



Quality Assurance
Academic Unit Review
Handbook

Revisions approved by GFC January 17, 2019

A. INTRODUCTION

The University of Calgary Eyes High Vision and the Academic Plan set out ambitious goals for the university and the strategies to achieve those goals. The Quality Assurance Process (QA) is a central element for achieving these goals. QA includes Academic Unit Reviews, Curriculum Reviews, and in some units external accreditation and department reviews also support QA work. Academic Unit Reviews and Curriculum Reviews are initiated and supported out of the Office of the Provost. Academic Unit Reviews focus overall academic activities including all key elements of a Unit's performance, management, resources, structure and governance, personnel complement, educational programs, research productivity, partnerships, budget, and space. Curriculum Reviews (CR) focus on the quality of the curriculum offered in degree programs and are intended to complement Unit Reviews.

The purpose of the unit review is to assess the quality of a unit as it relates to overall academic activities and performance, including management, resources, structure and governance, personnel complement, educational programs, research productivity, partnerships, budget, and space, which are interconnected and drive the key deliverables in research and teaching and learning. This review is based on relevant, evidence-based metrics and ideally include comparisons to units of similar size and scale at other national and international institutions. The review provides an opportunity for self-reflection and constructive feedback on key elements within the unit. The processes and templates included in this handbook may be used at the discretion of the unit lead for other quality assurance processes such as department or subject reviews.

Unit reviews are scheduled every 5-7 years. Academic units participating in accreditation processes may choose to adapt appropriate accreditation documentation for the purposes of the unit review in order to avoid duplication and are encouraged to align review cycles if that best meets the needs of the unit.

The Office of the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) holds administrative responsibility for the unit review process.

B. Academic Sponsor and Contacts

ACADEMIC SPONSOR

Dr. Dru Marshall, Provost and Vice-President Academic

CONTACTS

Dr. Florentine Strzelczyk, Deputy Provost

Executive Suite A100

strzelcz@ucalgary.ca

403 220 3060

Dr. Christine Johns, Senior Director Academic and International Strategies

Executive Suite A100

Christine.johns@ucalgary.ca

403 220 3385

Sara Fedoruk, Analyst, Planning & Reviews

Review Coordinator

Executive Suite A100

slfedoru@ucalgary.ca

403 220 4133

C. DEFINITIONS

Academic Policy and Planning Committee (APPC): A GFC standing committee that oversees and approves all items relating to academic programs and policies.

Curriculum Review: An element of the Quality Assurance process. The purpose is to review curriculum and course offerings of undergraduate and course-based graduate programs. A separate handbook for curriculum reviews is available.

Office of Institutional Analysis (OIA): Unit responsible for generating and storing data used for benchmarking and analysis.

Public Report: Written by the Provost's Office, the public report includes the recommendations from the review report and the response to the recommendations from the unit.

Review Report: Written by the review team based on a unit's self-appraisal report, additional documents, and information obtained during the site visit. The report highlights strengths of the unit and includes recommendations for change.

Review Team: Typically composed of three external reviewers and one internal reviewer from the University of Calgary (external to the unit being reviewed) charged with assessing all documentation,

meeting with stakeholders, participating in a site visit to the unit, reporting on findings and making recommendations.

Unit: A major academic entity, such as a faculty, school, or major interdisciplinary program.

Unit Lead: The person responsible for the unit; i.e. a dean, director, or head.

Unit Review: A comprehensive review that assesses the overall operations of a major unit; the review team includes external reviewers.

D. OBJECTIVES OF THE REVIEW

To support units in achieving and maintaining standards of excellence in research, teaching and learning, program development, and organizational effectiveness.

To establish unit effectiveness and excellence relative to comparable units nationally and internationally.

To articulate the unit contribution to and alignment with the university's vision and strategic goals.

To track commitments and progress towards established goals.

To provide information to senior university administrators regarding the allocation of resources.

To meet expectations of public accountability through a credible, transparent and action-oriented review process that includes the publication of assessment outcomes.

