UTQAP Template

Cyclical Review: Self-Study

**Framework for UTQAP reviews:**

UTQAP processes support a structured approach for creating, reflecting on, assessing and developing plans to change and improve academic programs and units in the context of institutional and divisional commitments and priorities.

The University of Toronto (U of T), in its [Statement of Institutional Purpose](https://governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/secretariat/policies/institutional-purpose-statement-october-15-1992) (1992), articulates its mission as a commitment "to being an internationally significant research university, with undergraduate, graduate, and professional programs of excellent quality." Thus “quality assurance through assessment of new program proposals and review of academic programs and units in which they reside is a priority for the University…:

The quality of the scholarship of the faculty, and the degree to which that scholarship is brought to bear in teaching are the foundations of academic excellence. More generally, all of the factors that contribute to collegial and scholarly life — academic and administrative complement, research and scholarly activity, infrastructure, governance, etc. — bear on the quality of academic programs and the broad educational experience of students. ([Policy for Approval and Review of Academic Programs and Units](https://governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/secretariat/policies/academic-programs-and-units-policy-approval-and-review-june-24-2010) (2010))

The University’s approach to quality assurance is built on two primary indicators of academic excellence: the quality of the scholarship and research of faculty; and the success with which that scholarship and research is brought to bear on the achievement of Degree Level Expectations. These indicators are assessed by determining how our scholarship, research and programs compare to those of our international peer institutions and how well our programs meet their Degree Level Expectations.

Reviews provide the opportunity to celebrate successes, identify areas where we can do better and vigorously pursue improvements.

**Self-Study:**

The self-study is a broad-based, reflective and forward-looking report that includes critical self-analysis. It is an assessment of the strengths and challenges facing the program(s) and/or unit, the range of its activities and the nature of its future plans. The self-study should address the terms of reference, including the program evaluation criteria, as these will be provided to the external reviewers and will form the basis of their assessment.

|  |
| --- |
| Issues that are addressed through existing, specific University procedures are considered **out of scope** for UTQAP reviews (e.g., individual Human Resources issues, specific health and safety concerns). **Any such issues raised at any point during a review process** (self-study, site visit, review report) **must immediately be brought to the attention of the commissioning officer and routed through appropriate University channels for resolution.** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Program(s) under review: | Commissioning officer to insert as they appear on the schedule of reviews |
| Division/unit under review OR division/unit in which program(s) is housed:Please select one of the above options and delete the other; i.e., if only the program is being reviewed and not the division/unit, then use the “division/unit in which program(s) is housed” | Commissioning officer to insert as they appear on the schedule of reviews |
| Commissioning officer: |  |
| Date of scheduled review: |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Template Instructions:** This self-study template has been designed to be customized to accommodate Provostial reviews of divisions (and the programs they offer) as well as Decanal Reviews of units and their programs. Commissioning officers may adjust the template to reflect enlarged or enhanced criteria that meet the needs of the disciplines.Clearly mark the self-study as “Confidential” if it is not to be made publicly available. If the intent is to broadly distribute the self-study and post it online, ensure that no confidential material is contained within it, including any confidential data provided in support of the self-study process. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Guidance to those engaged in the self-study process:*** The process of preparing a self-study must involve faculty, [students](https://oucqa.ca/guide/involving-students-in-quality-assurance-processes/) and staff.
* Throughout the self-study, reflections on individual prompts should be supported by appropriate evidence. This may include:
	+ - References to discussions/focus groups/interviews/surveys of faculty, students, staff and relevant others
	+ The self-study is one way of meeting the **requirement for professional programs** to make“the views of employers and professional associations, solicited by the unit/program” available to the external reviewers(the commissioning officer may choose, instead or in addition, to make these views available through the site visit meeting(s))
		- Standardized data (as provided by the [UTQAP data package](https://utoronto.sharepoint.com/sites/dvpp/vpap/SitePages/Standardized-Data-Sets.aspx?xsdata=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&sdata=eEY0UmlleXFiOFRPQnV1cmYzRjZUa0VHMGFsNm95VXVEbWpFbTAwNGs1dz0%3D&ovuser=78aac226-2f03-4b4d-9037-b46d56c55210%2Cdavid.lock%40utoronto.ca&OR=Teams-HL&CT=1678475526052&clickparams=eyJBcHBOYW1lIjoiVGVhbXMtRGVza3RvcCIsIkFwcFZlcnNpb24iOiIyNy8yMzAyMDUwMTQyMSIsIkhhc0ZlZGVyYXRlZFVzZXIiOmZhbHNlfQ%3D%3D) and any data supplied by the Dean’s Office)
		- Supplementary data (as appropriate for the discipline(s))
		- Measures of performance, including applicable provincial, national and professional standards (where available)
* When using qualitative or quantitative data, please provide a notation of the source
* Many of the prompts within the self-study require reflection on how a particular aspect of the program relates back to program objectives, program learning outcomes and degree level expectations. Consider articulating program objectives/PLOs/DLEs once and then referring to them throughout the document. While a table or grid or formal curriculum map might work in some disciplines; others might prefer a narrative description. The [Office of the Vice-Provost, Innovations in Undergraduate Education](https://www.viceprovostundergrad.utoronto.ca/strategic-priorities/curriculum-development/curriculum-development-consultation/) can provide advice and examples for both undergraduate and graduate programs. Articulating program learning outcomes (or program objectives, or producing a curriculum map) is not an end in itself — it is meant to create a common starting point for reflection on each program, both individually and as the program relates to others that are part of academic unit or group of programs under review.

