



University
of Victoria

PROCEDURES FOR ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEWS

Contents

1. Objective
2. Basic Principles
3. Initiating an Academic Program Review
4. Administrative Support
5. Components of the Process
 - A. Self-Study
 - B. The Academic Program Review Committee (APRC)
 - i) Membership
 - ii) Role
 - iii) Terms of Reference
 - iv) Site Visits and Interviews
 - v) The Report
 - C. Unit's response to the report
 - D. Dean(s)' response to the report
6. Completion

Appendices

- A. Self-Study Guidelines
- B. Timeline
- C. Administrative and Logistical Information
- D. Action Plan
- E. Review Summary Sheet

1. Objective

As part of its commitment to offering academic programs of high quality and standards, the University of Victoria has established an Academic Program Review (APR) policy. The policy is designed to provide regular and systematic reviews of the operation and objectives of academic programs, assist academic units and the Office of the Vice-President Academic and Provost in establishing, maintaining, and enhancing the academic quality and sustainability of their programs in accordance with the university's mission and strategic goals. The policy is a tool for internal and external accountability of the programs.

The two key objectives of the **Academic Program Review (APR)** process are:

- (1) to assist the academic unit in evaluating the quality, suitability, effectiveness and sustainability of its academic teaching, graduate supervision and research programs with a view to further improvement; and
- (2) to provide an opportunity for planning for the future.

The review may also provide a basis for making resource decisions to enhance, adjust or redirect funding in order to achieve the unit's and the university's goals.

The APR process will consider the following in relation to both current programs and future directions:

- undergraduate and graduate academic programs
- teaching and learning methodologies and outcomes
- scholarship and research productivity and directions
- service to the University, the profession and the community
- quality of learning and working environment and overall administrative and organizational structure

2. Basic Principles

The APR process is based on the principles that:

- the provision of academic programs, teaching, scholarship and research of the highest quality is an important goal;
- academic endeavors should be consistent with the strategic objectives and goals of the Faculty and of the University;
- academic programs should make the best use of the resources available to them;
- empirical evidence is a necessary precursor to informed judgment;
- informed judgments of academic quality should form the basis for meaningful decisions, including decisions about resource allocation; and
- academic units should periodically have the opportunity to examine their present and future in a more sustained and focused manner.

3. Initiating an Academic Program Review

An APR can be initiated in the following ways:

- APRs shall be scheduled, according to Policy AC1145, by the Associate Vice-President Academic Planning in consultation with the appropriate Dean(s); or
- A unit or a Dean may request that the Associate Vice-President Academic Planning initiate an APR.

4. Administrative Support

The unit undergoing review should identify a faculty coordinator and an administrative coordinator to support the review process. Ultimate responsibility for the review will rest with the Chair/Director and the Dean(s). See Appendix C for further administrative and logistical information.

5. Components of the Process

The key components of the APR process are: the Self-Study, the Academic Review Committee's Visit and Report, the unit's response, the Dean(s)' Response, an action plan from the unit and a follow up report by the Dean(s). The processes and attachments outlining self-evaluation and peer review may not apply to all units and units may revise processes set out in the attachments, or develop their own processes in consultation with and as approved by the Associate Vice-President Academic Planning.

A. Self-Study

The self-study is the starting point and primary document on which the review is based. Therefore, it is important that the self-study be well organized and concise. The self-study allows a unit to:

- examine its history (since last review, if applicable), development and expectations for the program
- indicate how its program meets both Faculty and University objectives as defined in their respective mission statements, plans and goals
- conduct a balanced appraisal of strengths and areas for improvement
- review the quality of program inputs and outputs
- evaluate its own performance
- consider the future direction of the program within its disciplinary context, including new academic programs, research directions, anticipated or desired growth in enrolments, enhancements to quality, student engagement and success, and faculty development.

