Assessment of student engagement ☐ Mentorship opportunities ☐ Student Feedback ☐ TA Budget (hours per student) and strategy ☐ Student-to-faculty ratio ☐ Student-to-TA ratio ☐ Student Handbooks
Culture of Respect and Inclusivity Dalhousie seeks to increase diversity and inclusion through program design and delivery.		☐ EDIA-specific policies and practices (descriptions and measurable impacts) ☐ EDIA is part of inclusive content, design, and teaching (e.g., learning outcomes) ☐ Outreach/partnerships and initiatives ☐ Access to programs and pathways for equity-denied groups ☐ EDIA data (e.g., student enrolment, faculty complement) considered? ☐ Student and faculty feedback about EDIA?

e.g., Culture of Respect and Inclusivity	*e.g., Yes – Standard 5 Accountability (5.1 to 5.5): accessibility; anti-oppressive policies and standards; identifying and eliminating barriers to admission; relational accountability to Indigenous Peoples and their communities; commitment to educational and healthcare environments that are justice-driven and anti-oppressive.*	*e.g.,* ✓ *EDIA policies and practices (descriptions and measurable impacts)* ✓ *EDIA in inclusive content, design, and teaching (e.g., learning outcomes)* ✓ *Outreach/partnerships and initiatives* ✓ *Access and pathways for equity-denied groups* ✓ *EDIA data (e.g., student enrolment, faculty complement)* ☐ *Student and faculty feedback*
Program Management A program's success requires effective and efficient leadership and management.		☐ Organizational chart ☐ Committee membership ☐ Staffing ☐ Student enrolment ☐ Student-to-supervisor ratio (by faculty member) – Grad ☐ Admission application processing times and process descriptions – Grad ☐ Degree completion statistics – Grad
Regulations Programs are required to adhere to university and faculty academic regulations.		☐ Academic policies and regulations ☐ Program-level processes and procedures ☐ Academic Calendar ☐ Student Handbooks ☐ FGS membership policy (program-level) – Grad ☐ Funding policies (program-level) - Grad

3. Follow-up Meeting and Outcome

Upon completion of the mapping activities contained in **2. Procedures**, the Program Director or designate shall meet with the Associate Vice-President Academic (undergraduate programs) or the Associate Dean Scholarships and Programs (Faculty of Graduate Studies; graduate programs only). The purpose of the meeting will be to discuss the completed tables and to agree upon necessary actions to address gaps, if any. Recommendations for suggested remediation shall be communicated to the Dean (or delegate) of the Faculty which delivers the Academic Program under review.

Please ensure that your up-to-date accreditation documentation for undergraduate and graduate programs is submitted to Courtney Sutton, Academic Quality Assurance Manager, Office of the Provost (courtney.sutton@dal.ca) as it becomes available (i.e., dates of upcoming site-visits, final results, etc.)

a. Possible outcomes and remediation

Outcome:	Remediation:
The accreditation visit is insufficient (missing one or more of the central components of the program policy and/or review significantly did not address the policy statements).	A full program review is required, using the *Senate Policy for Faculty Reviews of Academic Programs*.
Some gaps are identified.	An expedited program review or self-study tailored to the missing information is required. Department may be required to complete some steps in the *Senate Policy for Faculty Reviews of Academic Programs*.
Minimal to no gaps are identified.	No further action is required.

To be completed by the Office of the Associate Vice-President Academic or Faculty of Graduate Studies

Summary of outcome and proposed remediation
Click or tap here to enter text.

Faculty of Graduate Studies [Graduate programs only, typically Associate Dean] (Signature)

_____
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

A. GUIDELINES for SELF-STUDY PREPARATION

1. Purpose and Context for Self-Study:

In preparation for a review, the program conducts a self-study. The self-study is a critical analysis of the program, prepared by the program, and informs the Review Committee. Your self-study should focus on conducting a critical analysis highlighting program strengths, areas for improvement, opportunities, and potential risks. This should include the types of evidence used to assess the program (i.e., success indicators, feedback, etc.) program assessment, reflections on progress achieved since the last review, identification of current priorities, and outline of future plans. Specifically, the self-study:

- Provides an assessment, with evidence, of the criteria in D.6 of the *Senate Policy for Faculty Reviews of Academic Programs* and considers the related questions (B. Self-Study) in the *Procedures*. The questions are meant to be interpreted broadly, and within the context of the discipline/program/faculty under review.
- Includes assessment of the response to recommendations from previous reviews.
- Is student centered.
- Involves faculty and students that are participating in the program.
- Is shared with the program's governing body for input.

