

Office of the Provost Academic Unit Reviews

Guidelines

January 2007

Faculty of Arts
Faculty of Law
Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry
Faculty of Native Studies
Faculté Saint-Jean

University of Alberta Academic Unit Review Guidelines

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	2
PURPOSE	3
DEFINITIONS AND ROLES	4
CO-ORDINATION AND SUPPORT	4
TIMELINES AND SCHEDULES OF REVIEWS	5
SELF-STUDY	5
REVIEWERS.....	5
SITE VISIT	6

Appendices

APPENDIX I	TIMELINE AND SCHEDULE OF REVIEWS	8
APPENDIX II	SELF STUDY AND REPORT	9
APPENDIX III	ACADEMIC UNIT REVIEW– UNIT REVIEW TEAM TERMS OF REFERENCE	13

Executive Summary

Background

The University is committed to assuring quality in all activities inherent in its mandate. Quality assurance at the University of Alberta is a peer-review process, comprising detailed examination of elements related to the quality of teaching, research, and administration. To fulfill this commitment to quality assurance, the University of Alberta shall undertake periodic external reviews to evaluate units' programs of study and research, as well as the administrative support for these programs, whether central (i.e. reporting to the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) portfolio) or in a faculty, department, or other unit. The University has developed guidelines to facilitate these review processes.

The ultimate goal of the Academic Unit Review process is quality improvement; a transparent process to determine strengths, challenges, opportunities, and best practices for each unit and the institution as a whole. There is no expectation that the review process will have positive or negative financial impact on the unit.

For the purposes of these reviews, a unit shall be defined as a group of academic staff members and programs involved in teaching, research, and administration that can reasonably be reviewed by a group of reviewers with similar academic backgrounds. It may consist of a department or group of departments, a Faculty, or any other program delivery body.

Details

1. Academic Unit Reviews will take approximately 12 – 15 months to complete and generally will take place every five to seven years, most frequently prior to the review or selection of a dean. Reviews also may be commissioned by the Provost and Vice-President (Academic), often in conjunction with an accreditation review.
2. Academic Unit Review activities shall comprise the production a self-study report by the unit under review, a site visit team of internal and external reviewers, and the production of a final written report by the Unit Review Team.
3. Review Reports arising from the Academic Unit Reviews shall be distributed to:
 - a) The Provost and Vice-President (Academic), the Vice-President (Research), the Dean and the Unit Review Coordinating Committee, to be used to enhance long-term planning, resource allocation, and direction for program and research activities;
 - b) Relevant Department Chairs, to be used for planning and administering undergraduate and graduate programs, and as a measure to assess improvement and to set new long-term goals;
 - c) The Dean of the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research as information; and
 - d) The Lead of Unit Reviews (LUR) shall provide summary reports to GFC APC and BEAC for their information.
 - e) The Office of the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) holds the official copy of all Administrative Unit Review materials, in accordance with FOIPP regulations and retention policies.
4. Units at the University of Alberta shall continue to participate in or set procedures/timelines for:
 - a) Accreditation of professional programs: Every effort will be made to align the Academic Unit Reviews with professional accreditation reviews, as long as both mandates can be met through the accreditation review, with supplementary data and modification to the site visit as necessary;

- b) Annual review of the quality of its faculty members through the Faculty Evaluation Committee process;
- c) Ongoing student course evaluation; and
- d) Faculty and departmental curriculum reviews so as to provide information concerning the quality of curricula, programs, and course delivery/teaching.

Purpose

Academic Unit Reviews are designed to evaluate all undergraduate, professional, and graduate programs, as well as the central administrative units that support these functions within the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) portfolio at the University of Alberta. The reviews will be used to improve quality and to further innovation within the unit, as well as to help improve the administrative function of the unit. Faculties, departments, and the central administrative units that report to the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) will be guided by procedures established specifically for those units. Unlike accreditation reviews, this process is not intended to result in a decision to continue or discontinue a program or activity.

Academic Unit Reviews are designed to assess the quality of and contribution to excellence in the unit's:

1. Undergraduate, professional, and graduate academic programs;
2. Research;
3. Administration and infrastructure;
4. Citizenship and service.