**See also:** the Ontario Quality Council’s [summary of self-study best practices](https://oucqa.ca/guide/creating-an-effective-self-study/). |

# Cover Sheet

|  |
| --- |
| As Commissioning Officer, I have reviewed and approved the self-study and confirm that it addresses:* The terms of reference, including, for each discrete program that is part of the review, the evaluation criteria and quality indicators identified in UTQAP 6.7.2
* Program-related data and measures of performance, including applicable provincial, national and professional standards (where available), with a notation of all relevant data sources
* How concerns and recommendations raised in previous reviews have been addressed, especially those detailed in the Final Assessment Report and Implementation Plan and subsequent monitoring reports from the previous Cyclical Review of the program
* For the first Cyclical Review of a new program, the steps taken to address any issues or items flagged in the monitoring report for follow-up, and/or items identified for follow-up by the Quality Council in its approval letter
* Areas that the program’s faculty, staff and/or students have identified through the conduct of the self-study as: requiring improvement; holding promise for enhancement and/or opportunities for curricular change
* The adequacy of all relevant [academic services](https://oucqa.ca/framework/definitions/) that directly contribute to the academic quality of each program under review

I confirm that:* The self-study describes in detail the participation of program faculty, staff and students in the self-study and how their views have been obtained and taken into account

I have identified the reports and information to be provided to the Review Committee in advance of the site visit, and confirm that the following core items will be provided:* Terms of reference
* Self-study
* Previous review report, administrative response(s), and Final Assessment Report and Implementation Plan
* Any non-University commissioned reviews (e.g., for professional accreditation) completed since the last review of the unit and/or program
* Any documents required to provide context for the evaluation of “Program objectives and key features” (e.g., institutional or divisional plans, reports or policy statements that articulate priorities or commitments)
* The site visit schedule
* Access to all course descriptions
* Access to the curricula vitae of faculty
* (In the case of professional programs): the views of employers and professional associations solicited by the unit/program and made available to the Review Committee. (Note: the Commissioning Officer may instead/in addition provide these during the site visit.)
 |
| Commissioning Officer\*: [insert name] | Signoff Date: [insert date] |

\*The Dean is normally the Commissioning Officer for reviews of programs and units in departmentalized divisions; the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs is the Commissioning Officer for reviews of Faculties/Divisions with or without their programs.
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# Introduction

## Context

Please provide the broad context necessary to ensure readers can make sense of subsequent sections.