Out of Scope

Tip: An exemplar self-study will be brief, discuss and cite the evidence used (body) and be clearly organized by the policy statements. There is naturally potential for overlap across and between sections—cross reference as needed to avoid repetition.

Personal identifying information, or interpersonal/human resource issues that are addressed through other existing University processes (i.e., Human Resources, Human Rights and Equity Services, etc.), are out of scope for reviews of academic programs. If these types of issues are raised during a review process they should be brought to the attention of the Dean or responsible delegate and routed through the appropriate University channels.

2. Using Evidence in your Self-Study:

Best practice:	**Practices to avoid:**
• Incorporate evidence and data into the body of the self-study (i.e., reference to data, discussions, surveys, other). • Discuss evidence/data in relation to the policy criteria and questions in the self-study	• Attaching raw data as appendices without discussion. • Including personally identifying information (i.e., the name of an individual) or data. When in doubt and working with sensitive

template. • Append complete data tables, reports, survey summaries, etc. as needed.	demographic information about faculty members and students (especially in smaller programs), check with Dal Analytics.

i. What evidence will I use in my self-study?

Below is a list of the standardized sources of evidence you will use in your self-study, and a reference to where to find them, applicable resources, etc. Other evidence sources may be available at the program or departmental level or through the Faculty of Graduate Studies for graduate programs. Throughout the template (B. in this document) you will see suggestions of which evidence you might use in your discussion of each assessment criteria.

Tip: Kick off the development of your self-study by having the Centre for Learning and Teaching assist with a guided discussion for all faculty members in the program under review.

Table 1: List of evidence with source and resources

Type of evidence:	**Detail and resources:**
Student data/success indicators	Find in Tableau (Program Review Dashboard). Contact Dalhousie Analytics for support. Available data include: • Admissions • Enrolment • Degrees awarded • Student-to-faculty-ratio • Course registration • Retention • Graduate time to completion
Student feedback	To be collected by the program/self-study team for all student groups/levels under review. Mechanisms to procure this include: • Surveys—template available on CLT Curriculum website. Surveys can be administered using Brightspace or available survey tools (i.e., MS Forms). • Focus groups and interviews—CLT Curriculum can assist you with planning a guided discussion. • Student Learning Experience Questionnaire (SLEQs)—leverage in-course Student Learning Experience Questionnaires (link to resource) by adding custom, program-focused questions or requesting custom, aggregate reports. • Nationale Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)—reports from the NSSE survey can be found in Tableau (Program Review Dashboard) Contact Dalhousie Analytics for support. *Tip: leverage existing student societies or feedback mechanisms to generate participation in program review activities including collecting of feedback for the self-study.*
Faculty feedback	To be collected by the program/self-study team for all student groups/levels under review. Mechanisms include:

	• Surveys—can be administered using Brightspace or available survey tools (i.e., MS Forms). • Focus groups and interviews—CLT Curriculum can assist you with planning a guided discussion to get feedback from faculty members. • Leverage annual program retreats or committee meetings to gather feedback from faculty on topics relevant to the program review.
Diversity and demographic data (students, faculty and staff)	Find in Tableau (Program Review Dashboard). Contact Dalhousie Analytics for support.
Program-level learning outcomes	Consider presenting your outcomes in the self-study using the sample table provided as *Appendix C and* referencing as appropriate. A more detailed program mapping outlining how program-level outcomes align to course-level outcomes may also be included. Resources on mapping, including an introduction to mapping and a mapping analysis overview are available on the CLT website.

ii. Student and Faculty Feedback

Feedback from students, faculty, and other interest-holders, is one of the most important sources of evidence to support your self-study. Before beginning to collect feedback, consider the below:

> *Tip:* when collecting feedback (via survey, focus group, etc.), choose a limited number of questions and focus on gathering the information most pertinent to your program/the self-study.