This assessment parallels the University's four-year Academic Plan. The assurance of quality is a theme endorsed by Alberta Advanced Education and is a requirement of the Campus Alberta Quality Council.

The evaluation should be based in part on written material and include independent input from administrators, students, and faculty. The review's primary activities are a self-study report, a site visit by a team of internal and external reviewers, and a final report written by the reviewers.

Definitions and Roles

Unit¹: A group of academic staff members and programs involved in teaching, research, and administration that can reasonably be reviewed by a group of reviewers with similar academic backgrounds. It may consist of a department or group of departments, a Faculty, or any other program delivery body.

Dean: The Dean of the Faculty most affected is involved in the key planning and reporting meetings.

Department Chair: The Chair of the department whose staff and programs are being reviewed. The role of the Chair will vary according to the unit under review.

Head of Unit: A person other than a Dean or Chair who directs or manages a unit (i.e. the Director of the Centre for Neuroscience). The role of the Head of Unit will vary according to the unit under review.

Unit Designate: A senior academic staff member from the unit who coordinates the unit's input and clerical support. The Unit Designate is determined at the Review Planning Meeting (see Appendix I).

Unit Review Coordinating Committee (URCC): A standing committee of senior academic staff members recognized for teaching and research excellence as well as significant contributions to post-secondary administration. The URCC shall be struck by the Provost and shall be responsible for high-level oversight of the Academic Unit Review process.

Lead of Unit Reviews (LUR): The LUR is the Deputy Provost, who is charged with the responsibility of administering Academic Unit Reviews.

Unit Review Coordinator (URC): The URC is a full-time senior staff member from the Office of the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) primarily dedicated to providing support to the LUR and to the units under review. He/she coordinates the resources necessary to have the reviews completed in a timely and accurate fashion.

Unit Review Team (URT): The Unit Review Team is comprised of University of Alberta academics and external (national and international) academics. The role of the URT is defined throughout this document.

¹ The definition of each unit and the timing of the reviews will be determined in consultation with the Provost and Vice-President (Academic). The units will be departments in some cases, but the Provost's Office, the Faculty, and URCC will decide jointly at the beginning of each round of reviews whether some or all departments within a Faculty can be reviewed together, how to review undergraduate programs that are housed outside departments, as well as those housed outside the traditional Faculty structure, and how to assess interdisciplinary programs. Normally, all units in a Faculty will be reviewed within a short time period so that an overall evaluation of the Faculty can be determined. Recently completed accreditation reviews and graduate program reviews shall inform the Academic Unit Reviews in the first years of this undertaking. The primary timing factors are accreditation review schedules and Dean selection and review periods.

Co-ordination and Support

1. Academic Unit Reviews are funded and coordinated by the Office of the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) under the direction of the LUR.
2. The URC will liaise with the units, supervise the arrangement of travel plans, provide data needed for the review, produce letters and payment documents, book pre- and post-review meetings, arrange the review schedule, and conduct follow-up.

Timelines and Schedules of Reviews

1. The attached timeline (see Appendix I) will follow the cycle determined at the beginning of each round of reviews (see Purpose). Normally, review processes will begin in January and September.

Self-Study

1. The self-study gives the unit an opportunity to provide evidence of its success and to identify areas of challenge. It is a presentation of how the unit sees its programs within the framework of the Academic Plan. The study should make reference to the unit's contributions to the University's Academic Plan.
2. One unbound, single-sided copy of the Self-Study Report, Appendices, and any additional information the unit wishes provided to the URT is kept on file by the URC, along with one complete electronic copy in PDF format. It is anticipated that the Self-Study Report will not exceed 25 pages, excluding appendices.

Appendix II of this handbook comprises the required elements the self-study.

Reviewers

1. The importance of excellent external reviewers cannot be overestimated. A reviewer with excellent academic qualifications and research credentials who is at arm's length to the unit is essential.
2. The unit submits to the URC, through the Dean, the names, addresses, email addresses, and telephone numbers of 3-5 potential reviewers in each category (international, national, and internal) with an outline of their experience, qualifications, and curriculum vitae (if available). Units must provide a brief rationale for their selections and rank the nominees in each category. Sufficient information is frequently available on websites. **Units are not to contact potential reviewers.** Any relationship between proposed reviewers and members of the Faculty and unit (e.g., co-authorship, former student or advisors, external examiners, etc.) must be disclosed. This information is critical to enabling the URCC to make informed decisions about proposed reviewers.
3. Should additional reviewers be required due to inter-institutional or inter-Faculty programs, additional names should be submitted.