The self-study is a significant and valuable phase of the review. Therefore, it is vital that all the unit's faculty, staff, and appropriate student representatives be involved in the preparation of the self-study. Responsibility for ensuring that this occurs rests with the unit head. Upon completion, a copy of the self-study will be forwarded to the Dean of the unit, the Dean of Graduate Studies and to the Associate Vice-President Academic Planning. (draft is first reviewed by the Dean and the AVPA)

Institutional Planning and Analysis will provide a statistical package relevant to the unit and its program for the self-study process. References to and interpretations of this data should be included in the report when addressing the self-study questions. The Academic Program Review Committee should not be expected to have to carry out its own analysis or to extract the relevant information from unanalyzed data.

Appendix A (Self-Study Guidelines) provides detailed criteria on which the self-study should be based and the format for the self-study document. A unit is, of course, not limited to the criteria and may include additional relevant information or statistics specific to its area of study.

B. The Academic Program Review Committee (APRC)

i) Membership

An APRC shall normally consist of three members selected by the Associate Vice-President Academic Planning (AVPAP) after consultation with the unit and the Dean(s). One member will ordinarily be a member of another Faculty at the University of Victoria. The other two will be external to the University. Except in unusual circumstances, the committee will include a mix of genders.

When preparing the list of potential committee members for consideration by the AVPAP, the unit and the Dean(s) should select individuals capable of offering: a breadth of views, broad experience in the respective field, and some level of university or post-secondary administrative experience. When submitting names to AVPAP please provide a paragraph or website providing information on the position and experience of a proposed reviewer.

The APRC members must be at arms-length from the programs or units that they are assessing. Potential conflict of interest situations include, but are not limited to, a close relative, a collaborator, a former supervisor or supervisee, or a former student. None of these relationships necessarily eliminates a potential committee member but possible conflicts must be identified prior to the decision to appoint an individual as a committee member.

The AVPAP shall appoint one member of the APRC, normally an external member, to act as Chair.

ii) Role

The role of an APRC is to provide informed, dispassionate, and critical judgment of the quality of an academic program or unit from the perspective of an outside observer. The APRC will be guided by the Terms of Reference as detailed in the section below.

iii) Terms of Reference

The APRC will assess a wide range of information designed to address academic program quality, efficiency, and sustainability. The interaction between the academic unit and other units of the University will also be addressed.

The APRC will consider, at the very least, the following areas:

- undergraduate and graduate (where applicable) academic programs
- graduate supervision, teaching and learning methodologies and outcomes
- scholarship and research productivity, impact, and direction
- service to the University, the profession and the community
- quality of learning and working environment, and overall administrative and organizational structure

The assessment, in the form of a written report, will be evidence-based and “constructively critical,” identifying strengths to be protected and enhanced, weaknesses requiring attention, and new opportunities. It will consider what can be done by the unit to use existing resources more efficiently and effectively, along with considering where new resources, if available, would represent a strategic investment to allow the unit to grow with quality.

iv) Site Visit and Interviews

The purpose of the site visit is to provide an opportunity for interviews with faculty, students, staff, and others who can most appropriately provide informed comment and for examination of the physical facilities.

The APRC should be present together in Victoria for a minimum of two full days. The great majority of their time will be scheduled to be spent on campus.

The Chair/Director, will arrange for meetings between the APRC and appropriate groups or individuals and develop an itinerary which includes a meeting with:

- The Provost, the AVPAP, the Dean of the Faculty; and Dean of Graduate Studies at the beginning of the site visit and again at the end of visit
- Dean(s) or delegate(s) of the Faculty
- head of the unit
- faculty members in the unit
- undergraduate and graduate students or representatives of the unit
- staff or staff representatives in the unit

- Dean or delegate of the Faculty of Graduate Studies
- The Vice-President Research or delegate
- Other members of the University community (where appropriate)
- Other members of the external community (where appropriate)

The Dean will forward the itinerary to the AVPAP for approval. Members of the APRC will be free to seek information from other sources and, in particular, to suggest other individuals and groups with whom to meet during the site visit.

v) The Report

Based on information gained from the self-study, the site visit, interviews, consultations with appropriate groups and individuals, and independent inquiries, the APRC may prepare a first draft of the report for submission to the Associate Vice-President Academic Planning. The purpose of this submission is to enable the AVPAP to review the draft document and provide the APRC with comments on factual inaccuracies or areas needing further clarification.