- Plan and develop a strategy for engaging students and faculty members well in advance of a program review year, including collecting longitudinal feedback from all relevant student groups (i.e., from each degree program under review) and across multiple years of study.
- You'll want to consult student and faculty members (and other identified program participants or interest-holders) on multiple topics related to the assessment criteria (see the suggested evidence referenced throughout the template), e.g., learning supports, regulations, EDIA, learning outcomes, etc. Consider planning all your topics/question areas for each group, then determine the best mechanism and timeline to get the information (i.e., undertake a mini participant mapping and engagement plan), for example:

Table 2: Suggested approach for planning program participant and interest-holder feedback

Program participant or interest-holder group:	**What do I need to ask them about? (list of topics or assessment criteria)**	**How/when will I do it?**
e.g., Faculty members	*Programs goals and assessment, program delivery, program management,*	*Initial guided discussion to discuss programs goals; survey*

	regulations, culture of respect and inclusivity	*to span all areas; discuss EDIA during program committee meeting on X date.*
e.g., Staff	*Communication within unit, student support, etc.*	

- Some of the resources listed in Table 1. (sample surveys, SLEQ questions) are intentionally designed to cover a breadth of topics in alignment with the assessment criteria to assist you with this.
- Consider using a variety of mechanisms, as per Table 1., to maximize engagement. Choose the method best suited for the audience.

iii. Challenges engaging students in program reviews**:**

Common challenges engaging students in program reviews include student time, gathering feedback about an extended experience of a full program rather than the individual courses students are more familiar with and a perceived lack of value or impact of engaging in program review processes. To maximise student engagement and overcome these challenges:

> *Tip:* Adequately preparing students to participate in a program review, including an understanding of the purpose of the review, their role, and concept of "the program," will result in feedback that more accurately reflects the program and their experience.

- Use incentives or flexible methods of participation, working collaboratively with students where possible.
- Build awareness of program reviews (academic quality assurance) and emphasize the value and possible positive impacts (i.e., continuous improvement, action on recommendations)—help students understand the process and their role.
- Seek opportunities to discuss the 'program' and program goals and learning outcomes with both students and faculty.

3. Considerations for combining more than one program in a self-study:

> "…two or more Academic Programs may be reviewed together, or as part of a unit review. Certificates should be reviewed alongside cognate programs (*program review policy*)."

- Should you be combining multiple programs into a single self-study? Consider:
  - Do the programs share similar outcomes and structures such that presenting them together will reduce unnecessary duplication?
  - Will the same external reviewer be appropriate?
  - Who will be on the self-study team? Consider including from each program/level under review.
- When assessing multiples programs in a single self-study:
  - Clearly address the unique attributes and requirements of **each degree program** under

review (including evidence, data, consultations with students and faculty, etc.)

To avoid duplication, consider organizing the self-study by shared elements, and then using **branching or tables** to clearly illustrate any program specific components.

Table 3: Sample learning outcomes for undergraduate and graduate programs in "Dalhousie Studies."

Student Learning Outcomes (Major, Honours)	**Student Learning Outcomes (Masters)**
Describe the historical development of Dalhousie University, including its founding, key milestones, and influential figures.	Demonstrate a nuanced understanding of the historical evolution of Dalhousie University, engaging with primary sources, historiographical debates, and specialized research to contribute to the field's scholarship.
Critically analyze historical documents, artifacts, and events related to Dalhousie, interpreting their significance in the broader context of higher education and societal changes.	Critically analyze and interpret historical documents and emerging scholarship, synthesize complex historical narratives, and engage with theoretical frameworks
Connect historical developments at Dalhousie to contemporary issues in higher education, evaluating the impact of past decisions on the present and considering implications for the future.	Make interdisciplinary connections, integrating knowledge from various fields such as sociology, economics, and political science to makes meaning of the societal context influencing Dalhousie's development.
Contextualize the history of Dalhousie University within colonial structures and systems, critically examining how historical decisions, policies, and power dynamics influenced the university's development.	Develop strategies for transformation, decolonization, and reconciliation within the context of higher education.
(Honours Specific)	Design and execute original research projects related to Dalhousie's history, producing high-quality scholarly work suitable for publication or presentation at academic conferences.
Locate, evaluate, and synthesize information related to Dalhousie's history and effectively communicate findings in written and oral forms	