|  |
| --- |
| Suggested elements:* A brief statement of the current academic plan and priorities of the academic unit, in [the context of the division’s and the University’s plans/priorities/commitments](https://utoronto.sharepoint.com/sites/dvpp/vpap/SitePages/UTQAP-Guidance.aspx#mission%2C-academic-plan%2C-priorities%2C-commitments).
* Any history or special context for the academic unit and/or individual programs that will help readers understand the contents of the self-study
* A **brief** introduction to the program(s) that are part of the review according to the Terms of Reference, focused on the program vision/mission and [program objectives](https://utoronto.sharepoint.com/sites/dvpp/vpap/SitePages/UTQAP-Guidance.aspx#what-are-program-objectives) (grouped if objectives apply to more than one program)
* Basic indicators/data that provide context for the self-study (e.g., key facts and figures such as # of faculty, students, staff, etc.)

Recommended:provide links to key websites (e.g., department, division, [U of T Quick Facts](https://www.utoronto.ca/about-u-of-t/quick-facts), etc.) |

## Self-Study Participation

Please provide a detailed description of the involvement of program faculty, staff and students in the self-study and how their views have been obtained and taken into account. If the input of others deemed to be relevant and useful has been sought, please describe in this section (e.g., graduates of the program and representatives of industry, the professions, practical training programs and employers).

# Continuous Improvement

## Previous Reviews

Please describe how concerns and recommendations raised in previous reviews have been addressed, especially those detailed in the [Final Assessment Report and Implementation Plan](https://www.vpacademic.utoronto.ca/reviews-academic-plans/final-assessment-reports/) and any subsequent monitoring reports from the previous Cyclical Review of the program.

## Self-Study Reflections

Please describe areas that the program’s faculty, staff and/or students have identified through the conduct of the self-study as:

1. requiring improvement
2. holding promise for enhancement
3. opportunities for curricular change

# Program(s)

|  |
| --- |
| Guidance:The quality of each academic program and the learning environment of the students in each program must be addressed explicitly in the self-study and the external reviewers’ report. Normally the expectation is that programs and program components or options (e.g., a specialist, major, and minor in a specific discipline; a PhD program with multiple fields; a professional master’s program with online and part-time in-person delivery options, etc.) that support a distinct set of [Program Learning Outcomes](https://utoronto.sharepoint.com/sites/dvpp/vpap/SitePages/UTQAP-Guidance.aspx#program-learning-outcomes-(plos)) are considered together to ensure that all avenues for achieving the Program Learning Outcomes support a robust student learning experience, and that areas of strength and areas of improvement are identified.Given the above, to avoid considerable duplication, it may be helpful to organize this Program(s) section using shared elements. For example, when addressing the prompts in this section: * if the unit has renewed the curriculum across the specialist/major/minor, and/or across graduate programs and their fields in order to reflect changes in the discipline, describe that renewal initiative overall, including implications that are shared across multiple programs or program components, and then describe any implications that are program- or component-specific
* if the unit has introduced experiential learning across several related programs, describe that initiative once (and highlight any differences for students in a specialist vs a major; or for students in one field vs others in the same graduate program)
* if work is underway in the unit overall to remove barriers to access for Black or Indigenous students, describe the overarching initiative and unit-wide elements once — and then highlight any distinctive impacts on individual program requirements/structures
* articulate shared program objectives and program learning outcomes once (e.g., for a graduate program with multiple fields; for a related specialist and major); reflect first on any admission or program requirements that are shared, and then highlight the requirements that are different, why those differences are meant to support, and reflect on whether those structures are working as intended.

Please be clear about which programs or program components are being discussed at any point in the self-study. |

For **each** discrete program that is part of the review as defined in the Terms of Reference, please ensure that the self-study addresses the following:

## Program objectives and key features

|  |
| --- |
| Suggestion: Consider approaching the prompts in this section holistically, and in the context of continuous improvement, rather than as an exercise in checking boxes. Substantial consideration of the academic unit’s programs in relation to any oneof the priorities and commitments identified below entails significant work. The review is an occasion for checking in on the academic unit/program(s)’ commitments and priorities in the context of the discipline, the division, the University, etc. Consider focusing on specific areas on which the unit/program(s) have been working since the last review, as well as on areas that, based on discussion among faculty, students, staff and relevant others the unit/program(s) would like to work on after the site visit, with the benefit of the reviewers’ insights and recommendations.A note for item c): the reviewers will be asked to “identify and commend the program’s notably strong and creative attributes” and “provide evidence of any significant innovation or creativity in the content and/or delivery of the program relative to other such programs” — consider ways to highlight the unique features of each program in this section. |