The first part of the report should consist of a 1-2 page Executive Summary that highlights the major strengths of the program, identifies any significant areas of weakness or in need of further development, and comments of the future direction of the program. The Executive Summary will be the basis for the summary of the Academic Review that posted on a public University of Victoria accountability website. For the remainder of the written report, the APRC should use the outline below as a guide. The headings suggested align closely with the major areas of focus in the university's strategic plan, and will provide an opportunity to examine the degree to which the unit's goals are in alignment with the university's stated mission and purpose. The APRC is, of course, welcome to add any comments and considerations that it deems relevant.

QUALITY

Quality of the Academic Program(s):

- Does the curriculum appropriately cover the field or discipline in terms of breadth and depth?
- Are there elements that should be modified in order better to achieve those goals or to implement a better use of resources?
- What are the strengths and weaknesses of the program?
- Is the balance of offerings among the years appropriate (and justified in terms of resource allocation)?
- Where new programs are proposed, or major changes contemplated, please comment on potential suitability and sustainability.
- Have there been changes in the external environment that might increase or lessen the need for and viability of the program as structured?

Quality of the Student Experience and the Learning Environment:

- Assess any specific initiatives undertaken by the program to attract and retain a diverse group of talented students and assure their success in the program
- Assess the appropriateness of the learning outcomes articulated by the program
- Are the methods of teaching appropriate to the program and of high quality?
- What steps have been taken to provide students with enriching learning experiences (e.g., experiential or co-operative learning opportunities)?
- What is done to offer students exposure to the international or global dimensions of the field or discipline?
- Does the program offer sufficient intellectual challenge and engagement?

Quality of Research

- Consider the nature and quality of research being carried out in the unit.
- Comment on the unit's research foci, directions, and impact.
- Comment on the level and range of external research funding where appropriate.

PEOPLE

- Comment on the program's ability to attract and retain a diverse group of high quality students, and to effectively monitor and support student progress.
- Comment on the faculty, the range of their collective expertise, and their ability to adequately provide intellectual leadership and challenge.
- Comment on the level and effectiveness of staff and staff support.
- Comment on the unit's equity plan (faculty and staff hiring objectives), the inclusion of equity concerns in staffing, program design, and student opportunities. Comment on opportunities to enhance policies, practices and programs to ensure that a welcoming and inclusive working and learning environment.
- Comment on the overall administrative functioning of the unit.
- Address any areas in which administrative efficiencies might be found.
- Comment on the character of working relationships among members of the unit, between the unit and other units on campus, and, more widely, with the community (including professional communities). Suggest where there might be room for improvement.

RESOURCES

- Address the unit's use of faculty and staff resources.
- Given the reality of scarce resources across the University, consider the adequacy of current resources (human, technical, and physical) to fulfill

- the unit goals, with particular attention to priorities for the allocation of those resources.
- Consider the redirection of available resources, or possible new resources, and how they could improve the unit's program(s).

FUTURE

- Comment on the unit's plans to develop its teaching and research programs in the future.
- Address the program's comparative quality in the national or the international context.
- Evaluate the unit's plans for the future in the context of Faculty and University's goals and priorities.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- Provide recommendations for improvement and growth.

OTHER

- Address any specific questions put forth by the unit.

The final report will be sent directly to the Associate Vice-President Academic Planning who will forward the report to the Dean of the unit under review, Dean of Graduate Studies and the Vice-President Research.

C. Unit's Response to the Report

In departmentalized Faculties the Dean(s) will ask the Chair/Director of the academic unit to circulate the report to faculty, staff, and appropriate students. In consultation with these constituent groups, the Chair/Director will prepare a response and an action plan to the report. In non-departmentalized Faculties, the Dean(s), with appropriate consultation, will be responsible for these tasks.

The unit's response can be relatively brief and should 1) provide an overall impression with respect to the report's conclusions and recommendations; 2) correct of any factual errors or areas of misunderstanding in the report; and 3) fill out Appendix D (Action Plan) and identify what steps the unit intends or would propose to take in response to the report and recommendations of the APR.