B. SELF-STUDY COVER PAGE and TEMPLATE

This template is a resource for those developing self-studies for reviews of academic programs, using the *Senate Policy for Faculty Reviews of Academic Programs (2019)*. It ensures the production of well-organized, consistent self-studies and contains tips suggestions for content and evidence you might provide in each respective section, and procedural prompts. The content and evidence suggestions are not intended to be prescriptive or exhaustive, and the responses to the questions/assessment criteria will vary within the context of the program/discipline under review.

1. How to use the template

This is an editable word document with a programmed table of contents (click on the table and select

update field when you're complete). Guidelines (Section A.) and tip boxes should be removed prior to finalization and submission of the self-study.

Cover Page

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

Academic unit in which the program(s) are located: Click or tap here to enter text.

Date of anticipated site-visit/review: Click or tap here to enter text.

This self-study was completed following the *Senate Policy for Reviews of Academic Programs* (2018) and incorporates the following elements:

- This self-study includes a discussion of each of the policy statements and considers the related questions
- This self-study contains an assessment of the recommendations from the previous review (if applicable)
- Students in all programs under review (e.g., graduate and undergraduate level, if reviewing multiple programs within an academic unit) were consulted in the development of this self-study (see *Appendix A - Summary of Participant Feedback*)
- Faculty members involved with the program under review were involved in the development of this self-study (see *Appendix A - Summary of Participant Feedback*).
- This self-study was shared with the program(s) governing body (i.e., Faculty Council or equivalent) for input.

Respectfully Submitted,

Click or tap here to name.

(Program or Unit Director) on Click or tap to enter a date.

Upon completion of this self-study, submit[1] to the Dean (or Associate Dean Academic or other designate) of the Faculty delivering the program AND the Associate Dean Scholarships and Program, Faculty of Graduate Studies (for reviews involving graduate-programs) who shall ensure it meets the requirements of this policy prior to circulation to the Reviewers.

All feedback on the document should be addressed prior to final approval and circulation of the self-study to the Reviewers. The dates below will reflect the final document date for record keeping.

Date of approval by Dean of the Faculty offering the program(s): Click or tap here to enter text.

Date of approval by the Associate Dean, Faculty of Graduate Studies: Click or tap here to enter text.

[1] For graduate programs, please submit once to both the Dean (or delegate) in your home Faculty and with the Associate Dean of FGS via a shared, editable file.

Contents

a. Program Rationale and Structure 9
b. Program Renewal and Characteristics 10
c. Program Goals and Assessment 12
d. Program Delivery 14
e. Student Success Indicators 15
f. Relationships and collaborations 17
g. Learning Supports 18
h. Culture of Respect and Inclusivity 19
i. Program Management 21
j. Regulations 22
Appendix A: Summary of participant and interest-holder feedback 23
Appendix B: Summary of program changes since last review 25
Appendix C: Learning Outcomes table 26
Appendix D: Assessment of response to recommendations from previous review 27

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 learning 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?

ii. How closely aligned are the program outcomes with that of the unit? The Faculty?

[RESPONSE/CONTENT]

What might you discuss:

- A general outline of the program structure, including identifying any relevant streams/concentrations/pathways.
- Rationale for why the program is structured the way it is—this may refer to high-level program goals/objectives, suitability of depth and breadth for degree level, disciplinary norms and standards, professional requirements, student pathways to completing the program, etc.
- Summarise how curriculum requirements are integrated together to support the intended objectives of the program.
- Demonstrate strategic alignment by comparing unit/Faculty/Institutional goals and priorities with program goals and structure (outline how the program is aligned and/or advances these priorities)
- Discussion of how supervision and mentoring are integrated into the program structure may be appropriate (GR).