4. The LUR (in consultation with the URCC) reviews the Dean's suggested list of reviewers and may propose additional names. The LUR then recommends a list of reviewers to the Provost (who consults with the President and the Vice-President (Research)). Before reviewers are contacted, the Dean will be provided an opportunity to veto, with explanation, anyone on the list who may be deemed inappropriate.
5. The Unit Review Team shall comprise:
 - a) 1-2 members internal to University of Alberta and familiar with the unit's discipline(s), but external to and at arm's length from the unit; and
 - b) 2-4 members external to the University of Alberta, all of whom are internationally recognized within relevant discipline(s). Normally, these reviewers would be from Canada or the US, however may be from elsewhere if travel and costs are reasonable.
6. Review dates will be arranged in consultation with the Provost and Vice-President (Academic), the Deputy Provost (LUR), and Dean. The Chair and Unit Designate must also be available throughout the site visit.
7. The LUR will contact the prospective reviewers initially to confirm participation and a timeframe. The URC will then contact each reviewer to determine specific site visit dates, make detailed arrangements, and advise the unit of those arrangements.
8. The URC organizes the Unit Review Team's travel, accommodation, and honoraria. Communication with the Unit Review Team should be done through the Unit Review Coordinator.
9. During the review process, members of the unit must make every effort to ensure the objectivity of the review. Members of the Unit Review Team will not be asked to provide presentations, seminars or performances while at the University of Alberta for the purpose of participating in the review.

Information Package for Reviewers

1. The materials are compiled and distributed on CD and USB key (and in hard copy as necessary), with all reviewers receiving the full package of information. The package shall include:
 - a) The Review Team Terms of Reference;
 - b) The Self-Study Report and Appendices, which will include:
 - o Abbreviated curricula vitae of all continuing academic staff;
 - o Relevant calendar excerpts and Unit brochures and materials;
 - o Course materials;
 - o Web addresses for course outlines and materials;
 - o Instructor Designed Questionnaires and other evaluations;
 - c) A site visit schedule;
 - d) A copy of the current Academic Plan.
2. The reviewers meet as a group at the beginning and end of each day but coordinate subgroups to evaluate undergraduate and graduate programs (curriculum and delivery) research context, and administrative structures. The URT might divide into various subgroups throughout the visit.

Site Visit

1. Costs incurred by the site visit (travel, accommodations, meals, honoraria) will be paid by the Office of the Provost. It is expected that costs will be reasonable (i.e. economy class airfare). Special requests/ considerations will require prior approval by the LUR.
2. The Dean, Chair(s) and Unit Designate must be available during the site visit.
3. On the evening prior to the beginning of the review, a dinner meeting will be held to provide an opportunity for the Provost, the LUR, and the URC to meet the Unit Review Team and to provide information about the purpose and structure of the Review and the roles of the participants. Arrangements for the dinner will be made by the URC.
4. The Unit Designate should be available to meet with the Unit Review Team throughout the site visit as needed. The URT should have a tour of the Faculty and unit and all of its facilities and should meet with the following representatives of the unit and the University:
 - a) Faculty members;
 - b) Postdoctoral fellows;
 - c) Graduate students;
 - d) Undergraduate students;
 - e) Support and administrative staff; and
 - f) Others as appropriate (including technicians, etc.);
 - g) External and community stakeholders.
5. To facilitate discussion, meetings with faculty members can be grouped as appropriate (i.e. junior and senior faculty members or sub-disciplines within the unit). Meetings with students can likewise be grouped by undergraduate, Master's students, incoming doctoral students, outgoing doctoral students, or sub-disciplines within the unit.
6. Although the unit is hosting the Unit Review Team, the reviewers should operate independently during the visit, other than at scheduled meetings. Lunches should be working lunches (i.e., meetings with students or discussion time for the Unit Review Team). The unit is responsible for making arrangements for food, snacks, etc. The Unit Review Team should have a private dinner, arranged by the URC. Costs will be covered by the Office of the Provost.
7. At the end of the final day, the URT will meet with the Provost, Vice-President (Research), the Dean, LUR and URC to discuss the process and present an initial report.