The unit's response and Action plan should be received by the Dean of the unit under review within six-eight weeks of receipt of the report of the APR.

D. Dean(s)' Response to the Report

The Dean(s) of the unit under review and Dean of Graduate Studies where required will prepare an independent response to the report. In preparing the

response, the Dean(s) will review the unit's response and may need to consult further with members of the unit, the APRC, the Associate Vice-President Academic Planning, the Vice-President Academic and Provost and perhaps others.

The Dean(s) is responsible for submitting both responses to the report to the Associate Vice-President Academic Planning for consideration. Normally, both responses are anticipated to be submitted within 12 weeks of the receipt of the report of the APR.

6. Completion

Upon receipt of the responses, the Associate Vice-President Academic Planning and/or the Vice-President Academic and Provost may meet with the Dean(s), the head of the unit and the Dean of Graduate Studies as appropriate to discuss the report. The Office of the Provost will prepare a response to the Dean and Chair/Director of the unit.

The report will be maintained by the Office of the Vice-President Academic and Provost for the purposes of long term planning and a summary of the APR report as well as the responses from the unit and the Dean will be posted on the University's accountability website subject to issues relating to privacy and confidentiality.

The Dean(s) will be responsible for providing a progress report to the Office of the Vice-President Academic and Provost on the implementation of the action plan 12 months after the submission of the action plan.

The Vice-President Academic and Provost will maintain a record of the progress report and annually provide a summary of the program reviews to the Senate Committee on Planning, Senate and the Board of Governors on the status of Academic Program Reviews.

A summary of the program reviews (in the form prescribed by Appendix E) will be made publicly available subject to issues relating to the University Protection of Privacy Policy and Associated Procedures.

APPENDIX A

Academic Program Review Self-Study Guidelines Criteria, Considerations, Indicators

Preamble

These guidelines provide academic units with criteria on which the Self-Study can be based. Units are encouraged to engage in thoughtful self-examination to ensure that thorough, evidence based information is provided for consideration by the Academic Program Review Committee.

It is anticipated that units will address all of the relevant criteria in the guidelines. It is also recognized, however, that each unit should draft its Self-Study in a manner which best reflects the nature of its program(s) (e.g. interdisciplinary, undergraduate, graduate if applicable,) or discipline. Units should concentrate on addressing all criteria applicable to the unit in as clear and concise a manner as possible, but are also encouraged to provide any additional relevant and discipline specific information deemed appropriate.

Standardized data is available for all units by the Office of Institutional Planning and Analysis (IPA) through the Enrolment Portal which is accessible at this link: <https://sas.uvic.ca/SASPortal/>. Training for the portal is available – contact IPA.

It includes:

Undergraduate EETs
 Graduate EETS
 Headcounts, FTEs, demographic characteristics
 New to UVic, Previous Institution
 Study Permit and Citizenship
 Coop Enrolments and Work-terms
 Degree Sought
 Credentials Granted
 Indigenous Statistics
 Applicant Statistics
 Section information
 Graduation rate, Retention and Attrition Statistics
 Departmental profile from National Survey of Student Engagement
 Departmental profiles of graduate outcomes surveys (time series, two-years-out, five-years-out)

Criterion 1: History, Development, and Expectations of the Unit		Potential Information Sources
1.1	Provide a brief history of the program and summarize the unit's strategic plan and goals, over the next five years within the context of the Faculty level and University Strategic Plan.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unit data • University Strategic Plan • Unit/Faculty strategic plan
1.2	Briefly describe the major academic programs offered by the unit. What new programs are anticipated, if any?	
Criterion 2: Quality of and demand for the Academic Program(s)		Potential Information Sources
2.1	What has been the pattern of enrolment (EETS) in the program for the past 5-7 years? What is the number and proportion of program FTEs (students who have declared the program as their major)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enrolment Portal and/or Unit data
2.2	How many EETS has the program delivered per full time equivalent (FTE) faculty over the last 5-7 years? Compare this to the Faculty average and University averages.	