Suggested evidence and appendices:

- Unit/Faculty strategic goals or priorities—append or embed as link.
- A schematic showing program structure may be appropriate as an appendix

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?

[RESPONSE/CONTENT]

What might you discuss?
i.

- Summarize any defining program characteristics or structure. This might include any of the following: notably strong attributes or those that are particularly creative, unique, boundary-pushing, forward-looking, or otherwise worth of highlighting; evidence of innovation in content and/or delivery of program; specific elements of the program that nurture student enthusiasm for learning (e.g., exposure to current research, connections to practitioners, supported extracurricular activities, considering social impacts)
- Justification of the relevance of program curricula.

ii. and iii.

- A list of any experiential learning components embedded into the program and refer to any relevant course descriptions (as provided in appendix). Identify how these components align to any relevant program learning outcomes. If a program outline is provided as part of the Program Rationale and Structure section, these components may be integrated there.
- Identify any experiential components, community partnerships, service learning, informal experiences offered within units (e.g., seminar programming), embedded credentials (e.g., certificates) that are integrated into the program *specifically to support career development*.

iv.

- Describe how program-level learning outcomes have changed since the last program review and why these have changed.

Tip: If you don't have a previous review to refer to, or, you're unsure when the program was last substantially modified, use the academic calendar entry from 7-10 years ago as your baseline when filling out *Appendix B*.

- Describe any initiatives taken to enhance the quality of the program and the associated teaching environment (GR).
- Use the table in *Appendix B* to demonstrate the extent of changes to the curriculum since the last review *or* major program modification (whichever was more recent).

v.

- For new or recently modified programs, summarize any aspects of the program that are not yet in

place or rolled out differently than intended. Provide rationale. Has there been any unexpected change in resources required to offer the program? What was the impact on student learning of any unanticipated challenges?

Suggested evidence and appendices:

- List of course descriptions for core courses—append.
- *Appendix B – Summary of program changes since last review*.

c. Program Goals and Assessment

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

> *Tip: "Program goals" refers to the knowledge/skills/values students should attain by the end of the program (also commonly referred to as program-level learning outcomes). For additional information on learning outcomes, please visit the curriculum section of the CLT website.*

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]

What might you discuss?

i.

- Provide a list of program-level outcomes and how these are attained through the various program requirements. *Appendix C—Learning Outcomes Table* provides a sample table that includes program outcomes, course mapping and the measures used to assess how students are meeting those outcomes.
- Outline how the learning outcomes are appropriate to the credential, address the current state of the discipline, and/or future trends within the field.

ii.

- Evaluate the curriculum and any potential for reform by, for example, addressing any gaps/deficiencies and strengths in how the program components work together to meet program goals. This might be done by answering the following questions: are there sufficient opportunities in the current program structure for students to meet the intended learning outcomes? Do the required and elective course align to the program outcomes? Does the program (outcomes and curriculum) reflect the current state of the discipline/profession? (reference evidence as available from curriculum maps, faculty/student/interest-holder feedback)
- An assessment of whether students across demographics are meeting the intended learning outcomes (reference evidence as available).
- Highlight any opportunities for learning outside of the classroom that are made available to students that are particularly relevant to this review.

iii.

- Summarize how student learning is assessed (see *Appendix C* for example)
- Provide relevant student success indicators as evidence to meeting outcomes.

Suggested evidence and appendices:

- Student data/success indicators*—completion rates, time-to-completion (GR)

- Student feedback*
- Faculty feedback*
- Program-level learning outcomes*—append using *Appendix C* (a more detailed mapping may also be included).
- External interest-holder feedback, if applicable (e.g., feedback on student progress, gaps in knowledge, etc.)
- Evidence of student research success, e.g. tri-council, publications, conferences, etc. in the context of the program's goals and objectives (GR)
- Participation in academic meetings and conferences, professional development activities, etc. (GR)
- Thesis guidelines and assessment, if applicable (GR)

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 learning 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?