1. Consistency of the program’s [objectives](https://utoronto.sharepoint.com/sites/dvpp/vpap/SitePages/UTQAP-Guidance.aspx#what-are-program-objectives) with the institution’s [mission](https://governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/secretariat/policies/institutional-purpose-statement-october-15-1992) and U of T’s/the division’s/unit’s [academic plans](https://www.vpacademic.utoronto.ca/reviews-academic-plans/academic-planning/current-divisional-plans/), [priorities](https://www.president.utoronto.ca/priorities-and-commitments/) and commitments, including consistency with any implementation plans developed following a previous review
2. Evidence that the following have been substantially considered in the context of the program and its associated resources:
	1. [Universal design principles](https://teaching.utoronto.ca/resources/universal-design-for-learning/) and/or the potential need to provide mental or physical disability-related accommodations, reflecting the University’s [Statement of Commitment Regarding Persons with Disabilities](https://governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/secretariat/policies/statement-commitment-regarding-persons-disabilities-february-25-2021)
	2. Support for student well-being and sense of community in the learning and teaching environment, reflecting the work of the [Expert Panel on Undergraduate Student Educational Experience](https://www.provost.utoronto.ca/committees/expert-panel-on-undergraduate-student-educational-experience-usee/) and the commitment to establishing a Culture of Caring and Excellence as recommended by the Presidential and [Provostial Task Force on Student Mental Health](https://www.provost.utoronto.ca/planning-policy/student-mental-health/)
	3. Opportunities for removing barriers to access and increasing retention rates for Indigenous students; for integrating Indigenous content into the curriculum in consultation with Indigenous curriculum developers; and for addressing any discipline-specific calls to action, reflecting the commitments made in [Answering the Call: Wecheehetowin: Final Report of the Steering Committee for the University of Toronto Response to the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada](https://www.provost.utoronto.ca/wp-content/uploads/sites/155/2018/05/Final-Report-TRC.pdf)
	4. Opportunities for removing barriers to access and increasing retention rates for Black students; for promoting intersectional Black flourishing, fostering inclusive excellence and enabling mutuality in teaching and learning, reflecting the commitments made in the [Scarborough Charter](https://www.utsc.utoronto.ca/principal/scarborough-charter) and consistent with the recommendations of the [Anti-Black Racism Task Force Final Report](https://people.utoronto.ca/inclusion/anti-racism-strategic-tables/anti-black-racism-task-force/)
	5. Opportunities for fostering an equitable, diverse, and inclusive teaching and learning environment, reflecting the values articulated in existing institutional documents such as the [Statement on Equity, Diversity, and Excellence](https://governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/secretariat/policies/equity-diversity-and-excellence-statement-december-14-2006), the [Antisemitism Working Group Final Report](https://people.utoronto.ca/inclusion/anti-racism-strategic-tables/anti-semitism-working-group/), the aforementioned reports, and future institutional reports related to equity, diversity and inclusion
3. (Where appropriate) Unique curriculum or program innovations, creative components, significant [high-impact practices](https://utoronto.sharepoint.com/sites/dvpp/vpap/SitePages/UTQAP-Guidance.aspx#high-impact-practices-(hips))
4. Initiatives taken to enhance the quality of the program and the associated learning and teaching environment

## Program requirements

|  |
| --- |
| Suggestion:here and in sections 3.3 and 3.5,consider ways to focus on reflection rather than description in the discussion of requirements. For example, if there are common program learning outcomes, program or admission requirements, sequences of learning activities, etc. across a specialist/major/minor or across fields within a graduate program, consider one or more tables that capture this information at a glance. That will allow more time to focus on discussion of how well the requirement are working relative to ‘big picture’ goals (e.g., relative to program objectives, disciplinary expectations, etc.). |

