TABLE OF CONTENTS

BACKGROUND MATERIAL

FORMAL REVIEW PROCESS

APPENDICES

THE INSTITUTIONAL QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESS FOR CYCLICAL REVIEWS OF ALL UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS AT REDEEMER UNIVERSITY COLLEGE

(Original version approved by Senate in January 2013, last revisions approved in November 2015)
(Version 2.0 approved in May 2018 and November 2018)

This manual describes the Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP) for the regular cyclical review of all undergraduate programs at Redeemer University College.

BACKGROUND MATERIAL

HISTORY AND CONTEXT

Redeemer University College (RUC) first instituted procedures for periodic review of academic departments in 1995 "in order to maintain quality of education and in order to develop a strategic plan of efficiently using the available resources to attain the mission of the institution" (the Academic Affairs Committee, Faculty Council, Senate, 1995). Three years later, when RUC's charter was amended by an act of the Ontario Legislature to allow the university to grant B.A. and B.Sc. degrees, the Ministry in charge of universities made it a condition of its approval that the university should participate in the Undergraduate Program Review Audit Process. This process was run cooperatively by the provincially-funded universities since 1996 in order to conduct audits of academic reviews within member institutions over a seven-year schedule agreed to by the Ontario Council of Academic Vice Presidents (OCAV). The first such audit took place in 2004.

In 2010, the publicly-assisted Ontario universities created the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (OUCQA) which developed a Quality Assurance Framework (QAF) to describe the processes by which new programs are approved and existing programs are reviewed for quality. RUC chose to review its programs using a process that is very similar to that described in the QAF. RUC takes seriously its mission to provide a Christ-centred liberal-arts-and-sciences university-level education. External accreditation and review bodies (e.g., the New England Association of Schools and Colleges, the Postsecondary Education Quality Assessment Board) will want to be assured that RUC regularly reviews its academic programs using a rigorous process that is peer-reviewed.

The IQAPs of RUC are the core of its quality-assurance processes, and are consistent with the university's mission statement and undergraduate degree level expectations (UDLEs).

AUTHORITY

The entire process of reviewing undergraduate programs is carried out under the authority of the Senate of RUC. Management of the IQAP is the responsibility of the Provost and Vice President, Academic (Provost/VPA) with the assistance of the Academic Quality Assurance Committee (AQAC). The Office of the Provost/VPA administers the reviews. The Senate formally approves the IQAP.

IQAP MANUAL

The Provost/VPA, in consultation with the AQAC, is responsible for the preparation and systematic maintenance of a manual that describes the process for program reviews and the support provided for the reviews.

In line with the OUCQA QAF, this manual must at the very least:
1. Provide detailed instructions on the conduct of rigorous, objective, and searching self-study reports, and describe the potential benefits that can accrue from them;
2. Establish the criteria for the nomination and selection of arm's-length external peer reviewers;
3. Identify responsibilities for the collection, aggregation, and distribution of institutional data and outcome measures required for the Self-study Report;
4. Specify the format required for the Self-study Report and External Reviewers' Report; and
5. Set out the university's schedule of program reviews.

REVISIONS TO IQAP

Revisions to this IQAP may occur at any time. The Provost/VPA initiates the process of revision and must bring the revisions to faculty for information and to Senate for approval.

ACRONYMS

AQAC	Academic Quality Assurance Committee
CCCU	Council for Christian Colleges and Universities
CLOs	Course-level Learning Outcomes
CV(s)	*curricula vita(e)*
FT/PT	full-time / part-time
IQAP	Institutional Quality Assurance Process
OCAV	Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents
OUCQA	Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance
PLOs	Program-level Learning Outcomes
QAF	Quality Assurance Framework
RUC	Redeemer University College
UC	Universities Canada
UDLEs	Undergraduate Degree-level Learning Expectations
VPA	Vice President, Academic

DEFINITIONS

Academic Support Services: Academic support services are those services integral to a student's ability to achieve the program's learning outcomes. Such services include, but are not limited to: academic advising and counselling appropriate to the program, research skills training, learning services (e.g., the Writing Centre, tutor program, disabilities services), information technology, library and laboratory resources directed towards the program, and internship, co-operative education, and practicum

placement services – where these experiential components are a required part of a program. Not included are residence services, food services, health and wellness services, psychological services, financial aid services, and career services, unless any of these services are specifically identified to be an integral part of the academic program.

Degree: An academic credential awarded on successful completion of a prescribed set and sequence of requirements at a specified standard of performance consistent with OCAV's degree level expectations and the university's own expression of those expectations, the UDLEs.

Degree-Level Expectations: The degree-level expectations, established by OCAV, serve as Ontario universities' academic standards and identify the knowledge and skill outcome expectancies that reflect progressive levels of intellectual and creative development. Graduates are expected to be able to demonstrate these competencies. RUC has undertaken to adapt and describe the degree-level expectations in terms appropriate to its own mission and academic programs.

Program: Any degree, degree program, or program of specialization, currently approved by the Senate. "Degree" is defined above.

> A "degree program" is the complete set and sequence of courses, combinations of courses, and/or other units of study, research, and practice prescribed by the university to fulfill the requirements of a particular degree.

> A "program of specialization" (e.g., major, honours program) is an identified set and sequence of courses, and/or other units of study, research, and practice within an area of disciplinary or interdisciplinary study, which is completed in full or partial fulfillment of the requirements for the awarding of a degree, and is recorded on the graduate's academic record. Unless otherwise specified, the base term, "program," will refer to a program of specialization (i.e., a major or honours major).

> "Faculty members in a program" refer to the full-time faculty who teach more than one course that is part of the program requirements.

> "Faculty complement in a program" refer to all full-time and part-time faculty who teach at least one course that is a part of the program requirements or electives.

PURPOSE OF THE REVIEW

The general purpose of academic program reviews is to ensure that:
1. Each program promotes the mission of RUC;
2. Each program is achieving its expectations;
3. Redeemer's students, the general public, the province of Ontario, and the university's support community can be assured that the education offered at RUC is university-level and quality; and
4. Each program experiences continuous improvement.

The specific aims of a particular program review are to:
1. Determine the appropriateness of the program's mission and vision with respect to the university college's mission and vision;
2. Determine the appropriateness of the program curriculum (in terms of mission fit, program-specific student outcomes, etc.);
3. Evaluate the quality of the program in terms of inputs (faculty credentials, and teaching expertise, available resources, etc.) and outputs (students' achievement of program-level learning outcomes (PLOs), post-graduation outcomes, etc.);
4. Identify and celebrate program strengths; and
5. Identify and develop areas of program improvements.

PROGRAMS TO BE REVIEWED

As per the QAF, only programs in which students may earn a general major, four-year major, or honours major will be reviewed. Many programs have associated or related minors, and the requirements for the minor (and associated data – e.g., number of students enrolled) will be presented in the self-study report. Those minors with no associated major will be reviewed with closely-associated major programs, with the understanding that minors are not expected to demonstrate coverage of all the UDLEs in the same way major programs would be. As well, the Education programs and the Core Program will be reviewed using modified processes, outlined in Appendices G and H, respectively.

FREQUENCY OF REVIEWS

The Provost/VPA is responsible to ensure all undergraduate programs are reviewed every seven years.

REVIEW SCHEDULE

Appendix A lists the schedule of program reviews from 2018/19 to 2024/25. As evidenced by the table, a small number of minors with no associated major programs will be reviewed along with closely-associated departments. The Provost/VPA, after consultation with the Academic Quality Assurance Committee, and Senate must approve any adjustments to the schedule.

UNSCHEDULED REVIEWS

The Provost/VPA, in consultation with the dean overseeing the department most closely associated with the program (henceforth, "the dean"), or at the recommendation of the dean, may initiate an unscheduled review of a program in extraordinary circumstances. In such case, the Provost/VPA will inform Senate of the unscheduled review and the reasons for it.

JOINT PROGRAMS

In the case of joint programs, such as those that have an off-campus component or that collaborate with a program at another institution, the review will happen along with the review of the most closely-associated program(s).

ROLE OF DEANS AND SELF-STUDY AUTHORS

Both deans and Self-study authors play significant roles in the IQAP and their responsibilities are described in this manual. Typically, the chair of the most-closely-associated department is the Self-study author, but when that department chair may not be the best person to prepare the Self-study Report, the Provost/VPA may designate another faculty member in the program as the Self-study author, after consultation with that faculty member and the department chair.

The Self-study author may choose to receive a committee release for the year of the review. For any review, if additional faculty members provide significant assistance to the Self-study author, the dean will divide the equivalent of a single full committee release between them.

THE ACADEMIC QUALITY ASSURANCE COMMITTEE

The Academic Quality Assurance Committee (AQAC) is an advisory committee to the Provost/VPA, who is its chair. As an advisory committee, it does its work on behalf of its chair, who holds final authority on all matters considered by the committee. In general parlance, an item "approved by the AQAC" has in actuality been recommended for approval by the AQAC to the Provost/VPA, and the Provost/VPA has accepted that recommendation. Similarly, documents authored by the AQAC (must) have the endorsement of the Provost/VPA and effectively are the Provost/VPA's documents.

The scope of AQAC's role includes:
1. Selecting external reviewers for all program reviews.
2. Reviewing for approval the Response document for completeness and for appropriateness. Upon approval of the Response document, formulating a Final Assessment Report, including an Implementation Plan addressing the accepted recommendations in the External Reviewers' Report. After sharing the Final Assessment Report with the dean and Self-study author, the AQAC then sends the it to Senate for approval.
3. Reviewing for approval the annual Implementation Reports from a program's Self-study author.
4. Acknowledging completion of a particular program-review process when it is satisfied that all reasonable implementation steps have been completed.
5. Upon the Provost/VPA's request, or as outlined in the IQAP, providing advice to the Provost/VPA concerning program-review matters, including modifications to the IQAP or the schedule of reviews.

The composition of the AQAC is:
1. Provost/VPA (chair);
2. Three faculty members, one from each division.

The academic deans will be invited as needed when the AQAC considers program Response Documents (see Stage 5: Final Assessment Report) to answer questions and give any requested context.

COMPONENTS OF THE REVIEW

The IQAP has five principal components:

1. A Self-study Report, prepared by the Self-study author, in consultation with faculty in the program and the dean, with assistance from various offices and administrators.
2. External evaluation (peer review) with an external assessment report (the External Reviewers' Report) that contains recommendations to improve the quality of the program.
3. Institutional evaluation of the Self-study Report and the External Reviewers' Report.
4. Preparation and adoption of plans to implement the recommendations and to monitor their implementation.
5. Follow-up reporting on the principal findings of the review and on the implementation of the recommendations.

FORMAL REVIEW PROCESS

OVERVIEW

The review of an academic program proceeds in six stages. What follows is a summary of the six stages followed by a more detailed description of each stage.

STAGE 1: The Office of the Provost/VPA initiates the review, and the AQAC selects an External Review Committee.

STAGE 2: The Self-study author prepares a Self-study Report, to be sent to the dean for approval.