The Review Team Report

1. Review Reports arising from the Academic Unit Reviews shall be distributed by the URC to:
 - a) The Provost and Vice-President (Academic), the Vice-President (Research), the Dean and the Unit Review Coordinating Committee, to be used to enhance long-term planning, resource allocation, and direction for program and research activities;
 - b) Relevant Department Chairs, to be used for planning and administering undergraduate and graduate programs and as a measure to assess improvement and to set new long-term goals; and
 - c) The Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research as information.
2. The Dean will have two weeks to comment on the Review Report of the URT, commencing the date of receipt of the report.
3. The LUR will provide a summary of the Review Report to GFC APC and BEAC for their information.

Appendix I Timeline and Schedule of Reviews

As each Academic Unit Review will be unique, the following outline provides guidelines for task completion on a quarterly basis.

1st Quarter (i.e. January – March)

- Provost and/or LUR and URC meet with Dean (or Head of Unit) to initiate the review process. This meeting will provide an initial opportunity to review roles, responsibilities, process, requirements, documentation, concerns, timelines, and self-study questions and methods. (In planning, consider that the Self-Study Report must be completed by the end of the 3rd quarter.)
- LUR and URC determine potential site visit dates, based on availability of the Provost, LUR, LRC, and Dean (or Head of Unit).
- The unit proposes reviewers to the LUR, and as requested, the URC provides statistical data gathered from the Office of the Registrar and Student Awards, Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research (FGSR), Vice-President (Research), Resource Planning, and other appropriate sources.
- URT membership is approved, invited, and confirmed.

2nd Quarter (i.e. April – June)

- LUR, URC, and Unit Designate determine details, including site visit schedule.
- The unit submits its draft Self-Study Report to the LUR through the URC.
- The unit considers changes based on the Self-Study Report findings.

3rd Quarter (i.e. July – September)

- The LUR reviews and comments upon the Draft Self-Study Report and the changes being made based on the findings, including the Unit's plans to address outstanding issues.

4th Quarter (i.e. October – December)

- The unit submits its final Self-Study Report to the LUR, which includes changes made to the unit following the draft version, as well as recommendations regarding other outstanding issues.

5th Quarter (i.e. January – March)

- The visiting Unit Review Team is on site for two full days (0800 – 2000 hrs). Normally, there is a short introductory and organizational dinner meeting the evening prior.
- Submission of the Site Visit Report and expense claims of reviewers to the URC.
- The Dean or Head of Unit responds to the Site Visit Report.

6th Quarter (i.e. April – June)

- The Unit Review Coordinating Committee meets to develop an overall evaluation of the review process for the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) and the Vice-President (Research).
- The LUR and URC meet the Unit Designate to discuss the review process and ask each member of the Unit Review Team to respond to a questionnaire; LUR and URC prepare a Review Process Report.
- The Provost and V-P (A), the V-P (R) and the LUR meet with the Dean and Chairs to discuss the Report and the Committee's evaluation; the Dean of FGSR will also be involved as appropriate.
- Should the Provost and V-P (A) determine that a partial or complete review is necessary prior to the next round of reviews to address significant concerns, those expectations are communicated to the unit and the LUR.

Appendix II Self-Study Report

The Self-Study Report gives the unit the opportunity to provide evidence of its successes and challenges. It is an evaluation of the unit's undergraduate, graduate, and research programs as well as administrative support within the framework of the Academic Unit Review Terms of Reference (see Appendix III).

General points

1. The Self-Study Report should make reference to the unit's contributions to the University's Academic Plan.
2. The review will consider the previous five years, at minimum.
3. Strategic Analysis, the Office of the Registrar and Student Awards, Financial Services, the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, and the Office of the Vice-President (Research) will provide much of the historical data and statistics. The URC will compile this data and provide it to the unit.
4. The unit will incorporate information into the report where it sees fit.
5. Units shall identify their vision, mission, values, and core activities and describe how they effectively contribute to academic and research excellence. They shall suggest initiatives that would further enhance this culture of excellence. Units shall offer balanced and critical reviews of strengths and weaknesses, in which they include the perspectives and comments of faculty, staff, students, alumni, and employers.