To augment the Comprehensive and Strategic Plans with expert assessments of existing and planned initiatives in research, teaching, learning, and program development.

E. UNIT REVIEW PROCESS

A schedule of unit reviews will be established by the Provost and communicated from the Deputy Provost to the unit lead well in advance of a unit's review.

STEP	TIMELINE	PARTICIPANTS
Deputy Provost meets with unit lead to initiate review process and to discuss unit goals and appropriate benchmarks, issues and concerns.	9-12 months in advance of site visit.	Deputy Provost and unit lead
Unit provides names and contact information of 6 national and 6	9-12 months in advance of site visit.	Unit lead and Deputy Provost

international reviewer names to the Deputy Provost.		
Determination of review team and scheduling of the review. Deputy Provost issues invitations to reviewers.	7-9 months prior to site visit.	Provost in conjunction with the Deputy Provost and unit lead
Submission of self-appraisal document by unit lead to Deputy Provost for internal review.	3 months prior to site visit.	Unit lead and Deputy Provost
Recommendations for revisions from Deputy Provost to unit lead.	Within two weeks of receipt of self-appraisal from unit lead.	Deputy Provost and unit lead
Submission of final self-appraisal document by unit lead to deputy Provost, incorporating revisions.	6 weeks in advance of site visit.	Unit lead and Deputy Provost
Distribution of self-appraisal and other documentation by review coordinator to review team.	4 weeks in advance of site visit.	Review coordinator and review team
Site Visit	2-day on site visit.	All
Submission of review report by external reviewers to Provost.	1 month after the site visit.	External reviewers
Circulation of review report to unit lead for response.	6 weeks after the site visit.	Provost and unit lead
Unit response submitted by unit lead to the Provost and Deputy Provost.	1 month after receipt of the review report by unit lead.	Unit Lead, Deputy Provost and Provost
Final meeting between unit lead, Provost and Deputy Provost for provisional approval of response to review report.	Shortly after receipt of response from unit by the Provost.	Provost, Deputy Provost, and unit lead
Preparation of public document for submission to APPC.	Following meeting between unit lead, Provost and Deputy Provost.	Senior Director, Academic and International Strategies
Presentation of public report to APPC for discussion. Unit lead is invited to attend APPC.	APPC meeting immediately following provisional approval of unit review response.	Unit lead, Deputy Provost, and Provost
Mid-term progress report submitted to Provost's Office, meeting with Provost and unit lead, then presentation to APPC.	At midpoint of unit review cycle.	Unit lead, Deputy Provost, and Provost

Support for the unit

The Office of Institutional Analysis provides appropriate unit-level data prior to the start of the review process and will work with the unit lead and Provost to address any questions or concerns that may arise.

Self-Appraisal

Units complete a self-appraisal where they reflect on their academic activities and administrative operations, including research, teaching and learning, organizational structure and governance, faculty and staff complements, partnerships, budget and space. The process itself offers the unit the opportunity for in-depth analysis of programs, goals and achievement of priorities identified in the unit's own strategic plan.

The self-appraisal demonstrates how the unit aligns with and contributes to academic and institutional plans and strategies, including benchmarking the unit against those similar in scope and size at other institutions, if data is available, and using evidence-based metrics

The Deputy Provost can provide advice during the self-appraisal preparation. A guide to preparing the self-appraisal can be found in Appendix I.

Selection of Reviewers

The review team will be composed of:

- Three external reviewers, including at least one national and one international scholar. They will be experts in a field aligned with the unit being reviewed and experienced administrators.
- One internal reviewer from outside the unit under review and at arm's length from the unit and unit lead. The internal reviewer will be a respected academic knowledgeable about key administrative processes at the University of Calgary.