STAGE 3: External evaluation: A site visit takes place and the External Review Committee prepares an External Reviewers' Report.

STAGE 4: The Self-study author responds to the external assessment report and the programmatic recommendations contained therein and submits to the dean for approval. The dean must respond to any institutional recommendations in the report; the dean may also choose to append a response to any of the programmatic recommendations.

STAGE 5: The AQAC receives the Response document for approval and prepares a Final Assessment Report, containing the institutional Implementation Plan. Senate receives the Final Assessment Report for approval.

STAGE 6: Annually, the Self-study author and the dean update the AQAC on the status of the accepted recommendations. At least once per year, the AQAC will inform Senate of its satisfaction (or dissatisfaction) with the progress of the program's implementation plans.

IMPORTANT DATES

By February 1: The Provost/VPA will notify the relevant department chair of the upcoming review.

By March 15: The chair will provide a list of prospective reviewers to the Office of the Provost/VPA, and nominates a Self-study author to the Provost/VPA, if the author is not to be this department chair.

By June 15: The Office of the Provost/VPA will provide the Self-study author with the data included in the Data Appendix of the Self-study Report.

By September 1: The Self-study author will submit the Self-study Report to the dean.

By October 1: The dean will approve the Self-study Report and send the report to the Office of the Provost/VPA.

STAGE 1: REVIEW SETUP AND EXTERNAL REVIEWER SELECTION

1. The Provost/VPA will officially notify the department chair that (a) particular program(s) will be reviewed in the following academic year. This notification will happen no later than <u>February 1</u>.

2. If the department chair believes another faculty member in the program is better suited to be the Self-study author, the chair must make such a recommendation to the Provost/VPA by <u>March 15</u>. If the Provost/VPA approves such a recommendation, the chair's nominee will be the Self-study author. In all other cases, the Self-study author will be the department chair.

3. If the Self-study author is a member of the AQAC, the Self-study author will be recused from future AQAC meetings dealing with this review.

4. Also by <u>March 15</u>, the chair must submit to the Office of the Provost/VPA a list of potential external reviewers in the same discipline (normally at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor) to serve on the External Review Committee. The chair will nominate, in order of preference, at least three Christian faculty members from universities in Universities Canada (UC) and three faculty members from universities in the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities (CCCU). With the agreement of the Provost/VPA, the chair may submit a list of three nominees who represent industry or professional groups. The chair must support each nomination with a brief summary of the nominee's qualifications.
    1. All nominees must be "arm's length" from the program under review. This means that an external reviewer may not be a close friend, current or recent collaborator, or former supervisor, advisor, or colleague. Arm's-length does <u>not</u> mean that the reviewer must never have met or even heard of a single faculty member in the program. It does mean that the chair should not nominate reviewers who are likely, or perceived to be likely, to be predisposed, positively or negatively, about the program.
    2. Some examples of what may not violate the arm's-length requirement:
        i. appeared on a panel at a conference with a faculty member in the program;
        ii. author of an article in a journal, or of a chapter in a book, edited by a faculty member in the program;
        iii. presented a paper at a conference held at RUC;
        iv. invited a faculty member in the program to present a paper at a conference the reviewer organized, or to write a chapter in a book edited by the reviewer;
        v. received a degree at RUC;
        vi. co-author or research collaborator with a faculty member in the program more than seven years ago;
        vii. presented a guest lecture at RUC; or
        viii. reviewed for publication a manuscript written by a faculty member in the program.

3. Some examples of what may violate the arm's-length requirement:
    i. a previous faculty member in the program or of the department most closely associated with the program;
    ii. a regular co-author and research collaborator with a faculty member in the program within the past seven years, especially if that collaboration is ongoing;
    iii. a close family/friend of a faculty member in the program; or
    iv. the doctoral supervisor of a faculty member in the program.
4. If the chair has questions about a prospective nominee's arm's-length status, the chair should speak with the Provost/VPA before submitting the nominee's name.

5. The AQAC selects two external reviewers (normally one from a UC university and one from a CCCU university). Ideally, the reviewers will have a strong record as academic scholars (and/or teachers) and who have academic administrative experience (as department chairs or deans). The reviewers are expected to respect RUC's mission and vision as a Reformed Christian liberal-arts-and-sciences institution while performing their work as external reviewers. The Provost/VPA will ask one external reviewer to serve as chair of the External Review Committee.
    1. The Provost/VPA will contact the nominees directly. Faculty members in the program may not contact any nominees.
    2. If the AQAC is unable to recruit reviewers from the original list submitted by the department chair, the Provost/VPA may request more names from the chair.
    3. The Office of the Provost/VPA will ask the external reviewers for CVs for RUC's files.

6. The Provost/VPA will select one internal reviewer to serve as the third member of the External Review Committee. The internal reviewer will be a tenured faculty member in a different department and division than the department most closely associated with the program under review, and will not normally be a member of the AQAC (if an AQAC member serves as the internal reviewer, this reviewer will be recused from future AQAC meetings dealing with the review). The internal reviewer has the following responsibilities:
    1. Act as a host for the day to the external reviewers, and be available to meet with the external reviewers the evening before the review;
    2. Participate fully (to the extent possible, given disciplinary expertise) in the discussions of the committee;
    3. Ensure the external reviewers are aware of RUC's local context, including its unique mission and vision;
    4. Meet (including "virtually") with the external reviewers as needed in the formulation of the External Reviewers' Report; and
    5. Help ensure each recommendation is well-worded and actionable.

7. In exchange for their participation, the external reviewers receive a stipend and have their expenses covered by the university. The chair receives a higher stipend and will lead the committee's meetings and discussions before, during and after the site visit; and be the primary author of the External Reviewers' Report. The internal faculty member's participation will count for committee credit for the academic year in which the review takes place.

8. By way of formal instructions, the Provost/VPA is responsible for ensuring that all members of the Review Committee will:
   1. Understand their role and obligations, namely to:
      i. identify and commend the program's notably strong and creative attributes;
      ii. describe the program's respective strengths, areas for improvement, and opportunities for enhancement; and
      iii. make actionable recommendations for improving the program, distinguishing between "programmatic recommendations" and "institutional recommendations".
         1. Programmatic recommendations are those the faculty in the program could initiate and/or implement themselves (e.g., should have minimal budgetary impact, should require minimal action by and/or input from people outside the program);
         2. Institutional recommendations are those that require university-level action or significant financial or university-wide time resources.
   2. Recognize RUC's autonomy in determining priorities for funding, space, and faculty allocation; and
   3. Respect the confidentiality required for all aspects of the review process.

STAGE 2: THE SELF-STUDY REPORT

Stage 2 involves the preparation of the Self-study Report, which is at the heart of the review process. The act of self-study is an opportunity for a careful examination of the program(s). The self-study provides an opportunity to engage in serious self-reflection about the strengths and weaknesses of all aspects of the program(s) and the way the program(s) is (are) delivered to students, as well as to indicate hopes and goals for the future of the program(s). The Self-study Report must be broad-based, reflective, and forward-looking. It must include critical analysis.

1. The dean must receive the entire Self-study Report by September 1.
    1. The dean, in turn, makes the report (minus the Data Appendix) available to members of the relevant division for comment (such as, at a division meeting) in September.
    2. If the program(s) have a considerable presence in departments outside the division, the dean will ensure that relevant RUC faculty have the opportunity to read and comment on the Self-study Report (minus the Data Appendix) at this time.

2. The Self-study author is responsible to make revisions as required by the dean; the dean must (be able to) approve the Self-study Report by October 1 and send the entire Self-study Report to the Office of the Provost/VPA, which will ensure it is passed along to the External Review Committee well in advance of the committee's site visit.

3. The Self-study author writes the main elements of the Self-study Report by following the required structure given below in Item 4 of this section. The Self-study Report also includes a Data Appendix prepared by staff in the Office of the Provost/VPA, the Registrar's Office, and elsewhere, containing the supported data listed later (Item 6 in the current section).

4. The following pieces of information must be included in the Self-study Report. The report should cover the last seven years of the program, unless otherwise specified. The information and evaluation to be included in the Self-study Report must be organized into the following sections (and subsections):

    1. OBJECTIVES:
        Provide the mission of the program(s) and evaluate its alignment with the mission of Redeemer University College (RUC). *Relevant Appendix data: RUC's Mission and Vision Statements.*

    2. CURRICULUM:
        i. Outline the structure of the program(s), provide the calendar course descriptions for all courses in each program, and include the enrolment caps for each course. Note: the most recent syllabi on file for each courses will be included in the Appendix data. *Relevant Appendix data: course-cap data for all courses in the program.*

    ii.   Present a mapping of the Program-level Learning Outcomes (PLOs) "up" to the Undergraduate-degree Learning Expectations (UDLEs) and "down" to the most-relevant courses that address each PLO (it is understood that the program's PLOs are not expected to fully map to each UDLE; the Core's mapping is already included in the templates). Evaluate coverage (both "up" and "down") and explain differences between LOs for courses at different levels. A template is provided in Appendix E. *Relevant Appendix data: RUC's UDLEs.*

    iii.   With reference to the PLOs, briefly summarize the themes in the program that encourage students to develop a reformed worldview. Comment on how these themes are organized through the program.

    iv.   If applicable, note any outside accreditation and/or reviews the program(s) also undergo, as well as any articulation or transfer considerations of the program. Any future considerations of this nature should be noted here as well. *Relevant Appendix data: Accreditation reports or the like, if applicable.*

3.   TEACHING AND ASSESSMENT:

    i.   Describe and evaluate the program's overall design and the intended methods of delivery (i.e., course levels and scaffolding; different pedagogical methods to be used; experiential-learning courses, etc.). This is not to be an evaluation of how well the delivery is being accomplished; that will come in Section 6. *Relevant Appendix data: applicable student and alumni survey responses; applicable portions of teaching evaluations.*

    ii.   Describe the various means of assessment, and evaluate their appropriateness and effectiveness in clearly demonstrating achievement of i) course-level learning outcomes (CLOs) and ii) PLOs, especially in the final year of the program. *Relevant Appendix data: applicable student and alumni survey responses; applicable portions of teaching evaluations; course-cap data for all courses in the program.*

4.   RESOURCES:

    i.   Evaluate the resources available to offer the program(s), including financial, library holdings and databases, equipment, space, facilities. *Relevant Appendix data: financial, physical and library resources allocated to the program.*

    ii.   Fill out and integrate into the Report the template provided (Appendix F) to summarize the faculty complement in the program(s). Below the list, you may comment further on the relevance of faculty members' scholarship to the program(s), keeping in mind that all the faculty member's CVs will be available in the Appendix data. *Relevant Appendix data: Faculty CVs.*

iii. Summarize any trends and concerns related to program and class sizes. *Relevant Appendix data: Enrolment and course-cap data for all courses in the program; enrolment data for the program.*

5. ADMISSION:

Present a list of institutional admission and continuance-in-program requirements as well as any specific program-entry and continuance-in-program requirements. Note any concerns, if any, about how these requirements affect the program(s).