* Appropriateness of the program’s structure and the requirements to meet its objectives and program-level learning outcomes, including the structure and requirements of any identified streams (undergraduate), fields or concentrations (graduate)
* Appropriateness of the program’s structure, requirements and program-level learning outcomes in meeting [the institution’s applicable undergraduate or graduate Degree Level Expectations](https://www.vpacademic.utoronto.ca/academic-programs/degree-diploma-certificate-programs/degree-level-expectations/)
* Appropriateness and effectiveness of the mode(s) of delivery (i.e., means or medium used in delivering a program; e.g., lecture format, distance, online, synchronous/asynchronous, problem-based, compressed part-time, flex-time, multi-campus, inter-institutional collaboration or other non-standard forms of delivery) to facilitate students’ successful completion of the program-level learning outcomes
* Ways in which the curriculum addresses the current state of the discipline or area of study and is appropriate for the level of the program

## Program requirements for graduate programs only

* Clear rationale for program length that ensures that students can complete the program-level learning outcomes and requirements [within the time required](https://www.sgs.utoronto.ca/resources-supports/improving-doctoral-time-to-completion/)
* Evidence that each graduate student in the program is required to take all of the course requirements from among graduate-level courses; evidence of sufficient graduate-level courses that students will be able to meet this requirement
* For research-focused graduate programs, clear indication of the nature and suitability of the major research requirements for degree completion

## Assessment of teaching and learning

* Appropriateness and effectiveness of the [methods for assessing student achievement of the program-level learning outcomes and degree level expectations](https://utoronto.sharepoint.com/sites/dvpp/vpap/SitePages/UTQAP-Guidance.aspx#assessing-student-achievement-of-program-learning-outcomes-and-degree-level-expectations)
* Appropriateness and effectiveness of the [plans to monitor and assess](https://utoronto.sharepoint.com/sites/dvpp/vpap/SitePages/UTQAP-Guidance.aspx#ongoing-program-monitoring-and-assessment):
	+ - The overall quality of the program
		- Whether the program is achieving in practice its proposed objectives
		- Whether its students are achieving the program-level learning outcomes
		- How the resulting information will be documented and subsequently used to inform continuous program improvement

## Admission requirements

* Appropriateness of the program’s admission requirements given the program’s objectives and program-level learning outcomes
* 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.

## Resources

|  |
| --- |
| Guidance:In this section, the discussion of resource utilization — prompt d) — should focus on resources connected directly to programs. Self-Study Section 4 (Faculty/Research) is the place to consider broader questions of faculty resource/complement planning, e.g., as they relate to areas of research strength, etc. If specific data or examples are applicable to both sections, please provide the details once only and cross-reference as needed. |

In making assessments related to resources here and in 1.7, reviewers must recognize the institution's autonomy in determining priorities for funding, space and faculty allocation.

Given the program’s class sizes and cohorts as well as its program-level learning outcomes:

1. Participation of a sufficient number and quality of 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 sessional 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 (see [QAF Guidance](https://oucqa.ca/guide/guidance-on-sessional-adjunct-faculty-qaf-2-1-2-6-and-5-1-3-1-6/))
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
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

## Resources for graduate programs only

In making assessments related to resources here and in 1.6, reviewers must recognize the institution's autonomy in determining priorities for funding, space and faculty allocation.

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 sustain the program, promote innovation, and [foster an appropriate intellectual climate](https://www.sgs.utoronto.ca/resources-supports/supervision-guidelines/)
2. Where appropriate to the program, evidence that [financial assistance for students](https://www.sgs.utoronto.ca/awards-funding/how-funding-works-research-stream/) will be sufficient to ensure adequate quality and numbers of students
3. Evidence of how supervisory loads will be distributed, in light of qualifications and appointment status of the faculty.