Guidelines for Self-Study Reports

These guidelines are not intended to be prescriptive, not all points are applicable to all units. Units may choose to add supplementary information. The Site Visit Terms of Reference (Appendix III) should also be consulted in preparation for the review.

Reports shall address the following topics:

1. Introduction
 - a) Date unit or program was established.
 - b) Goals of the unit and its relationship to Faculty and University goals (contributions to the Academic Plan), defining characteristics, priority activities, internationalization and exchange activities.
 - c) Benchmark assessment compared to peer institutions of undergraduate and graduate:
 - i) Demand for programs;
 - ii) Research;
 - iii) Teaching.
 - d) Summary of most recent unit review or accreditation, where applicable – main findings, conclusions and recommendations, and actions taken.
 - e) Process used to prepare the self-study, including roles of students, alumni, and staff. (Note: Student perspectives should be incorporated by using a mix of methods for consultation, such as a survey, focus groups, student representation on the team preparing the Self-Study Report and/or students reviewing the draft report.)
2. Unit Organization and Human Resources
 - a) Administrative Organization (Include a current organizational chart)
 - i) Administrative positions.

- ii) Reporting structures, including support staff: It may be desirable to include the structure of some of the associated units and emphasize the research of those units within the Research section.
 - iii) Terms of Reference for the Faculty's FEC are to be included.
- b) Human Resources
- i) Number and type of full-time, part-time, and adjunct appointments (including support staff).
 - ii) Current faculty members and credentials (include the curriculum vitae of each full-time Board-appointed faculty member in Appendix A). CVs need not conform to a specific format but should be consistent². The CVs should cover the 5-year period of the review.
 - iii) Impact of budget changes (this could be analytical, for example, showing the change in the number of faculty, or the change in faculty to staff or student ratios over time; or anecdotal, i.e. providing an explanation about areas of expertise lost or gained).
 - iv) Faculty demographic profile, including recruitment and retention.
 - v) Complement planning: recruitment and succession planning.
 - vi) Workload (include undergraduate and graduate teaching load and numbers of Master's and doctoral students supervised).
 - vii) Technical support staff – profile and budget implications.
 - viii) Other support staff – profile and budget implications.
3. Research and Scholarly Activity
- a) Areas of specialization and strength.
 - b) Research funding: value of awards and sources for faculty and students.
 - c) Research groups and associated research units.
 - d) Roles and numbers of postdoctoral fellows.
 - e) Awards, honours, and recognition for faculty, staff, and students (undergraduate and graduate).
 - f) Connections between research and teaching.
 - g) Other indicators of research and scholarly activity (i.e. peer-reviewed publications).
 - h) Descriptions of interdisciplinary collaborations.
4. Teaching Activity (Undergraduate): All of the following may not be required but may need separate headings or to be combined within other sections of the Self-Study Report:
- a) Programs offered (general, honours, joint, certificates, diplomas, options, and majors). A program flowchart may provide valuable clarification.
 - b) Regular programs, interdisciplinary programs, distance education, and internships (co-operative programs, practica, etc.).
 - c) Relationship of curriculum to department goals, discipline preparation, preparation for post-university activity.
 - d) Innovation and enrichments in program (e.g., internationalization, student exchanges, sponsored lecture series).
 - e) Courses provided for students outside the unit (service teaching) and the impacts of offering these courses.
 - f) Cooperation with other units, faculties, universities and colleges. Where appropriate, this would include the unit's role in faculty-wide activities/programs.

² The information in this CV is requested under the authority of Section 33(c) of the Alberta Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act for the purposes of conducting the Academic Unit Review of a specific unit. This information will be used as part of the overall assessment of the unit and may be disclosed to internal and external bodies as part of the review process.