6. QUALITY INDICATORS:

   i. Faculty:

      1. (Full-time (FT)) Faculty members in the program(s): Evaluate qualifications, research and scholarly records, teaching quality indicators. *Relevant Appendix data: faculty CVs, teaching evaluations.*

      2. The rest of the faculty complement in the program(s): Evaluate qualifications and teaching quality indicators. *Relevant Appendix data: faculty CVs, teaching evaluations.*

      3. Evaluate percentage of classes taught by part-time (PT) faculty. Student course-evaluation data may be relevant. *Relevant Appendix data: List of courses taught by FT/PT faculty; teaching evaluations; student:faculty ratios.*

      4. Describe any efforts at faculty collaboration done in support of program quality.

   ii. Students: Evaluate data related to matriculations, graduation rates, and academic awards for students in the program(s). *Relevant Appendix data: Student matriculation rates into the program(s) (as available); graduation rates; academic awards; grade averages by department and by course (as available); overall university grade averages by course level.*

   iii. Graduates: Evaluate any data available concerning employment and/or post-graduate studies of graduates from the program(s), along with other relevant data from the alumni survey (the External Review Committee will be informed that these items may not be available and applicable to all programs and that response rates may not be sufficient to imply significance). *Relevant Appendix data: Alumni survey results; data regarding post-graduate education or employment of graduates.*

7. QUALITY ENHANCEMENT:
    i.   Summarize the recommendations and implementations of the last review of the program(s).
    ii. Highlight important developments since the last review (or in the last seven years, whichever is more recent), including any planned initiatives to enhance the quality of the program(s).
    iii. Summarize any program areas identified through the current self-study process as requiring improvement or as holding promise for enhancement.

8. STUDENT ADVISING AND ACADEMIC SUPPORT:
    Present the institutional and programmatic advising models and list the institutional academic supports. Note any concerns about how these models or supports affect the program(s).

9. EXTRA-PROGRAMMATIC SERVICE:
    i.   Identify courses in the program(s) that contribute to the core program as Local/Global Issues or Non-Western Perspectives electives, or to the requirements of other programs. If a single department houses the vast majority of the program(s) being reviewed, also include any other departmental courses that contribute to the core or other programs. Note any implications these "services" have for the program(s) under review.
    ii. Identify courses in the program(s) that are cross-listed with other departments for service to other programs. Note any implications for the program(s) under review.
    iii. Identify those faculty members in the program(s) who also teach (or taught) required Core courses (including the frequency of doing so). Note any implications that this service has for the program(s). *Relevant Appendix data: Faculty CVs.*
    iv. Identify faculty with additional responsibilities (e.g., department chair, dean, director, Provost/VPA, etc.) and any implications on the program(s).

10. OTHER INFORMATION:
    Include here other topics or issues that are worthy of inclusion, but do not fall under any other category.

11. QUESTIONS FOR EXTERNAL REVIEWERS:
    List questions or concerns the Self-study author or the dean has about which they are seeking advice from the External Review Committee.

5. All current faculty members in the program must have the opportunity to participate in the self-study process. It is important to provide critical assessment and evaluation in the Self-study Report. Nothing is more important to a successful program review than the appraisal given in the Self-study Report. Therefore, it is important that the Self-study author give sufficient time for thoughtful reflection and idea-exchange with faculty. The following guidelines may also help the Self-study author produce a strong Self-study Report:
   1. Although some information in the self-study report will be descriptive, make sure that the content of the report is also reflective, analytical, self-critical, and evaluative.
   2. Comment on, or analyze, the data included in the Appendix of the self-study report in the relevant section(s).
   3. Write the Self-study Report in the context of quality improvement. Avoid being defensive or self-justifying. If there is an issue/concern/problem, identify it (do not hide it). If you have a potential solution, state it, or if you need advice or guidance from the Review Committee, ask for it.

6. The following data must be included in a Data Appendix to the Self-study Report. The data should cover the last seven years, by academic year, unless otherwise specified. The Office of the Provost/VPA is responsible for assembling the Data Appendix and providing it to the Self-study author by June 15 of the review:
   1. RUC's Mission and Vision Statements (for Section 1);
   2. RUC's UDLEs (for Section 2);
   3. Any summary reports of recent accreditation or reviews by professional associations (for Section 2);
   4. Enrolment, course-cap, and average-grade data for all courses in the program(s); average of all regular- (3-credit-) course grades at RUC by year and grade level (for Sections 2, 3, 4 and 6);
   5. Most recent course syllabi for all courses in the program(s) (for Section 2);
   6. Teaching evaluation numerical summaries (along with the lists of questions) for all courses taught in the program(s) (for Sections 3 and 6);
   7. Student and alumni survey responses (more information on the survey and questions to be asked are found below) (for Sections 3 and 6);
   8. CVs for the faculty complement in the program(s) (for Sections 4, 6 and 9);
   9. List of resources: financial, physical, and library (for Section 4). To be included:
      i. approximate funds allocated for: supplies and services; student assistants; and equipment;
      ii. library holdings (approximate number of books, journals, relevant databases, electronic sources, audio/visual materials) as well as a summary of library expenditures devoted to the department most closely associated with the program(s) (also indicated as a percentage of total library expenditures);
      iii. physical space allocated to the program (e.g., lab space for the sciences, practice rooms and studio space for the fine arts) and summary of classroom (lecture hall, seminar rooms), laboratory, and practice/performance/studio space for the entire university;

16

10. Enrolment data for the program(s) under review (for Sections 4 and 6):
    i. average class sizes by year level;
    ii. student-faculty ratios in the program(s) and for RUC in general;
    iii. matriculation rate(s) into the program(s);[1]
    iv. number of declared majors and minors;
    v. number of graduates of the program(s); and
    vi. percentage of majors and minors on the Deans' or Provost's Honours Lists;
11. Listing of courses, by term, that have been taught by part-time instructors (for Section 6); and
12. Any data regarding graduates' post-graduation education or employment, ideally at six months and two years after graduation (for Section 6).

7. The Student/Alumni Survey:
    1. The Office of the Provost/VPA will initiate a survey of students and alumni who, if currently enrolled have taken <u>four or more courses</u> in the program(s) at some time during the last seven years, or, if recently graduated, graduated with an honours major, major, four-year major, or minor in (one of) the program(s) under review. Not every student who satisfies the above criteria will necessarily be contacted; the Provost/VPA must ensure, however, that an appropriate number of students are invited to participate. The student survey will take place such that the Self-study author will have time to consider the results from the survey when it completes the Self-study Report. The results reported will distinguish between current students and alumni.
    2. The survey will ask, among other things:
        i. if the curriculum reflected students' interests and needs;
        ii. if the teaching methods were appropriate to the discipline;
        iii. if methods of evaluation were appropriate;
        iv. if equipment and facilities were appropriate;
        v. if the quality of instruction met their expectations;
        vi. if library holdings -- including audio/visual material, computer software, databases, etc. -- were appropriate in terms of quality, quantity, and availability;
        vii. if the academic advising provided enabled them to make good academic choices;
        viii. what were the most valuable aspects of their program;
        ix. what were the least valuable aspects of their program;
        x. if they have any recommendations for improvements; and
        xi. their impression of the general quality of education they are receiving or have received.
    Students will also have an opportunity to offer additional comments. See Appendix C for the standard student/alumni survey template.
    3. The Self-study author and the dean will have an opportunity to add additional questions to the survey or re-word existing questions (to better suit the program(s) under review), upon approval from the Provost/VPA.

---

[1] No data earlier than Fall 2016, which is when students were first able to enroll directly into a program upon matriculation.

STAGE 3: EXTERNAL REVIEW COMMITTEE'S ON-SITE VISIT AND REPORT

1. After the dean submits the Self-study Report to the Office of the Provost/VPA, the Provost/VPA will send the following to the members of the External Review Committee:
   1. The entire Self-study Report (including the Data Appendix);
   2. The most recent edition of the Academic Calendar;
   3. *The Cross and Our Calling; and*
   4. Any other documents that may be required to help the committee become more knowledgeable about RUC.
   5. This IQAP document.

2. Site visits will normally be held in November (for Fall reviews) and February or March (for Winter reviews).

3. The Provost/VPA is the university representative who keeps in contact with the members of the External Review Committee. Either before, during, or after the site visit, any member of the External Review Committee may ask the Provost/VPA for clarifications or additional information.

4. The site visit lasts for one full day. The schedule for the day is as follows:
   0. (Optional) The External Review Committee (hereafter in this section, "the committee") could meet the evening before to get acquainted and review together observations made from reading the Self-study report.
   1. The External Review Committee meets first with the Provost/VPA for introductions and orientation.
   2. The committee then meets *in camera* to discuss procedures, questions, and additional information that may be required during the day.
   3. The committee then meets with faculty in the department.
   4. The committee meets with the following persons (in any order):
      i. the dean;
      ii. students currently enrolled in the program(s) under review;
      iii. the Registrar;
      iv. the Library Director;
      v. as deemed relevant to the review by the chair of the External Review Committee in advance of the meeting and communicated to the Office of the Provost/VPA, any of the following Directors: Admissions, Athletics, Centre for Experiential Learning and Careers, Information Technology, Marketing, Mentoring, Teaching and Learning, Research;
      vi. the Provost/VPA and the dean, usually over lunch, when any points for clarification can be raised; and
      vii. faculty in the program(s) a second time to ask any follow-up questions.
   5. The committee then meets *in camera* to discuss preliminary assessments.

6. The committee then meets a second time with the Provost/VPA to provide a preliminary assessment.

5. Within one month of the site visit, the chair of the External Review Committee will submit to the Provost/VPA the External Reviewers' Report, drafted by the chair with input from all members of the External Review Committee.
   1. The other two members of the External Review Committee must approve the External Reviewers' Report before the chair submits it to the Provost/VPA.
   2. If such approval is not forthcoming, the chair may still submit the External Reviewers' Report, but the other reviewer(s) who did not approve the report must submit a short document that describes the concern(s) they have with the External Reviewers' Report; the short report(s) will be appended to the External Reviewers' Report.

6. The External Reviewers' Report must include the following sections, addressing the relevant questions or instructions (noting that the questions are stated under the assumption that one single program is being reviewed; the External Reviewers Committee should interpret and answer the questions and instructions in such a way as to address all programs being reviewed collectively or individually, as needed):

   1. OBJECTIVES: How strong and coherent is the alignment between the mission of the program(s) and RUC's mission?

   2. CURRICULUM:
      i. Given the resources available, is the program structure, and the courses offered, the best selection for the institution to offer?
      ii. Is the mapping of program-level learning outcomes to RUC's UDLEs, appropriate for the type of degree program it is? Are the mappings of course-level learning outcomes to program-level learning outcomes appropriate? To help answer these questions, the External Review Committee is directed to choose one of the six main UDLE categories and do an audit of the PLO->UDLE and the CLO->PLO mappings given in the Self-study Report.
      iii. How appropriate are the programmatic themes used to encourage students to develop a reformed worldview? Are these themes well-integrated into the program?
      iv. (If applicable:) Is any other external accreditation or official review of this program, current or proposed, appropriate for the program? Are there issues, current or possible, regarding the accreditation that may need to be considered?