## Quality and other indicators

|  |
| --- |
| Guidance:In this section, the discussion of faculty — prompts a) and b) — should focus on quality indicators that connect directly to programs. Self-Study Section 4 (Faculty/Research) is the place to discuss faculty quality more broadly. If specific data or examples are applicable to both sections, please provide the details once only and cross-reference as needed.Discussion of the program relative to peers — prompt f) — should focus on comparisons that are specific to programs. Self-Study Section 8 (International Comparators) is the place to discuss the Faculty relative to peers more broadly. Again, if specific data or examples are applicable to both sections, please provide the details once only and cross-reference as needed. |

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)
	* The quality of the scholarship of the faculty, and the degree to which that scholarship is brought to bear in teaching
2. Any other evidence that the program and faculty will ensure the intellectual quality of the student experience.
3. Quality indicators related to students (e.g., grade level for admission; applications and registrations; attrition/retention rates; times-to-completion; final year academic achievement; graduation rates; scholarly output; success rates in provincial and national scholarships; competitions; academic awards; student in-course reports on teaching; and commitment to professional and transferable skills)
4. Quality indicators related to program graduates (e.g., rates of graduation; employment six months and two years after graduation; postgraduate study; “skills match”; and alumni reports on program quality when available and when permitted by the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (FIPPA). Auditors will be instructed that these items may not be available and applicable to all programs.)
5. Any additional indicators of quality identified by the division or academic unit, including but not limited to data to support the assessment of progress towards fulfilling the plans, priorities and commitments identified in 1.1.a and 1.1.b
6. How the program compares to the best in its field among peer institutions in Canada, North America and internationally, including areas of strength and opportunities

## Program undergoing its first cyclical review (if applicable)

1. Commissioning officer to add, if applicable, terms to address any areas the new program monitoring report identified for consideration in the first cyclical review of the new program, along with any items the Quality Council identified for follow-up in its approval letter.

# Faculty/Research

|  |
| --- |
| Guidance:to support discussion and reflection in this section, it will be helpful to include or link to:* A table of faculty showing the number of tenure and tenure-stream faculty (assistant professor; associate professor; and professor); teaching stream (assistant professor, teaching stream; associate professor, teaching stream; and professor); CLTA (either stream); part-time faculty (either stream); “Other faculty” as relevant (e.g., status only, adjunct, clinical (for Faculty of Medicine)) {any faculty member captured in the table should provide a CV for the appendix}

Areas to reflect on within these broad prompts could include:* Major research themes/priorities/areas of strength and expertise, focusing on current status as well as plans for future development
* Any notable changes (or anticipated changes) in the strengths and weaknesses of the complement as a whole
* Support for faculty development
 |

* Scope, quality and relevance of faculty research activities.
* Appropriateness of the level of activity relative to national and international comparators.
* Appropriateness of research activities for the undergraduate and graduate students in the Faculty.
* Faculty complement plan.
* Appropriateness and effectiveness of the academic unit’s use of existing human resources. In making this assessment, reviewers must recognize the institution's autonomy in determining priorities for funding, space and faculty allocation.

# Relationships

* Strength of the morale of faculty, students and staff.
* Scope and nature of relationships with cognate Faculties, academic departments and units.
* Extent to which the Faculty, department or unit has developed or sustained fruitful partnerships with other universities and organizations in order to foster research, creative professional activities and to deliver teaching programs.
* Scope and nature of the Faculty, department or unit’s relationship with external government, academic and professional organizations.
* Social impact of the Faculty, department or unit in terms of outreach and impact locally and nationally.

# Organizational and Financial Structure

|  |
| --- |
| Guidance:**Financial structure:** It may be helpful to provide links to information on U of T’s [budget model](https://planningandbudget.utoronto.ca/operating-budget/the-budget-model-2/).**Academic services:** Please note that the Office of the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs will request and provide you with a Library report and standard Student Services report. You should include these as Appendices. In the reflection on the adequacy of academic services in this section, please include necessary context/information/links about local (divisional/unit level academic services). |

* The appropriateness and effectiveness of the Faculty, department or unit’s organizational (including divisional or unit-level governance) and financial structure.
* The appropriateness with which resource allocation, including space and infrastructure support (e.g., major equipment requirements to support programming and research; any unique space pressures and requirements and how these are accommodated), has been managed. In making this assessment, reviewers must recognize the institution's autonomy in determining priorities for funding, space and faculty allocation.
* Assessment of the adequacy of all relevant [academic services](https://oucqa.ca/framework/definitions/) that directly contribute to the academic quality of each program under review.
* Opportunities for new revenue generation.