The unit lead will send the names, affiliations, and contact information for six potential reviewers at each of the national and international levels to the Deputy Provost along with a short CV or brief rationale for their nominations. Any known significant relationship between proposed reviewers and the unit must be disclosed. The unit must not contact potential reviewers. Professional faculties/programs may also include a member from the relevant professional community on their review teams. The Deputy Provost or the Provost may add to the list of reviewers suggested by the unit. The review team will reflect considerations for achieving gender balance. The Provost will ultimately determine the final composition of the committee.

Instructions for the review team are in Appendix II.

Coordination of review team visit

The review coordinator handles all logistics of the review team on behalf of the Deputy Provost, including arrangements for air and ground travel, accommodation, meals and honorarium, and responds to questions or concerns regarding the process.

The Office of the Provost will provide funds to cover honoraria and expenses for the external reviewers, including hotel accommodation, meals, airfare and ground transportation.

Contacting the Review Team

Once the Deputy Provost and the unit lead have agreed on a date for the site visit, and the review team has been selected by the Provost, the Deputy Provost will invite the reviewers to participate. There should be no communication between the unit and the review team prior to the review process; all communication with the review team will be conducted through the Office of the Provost. The Provost will meet with the review team at the beginning of the site visit. Members of the review team will not

make presentations or performances during their visit. During the review process, members of the unit should make every effort to ensure the objectivity of the review.

F. MAJOR UNIT REVIEW SITE VISIT

Site visits will normally be comprised of two full days preceded by a working dinner the evening before. The last half of the second day will be unscheduled to allow time for the review team to develop preliminary recommendations. The Review Coordinator and the appropriate administrative support in the unit will create an itinerary for the site visit, based on the unit lead's recommendations and ensuring that all appropriate stakeholders meet with the review team. The Deputy Provost will approve the schedule at least two weeks in advance of the site visit.

The site visit will begin with a meeting of the Provost and the review team. The Deputy Provost and Senior Director, Academic and International Strategies will also attend. The site visit should include a tour of the unit spaces and facilities. The review team should meet with representatives from across the unit, including administrative leads, academic staff, graduate students, undergraduate students, postdoctoral fellows, and support staff. When possible, key alumni and community partners should also be involved. To facilitate discussion, meetings with faculty members can be grouped in ways that make sense to the unit (by rank or by discipline for example) and meetings with students can likewise be grouped by level of study or by disciplines. These groupings are decided by the unit lead in consultation with the unit's senior administrative team. The unit lead and key faculty should be available during the site visit.

The closing meeting with the review team will include the Provost, Deputy Provost, Vice-President Research or designate, the Dean of the Faculty of Graduate Studies, Senior Director, Academic and International Strategies, the unit lead, and the team within the unit responsible for the production of the self-appraisal document. This meeting will take place towards the end of the site visit and will be scheduled for a minimum of one hour. External reviewers will plan their departures so as to be present at this closing meeting, which is an important opportunity for participants to comment on the preliminary recommendations of the unit review team and to clarify next steps.

Appendix III provides a template for the review report.
Appendix IV provides a sample schedule for a site visit.

G. FINAL REVIEW REPORT

Reviewers will be required to submit a final review report to the Office of the Provost within one month of the site visit. The Provost will review the document, request any required clarifications or additional information from the review team and then share the document with the Deputy Provost and unit lead. This final review report is considered a confidential document; the unit lead will decide how best to share information with the unit.

H. POST REVIEW PROCESS AND PUBLIC REPORT

Unit response to the Quality Assurance review report

The unit is required to provide the Provost with a written response to the review report within one month of receipt. The unit response must be clear, concise and provide strategies for addressing each recommendation identified in the review report, including timelines and an explanation of how initiatives and actions will be resourced. If a unit does not agree with a recommendation, it must provide a rationale explaining why it does not think it relevant, appropriate and/or feasible. The Deputy Provost can be consulted during the preparation of the unit response.

Meeting to discuss unit response

The Review Coordinator will arrange a meeting for the unit lead, Provost, Deputy Provost and Senior Director, Academic and International Strategies to discuss the review report and the unit response.