   3. TEACHING AND ASSESSMENT: Is the program and its methods of delivery designed appropriately to address the course- and program-level learning outcomes? Are the methods of assessment appropriate to assess students' achievement of course- and

program-level learning outcomes, especially in the 300- (and, where relevant, 400-) level courses in the program?

4. RESOURCES:
   i. Are the library and physical resources available appropriate for the type of program and number of students enrolled in it? Are the financial resources adequate to maintain the program?
   ii. Is the program's faculty complement – especially the full-time faculty who teach more than one course in the program – well qualified to deliver the courses offered in the program?
   iii. Are there course-enrolment trends in the program that (may) indicate concerns or highlights for the program? This could be because of abnormally-high or -low course enrolments.

5. ADMISSION: Are the admission and continuance-in-program requirements to the program appropriate? Are they aligned with the learning outcomes established for completion of the program?

6. QUALITY INDICATORS:
   i. Faculty:
      1. (*in camera*) Are the qualifications of faculty in the program appropriate? Given RUC's faculty expectations, are the scholarly-output levels/quality and teaching quality sufficiently high?
      2. (*in camera*) Are the qualifications of the rest of the program's faculty complement appropriate (keeping in mind the different qualification expectations for full-time and part-time faculty)?
      3. In light of RUC's teaching mission, do part-time faculty teach an appropriate percentage and selection of the program's courses?
      4. Are there appropriate intra-faculty collaboration efforts to support program quality and student outcomes?
   ii. Students:
      1. In light of RUC's liberal-arts-and-sciences character, do the program's matriculation and graduation rates point to possible programmatic issues (possible examples: lack of scaffolding, difficulty in course sequencing; courses attracting new students to transfer into the program, courses leading to students transferring out of the program; etc.)?
      2. Do the average student grades, number of student awards, etc., imply any concerns about program or teaching quality?
      3. Does the student and/or alumni survey indicate overall satisfaction with the program?
   iii. Graduates: Are graduates of the program achieving appropriate post-graduate academic and employment outcomes?

7. QUALITY ENHANCEMENT:
   i. Has the program undergone appropriate improvements since the last review, both through the implementation of previous review recommendations and through other means?
   ii. Are plans for program enhancement proposed in the Self-study Report (if any) appropriate?

8. STUDENT ADVISING AND ACADEMIC SUPPORT: Are the advising and academic support services offered appropriate and sufficient to support the program?

9. EXTRA-PROGRAMMATIC SERVICE:
   i. Are there programmatic concerns or highlights (student access in terms of over-enrolment, modifications in subject and depth of coverage, etc.) regarding the use of various courses as Local/Global Issues or Non-Western Perspectives core elective, or as electives or required courses in other programs? Explain.
   ii. Are there programmatic concerns or highlights regarding faculty in the program teaching some of the required core courses? Explain.

10. OTHER INFORMATION: Please address, as appropriate, any issues raised in Section 10 of the Self-study Report.

11. ANSWERS TO SELF-STUDY REPORT QUESTIONS: Please address, as appropriate, any questions raised in Section 11 of the Self-study Report.

12. *IN CAMERA ISSUES:* Aside from the *in camera* faculty evaluations in Section 6.i., are there other issues, concerns or recommendations that you wish to raise that need to be *in camera* (examples of *in camera* issues include personnel issues; confidential inter-university business; disciplinary issues regarding staff, faculty, or students; etc.)

13. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR QUALITY IMPROVEMENT:
    Provide a summary list of recommendations, in priority order, and separated into "Programmatic" and "Institutional" categories at the end of the report.
    i. Programmatic recommendations are those which apply directly to the program being reviewed and which faculty in the program should be able to initiate and/or implement with minimal assistance or additional resources from the university as a whole. For example, recommendations dealing with course content or assessment methods are programmatic recommendations.
    ii. Institutional recommendations are those which require additional resources or whose implementation requires significant contributions from staff and faculty outside the program itself. For example, recommendations regarding additional staff or faculty support, or changes to institutional structures or priorities are institutional recommendations.

These recommendations will have such a force that the Self-study author and/or the dean is obliged to respond either by proposing an implementation plan concerning the recommendation, or by providing written rationale why it is not practical to implement the recommendation (whether or not they agree with the recommendation).

7. When formulating their recommendations, the External Review Committee must ensure that:
    1. All recommendations are actionable and accomplishable in a timely manner (they should be "SMART" goals: specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, time-bound);
    2. Highest-priority recommendations focus on the program itself;
    3. Recommendations are based on the context provided in the External Reviewers' Report and/or the information gained in the site visit, with references to specific data as appropriate;
    4. Suggestions are made instead of recommendations for minor items (the Self-study author and the dean are not obliged to respond, nor to track implementation of, suggestions); and
    5. Suggestions are made instead of recommendations for tangential items, especially those items or concerns raised in the Self-study Report that are not focussed on the program itself.

8. While making their recommendations for quality improvement, the reviewers must recognize the autonomy of RUC to determine priorities for funding, space, and faculty allocation.

9. A template for the External Reviewers' Report is in Appendix D.

STAGE 4: RESPONSE TO THE EXTERNAL REVIEWERS' REPORT

1. After the Provost/VPA receives the External Reviewers' Report and ensures its completeness, the Provost/VPA will distribute copies of it to the Self-study author and the dean.

2. After consultation with the Self-study author and after receiving permission from the Provost/VPA, the dean may have a follow-up discussion with the chair of the External Review Committee concerning aspects of the committee's Report. If the matter is deemed by the Provost/VPA to be minor, the dean may consult with the internal member of the External Review Committee.
    1. Any discussions between the dean and chair of the External Review Committee must occur within one month of RUC's receipt of the External Reviewers' Report;
    2. All discussions between the dean and the chair of the External Review Committee must be documented with the minutes / transcription / email conversation appended to the External Reviewers' Report.

3. The dean may re-categorize any recommendations in the External Reviewers' Report from programmatic to institutional, or *vice versa*.

4. Within one month of the university's receipt of the External Reviewers' Report, the Self-study author must submit, for approval, a written response document to the dean, which will include the following:
    1. Factual corrections to the External Reviewers' Report;
    2. Why the Self-study author disagrees with any conclusions or evaluations made about the program(s) in the Report; and
    3. For each programmatic recommendation:
        i.   whether and why the self-study author agrees with the recommendation; and
        ii. for each agreed-with recommendation, a proposed plan to implement the recommendation, including timelines and an estimate of the resources required; or, despite agreeing with the recommendation, why it cannot be implemented.
        The Self-study author does not respond to institutional recommendations, but may comment on them.

5. Once the dean approves the Self-study author's response, the dean adds the following to the Self-study author's response:
    1. Comments to the responses to any of the programmatic recommendations, as desired;
    2. A response to each institutional recommendation:
        i.   whether or why the dean agrees with the recommendation; and
        ii. for each agreed-with recommendations, a proposed plan to implement the recommendation, including timelines and an estimate of the resources required; or, despite agreeing with the recommendation, why it cannot be implemented.
    The dean will share this official Response Document with the Self-study author and submit it to the AQAC for approval within two weeks of approving the Self-study author's response (or one month after the university's receipt of the External Reviewers' Report, whichever comes later).

STAGE 5: FINAL ASSESSMENT REPORT

1. The AQAC reviews for approval the Response Document from the dean for completeness and appropriateness. For this task, it also receives the Self-study Report and External Reviewers' Report for information.

2. Upon approval of the Response Document, the AQAC formulates a Final Assessment Report, which is an institutional synthesis of the review and response; it is a record to show how, or to what extent, the External Review Committee's recommendations will be implemented. Specifically, the Final Assessment Report will:
   1. Identify any significant strengths of the program(s);
   2. Identify opportunities for program improvement and enhancement;
   3. Include an *in camera* section for any personnel or other confidential issues that have arisen during the review process;
   4. List all recommendations, and indicate those which have been agreed with by the Self-study author and/or the dean;
   5. Present the institutional Implementation Plan based on the plans given in the Response Document; and
   6. Include as an appendix a one-page Executive Summary of the program review and its results so far that is suitable for publication on RUC's website.

3. The AQAC then sends the Final Assessment Report to the dean and Self-study author for information and to Senate for approval, with the Self-study Report, External Reviewers' Report and Response Document available for information.

4. After Senate approval, the Final Assessment Report (minus any *in camera* material) is sent to Faculty for information.

5. Within one month of Faculty receiving the Final Assessment Report, the Office of the Provost/VPA ensures that the Executive Summary is published on an appropriate page on RUC's website.

6. The Office of the Provost/VPA adds the implementation plans for all accepted institutional recommendations to a master list of institutional implementation plans, held by the Office of the Provost/VPA and shared with the academic deans.

7. By the final Senate meeting of the academic year in which the Senate approves the Final Assessment Report, the Provost/VPA will provide Senate with a process-compliance report for the program-review process up to that point. Any variance from the prescribed process (e.g., missed dates, skipped or modified steps, etc.) must be noted and explained in this process-compliance report.

STAGE 6: MONITORING THE IMPLEMENTATION PLANS

1. Each year, the Office of the Provost/VPA will request that Self-study authors (or their replacements) submit an Implementation Report to the dean, accounting for the implementation of the External Review Committee's programmatic recommendations for which there is an institutional implementation plan.

2. The dean gives approval when the dean believes that the status updates are correct; the dean may append additional comments to any of the particular items before sending the Implementation Report on to the AQAC.

3. The AQAC receives the Implementation Report and prepares a short statement of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the progress made in the context of the institutional Implementation Plan for the program.
    1. A statement of dissatisfaction means that, in the AQAC's view, implementation of one or more of the plans is delayed significantly without sufficient rationale; such a statement would only be put forward after further discussion with the Self-study author and the dean.
    2. The AQAC's statement will be shared with the dean and Self-study author when it is sent, appended to the Implementation Report, to Senate for information.

4. If the AQAC is satisfied that the accepted-for-implementation recommendations have all been addressed as much as is reasonable, the AQAC will also report to Senate that the implementation process for that particular program review is complete.

5. Each year, the Provost/VPA, in consultation with the deans, will prepare an institutional Implementation Report on all unfinished accepted institutional recommendations and share that document with Senate for information at its final meeting of the academic year. Faculty will be provided with updates on the *ex camera* institutional recommendations.