# Long-Range Planning Challenges

* Consistency with the University’s [academic plan](https://utoronto.sharepoint.com/sites/dvpp/vpap/SitePages/UTQAP-Guidance.aspx?csf=1&web=1&xsdata=MDV8MDF8fGE4ZjA1ZjUxMjk4MDRmMTU5NDIyMDhkYTk3ZmM3NTcyfDc4YWFjMjI2MmYwMzRiNGQ5MDM3YjQ2ZDU2YzU1MjEwfDF8MHw2Mzc5ODk0MDc3ODQzNDI1NjJ8R29vZHxWR1ZoYlhOVFpXTjFjbWwwZVZObGNuWnBZMlY4ZXlKV0lqb2lNQzR3TGpBd01EQWlMQ0pRSWpvaVYybHVNeklpTENKQlRpSTZJazkwYUdWeUlpd2lWMVFpT2pFeGZRPT18MXxNVGs2TURnNVkyWXdZMlV0TW1aak15MDBZVGczTFRnMU5USXRZVEppTkRnM1l6TmhOR1V3WDJVd1pXUmxaak5tTFdVeU9Ea3ROREEyTlMwNVlqRXpMVFpqTlROallqVmpZV0kwWTBCMWJuRXVaMkpzTG5Od1lXTmxjdz09fHw%3D&sdata=NHQ2RDExNkk1V3kxL1diTzhlMjdLRGV0eHM2bWk1cExOakVvek5SZENwdz0%3D&ovuser=78aac226-2f03-4b4d-9037-b46d56c55210%2Cdaniella.mallinick%40utoronto.ca&OR=Teams-HL&CT=1663351132650&clickparams=eyJBcHBOYW1lIjoiVGVhbXMtRGVza3RvcCIsIkFwcFZlcnNpb24iOiIyNy8yMjA3MzEwMTAwNSIsIkhhc0ZlZGVyYXRlZFVzZXIiOmZhbHNlfQ%3D%3D&cid=71d33a67-9a0d-47c4-b0d7-2021e6f2a925#mission%2C-academic-plan%2C-priorities%2C-commitments)
* Appropriateness of:
	+ - Complement plan, including balance of tenure-stream and non-tenure stream faculty
		- Enrolment strategy
		- Student financial aid
		- Development/fundraising initiatives
		- Management and leadership

# International Comparators

Assessment of the Faculty, department or unit and the program(s) under review relative to the best in Canada/North America and internationally, including areas of strength and opportunities.

# Appendices

|  |
| --- |
| Guidance:For the items below, links to files or SharePoint folders are acceptable as long as they are stable and within the University of Toronto’s domain; an individual’s OneDrive account is not a sustainable means of providing access.Access to course descriptions can be provided through a link to the academic calendar, specific website(s), or by providing a list of courses with the course number, credit value and course description, organized to reflect the manner in which the courses count toward program requirements.In addition to the required elements, below, appendices can include:* History of the division/unit/program
* Constitution of the division/unit
* Recent committee/professional service of faculty
* Workload Policy of division/unit
* Calendar entry for undergraduate/graduate programs
* Graduate reading list
* Any curriculum renewal material
* Divisional marking scheme
* Student Services Statement for the division.
 |

Please ensure that appendices include the following:

* Previous review report, administrative response(s), and Final Assessment Report and Implementation Plan
* Non-University commissioned reviews (e.g., for professional accreditation) completed since the last review of the unit and/or program
* Documents required to provide context for the evaluation of “Program objectives and key features” (e.g., institutional or divisional plans, reports or policy statements that articulate priorities or commitments)
* Access to all course descriptions
* Access to the curricula vitae of faculty
* University of Toronto Libraries Report for the division/unit [provided by the Office of the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs (via the Dean’s Office in the case of departmentalized Faculties/divisions)]
* Student Services Statement [provided by the Office of the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs (via the Dean’s Office in the case of departmentalized Faculties/divisions)]