2.3	What is the pattern of enrolment in core courses taught by the program or by the program's faculty as electives for other programs in the University? What can explain the pattern of enrolment, and do you anticipate changes in the next few years?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enrolment Portal • Institutional Planning and Analysis (IPA) • Avg course GPA • Student Financial Aid (Admin Reg) • Unit Data 	
2.4	How does the pattern of enrolment (and declared majors where applicable) compare with other programs in the region or with national trends?		
2.5	To what extent have similar programs been introduced by other post-secondary institutions in the region in recent years? What characteristics of your program suggest a unique advantage or difference compared to other programs in the region?		
2.6	To what extent is the program's field of study remaining viable? How is the environment changing that might lessen or increase the need for the program as constituted? What plans are in place for ensuring an alignment between student interest/demand and program offerings?		
2.7	What has been the profile of students entering the program in recent years (e.g. out of high school or mature learners, Aboriginal, etc.) What has been the quality of students drawn to the program in recent years? What is the likely pattern in the next few years? What is the desired student profile?		
2.8	What is the current status of student representation from underrepresented or designated groups (i.e. Aboriginals, visible minorities, women, those with disabilities)? How does this compare with other similar programs regionally, nationally, or internationally?		
2.9	What steps is the unit taking to attract and retain high quality students? What efforts have the unit taken to increase the number of students from under-represented/designated groups, or to make courses more accessible to them?		
Criterion 3: Quality of the Student Experience and the Learning Environment			Potential Information Sources
3.1	What activities undertaken by the program in the past 5-7 years provide evidence of formal, ongoing curricular assessment at the undergraduate and/or graduate level? What activities are currently underway or planned?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unit data
3.2	What are the most important learning objectives or outcomes of the program? What has the unit done to articulate and ensure opportunities to develop the knowledge, skills and competencies to be demonstrated by its majors? (e.g., writing skills, other communication skills, critical thinking and analysis, quantitative skills, creative skills).		
3.3	In the past 5-7 years, what proportion of EETs, by course level, are taught by a) regular faculty, b) sessional instructors and c) term faculty? What steps are taken to ensure and reward effective and high quality teaching?		
3.4	Describe student experience for undergraduate students in years 1 and 4 of the program with respect to the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) (where appropriate).		
3.5	What efforts have the unit made to internationalize its program, (e.g., using diverse student demographics in the classroom as a teaching tool; using research, international consulting and conferences to enrich a course; inviting international guest speakers; rethinking course goals to incorporate global issues and perspectives.) What are the future plans in relation to internationalization?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Co-op Office 	
3.6	How many students participate in experiential learning opportunities during their program (e.g., co-operative education, field work, volunteer experiences and service learning, research practica etc.)? What are the trends in this respect? Are there plans to		

<p>create more opportunities for experiential learning?</p> <p>3.7 How has the program sought to integrate research with learning and teaching? What exposure to peer-reviewed research literature do students receive in the program? To what extent have research findings of the faculty been incorporated into the program? What opportunities do students have for exposure to various modes of research inquiry? What opportunities do students have for participation in primary or applied research experiences in the laboratory or field (e.g., via co-operative education, practica, etc.)?</p> <p>3.8 What efforts has the program made to make courses inclusive and fully accessible to students with disabilities? What measures have been taken to equip instructors with the knowledge and skills necessary to accommodate the diversity of students in their courses and in the program? (For resources available to support persons with disabilities, go to http://rcsd.uvic.ca/)</p> <p>3.89 Has the program encouraged civic engagement on the part of students and faculty within the local, regional, national or international community, and if so, how?</p> <p>3.10 To what degree are co-curricular activities, student societies, or other forms of student engagement with each other, with other units on campus, and with faculty supported and encouraged?</p> <p>3.11 How do most of the students in the programs obtain academic advising? Are students who may be at risk for academic difficulty or failure identified and provided with appropriate supports or assistance?</p> <p>3.12 What activities undertaken by the program's faculty demonstrate that they have been engaged in research and scholarship on teaching or learning?</p> <p>3.13 What demonstrates that the program has successfully integrated information technology into instructional practices or assessment strategies? What opportunities or challenges are anticipated in this area?</p>	
<p>Criterion 4: Quality of Student Outcomes</p>	<p>Potential Information Sources</p>
<p>4.1 How many undergraduate degrees have been granted during the past 5-7 years? What is the pattern of retention and attrition of students over the past 5-7 years?</p> <p>4.2 What is the pattern of graduate student enrolment over the last 5-7 years? How many graduate students have completed their programs in the last 5-7 years? What is the average time to completion?</p> <p>4.3 What percentage of post-baccalaureate students gained employment in the field within two years of graduation?</p> <p>4.4 What percentage of the program graduates are successful applicants to graduate or professional programs? What percent of program graduates applied for and received an assistantship or fellowship for graduate studies?</p> <p>4.5 In the past five years, what percent of undergraduate majors graduated within four years? What percent of graduate students graduated within the expected time-to-degree standard for the program?</p> <p>4.6 What is the extent of alumni satisfaction with the program? To what extent are the program graduates likely to recommend the program to prospective students?</p> <p>4.7 What evidence exists of alumni success (employment related to program or return for higher education)?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IPA (graduate follow-up survey) • Enrolment Portal • IPA