APPENDIX A: SCHEDULE OF REVIEWS OF PROGRAMS

FALL 2018

Education:
Primary/Junior Stream
Junior/Intermediate Stream

French:
General Major

WINTER 2019

Music:
General Major

FALL 2019

Health Sciences:
Honours Major: Pre-Medicine Stream
Honours Major: Professional Stream
General Major

Politics and International Studies:
Hons Major: International Relations Stream
Hons Major: International Develop. Stream
General Major: Politics and Internat. Studies

WINTER 2020

Religion and Theology:
Hons Major: Urban & Intercultural Ministry
General Major: Youth Ministry
General Major: Biblical & Theolog. Studies

Mathematics:
Honours Major
Four-year Major
General Major

FALL 2020

Kinesiology and Physical Education:
Honours Major: Kinesiology (B.Sc.)
Honours Major: Kinesiology (B.A.)
General Major: Physical Education

History:
Honours Major
General Major

WINTER 2021

English:
Honours Major: Literature
Honours Major: Writing
General Major: Literature
General Major: Writing

The Core Program

FALL 2021

Theatre Arts:
General Major

Biology:
Honours Major
General Major

WINTER 2022

Applied Social Sciences:
Honours Major: Social Work Stream
General Major
Minor: Criminal Justice
Minor: Social Justice
Minor: Disability Studies

Media and Communication Studies:
Hons Major: Digital Media & Prod. Stream
Gen Major: Digital Media & Prod. Stream
Honours Major: Media and Culture Stream
General Major: Media and Culture Stream

FALL 2022

Business:
Honours Major: Accounting
Four-Year Major: Accounting
Honours Major: Management
Four-Year Major: Management
Honours Major: Marketing
Four-Year Major: Marketing
Honours Major: Not-for-Profit Management
Four-Year Major: N-f-P Management

Art:
General Major

WINTER 2023

Environmental Sciences:
Honours Major: Environmental Science
Four-Year Major: Environmental Science
General Major: Environmental Science
Four-Year Major: Environmental Studies
General Major: Environmental Studies
Minor: Geography

Philosophy:
General Major

FALL 2023

Psychology:
Honours Major: Clinical Stream
Honours Major: Experimental Stream
General Major

Chemistry:
Honours Major: Biochemistry
General Major

FALL 2024 and WINTER 2025

Other new programs beginning after July 1, 2018

WINTER 2024

New programs beginning after July 1, 2018

APPENDIX B: TEMPLATE FOR FACULTY *CURRICULUM VITAE*

All full-time faculty must use the following template for CVs for program reviews.

1. <u>Name</u>, <u>rank</u> (Lab Instructor, Lecturer, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor), and <u>status</u> (tenure-track, tenured, limited-term/sessional).
2. <u>Degrees</u> (undergraduate and graduate): institution, department, year.
3. <u>Employment history</u>: dates, rank/position (full-time and part-time), department, institution, current position
4. <u>Academic honours</u>: e.g., Governor General's Awards, honorary degrees
5. <u>Courses taught during the last seven years</u>. List by course with course code, course title, and number of sections (e.g., 2006-2013: PSY 122 – Introduction to Clinical and Developmental Psychology; 8 sections).
6. <u>Scholarly and professional activities during the last seven years</u>. List executive and editorial positions, but not memberships. List invited presentations at national or international conferences; do not list conferences you only attended. Do not list manuscript and grant application preparations or reviews.
7. <u>External research funding during the last seven years</u>. Indicate, by year: the source of the funds (granting councils, industry, government, foundations, individual donors, other external sources), the amount of the award, and the purpose of the award (operating, travel, publication, equipment, etc.). If it is a group grant, indicate the number of grantees and whether you are the principal researcher/investigator.
8. <u>Internal research funding during the last seven years</u>. Indicate, by year: the type of grant (e.g., internal research grant, instructional development grant), the amount of the award, and the purpose of the award (research, course development, etc.). Include in this section funds awarded from a SSHRC aid-to-small universities grant.
9. <u>Publications</u>: (1) Provide <u>a life-time summary (count)</u> for each of the following categories. (Count if you are either an author or co-author, or editor or co-editor.) (a) scholarly books authored, (b) scholarly books edited, (c) refereed chapters in books, (d) non-refereed chapters in books, (e) papers in refereed journals, (f) papers in refereed conference proceedings, (g) major invited contributions and/or technical reports, (h) papers read at conferences, and (i) other (e.g., workshops presented). (2) Provide full citations for each item counted in (1) above <u>from the last seven years</u>. Make sure that (i) you provide page numbers for books, chapters, journal articles, and conference proceedings (if a work has not yet been published, include the number of manuscript pages), (ii) the names of the authors are stated in the order they appear on the publication, and (iii) when giving details on publications you be as specific as possible in the case of forthcoming publications – (e.g., in press, submitted, accepted).

Note: For some faculty members (e.g., those in the performing arts), it may be more appropriate to list exhibitions, performances, concerts, by year (for the last seven years) indicating the nature of the exhibition, performance, or concert (e.g., juried, local / national / international, competition, public / private).

APPENDIX C: STUDENT/ALUMNI SURVEY TEMPLATE

The survey to assess student and alumni evaluations of the program(s) under review will be used according to the process described above, and adjusted appropriately for specific programs.

REDEEMER UNIVERSITY COLLEGE
CONFIDENTIAL STUDENT SURVEY FOR THE "Y" PROGRAM(S)

This coming year, the _____ program(s) at Redeemer University College will be formally reviewed as part of an Institutional Quality Assurance Process. This institutional review will assess the quality of the courses and instruction and the university's support of the program(s). Each program is formally reviewed every seven years and includes an assessment by an External Review Committee.

Part of each assessment involves an examination of student and alumni feedback and, for this, we ask for your assistance. By responding to this survey, you will be performing a valuable service to the university and to the _____ program(s). We would like your help in determining the quality of the program(s), recognizing what is working well and considering ways to make the program(s) stronger. <u>Your responses to this survey are completely voluntary and confidential. Please complete the survey by MONTH, DAY, YEAR.</u>

To access the survey, please click on this link: [link]

Please check the category that best describes your own status:
> [From a provided list, students will be asked to check the program in which they are currently enrolled or from which they graduated.]

In what year did you begin your studies at Redeemer University College? _____

Please respond to the following items using one of the following five choices:
1 = Strongly Agree, 2 = Agree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Disagree, 5 = Strongly Disagree

CURRICULUM:
1. The courses offered in the program were appropriate for the program to realize its learning objectives.
   >   1   2   3   4   5
   >   Comments:

2. The variety of courses offered in the program was adequate.
   >   1   2   3   4   5
   >   Comments:

3. The curriculum in the _____ program encourages:

   A. well-rounded expertise in the discipline.   1   2   3   4   5
   B. an ability to research, create, or perform.   1   2   3   4   5
   C. the development of critical-thinking skills (the ability to debate, analyze, and critique information.   1   2   3   4   5
   D. the development of advanced writing skills.   1   2   3   4   5
   E. the development of oral communication skills.   1   2   3   4   5
   F. the development of other skills specific to the discipline.
                                                        1   2   3   4   5
   G. the integration of a Reformed Christian worldview in the discipline.
                                                        1   2   3   4   5
   H. an appreciation for how the discipline fits into a broader liberal arts and sciences education.   1   2   3   4   5
   I. the use of learning (knowledge and skills) for the good of neighbour and to give glory to God.   1   2   3   4   5

4. Each program has a capstone course that all majors and honours majors are required to take, usually in their final year of studies. The purpose of a capstone course is to bring together the historical, philosophical, and theological foundations that underlie a discipline. If you took a capstone course, or are taking it now, please comment on the experience. Please place a check in this line if you did not take a capstone course or are not sure that you did. _____ (The capstone course for the _____ program is ABC 123.)

TEACHING:
5. The methods of instruction in the program (lectures, class discussions, labs, group-work, seminars, student presentations, etc.) were appropriate.
   1   2   3   4   5
   Comments:

6. a. The methods used to evaluate my academic work in the program were appropriate.
   1   2   3   4   5
   Comments:

   b. The evaluation of my academic work in the program was fair.
   1   2   3   4   5
   Comments:

RESOURCES:
7. The instructional resources for the program (audio-visual materials and equipment, Discovery, classroom space, lab space, studio space, practice and performance spaces, instruments, equipment, and facilities) were sufficient.
   1   2   3   4   5
   Comments:

8. The library resources for the program (books, journals, recordings, electronic databases, reference material, computer hardware and software) were sufficient.
   1   2   3   4   5
   Comments:

9. a. I was aware of the library resources available to me.
   1   2   3   4   5

   b. I was able to access the library resources.
   1   2   3   4   5
   Comments:

QUALITY INDICATORS:
   10. The overall quality of instruction in the _____ program met my expectations.
   1   2   3   4   5
   Comments:

   11. Describe the workload in the courses offered in the ____ program):
                          VERY HEAVY   HEAVY   JUST RIGHT   LIGHT   VERY LIGHT

   12. If you completed an honours thesis or an independent research course (or completed any senior research project under the supervision of a faculty member), please comment on the experience.

   13. [FOR ALUMNI WHO STARTED AT REDEEMER IN FALL 2016 OR LATER] Please comment on how well the Core program related to, supported, and/or supplemented what you were learning in the _____ program

   14. [FOR ALUMNI ONLY] Please tell us what sort of employment you found post-graduation, or if you pursued graduate studies (Master's, Ph.D.). Comment on how well your program prepared you for your current employment or for graduate studies.

QUALITY ENHANCEMENT:
   15. Identify the most valuable aspect of the education you received in the _____ program.

   16. Identify the least valuable aspect of the education you received in the _____ program.

   17. What recommendations would you make to improve the quality of the _____ program?

STUDENT ADVISING:

18. The academic advising available to me enabled me to make good academic choices.

    1   2   3   4   5

Comments:

OTHER:

19. Please comment here on any other aspect of the _____ program that you believe would be helpful for the External Review Committee to know.

Thank you for taking the time to respond to these questions about the _____ program at Redeemer University College. We sincerely appreciate your help as we carry out this review.

APPENDIX D: SAMPLE TEMPLATE FOR THE EXTERNAL REVIEWERS' REPORT

EXTERNAL REVIEWERS' REPORT ON THE _____PROGRAM(S) AT REDEEMER UNIVERSITY COLLEGE

OUTLINE OF VISIT
-The names of the members of the External Review Committee
-The names and titles of those persons who were visited
-What facilities were seen
-Any other activities that are relevant to the assessment

GENERAL OVERVIEW

Recognizing the university's autonomy to determine priorities for funding, space, and faculty allocation, please address the following:
1. Identify and commend the program's notably strong and creative attributes.
2. Describe the program's respective strengths, areas for improvement, and opportunities for enhancement.

FEEDBACK ON EVALUATION CRITERIA:

Please report on the following items, based on the questions/directions in each section.
● In each section, include any specific, actionable recommendations (cf. Item 7 of Stage 3) for improving the program based on the External Review Committee's analysis in that section, distinguishing between programmatic and institutional recommendations
● Suggestions may be given, when appropriate. Suggestions may be more detailed, but the Self-study author and the dean will not be required to make an official response to suggestions.