Tip: Within the discussion, summarize in reference to the program delivery or full faculty complement rather than focusing on individual courses or individuals.

[RESPONSE/CONTENT]

What might you discuss?

i.

- Outline how the following supports students in meeting the learning outcomes and degree-level expectations of the program: structure and sequence of learning activities, program requirements, admission requirements, modes of assessment, mode of delivery (e.g. lecture-based, problem-based, distance, online, multi-location, incorporation of principles of Universal Design for Learning, etc.
- Answer the question: does the program in its current delivery form meet the needs of student, faculty, and program? Why or why not. Integrate any relevant evidence into your discussion, e.g. feedback from students and faculty that highlights strengths and challenges in delivery of the program as it relates to student success.
- What mechanisms or planning processes are in place to monitor/review program delivery? How are student data/success indicators used?

ii.

- Outline how faculty expertise (teaching and research) enhances program offerings and facilitates student success in the program. Highlight areas of strength and areas for future development. Refer to any relevant program components and learning outcomes.
- Discuss the ways that teaching evaluation data and feedback is used for teaching and learning improvement, making reference to appropriate data on teaching effectiveness (e.g. SLEQ aggregate data, implementation of peer reviews, holistic evaluation of teaching, grades distributions, program completion rates and time, faculty teaching and mentorship awards, professional development initiatives).

Suggested evidence and appendices:

- List of core courses and the frequency with which they are offered.
- Student feedback*

- Faculty feedback*

e. Student Success Indicators

Program design and delivery should support student success. Self-

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?

[CONTENT/RESPONSE]

What might you discuss?

i.

- Summarize key findings from your analysis of the student data/success indicators. Historical trends may be included to outline changes over time (cross-reference with previous sections or discussions as appropriate to avoid repetition).
- Discuss whether you are seeing the desired number of applicants to the program.
- Include a discussion on the admission requirements to the program as it relates to student success, e.g., are they rigorous enough to ensure students have the appropriate background knowledge and skills to be successful? Are they flexible enough to allow a diverse group of interested and qualified students to engage in the program?

ii.

- Address data that supports progress toward meeting program priorities and commitments (see suggested evidence below).

iii.

- Outline barriers/impediments to student success and progression within a program including those related to the delivery of courses, challenges with pre-requisite structures, scheduling, regulations, available supports, etc. Refer to student and faculty data and feedback, as appropriate.

iv.

- Summarize the program's approach to program planning and renewal (e.g., curriculum committee, annual retreats, etc.) and describe how student feedback and other evidence from students, as referenced in iv., is used in these processes.

v.

- Identify measures used to assess the success of program's graduates (e.g., employment, scholarly output, academic awards, etc.), if available. If this information is not easily available, explain why.
- Outline the range of post-graduation outcomes and summarize whether these are consistent with both the program expectations and student expectations (e.g., how the program has helped them achieve their career goals).

Suggested evidence and appendices:

- Student data/success indicators*—enrollment over time, attrition, retention rates, demographic data, time-to-completion, graduate rates
- Information on student applications/offers/confirmations
- Student feedback*
- Faculty feedback* (especially for iii.)
- Alumni feedback, graduate employment rates, etc. (if available)
- Experiential learning placement success (for co-op programs) –from applicable co-op office
- Terms of Reference for relevant committees—Department/Faculty
- Evidence of student research success, e.g. tri-council, publications, conferences, etc. in the context of the program's goals and objectives (GR)

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?

[RESPONSE/CONTENT]

What might you discuss?