<p>4.8 To what extent are employers satisfied or dissatisfied with students or graduates of the program? What steps has the unit taken to enhance improve employer satisfaction in the past 5-7 years?</p>	
<p>Criterion 5: Quality of Research and Scholarly Activity</p>	<p>Potential Information Sources</p>
<p>5.1 How do the research programs of the unit support the academic goals and vision of the unit? What are the primary areas of research expertise and how do they relate to each other and to the mission and goals of the university?</p> <p>5.2 To what extent have the faculty (regular and sessional) gained recognition in the professional community? What proportion and number of faculty have achieved external recognition or awards?</p> <p>5.3 Provide an overview of research and scholarly productivity, (articles in refereed journals, authored books, contributions to books, works performed or exhibited publicly within the past 5-7 years? The unit may wish to also attach CVs.</p> <p>5.4 Summarize research funding activity. For example, how many of the regular faculty, as principal or co-principal investigators, have submitted a grant proposal seeking external funding in the past 5-7 years? How many have been successful? Of proposals submitted in the past five years, what number and percent of the full-time faculty have had their proposals funded? What is the dollar amount of externally funded research per FTE faculty member in the past five years? Provide any additional information about the funded research effort.</p> <p>5.5 To what extent have the program faculty contributed to, participated in, or been recognized by external bodies or organizations as teachers, scholars, or service contributors regionally, nationally, and internationally?</p> <p>5.6 To what extent have the program faculty been recognized for teaching or research excellence by the University in the recent past?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VPR • Unit Data
<p>Criterion 6: Faculty and Staff Characteristics</p>	<p>Potential Information Sources</p>
<p>6.1 What has been the pattern of faculty hiring? How are the designated equity groups represented? To what degree is the current complement appropriate to the unit?</p> <p>6.2 What is the unit's recent hiring history with respect to faculty and anticipated hiring plan for the future? If applicable, in what area(s) will the unit concentrate its efforts?</p> <p>6.3 What initiatives has the unit implemented in the past 5-7 years to promote ongoing faculty mentorship or development? Has the unit any plans in this area for the future?</p> <p>6.4 Do faculty evaluation policies reflect a high standard for teaching, research and service activity, and an appropriate balance of activities?</p> <p>6.5 What actions have been taken to ensure that the unit provides a welcoming and inclusive working and learning environment? What policies, procedures and practices are in place to promote the University's equity goals?</p> <p>6.6 Is the complement of staff appropriate to the unit? How are staff supported and integrated into unit activities in support of unit goals?</p> <p>6.7 What support is provided for sessional instructors and how are they mentored and integrated into program activities and structures?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IPA • Unit Data