1. Objectives:
　　How strong and coherent is the alignment between the mission of the program(s) and RUC's mission?

2. Curriculum:
　i.　Given the resources available, is the program structure, and the courses offered, the best selection for the institution to offer?
　ii.　Is the mapping of program-level learning outcomes to RUC's UDLEs, appropriate for the type of degree program it is? Are the mappings of course-level learning outcomes to program-level learning outcomes appropriate? To help answer these questions, the External Review Committee please choose one of the six main UDLE categories and do an audit of the PLO->UDLE and the CLO->PLO mappings given in the Self-study Report.
　iii.　How appropriate are the programmatic themes used to encourage students to develop a reformed worldview? Are these themes well-integrated into the program?

iv. (If applicable:) Is any other external accreditation or official review of this program, current or proposed, appropriate for the program? Are there issues, current or possible, regarding the accreditation that may need to be considered?

3. Teaching and Assessment:

Is the program and its methods of delivery designed appropriately to address the course- and program-level learning outcomes? Are the methods of assessment appropriate to assess students' achievement of course- and program-level learning outcomes, especially in the 300- (and, where relevant, 400-) level courses in the program?

4. Resources:

i. Are the library and physical resources available appropriate for the type of program and number of students enrolled in it? Are the financial resources adequate to maintain the program?

ii. Is the program's faculty complement – especially the full-time faculty who teach more than one course in the program – well qualified to deliver the variety of courses offered in the program?

iii. Are there course-enrolment trends in the program that (may) indicate concerns or highlights for the program?

5. Admission:

Are the admission and continuance-in-program requirements to the program appropriate? Are they aligned with the learning outcomes established for completion of the program?

6. Quality Indicators:

i. Faculty (*in camera*)
   1. Are the qualifications of faculty in the program appropriate? Given RUC's faculty expectations, are the scholarly-output levels and teaching quality sufficiently high?
   2. Are the qualifications of the rest of the program's faculty complement appropriate (keeping in mind the different qualification expectations for full-time and part-time faculty)?

ii. Faculty
   1. In light of RUC's teaching mission, do part-time faculty teach an appropriate percentage and selection of the program's courses?
   2. Are there appropriate intra-faculty collaboration efforts to support program quality and student outcomes?

iii. Students
1. In light of RUC's liberal-arts-and-sciences character, do the program's matriculation and graduation rates point to possible programmatic issues (eg., lack of scaffolding, difficulty in course sequencing; courses attracting new students to transfer into the program, courses leading to students transferring out of the program; etc.)?
2. Do the average student grades, number of student awards, etc., imply any concerns about program or teaching quality?
3. Does the student and/or alumni survey indicate overall satisfaction with the program?
iv. Graduates
Are graduates of the program achieving appropriate post-graduate academic and employment outcomes?

7. Quality Enhancement:
i. Has the program undergone appropriate improvements since the last review, both through the implementation of previous review recommendations and through other means?
ii. Are plans for program enhancement proposed in the Self-study Report (if any) appropriate?

8. Student Advising and Academic Support:
Are the advising and academic support services offered appropriate and sufficient to support the program?

9. Extra-programmatic Service:
i. Are there programmatic concerns or highlights (student access in terms of over-enrolment, modifications in subject and depth of coverage, etc.) regarding the use of various courses as Local/Global Issues or Non-Western Perspectives core elective, or as electives or required courses in other programs? Explain.
ii. Are there programmatic concerns or highlights regarding faculty in the program teaching some of the required core courses? Explain.

10. Other Information and issues:
i. Please address, as appropriate, any issues raised in Section 10 of the Self-study Report.
ii. If there are other issues to report on that do not fit in other parts of the report, include them here as well.

11. Answers to Self-study Report Questions:
Please address, as appropriate, any questions raised in Section 11 of the Self-study Report.

12. *In camera* Issues:

Aside from the *in camera* faculty evaluations in Section 6, are there other issues, concerns or recommendations that you wish to raise that need to be *in camera*?

13. Recommendations for Quality Improvement:

i. Provide a summary list of *ex camera* recommendations made in the above sections of the report, in priority order, and separated into "Programmatic" and "Institutional" categories. The Self-study author and/or dean will respond to these recommendations, as described in Stage 4 of the process.

ii. Provide a summary list of any suggestions made in the above sections of the report, in priority order, and separated into "Programmatic" and "Institutional" categories.

14. Summary or Closing Remarks (Optional)

APPENDIX E: LEARNING OUTCOMES MAPPING TEMPLATES

Template 1: Mapping PLOs by UDLE (sub-) categories, with relevant course identification

Blank Template for General Majors:

UDLE pre-statement: This degree is awarded to students who have demonstrated:

PLO pre-statement: Upon graduation with a General Major in _____, a successful graduate will be able to:

Learning Outcome	100-level	200-level	300-level	400-level
Depth and Breadth of Knowledge				
A. An understanding of one of more academic disciplines set in a knowledge of the contours of Western culture, with a beginning introduction to some elements of other cultures, through the study of a broad liberal arts and science curriculum				
[PLO]	[courses]	[courses]	[courses]	[courses]
...				
[core] Demonstrate knowledge of God's unfolding story of creation, fall, redemption, and restoration and the ability to situate oneself within that story.	HUM-110 (r) HUM-120 (r)			
[core] Demonstrate an understanding of and engagement with cultural diversity.			L/G & N-W electives (r)	
B. An understanding of how the subject material in the disciplines in which they have majored has been shaped by historical forces, philosophical ideas and systems, and of religious commitments and worldviews that have shaped Western culture				
[PLO]				
...				
[core; repeat] Demonstrate knowledge of God's unfolding story of creation, fall, redemption, and restoration and the ability to situate oneself within that story.	REL-110 (r)	PHL-210 (r)		
[core] Explain the role of foundational frameworks with which students engage all learning and knowledge	REL-110 (r)	PHL-210 (r)		
C. A familiarity with a long tradition of Christian inquiry into the nature of human life with special attention to writers in the Reformed tradition from the sixteenth century to the present. Students are expected to show how their own analyses and creative productions stand in that tradition, in appreciative and critical ways				
[PLO]				
...				
[core; repeat] Demonstrate knowledge of God's unfolding story of creation, fall, redemption, and restoration and the ability to situate oneself within that story.	REL-110 (r)	PHL-210 (r)		
[core; repeat] Explain the role of foundational frameworks with which students engage all learning and knowledge	REL-110 (r)	PHL-210 (r)		
D. A general knowledge of many key concepts, methodologies, theoretical approaches, and assumptions in a discipline.				
[PLO]				
...				
[core; repeat] Explain the role of foundational frameworks with which students engage all learning and knowledge		HUM-210 (e) SSC-210 (e) SCI-210 (e)		
E. A broad understanding of some of the major fields in the discipline, including, where appropriate, from an interdisciplinary perspective				
[PLO]				
...				
[core] Draw on diverse ways of knowing and interdisciplinary perspectives and experiences.		HUM-210 (e) SSC-210 (e) SCI-210 (e)		CTS-410 (r)
F. Some detailed knowledge in an area of the discipline and the ability to do research or creative work in a field as evidence of understanding its chief contours				
[PLO]				
....				

[core] Demonstrate proficiencies in key competencies in reading, writing, speaking, critical thinking, research, and analysis.	HUM-120 (r)			
G. An ability to gather, review, evaluate, and interpret information, relevant to one or more of the major fields in a discipline				
[PLO]				
…				
H. Some creative and imaginative approaches showing critical thinking, analytical and technical skills inside and outside the discipline				
[PLO]				
…				
[core; repeat] Demonstrate proficiencies in key competencies in reading, writing, speaking, critical thinking, research, and analysis.				CTS-410 (r)
Knowledge of Methodologies: an understanding of methods of inquiry or creative activity, or both, in their primary area of study that enables students to:				
A. Begin to discern what are the philosophical and worldview assumptions imbedded in the paradigms and conceptual frameworks commonly relied on in their areas of study				
[PLO]				
…				
[core; repeat] Explain the role of foundational frameworks with which students engage all learning and knowledge		PHL-210 (r) HUM-210 (r) SSC-210 (r) SCI-210 (r)		
B. Begin to judge what are the valid insights in such paradigms and concepts and evaluate how they can be used with integrity within a Christian frame of reference				
[PLO]				
…				
[core; repeat] Explain the role of foundational frameworks with which students engage all learning and knowledge		PHL-210 (r)		
C. Develop arguments, solve problems, or create artistic works using such methods				
[PLO]				
…				
Application of Knowledge				
A. The ability to review, present, and interpret information, different types of evidence, or creative work to: (1) develop lines of argument; (2) make sound judgements that respect the data being studied and employ appropriate and responsible paradigms				
[PLO]				
…				
B. The ability to use a range of appropriate techniques to: (1) analyze information; (2) evaluate the appropriateness of different approaches to solving problems related to their area(s) of study; and (3) propose solutions				
[PLO]				
…				
[core; repeat] Demonstrate proficiencies in key competencies in reading, writing, speaking, critical thinking, research, and analysis.				CTS-410 (r)
C. The ability to make use of scholarly reviews and primary sources with a beginning sense of critical judgement of the value of the sources				
[PLO]				
…				
[core; repeat] Demonstrate proficiencies in key competencies in reading, writing, speaking, critical thinking, research, and analysis.	HUM-120 (r)			
Communication Skills: The ability to communicate accurately, reliably, and winsomely and with conviction -- orally and in writing -- to a range of audiences				

[PLO]				
...				
[core; repeat] Demonstrate proficiencies in key competencies in reading, writing, speaking, critical thinking, research, and analysis.				CTS-410 (r)

Awareness of Limits of Knowledge: An awareness of the limits of their own knowledge, and that of other humans, knowing that we see now as "through a glass darkly," balanced by a recognition of patterns of constant standards rooted in the created order that have always assured men and women that truth, right, and wrong can be discerned.
They are expected to have some awareness of postmodern theories concerning the contingency of knowledge, in the context of both the reliability of the created order, which allows one to know, and the biblical hope that the end of men and women is finally to see fully and truly in the light of God.

