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University of Windsor Quality Assurance Processes

Cyclical Program Review Guidance for Internal Facilitators

**Introduction**

The purpose of this document is to outline the role of Internal Facilitators on the review teams in Cyclical Program Review, and to provide guidance to these internal reviewers.

Independent expert review is foundational to the [Quality Assurance process for Ontario’s universities.](https://oucqa.ca/guide/guidance-for-external-reviewers-of-existing-programs/) Thank you for participating in this essential process. The Cyclical Program Review of existing programs is the key quality assurance process aimed at assessing the quality of existing academic programs, identifying ongoing improvements to programs, and ensuring continuing relevance of the program to students and other stakeholders. For any questions, contact [iqap@uwindsor.ca](mailto:iqap@uwindsor.ca)

**Quality Assurance of Ontario’s Universities**

The Quality Council is the provincial body responsible for assuring the quality of all programs leading to degrees and graduate diplomas granted by Ontario’s publicly assisted universities. It operates at arm’s-length from both the provincial government and the universities. The Quality Council does not make decisions regarding the funding of university programs; however, the provincial government’s Ministry of Colleges and Universities (MCU) will not fund a program which has not been quality assured and approved by the Quality Council. Ontario’s universities have committed to a process to ensure the quality and continuous improvement of their academic undergraduate and graduate programs.

The degree of rigour established throughout the Quality Assurance Framework (QAF) and in particular, the Protocol for Cyclical Program Reviews plays an essential role in ensuring the ongoing improvement of existing academic programs using internationally accepted quality assurance practices.

**Role of the Internal Facilitator in Cyclical Program Review**

Internal Facilitators serve as a resource for the external reviewers with respect to the University’s academic policies and program structures. They accompany external reviewers during the site visit and attend every meeting scheduled during the visit (eg staff, students, faculty, administrators). Internal facilitator’s act as a host and a guide to the University of Windsor. They are not members of the academic program under review. The internal facilitator helps to answer external reviewer questions pertaining to Windsor’s academic policies and help to keep the reviewers focused on the elements within the scope of the review.

Internal facilitators do not assist in the writing of the External Reviewers’ Report. However, they may be asked to read through the report if requested.

The internal facilitators receive all documentation that is sent to the External Reviewers:

* Program’s Self Study document
* Faculty CVs
* Supporting documentation such as Appendices and University’s Strategic Plan

Below is the University of Windsor’s Quality Assurance Flow Chart. The section highlighted in blue under the Cyclical Program Review is your role in the process. Following the Flow Chart is a graphic outlining the Focus of IQAP Program Reviews. If you require any further information concerning your role, please do not hesitate to contact me or the IQAP office support staff.

Sincerely,



Dr. Erika D.H. Kustra

Acting Associate Vice President Academic

University of Windsor, Room 106, Assumption Hall

T: 519-253-3000 ext 2010

E: kustraed@uwindsor.ca

**Office of Quality Assurance Support Staff:**

Penny Kollar, Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP) Administrator

(519) 253-3000 x. 2114

[pkollar@uwindsor.ca](mailto:pkollar@uwindsor.ca)

Svetlana Georgieva, Graduate Administrative Services Facilitator

(519) 253-3000 x. 2104

[svetlana@uwindsor.ca](mailto:svetlana@uwindsor.ca)

**University of Windsor- Quality Assurance Flow Chart**
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Adapted *from the University of Ontario Institute of Technology Quality Assurance Handbook, 2010*

**Focus of IQAP Program Reviews**

****

***Table 5***

**University Program Review Evaluation Criteria**

**From the *Quality Assurance Framework***

|  |
| --- |
| The IQAP for review of existing undergraduate and graduate programs requires the evaluation criteria below. |
| **5.1.3.1.1 Objectives**  a) Program is consistent with the institution’s mission and academic plans. |
| **5.1.3.1.2 Program requirements**   1. Appropriateness of the program’s structure and the requirements to meet its objectives and the program-level learning outcomes; 2. Appropriateness of the program’s structure, requirements and program-level learning outcomes in meeting the institution’s own undergraduate or graduate Degree Level Expectations; 3. Appropriateness and effectiveness of the mode(s) of delivery to facilitate students’ successful completion of the program-level learning outcomes; and 4. Ways in which the curriculum addresses the current state of the discipline or area of study. |
| **5.1.3.1.3 Program requirements for graduate programs only**   1. Clear rationale for program length that ensures that students can complete the program-level learning outcomes and requirements within the time required; 2. Evidence that each graduate student in the program is required to take a minimum of two-thirds of the course requirements from among graduate level courses; and 3. For research-focused graduate programs, clear indication of the nature and suitability of the major research requirements for degree completion. |
| **5.1.3.1.4 Assessment of teaching and Learning**   1. Appropriateness and effectiveness of the methods for assessing student achievement of the program-level learning outcomes and degree level expectations; and 2. Appropriateness and effectiveness of the plans to monitor and assess:    * The overall quality of the program;    * Whether the program continues to achieve in practice its objectives;    * Whether its students are achieving the program-level learning outcomes; and    * How the resulting information will be documented and subsequently used to inform continuous program improvement. |

|  |
| --- |
| **5.1.3.1.5 Admission requirements**   1. Appropriateness of the program’s admission requirements given the program’s objectives and program-level learning outcomes; and 2. Sufficient explanation of alternative requirements, if applicable, for admission into a graduate, second-entry or   undergraduate program, e.g., minimum grade point average, additional languages or portfolios, and how the program recognizes prior work or learning experience. |
| **5.1.3.1.6 Resources\*\***  Given the program’s class sizes and cohorts as well as its program-level learning outcomes:   1. Participation of a sufficient number of qualified core faculty who are competent to teach and/or supervise in and achieve the goals of the program and foster the appropriate academic environment; 2. If applicable, discussion/explanation of the role and approximate percentage of adjunct and part-time faculty/limited term appointments used in the delivery of the program and the associated plans to ensure the sustainability of the program and quality of the student experience; 3. If required, provision of supervision of experiential learning opportunities; 4. Adequacy of the administrative unit’s utilization of existing human, physical and financial resources; and 5. Evidence that there are adequate resources to sustain the quality of scholarship and research activities produced by students, including library support, information technology support, and laboratory access. |
| **5.1.3.1.7 Resources for graduate program only\*\***  Given the program’s class sizes and cohorts, as well as its program-level learning outcomes:   1. Evidence that faculty have the recent research or professional/clinical expertise needed to foster an appropriate intellectual climate, sustain the program, and promote innovation; 2. Where appropriate to the program, evidence that financial assistance for students is sufficient to ensure adequate quality and numbers of students; and 3. Evidence of how supervisory loads are distributed, in light of qualifications and appointment status of the faculty. |
| **5.1.3.1.8 Quality indicators**   1. Evidence of the quality of the faculty (e.g., qualifications, funding, honours, awards, research, innovation and scholarly record; appropriateness of collective faculty expertise to contribute substantively to the program and commitment to student mentoring); 2. Any other evidence that the program and faculty ensure the intellectual quality of the student experience; and 3. For students: grade-level for admission, scholarly output, success rates in provincial and national scholarships, competitions, awards and commitment to professional and transferable skills, and times-to-completion and retention rates. |

\*\*In keeping with past practice and the requirement for a review of academic services that directly contribute to the quality of each program under review in the Self-Study, consideration must also be given to the appropriateness, effectiveness, and sufficiency of resources and services that directly contribute to the academic quality of programs, in particular, library resources and services, for both graduate and undergraduate programs.