Criterion 7: Resources		Potential Information Sources
7.1	To what extent has the University funded program improvements or expansions during the past 5-7 years? (e.g., additional faculty and/or staff, TA funding, capital improvements)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IPA • Unit Data
7.2	What activities has the unit undertaken to secure external grants or donations to support the academic and research activities of the program, including student support, the purchase of equipment and other capital items in the past 5-7 years? What activities are planned for the future?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development/ External Relations
7.3	To what extent has the program made attempts in developing formal partnerships, collaborations, joint ventures, and other relationships with community stakeholders in the past 5-7 years? What have been the outcomes? What are the unit's plans for the future?	
Criterion 8: Opportunity Analysis for the Unit and Future Directions		Potential Information Sources
8.1	What other programs, nationally and internationally, provide comparators for this program? How does this program compare? Is the unit comfortable with this comparison? In what way, if any, would the unit like future comparisons to change?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unit Data • National or international comparative data
8.2	What aspirations does the unit have for its program over the next 5-7 years? What opportunities have been articulated in the unit's or faculty's strategic plan to which the program can respond?	
8.3	What plans are there to increase undergraduate and/or graduate enrolments? What steps need to be taken or support is needed to achieve these goals?	
8.4	How has the program responded to environmental challenges or threats and to environmental opportunities? To what extent has the program overcome barriers to developing effective responses to these challenges and taken advantage of opportunities?	
8.5	What are the unit's two most important priorities and what significant gains would come of the realization of these priorities?	
8.6	To what extent could the unit reallocate funds to realize these goals and objectives? What additional funds may be necessary?	

Appendix B

To Do Date or Check	When	What	Who	Handbook Ref
STEPS IN PREPARING FOR AND CARRYING OUT ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW				
	8-12 months	Decision made to initiate an APR	Dean or Provost	3
	8-12 months	Commence self-study (assistance from Institutional Planning and Analysis)	Unit	5 A; App A
	6-8 months	Identify a faculty coordinator	Unit	4
	6-8 months	Identify an administrative coordinator	Unit	4
	6-8 months	Prepare list of potential committee members in consultation with the Dean's Office for the Associate Vice-President Academic Planning (AVPAP)	Unit	5 B i
	10 months	Select committee members and Chair - identify potential period of site visit	AVPAP	-
	6 months	Identify suitable date(s) - minimum 2 full days	Unit	-
	6 months	Sends formal letter of invitation	AVPAP	5 B i
	4-6 weeks	Arrange for meetings between the APRC and appropriate groups and individuals; schedule meetings with AVPAP, Provost, Dean of Faculty and Dean of Graduate Studies on first day of site visit and again on final day in Victoria	Unit	5 B iv
	4-6 weeks	Book accommodation for visiting committee members	Unit	App C
	4-6 weeks	Book travel using Uniglobe for visiting committee members, if required	AVPAP	App C
	4-6 weeks	Submit self-study package to Provost and Dean for review	Unit	App C
	4-6 weeks	Once self-study is approved; forward 7 copies to AVPAP for distribution	Unit	
	4 weeks	Submit itinerary to AVPAP for approval	Unit or Dean	5 B iv
	4 weeks	Send itinerary to reviewers once approved	Unit	
	4 weeks	Send information packages to each member of APRC (self-study and other relevant university documents)	AVPAP	-

FOLLOWING COMPLETION OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW				
		Final report to be sent directly to the Provost's office who will forward the report to the Dean.	-	5 B v
		Dean requests that Chair circulates the report to faculty, staff & appropriate students. [In non-departmentalized faculties, the Dean's office circulates the report to faculty, staff & appropriate students.]	Dean's office	5 C
		In consultation with above constituent groups, chair/director prepares a response to report. [In non-departmentalized faculties, the Dean prepares a response to the report having consulted with above constituent groups.]	Chair	5 C
		Dean's office prepares a response to the unit's report	Dean's office	5 D
		Submit both unit's and Dean's responses to the AVPAP. [In non-departmentalized faculties, only Dean's response is submitted to the AVPAP.]	Dean's office	5 D