[PLO]				
...				
[core; repeat] Demonstrate knowledge of God's unfolding story of creation, fall, redemption, and restoration and the ability to situate oneself within that story.	REL-110 (r) CTS-110 (r) HUM-110 (r) HUM-120 (r)	HUM-210 (e) SSC-210 (e) SCI-210 (e)		
[core; repeat] Explain the role of foundational frameworks with which students engage all learning and knowledge	REL-110 (r) CTS-110 (r) HUM-110 (r) HUM-120 (r)	HUM-210 (e) SSC-210 (e) SCI-210 (e)		

Maturity and Professional Capacity

A. Qualities and transferable skills necessary for further study, employment, and community involvement in church and society, requiring
(1) the exercise of personal responsibility and decision-making in the context of membership in Christ's Church and as part of God's world; and
(2) working effectively with others

[PLO]				
....				
[core] Demonstrate in activities and assessments the development of holistic Christian character.	REL-110 (r) CTS-110 (r)			CTS-410 (r)
[core; repeat] Demonstrate proficiencies in key competencies in reading, writing, speaking, critical thinking, research, and analysis.	REL-110 (r) CTS-110 (r)			CTS-410 (r)

B. The ability to identify and address their own changing needs in a changing world and to select, in community, an appropriate program of further study

[PLO]				
...				
[Co-curricular outcomes]				

C. Behaviour consistent with academic integrity and the ethic of educated Christians, committed to using their learning and leadership in service to neighbour and to the glory of God

[PLO]				
...				
[core; repeat] Demonstrate in activities and assessments the development of holistic Christian character	CTS-110			

Blank Template for Honours Majors:

UDLE pre-statement: This degree is awarded to students who have demonstrated:

PLO pre-statement: Upon graduation with an Honours Major in _____, a successful graduate will be able to:

Learning Outcome	100-level	200-level	300-level	400-level
Depth and Breadth of Knowledge				
A. A developed understanding of one of more academic disciplines set in a deep knowledge of the history and ethos of Western culture, with knowledge of other cultures, through the study of a broad liberal arts and science curriculum				
[PLO]	[course]	[courses]	[courses]	[courses]
…				
[core] Demonstrate knowledge of God's unfolding story of creation, fall, redemption, and restoration and the ability to situate oneself within that story.	HUM-110 (r) HUM-120 (r)			
[core] Demonstrate an understanding of and engagement with cultural diversity.			L/G & N-W electives (r)	
B. A developed understanding of how the subject matter in the disciplines in which they have majored has been shaped by historical forces, philosophical ideas and systems, and of religious commitments and worldviews that have shaped Western culture				
[PLO]				
…				
[core; repeat] Demonstrate knowledge of God's unfolding story of creation, fall, redemption, and restoration and the ability to situate oneself within that story.	REL-110 (r)	PHL-210 (r)		
[core] Explain the role of foundational frameworks with which students engage all learning and knowledge.	REL-110 (r)	PHL-210 (r)		
C. A strong knowledge of a long tradition of Christian inquiry into the nature of human life with special attention to writers in the Reformed tradition from the sixteenth century to the present. Students are expected to articulate with some depth how their own analyses and creative productions stand in that tradition, in appreciative and critical ways				
[PLO]				
…				
[core; repeat] Demonstrate knowledge of God's unfolding story of creation, fall, redemption, and restoration and the ability to situate oneself within that story.	REL-110 (r)	PHL-210 (r)		
[core; repeat] Explain the role of foundational frameworks with which students engage all learning and knowledge	REL-110 (r)	PHL-210 (r)		
D. A developed knowledge and critical understanding of the key concepts, recent developments, methodologies, theoretical approaches, and assumptions in a discipline generally, as well as in a specialized area of a discipline				
[PLO]				
…				
[core; repeat] Explain the role of foundational frameworks with which students engage all learning and knowledge		HUM-210 (e) SSC-210 (e) SCI-210 (e)		
E. A developed understanding of many of the major fields in the discipline, including, where appropriate, from an interdisciplinary perspective				
[PLO]				
…				
[core] Draw on diverse ways of knowing and interdisciplinary perspectives and experiences.		HUM-210 (e) SSC-210 (e) SCI-210 (e)		CTS-410 (r)
F. A developed, detailed knowledge of a field and a level of research, writing, or creative work that suggests readiness to pursue that field beyond the undergraduate level				
[PLO]				
….				
[core] Demonstrate proficiencies in key competencies in reading, writing, speaking, critical thinking, research, and analysis.	HUM-120 (r)			

G. A developed ability to gather, review, evaluate, and interpret information, and to compare the merits of alternative hypotheses or creative options, relevant to one or more of the major fields in a discipline				
[PLO]				
...				
H. Significant creative and imaginative approaches showing critical thinking, analytical and technical skills inside and outside the discipline				
[PLO]				
...				
[core; repeat] Demonstrate proficiencies in key competencies in reading, writing, speaking, critical thinking, research, and analysis.				CTS-410 (r)
Knowledge of Methodologies: an understanding of methods of inquiry or creative activity, or both, in their primary area of study that enables students to:				
A. Discern what are the philosophical and worldview assumptions imbedded in the paradigms and conceptual frameworks commonly relied on in their areas of study and be able to articulate how theories and methodologies are shaped by worldview				
[PLO]				
...				
[core; repeat] Explain the role of foundational frameworks with which students engage all learning and knowledge		PHL-210 (r) HUM-210 (r) SSC-210 (r) SCI-210 (r)		
B. Judge what are the valid insights in such paradigms and concepts and evaluate how they can be used with integrity within a Christian frame of reference				
[PLO]				
...				
[core; repeat] Explain the role of foundational frameworks with which students engage all learning and knowledge		PHL-210 (r)		
C. In a developed way, formulate arguments, solve problems, or create artistic works using such methods, and describe and analyze current research or advanced scholarship				
[PLO]				
...				
Application of Knowledge				
A. The ability to review, present, and interpret information, different types of evidence, or creative work to: (1) develop lines of argument; (2) make sound judgements that respect the data being studied and employ appropriate and responsible paradigms; (3) refine underlying concepts, principles, and techniques of analysis, adapting them to fit the data, and to be faithful to a non-reductionistic worldview for use in and outside the discipline; and (4) where possible, use such revised paradigms or techniques to forge new understandings in the creative process				
[PLO]				
...				
B. The ability to use a range of appropriate techniques to: (1) initiate and undertake evaluation of arguments, assumptions, abstract concepts, and information; (2) propose solutions; (3) frame appropriate questions for the purpose of solving a problem; and (4) solve a problem or create new work and a new understanding				
[PLO]				
...				
[core; repeat] Demonstrate proficiencies in key competencies in reading, writing, speaking, critical thinking, research, and analysis.				CTS-410 (r)
C. Dexterity in making critical use of scholarly reviews and primary sources				
[PLO]				
...				

[core; repeat] Demonstrate proficiencies in key competencies in reading, writing, speaking, critical thinking, research, and analysis.	HUM-120 (r)			
Communication Skills: The ability to communicate information, arguments, and analyses accurately and reliably, winsomely and with conviction -- orally and in writing -- to a range of audiences				
[PLO]				
...				
[core; repeat] Demonstrate proficiencies in key competencies in reading, writing, speaking, critical thinking, research, and analysis.				CTS-410 (r)
Awareness of Limits of Knowledge: An awareness of the limits of their own knowledge, and that of other humans, knowing that we see now as "through a glass darkly," balanced by a recognition of patterns of constant standards rooted in the created order that have always assured men and women that truth, right, and wrong can be discerned. They are expected to know postmodern theories concerning the contingency of knowledge, in the context of both the reliability of the created order, which allows one to know, and the biblical hope that the end of men and women is finally to see fully and truly in the light of God.				
[PLO]				
...				
[core; repeat] Demonstrate knowledge of God's unfolding story of creation, fall, redemption, and restoration and the ability to situate oneself within that story.	REL-110 (r) CTS-110 (r) HUM-110 (r) HUM-120 (r)	HUM-210 (e) SSC-210 (e) SCI-210 (e)		
[core; repeat] Explain the role of foundational frameworks with which students engage all learning and knowledge	REL-110 (r) CTS-110 (r) HUM-110 (r) HUM-120 (r)	HUM-210 (e) SSC-210 (e) SCI-210 (e)		
Maturity and Professional Capacity				
A. Qualities and transferable skills necessary for further study, employment, and community involvement in church and society, requiring: (1) the exercise of initiative, personal responsibility, and accountability in the context of membership in Christ's Church and as part of God's world; (2) working effectively with others; and (3) decision-making and leadership in complex contexts				
[PLO]				
….				
[core] Demonstrate in activities and assessments the development of holistic Christian character.	REL-110 (r) CTS-110 (r)			CTS-410 (r)
[core; repeat] Demonstrate proficiencies in key competencies in reading, writing, speaking, critical thinking, research, and analysis.	REL-110 (r) CTS-110 (r)			CTS-410 (r)
B. The ability to identify and address their own changing needs in a changing world and to select, in community, an appropriate program of further study				
[PLO]				
...				
[Co-curricular outcomes]				
C. Behaviour consistent with academic integrity and the ethic of educated Christians, committed to using their learning and leadership in service to neighbour and to the glory of God				
[PLO]				
...				
[core; repeat] Demonstrate in activities and assessments the development of holistic Christian character	CTS-110			

APPENDIX F: FACULTY COMPLEMENT TABLE TEMPLATE

Blank Template:

Name	Highest Degree attained	Position / Rank (Department)	Courses Taught in Program(s) in last 7 years	Area of Research Specialization

Example of use:

Name	Highest Degree attained	Position / Rank (Department)	Courses Taught in Program(s) in last 7 years	Area of Research Specialization
Jane Doe	PhD, Microbiology	Assistant Professor, Full-time, Tenured (Biology)	BIO 121, 122, 231, 336, 428, 490	Microbiology (Microphage digestion)
Peter John	PhD, Ecology	Assistant Professor, Full-time, Tenure-track (Biology)	BIO 121, 122, 241, 315, 253, 490	Ecology (River and Stream Ecology)
Jody Francis	MSc, Biochemistry	Adjunct Part-time instructor (Biology)	BIO 221, 321	Biochemistry
Shannon Davis	PhD, Entomology	Laboratory Instructor, Full-time, non-tenure-track (Biology)	Labs for BIO 121, 122, 221, 231, 241, 253	Entomology
Kim Sczebalk	PhD, Philosophy	Associate Professor, Full-time, Tenure-track (Philosophy)	SCI 310, PHL 313	Asian Philosophy

APPENDIX G: REVIEW OF THE EDUCATION PROGRAM

The goals of a review of the Education programs are the same as the goals of a review of other programs. Because the Education program is a second-degree program – implying its students can already demonstrate mastery of the UDLEs – and because it is accountable to the Ontario College of Teachers, which also reviews the programs, the institutional review process will be modified.

1. Changes to the Self-study Report and the External Reviewers' Report:

    1. Section 2 (CURRICULUM), Item ii is REVISED.
        The instructions for the Self-study Report (Stage 2.4.) are:
        > Present a mapping of the Learning Outcomes for the Bachelor of Education degree "up" to the learning outcomes set out by in Schedule 1 of Regulation 347/02 of the Ontario College of Teachers Act (1996) and "down" to the most-relevant courses that address each LOBE. Evaluate coverage (both "up" and "down").

        The questions for the External Reviewers (Stage 3.6; Appendix D) are:
        > Is the mapping of the Learning Outcomes for the Bachelor of Education degree to Ontario College of Teachers Act (1996) Regulation 347/02, Schedule 1, and to the individual courses clear and complete? To help answer this question, the External Review Committee is directed to do an audit of course syllabi to verify the mapping.

    2. Section 9, Items i and iii are ELIMINATED. Items ii and iv are kept.

2. Stage 2.6.4: The Data Appendix will not include "average of all regular- (3-credit-) course grades at RUC by year and grade level."
    1. As a result, the Self-study Report (Stage 2.4) will not require consideration of comparisons of grade averages in the Education Program with the average grades throughout the university.