- g) Student demand and enrolment in courses; Program applications, enrolment and graduation patterns over the previous five years.
 - h) Student advising.
 - i) Indicators of teaching and program quality, including input from students and recent graduates.
5. Teaching Activity (Graduate): All of the following may not be required but may need separate headings or to be combined within other sections of the Self-Study Report:
- a) Programs offered (course-based and thesis-based Master's, doctoral);
 - b) Relationship of the curriculum to unit goals and preparation for post-university activity;
 - c) Innovations and enrichments in programs;
 - d) Cooperation with other units, faculties, universities and colleges;
 - e) Student demand and enrolment in courses; application, enrolment, and graduation patterns over the previous five years;
 - f) Indicators of teaching and program quality, including input from students and recent graduates.
6. Continuing Education/Post Degree Continuous Learning
- a) Programs offered;
 - b) Relationship of curriculum to unit goals;
 - c) Enrolment patterns over previous five years;
 - d) Indicators of teaching and program quality including input from students and recent graduates.
7. Student Information³
- a) Number of full- and part-time students in undergraduate and graduate programs;
 - b) Academic quality of students when accepted into programs;
 - c) Entrance scholarships;
 - d) Scholarships and other awards earned by students after entering programs, both internal and external to the unit;
 - e) Attrition from, and retention in, programs;
 - f) Time to graduation (within the framework of each program);
 - g) Demographics of entering students;
 - h) Student involvement in the unit;
 - i) Post-graduation activities of students (e.g. students proceeding to further study);
 - j) Employment of graduates;
 - k) Graduates' performance on standardized examinations.
8. Professional and Community Service, related to discipline or professional activities
- a) The details for this section may be covered in the faculty CVs. If so, the unit may choose to highlight and summarize these items and refer to the CVs for details.
 - b) Service to professional or disciplinary associations, such as elected officers, journal editors, associate editors, member of editorial boards.
 - c) Service as invited reviewers or committee members for national and international research competitions.
 - d) Service to other units or research centres at other universities (may require greater description and explanation than a reference to the CVs because it has the potential for significant impact on undergraduate programs).
 - e) Connections among the profession, the community, and teaching (if appropriate).

³ In accordance with FOIPP regulations, any and all student records containing personal information must be presented in such a way as to ensure non-disclosure of any personal identifiers except where the record forms part of public knowledge.

9. Financial Support

The main purpose of this section is to indicate the level of support provided by the operating budget and to allow the unit an opportunity to highlight support from alumni and external sponsors. This is the appropriate section to indicate any challenges with infrastructure funding and initiatives taken with new funding. The unit may choose to discuss use of discretionary monies and the impact on the unit.

- a) Change in operating funds over time (impact on undergraduate and graduate education and research);
- b) External sources;
- c) Scholarships, teaching and research assistantships provided by the unit.

10. Physical Resources

- a) Laboratory equipment, computers, etc.;
- b) Library resources;
- c) Space: faculty and staff offices, TA and RA offices, teaching space, project space, social space;
- d) Facilities and equipment shared with other units, departments, faculties and universities.

11. Five-Year Plan

- a) Initiatives and activities for the next five years, with reference to unit goals and the Academic Plan. SWOT analysis (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats) may be incorporated here.
- b) Cooperation with other units, departments, faculties, universities and colleges.

12. Additional Issues

Material not addressed in any of the above headings.

Appendices

Appendix A Curricula vitae of full-time faculty members

Appendix B Unit's Academic Plan Submission

Appendix III Academic Unit Review – Unit Review Team Terms of Reference

Academic Unit Reviews are periodic external reviews that evaluate units' programs of study and research, service, as well as the administrative support for these programs and activities whether central (i.e. reporting to the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) portfolio) or in the Faculty, department or other unit.

Academic Unit Review activities shall comprise the production a Self-Study Report by the unit under review, a site visit by a team of internal and external reviewers, and the production by the Unit Review Team of a final written report, submitted to the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) within eight weeks of the site visit. The evaluation of the Academic Unit by the URT shall be based on information gathered from the Self-Study Report and site visit, which may include information from interviews, input from students, faculty and other staff, data and statistics, and other pertinent information.

The Unit Review Team is asked to address the following issues in their Academic Unit Review Report:

Undergraduate Programs

1. Provide an assessment of the health and vitality of the unit's programs. What are their strengths and weaknesses? What is your assessment of the progress of undergraduate programs according to the unit's current academic plan?
2. How are the programs fulfilling an important mandate? How should their goals be narrowed or broadened?
3. Explain how the programs attract high quality students and monitor their progress effectively. How long are students taking to complete their degrees? Is this an appropriate length of time? What are the reasons for not completing? What is the quality of the undergraduate student experience?
4. Do the programs provide sufficient intellectual challenge and learning or training to justify the degree? Is there adequate breadth and depth? What measures are in place to determine and ensure that this standard is maintained?
5. Are graduates from the programs well-prepared for and able to find appropriate placements (employment, graduate school, etc.)? Do the numbers of students in the programs achieve a balance between the requirements of future placements and academic standards for entrance into the programs? Explain.