- For both collaborations/partnerships internal to and external to Dalhousie (e.g., with organizations, other institutions, community groups, etc.): Discuss scope, nature, and strategies used for collaborations, including any collaborative efforts in program delivery and design and the development of professional skills. Why they are beneficial to students, how they relate to strategic plans and priorities of the program/unit and program outcomes (refer to relevant outcomes in table) and highlight any future collaborative efforts.
- Highlight any formal structures that allow students to study outside of the classroom, locally, nationally, or internationally (e.g. co-op, placements, internships)

Suggested evidence and appendices:

- Unit/Faculty strategic goals or priorities (append or embed as link)
- Program-level learning outcomes*—append using *Appendix C* (a more detailed mapping may also be included).
- Interest-holder feedback, as appropriate—internal and external relationships

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?

[RESPONSE/CONTENT]

What might you discuss?
i, ii.

- Highlight and describe unit/program-level supports (including mentorship or peer supports) and advising structures. Tie in student and faculty adviser feedback as you describe strengths and challenges.
- Funding policies, summary of student funding and scholarships awarded over review period (GR).
- Discuss whether students know where to go for support, whether the advising structure is clear to them, etc. Tie in student feedback as appropriate.
- Highlight strengths and challenges of learning supports as it relates to the student experience and achievement of learning outcomes. Include a summary of supports that are inadequate as it relates to all students being able to meet the learning outcomes of the program.

iii.

- Summarize any changes to resources since the last program review that have impacted program delivery either positively or negatively.
- Talk specifically about the program-level processes at the program and Dean's office used to review resources, e.g. what do you do when you get feedback, how do you get feedback, and how do you review (regular feedback mechanisms, planning activities, committees, adding program review questions on SLEQ, focus groups/interviews, …).
- Summarize the program's approach to evaluating resources and supports. How is feedback and information collected and what planning processes are in place to address challenges as they arise. How are student feedback and success indicators used in these processes?

Suggested evidence and appendices:

- Student handbook (GR)
- Student data/success indicators*—as appropriate, including faculty-to-student ratio.
- Student feedback*
- Faculty feedback*
- Strategy for use of Teaching Assistants and TA-to-student ratio

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?

[RESPONSE/CONTENT]

Tip: Consider holistically the various aspects of program design and delivery, student experience, and Faculty development that may contribute to a culture of respect. Specifically reference your program rather than general approaches taken by your Faculty.

What might you discuss?

i.

- Outline key elements of strategic plans/initiatives (including anticipated timelines) specifically designed to support program goals of fostering inclusive excellence and equitable, diverse, and inclusive teaching and learning environments. Examples of efforts that may be addressed include (but it not limited to): ensuring inclusive content and/or teaching practices, supporting different ways of learning and knowing, representing intercultural/international perspectives within the curriculum, indigenization of the curriculum, supports for student well-being and building a sense of community, removal of barriers to access, faculty professional development and support in introducing transformative pedagogies.
- In the above discussion, highlight key outcomes and identified challenges to date.
- Reference any specific learning outcomes that describe how the program prepares students to develop a culture of respect.

ii.

- Highlight student recruitment strategies and dedicated admission pathways, admission requirements intended to reduce barriers to deserving students, and outreach efforts related to improving opportunities for historically underserved student populations.
- Outline any difficulties the program may be experiencing in retaining Indigenous students, Black students, students living with disabilities, or students from across marginalized groups.
- Where appropriate, reference data around the recruitment, enrolment, retention, and experience of equity-deserving groups.

iii.

- Summarize professional development opportunities made available to faculty as they continue to work toward more inclusive content and teaching practices, including how this professional development is recognized and encouraged.
- In addition to recruitment initiatives, outline any initiatives put in place to support the success and well-being of diverse faculty and staff within your unit/program.

Suggested evidence and appendices:

- Student feedback*
- Faculty feedback*
- Feedback from relevant interest-holders
- Diversity and demographic data*
- List of courses
- Program-level learning outcomes*—append using *Appendix C* (a more detailed mapping may also be included).

i. 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?

Tip: focus your discussion of resources on maintaining or improving the quality of the academic program and the student experience. Avoid comparisons with other programs or units.

[RESPONSE/CONTENT]

What might you discuss?