Appendix C

Administrative and Logistical Information

- Timing of the review is subject to the availability of the Deans and the Associate Vice-President Academic Planning (AVPAP). The Review generally takes place over two full days.
 - The Dean in consultation with the Department/School will forward list of proposed reviewers to the AVPAP. The AVPAP will make contact with the reviewers and identify a potential period for a site visit. The Department/School will follow up with the reviewers to confirm dates for on-site visit. This should be done in consultation with the Dean, AVPAP and Provost to ensure availability. The Department/School notifies AVPAP of the confirmed dates and the AVPAP sends formal letters of invitation to the reviewers.
- Self-Study
 - The AVPAP office requires enough copies of the self-study to forward on to each of the reviewers, plus an additional four copies for the Provost, AVPAP, Vice-President Research, and Dean of Graduate Studies.
- Travel and accommodation
 - The AVPAP's Office will assist APRC members in conjunction with Uniglobe Geo Travel to make their travel arrangements.
 - The Chair/Director's office is responsible for making accommodation arrangements, which must be at government rate. The Hotel Reservation & Authorization Form is completed, forwarded to AVPAP office for completion of account code and signature. AVPAP's office will fax signed form to Purchasing.
 - Only room and room taxes are billed to UVic; the reviewer pays all other hotel charges with appropriate items submitted for reimbursement.

- APRC members submit their travel expenses to the Chair/Directors' office, which verifies them and forwards them to the AVPAP's office for account code, signature and payment.
- Itinerary
 - The itinerary is developed by the unit and/or the Dean. It should include one-half hour meetings with the Dean of Graduate Studies, Vice-President Research (or their designates), and other Chairs/Directors in the Faculty.
 - The AVPAP, Provost, Dean of the Faculty and Dean of Graduate Studies meets jointly (45 minutes) with the APRC at the beginning of their site visit and again at the end of the visit (30 minutes).
 - The VPAC office will cover expenses for one lunch or dinner with up to three faculty members plus the reviewers (up to \$25.00 per person).
 - The itinerary is forwarded to the AVPAP for approval. Once approved the unit or the Dean's office will forward it on to the reviewers.
- Maintaining appropriate relationships with the APR
 - During the process of the Academic Review, the members of the APR have a duty and responsibility to provide fair, impartial, honest, and unbiased opinions and analyses of the unit undergoing review. While interactions with the unit are anticipated to be friendly and cordial, it is not considered appropriate to hold social events that extend late into the evening or that otherwise might compromise the objectivity or independence of the APR.
- Final Report
 - APRC submits a final report to AVPAP and Provost, which is then forwarded to the Dean of the Faculty (for dissemination to the Chair/Director), Dean of Graduate Studies and Vice-President Research.
 - The AVPAP requisitions one honoraria payment per reviewer upon submission of the final report by the APRC.
 - Following receipt of the final report, a response to the report from the Chair/Director and Dean is sent to the AVPAP.

- The program head, Dean(s) and Associate Vice-President Academic Planning will meet to discuss the review and approve the action plan.
- A review summary sheet (Appendix E) will be posted on the VPAC website.

N.B. Some Deans delegate certain responsibilities to the unit being reviewed.

Office of the Vice-President Academic and Provost (November 25, 2005, Revised April 25, 2007, Revised August 27, 2007, Revised November 10, 2010, June 16, 2011, Revised April 3, 2012, Revised June 2013)



**APPENDIX D:
Action Plan**

Please continue on a separate sheet, if necessary.

Program: _____ Faculty: _____ Date of review: _____ Date of action plan: _____		
Recommendations of Reviewers:		
Action(s)¹:	Person(s) responsible:	Target date:

12 month follow up date: _____

¹ To be filled out by head of the Program or Dean of the Faculty.

**APPENDIX E:
REVIEW SUMMARY SHEET¹**

UNIT REVIEWED:

FACULTY:

DATE OF REVIEW:

DATE OF PREVIOUS REVIEW:

REVIEWERS:

SUMMARY OF REVIEW PROCESS (INCLUDING CONSULTATION PROCESS):

SUMMARY OF REVIEWERS RECOMMENDATIONS:

UNIT'S RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS BY REVIEWERS:

¹ This summary should be prepared to meet applicable privacy legislation and must maintain the privacy of all those involved in the reviews. The University is required to uphold applicable privacy legislation governing the collection, use and disclosure of any personal information. If you have any questions, please contact the university privacy officer.