Graduate Programs

1. Provide an assessment of the health and vitality of the programs. What are their strengths and weaknesses? What is your assessment of the unit's academic plan as it relates to graduate programs in relation to their current position?
2. How should program goals be adjusted to fulfill an important mandate?
3. How do the programs compare to similar programs nationally and internationally? How do the programs compare to related programs on campus? Be as specific as possible.
4. Is the quality of supervision of graduate students sufficient to be commensurate with an excellent program? What leads you to that conclusion?
5. How do the programs attract high quality students and monitor their progress effectively? Are students taking an appropriate length of time to complete their degrees? What are the reasons for not completing? What is the quality of the graduate student experience?

6. Do the programs provide sufficient intellectual challenge and learning or training to justify the degrees offered? Is there adequate breadth and depth?
7. How do the programs (e.g. Master's) provide adequate, high quality clinical placements (as appropriate) to enable students to become clinically competent?

Postdoctoral Fellows

1. Does the unit attract the numbers and calibre of Postdoctoral Fellows appropriate to a unit of this kind at an excellent university? Does the unit provide them with a high quality experience? Are the postdoctoral fellows provided with mentoring commensurate with an excellent unit? Explain your conclusion.

Research

1. Comment on the research culture of the unit, referring to such topics as infrastructure in support of research, opportunity for growth and development of junior research colleagues through contact with the broader campus research community, distinguished lecturers, artists, and visitors.
2. How does the unit identify and support academic staff members who are mentoring junior researchers (PhD students, PDFs) in the unit?
3. How does the unit enable its graduate students to take responsibility for developing their initiative and independence in research and how does it assess the impact of its strategy?
4. Does the research done by the unit have a significant impact commensurate with the size of the unit? Note that the measures of excellence of faculty members with respect to awards, funding/publications and the ability to attract competitively funded trainees should be outlined here.
5. Is there an appropriate balance among the activities of teaching, research, and service? How does this balance translate into expectations for trainee development in these areas?
6. Are Postdoctoral Fellows provided with sufficient opportunities to develop their professional skills and their independence and responsibility as researchers? Is the approach innovative?

Integration of Teaching and Research

1. How does the unit (e.g. department) actively integrate research experiences into the undergraduate curriculum? Please give examples.
2. Do graduate and undergraduate teaching inform research in the unit? How does the activity of trainees, in the context of teaching, contribute to the development of progress in research in the unit? Please give examples.

The Unit

1. What measures are used to determine the excellence of the faculty and the range of their expertise adequate to provide intellectual leadership and challenge at all levels of program?
2. Describe the adequacy of the facilities, space, and other resources to support the programs.
3. Comment on the numbers of students in the various programs. Do the programs have an appropriate balance of students, for example, in the numbers of undergraduate, honours, Master's, and doctoral students (where relevant); Canadian and international students?
4. What unit resources are necessary to provide service courses/programs to other units? How is the unit compensated? Is the current arrangement most appropriate? What measures are in place to ensure that all faculty and students are satisfied with the quality of the courses/programs?

5. Provide recommendations for improving the programs and other brief comments as appropriate. What redirection of available resources, or new resources, would be required to significantly improve the unit's undergraduate, graduate, and research programs?
6. Describe the adequacy the administrative support.
7. What criteria should be considered for comparison with international ratings?

Administration

1. How does the organizational structure meet the needs of the unit?
2. Are administrative roles defined with clear accountabilities?
3. Does the administrative structure provide sufficient support to the unit?
4. Other comments or concerns.

Citizenship and Service

1. How does the unit (as a whole or by individual members) contribute to the larger University community?
2. How does the unit (as a whole or by individual members) contribute to the community beyond the University?
3. Based on input from alumni, employers, community members, what is the profile of the unit beyond the institution? How do the unit and/or its members add value to external stakeholders?