3. The survey sent to both students and alumni will be the same as the one used for all other program reviews (Appendix C), except for the following changes:

    1. The introductory question, "In what year did you begin your studies at Redeemer University College?" will be REVISED to "In what year did you begin your studies in the Education Program at Redeemer University College? (For concurrent students, indicate the year when you began taking primarily Education courses)".

2. Students and alumni will not be asked to identify if they completed the concurrent or consecutive education program. The only exception to this will be for the 2018/19 review, in which alumni will be asked which program they completed.

3. The survey questions 4, 12 and 13 are ELIMINATED.

4. The survey questions in 3 "The curriculum in the Education program encourages:" will have the following revisions:
   i. B. "an ability to research, create, or perform" is ELIMINATED;
   ii. C. "the development of critical-thinking skills (the ability to debate, analyze, and critique information)." is REVISED to "the development of critical-thinking skills.";
   iii. D. "the development of advanced writing skills." is REVISED to "the development of professional communication skills."
   iv. H. "an appreciation for how the discipline fits into a broader liberal arts and sciences education." is ELIMINATED.
   v. "the ability to discern and apply the Ministry of Education curriculum." is ADDED.
   vi. "the development of effective teaching knowledge and skills." is ADDED.

4. The "Student Practicum Placement Coordinator" is ADDED to the list of people the External Review Committee may choose to meet with (Stage 3. Item 4.5.v).

APPENDIX H: REVIEW OF THE CORE PROGRAM

The Core Program is a set of 10 interdisciplinary courses all B.A. and B.Sc. students are required to complete, with some exceptions for transfer students. They complement students' major and minor programs, contribute to the overall satisfaction of the UDLEs, and are intended to provide students with a broad basic understanding and integration of a Reformed worldview applied beyond their own discipline.

Students take four Core courses in their first year:

- "The Drama of Scripture", REL-110;
- "Western Culture & Tradition I and II", HUM-110 and HUM-120; and
- "Being and Knowing in the Digital Age", CTS-110.

Over the next three years, they take six more Core courses:

- "Faith and Philosophy", PHL-210 (second year);
- two of the "Understanding our World" courses, HUM-210, SSC-210, and SCI-210;
- one "Local/Global Issues" elective;
- one "Non-Western Perspectives" elective; and the
- "Core Capstone Experience", CTS-410 (fourth year).

The Core program review will be as similar to a regular program review as possible, given its special nature. The following are the modifications to the regular review process.

1. The Self-study author will be the chair of the Core Oversight Group (or its successor committee). The members of the Core Oversight Group will participate in the program-review process in the role of "Faculty members in a program" to assist in the production of the Self-study Report.
    1. If the chair of the Core Oversight Group is not a dean, then the Provost/VPA will select one of the academic deans to fill the decanal role in the IQAP process.
    2. If the chair of the Core Oversight Group is a dean, then the Provost/VPA will fill the decanal role in the IQAP process. It is understood that this will result in reporting issues when the review is considered by the AQAC, which the Provost/VPA must be sensitive to.

2. When selecting external reviewers (see Stages 1.4 and 1.5), the AQAC and the VPA may make the choice to select both external reviewers from CCCU universities, given the very small number of Universities Canada institutions with significant core programs as an integral required part of their undergraduate academic programming.

3. Changes to the Self-study Report (Stage 2.4) and the External Reviewers' Report (Stage 3.6 and Appendix D):
    1. Section 2 (CURRICULUM) is REVISED to remove any expectation that the Program-level Learning Outcomes of the Core Program are to satisfy the UDLEs on their own and to evaluate those learning outcomes based on the stated objectives of the Core Program.

The instructions for the Self-study Report (Stage 2.4.2) are:

> Include the mapping of Program-level Learning Outcomes (PLOs) "up" to the Undergraduate-degree Learning Expectations (UDLEs) and "down" to the most relevant courses that address each PLO provided in Appendix E. Evaluate the coverage (both "up" and "down") in terms of the objectives of the Core Program and explain differences between LOs for courses at different levels.

The questions for the External Reviewers (Stage 3.6.2; Appendix D.2) are:

> Is the mapping of the program-level learning outcomes to RUC's UDLEs appropriate for the objectives of Core Program? Are the mappings of course-level learning outcomes to program-level learning outcomes appropriate? To help answer these questions, the External Review Committee is directed to choose one of the six main UDLE categories and do an audit of the PLO->UDLE and the CLO->PLO mappings given in the Self-study Report.

2. Section 5 (ADMISSION) is RENAMED AND REVISED.

    The name of the Section is "ENROLMENT EXCEPTIONS."

    The Instructions for the Self-study Report (Stage 2.4.5) are:

    > Provide a list of possible exceptions and/or waivers given to students regarding the requirement to take all Core courses. Evaluate whether or not these waivers substantially hinder the students receiving the waivers from meeting the objectives of the Core Program.

    The questions for the External Reviewers (Stage 3.6.5; Appendix D.5) are:

    > Are the criteria for awarding exceptions and/or waivers to students regarding Core courses clear? Do students receiving these waivers still achieve substantially the objectives of the Core Program?

3. Section 6.i (QUALITY INDICATORS/FACULTY) is REVISED.

    Sections 6.i.1 and 6.i.2 (regarding Full-time Faculty teaching in the program) are MERGED.

    The instructions for the Self-study Report (Stage 2.4.6.i.1 and 2) are:

    > 1. Evaluate qualification, and teaching quality indicators of the faculty complement teaching in the Core Program. *Relevant Appendix data: faculty CVs, teaching evaluations.*
    > 2. Comment on the appropriateness of instructors teaching required Core courses in terms of variety of instructors and the breadth of disciplines they represent. *Relevant Appendix data: faculty and home-department listings for all Core courses.*

    The questions for the External Reviewers (Stage 3.6.6.i.; Appendix D.6.i and ii) are:

1. *(in camera)* Are the qualifications of the faculty complement teaching in the Core Program appropriate (keeping in mind the different qualification expectations for full-time and part-time faculty)?

2. Is the variety of individual instructors and the range of disciplines represented by Core-course instructors appropriate for the Core Program to achieve its objectives?

4. Section 6.ii (QUALITY INDICATORS/STUDENTS) is REVISED.

   The instruction for the Self-study Report (Stage 2.4.6.ii) is:
   Evaluate data related to grade averages for courses in the Core Program.

   The question for the External Reviewers (Stage 3.6.6.ii; Appendix D.6.iii) is:
   Do the grade averages for Core courses imply any concerns about the Core Program or teaching quality?

5. Section 6.iii (QUALITY INDICATORS/GRADUATES; Stages 2.4.6.iii and 3.6.6.iii; Appendix D.6.iv) is ELIMINATED.

6. Section 8 (STUDENT ADVISING AND ACADEMIC SUPPORT) is RENAMED AND REVISED.

   The name of the Section is "ACADEMIC SUPPORT."

   The instructions for the Self-study Report (Section 2.4.8) are:
   List the institutional academic supports. Note any concerns about how these supports affect the Core Program.

   The question for the External Reviewers (Stage 3.6.8; Appendix D.8) is:
   Are the academic support services offered appropriate and sufficient to support the Core Program?

7. Section 9 (EXTRA-PROGRAMMATIC SERVICE) RENAMED AND REVISED.
   The name of the section is "PROGRAM INTEGRATION."

   The instructions for the Self-study Report (Stage 2.4.9) are:
   i. Describe the ways in which other programs make use of required Core courses to supplement, build on, or provide scaffolding for elements in their own programs. Consideration can be made of, but does not need to be limited to, particular course content, worldview approaches, or skills development addressed in particular Core courses. Evaluate the effectiveness of this integration of Core programming into other programs. *Relevant Appendix data: applicable student and alumni survey results, including survey responses from previous program reviews related to the Core Program.*

ii. Describe the range of options for Local/Global Issues and Non-Western Perspectives electives. Comment on the effect the range of options has on students in particular major and minor programs. *Relevant Appendix data: 'home-department' information for all courses.*

The question for the External Reviewers (Stage 3.6.9; Appendix D.9) is:
i. Given Redeemer's Reformed Christian liberal-arts-and-sciences mission and the particular objectives of the Core Program, is the Core Program effectively integrated into other academic programs?

4. The Data Appendix (Stage 2.6) requirements are REVISED.
   1. Instructors names and 'home departments' will be included with the Enrolment, Course-cap, etc., data listed in Stage 2.6.4.
   2. In addition to the regular student and alumni survey responses (Stage 2.6.7), survey responses from previous program reviews (within the past 7 years) regarding the Core Program will be included, with the particular program review associated with any response comments identified.
   3. The list of Library holdings (Stage 2.6.9.ii) will refer to the required Core courses only (i.e., all the 100- and 400-level Core courses, and the PHL-/HUM-/SSC-/SCI-210 courses), not the Local/Global Issues or Non-Western Perspectives electives.
   4. The following enrolment data (Stage 2.6.10) will refer to institution-wide, non-EDU, enrolment for:
      i. matriculation rates;
      ii. number of declared majors and minors for each academic program;
      iii. number of graduates; and
      iv. percentage of students on the Deans' or Provost's Honour Lists.
   5. Data regarding graduates' post-graduation education or employment (Stage 2.6.12) will not be required.

5. The Student/Alumni Survey (Stage 2.7 and Appendix C: Student/Alumni Survey Template) is REVISED:
   1. Stage 2.7.1. is REVISED to note that eligible students to take the Student Survey are all those currently-enrolled students who have completed four or more Core courses by the Winter semester prior to the academic year of the program review, and that all graduates in the past seven years who took the current Core Program are eligible to participate in the Alumni survey.

   2. The requirement to ask about academic advising (2.7.2.vii) is ELIMINATED.

   3. In the Survey (Appendix C) wording, "Core Program" REPLACES the bare word "program" as appropriate in order to ensure students and alumni understand they are addressing the Core Program rather than the program they currently are in or from which they graduated.

4. Some survey questions (Appendix C) will be modified or eliminated:

   i. In Question 3,
      1. the phrase "in the discipline" is REMOVED from all sub-questions.
      2. Question 3.F is ELIMINATED
      3. Question 3.G is REVISED to: "the development of a Reformed Worldview in your chosen discipline."
      4. Question 3.H is REVISED to: "an appreciation for how a broad liberal-arts-and-sciences education helps you view your own discipline more fully."

   ii. Question 4 is REVISED to: "The purpose of the Core Capstone Experience is for 'students to develop a Christian perspective on global issues such as climate change, population growth, poverty, etc., and develop skills such as teamwork and communication' as they work in 'interdisciplinary groups to wrestle with these issues.' If you took this Core Capstone Experience, or are taking it now, please comment on the experience.

   iii. Question 12 is ELIMINATED.

   iv. Question 13 is REVISED to: "… what you were learning in your major program."

   v. Question 14 is REVISED to: "…. Comment on the ways in which experiences in the Core Program helped prepare you for your current employment or graduate studies."

   vi. Question 18 is ELIMINATED.