- As it relates to program management: Highlight strengths and challenges related to the student experience and achievement of learning outcomes. Include a summary of the ways that any structures are inadequate as it relates to all students being able to meet the learning outcomes of the program.
- Identify opportunities as it relates to structures that will enhance student learning and experience. Clearly state how those opportunities will benefits students and reference feedback from students, faculty, and staff as appropriate.

Suggested evidence and appendices:

- Student data/success indicators*—as appropriate
- Student feedback*
- Faculty feedback*

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.)?

[RESPONSE/CONTENT]

What might you discuss?

- How does the program/department establish, review or modify academic regulations? What evidence is used to determine whether regulations are appropriate and effective? Consider providing examples or reflecting on significant changes to academic regulations since the last program review.
- Describe your strategy and process for communicating regulations and summarize whether it is working or not (e.g., by providing student feedback and input as it relates to communication of and ease of understanding application of regulations and policy).
- Outline any advances in and/or barriers to student success in your program (including those related to equity, diversity, inclusion, and accessibility) resulting from academic policies and regulations (relates to h.).

Suggested evidence and appendices:

- Faculty feedback*
- Staff and advisor feedback
- Student feedback*
- Student data/success indicators*—as appropriate
- Calendar entries, regulations, policies, etc.—as appropriate
- Graduate student handbook (GR)
- Departmental policy on FGS membership and funding policy (GR)

Appendix A: Summary of participant and interest-holder feedback

Participant or interest-holder Group (i.e., students, faculty, alumni, external, other**)**	**Mechanism (i.e., survey, SLEQs, focus group)**	**Date collected or administered**
e.g., undergraduate students; 18 in-attendance (two honours and 16 majors); second to fourth year.	*Focus group, facilitated by CLT*	*October 2, 2023.*
e.g., graduate students, 22 responses	*Survey – administered via Brightspace*	*November 14, 2023*

Appendix B: Summary of program changes since last review

Dalhousie Studies Program (2016)	**Dalhousie Studies Program** (2023)	**Brief description or rationale for change** e.g., incremental changes over time, major modification, no change
Program Duration		
Regulations		
Content/Curriculum		
e.g., *Core courses included:* *DALH 3340, DALH 3500*	*Core courses DALH 3340 and DALH 3500 have been replaced with: DALH 3350, DALH 3510*	*Incremental change over time; Two core courses were revised to reconfigure content to support student success in the program. We were able to bring in new and relevant content because of this change*
e.g., *12 credits of free electives*	*9 credits of free electives + 3 elective credits selected from list of courses (DALH 4100, 4200, 4300, 4400)*	*Incremental over time; Change introduced to ensure students take an elective in a focus area related to equity, diversity, and inclusion, in support of meeting learning outcome #3 for the program. This change is new, and the impact is under review.*

Appendix C: Learning Outcomes table

Student Learning Outcomes	List Related Courses and Program Components	Related Assessment/ Evaluations [tip]
E.g., Students should be able to identify and apply the links between feminist theory and practice.	*HIST 3811 Canadian Working-Class and Labour History*	*Multiple-choice exam, written essay*
	HIST 4571 History of the Modern American Women's Movement	*Critical reflection, group project*
	POLS 3031 Women and Politics	*In-class debates, short-answer tests, research paper*
	POLS 4141 Interest Groups and Social Movements in Canada	*Volunteering with community group or designing a community project of their own*
	WGST 4007 Feminist Praxis	*Written exam, oral argument, discussion forums*

Tip: In the last column, you may choose to outline the assessments, evaluation, and/or ways that students will demonstrate that they have achieved the stated learning outcomes. This may be measured through one or more assessments (summative and/or formative) in a course or program component. In cases where specific measurement of outcomes is less evident, briefly describe the ways an instructor will determine that students have achieved the outcome and how it may be reflected in other work or activities.

Appendix D: Assessment of response to recommendations from previous review

> *Tip:* in lieu of using the table below, if you have access to it, append the list of recommendations and action plan from your last review, and add a column on the right to provide an update on the current status of the recommendation.

Recommendation from last report	Implementation Plan	Original Time/Responsible Individual or Unit	Current Status or update on recommendation including brief assessment