Public report

Once the unit response has received provisional approval from the Provost, the Senior Director, Academic and International Strategies will create a public document that includes an overarching summary of the unit review including positive contributions of the unit, the report's review team recommendations and the unit's response to those recommendations.

Presentation of the public document to APPC

The unit lead will attend a meeting of APPC to discuss the review and responses to key recommendations as outlined in the report. The unit review documents, including the self-appraisal, the review report and the unit response, will remain confidential documents. Any agreed-upon recommendations from the review report process must be referred to in subsequent plans produced by the unit. Individual units are encouraged to share the review report and response or public document in a manner best suited to their needs.

Mid-term progress report

At the mid-point of the review cycle, the unit will submit a progress report to the Provost. This report will be reviewed by the Provost and Deputy Provost, discussed with the unit lead, and then submitted to APPC. The mid-term progress report will outline the progress the unit has made towards fulfilling its plan to address the recommendations made in the original review. Where possible, it will indicate progress made on these recommendations utilizing any metrics and benchmarks used in the original review. In cases where metrics have yet to improve or progress has yet to be made, the unit will provide additional strategies, timelines and resource plans that will ensure progress towards key goals prior to the next review.

A template for the mid-review report is attached as Appendix V

I. Feedback on Process

The unit may provide any comments on the process to the Provost or Deputy Provost.

APPENDIX I: SELF-APPRAISAL DOCUMENT- INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE ACADEMIC UNIT REVIEW

The self-appraisal document is the foundational part of the unit review process as it provides opportunity for self-evaluation and reflection. However, a well-written self-appraisal will also help the review team be more focused on their on-site visit and more informed as they make recommendations.

The self-appraisal document will:

- Provide a brief history and articulate the current state of affairs within the unit, including the scope the unit.
- Identify the unit's alignment with institutional strategies and plans.
- Provide evidence to support all claims.
- Include a written narrative of no more than 25 pages, not including appendices.
- Include appendices of figures and tables of data provided by the Office of Institutional Analysis, and which have been verified by the unit. Data included in the appendices are specified and provided by the OIA to the extent possible.

The self-appraisal document will not:

- Attempt to justify requests for additional resources. Those issues must be separate from the Quality Assurance Process.

The self-appraisal document will include the following sections and will minimally address the elements described below:

HISTORY AND OVERVIEW

This one-page summary will be written as a stand-alone document as it sets the stage for the external reviewers, who should be able to make ready comparisons to other units of similar size and scope. A brief statement of the history and current structure of the unit (including number of students, staff, unit organization, etc.), size of budget, areas of distinctiveness at a national or international level as well as key elements from the self-appraisal will be included.

ALIGNMENT WITH INSTITUTIONAL STRATEGY

Describe how the unit's strategic plan and academic and research priorities align with and support Eyes High, the academic and research plans and any key institutional strategies.

STRUCTURE AND GOVERNANCE

Describe the organizational structure and key elements of governance within the unit. Describe key elements of decision making for the unit and the general communication structures/plans for key decisions. Describe how transparency in decision making is ensured.

ACADEMIC AND NON-ACADEMIC STAFF COMPLEMENT

- Discuss how the current support staff and faculty complements in the unit support the mission and vision of the unit.
- Is the distribution of faculty expertise appropriate for the academic responsibilities and aspirations of the unit?
- Is the faculty to student ratio appropriate for the educational programs delivered?
- Is the ratio of full-time appointments (i.e., tenure and tenure-track professoriate and instructors) relative to sessional and term appointments appropriate?
- How does the demographic mix of support staff to faculty allow the unit to meet their goals?
- How do the unit's hiring priorities encourage success over the next five years? What changes are anticipated/planned for the faculty complement? Support-staff complement?

PROGRAMS

Provide a brief description of program(s) offered by the unit, highlighting changes since the last review, alignment with the institution's and unit's strategic plans and response to disciplinary trends.

A large set of possible questions regarding undergraduate and graduate programs, enrolment, teaching and learning have been provided below. These questions are designed as a guide to assist units with interpreting and providing a narrative to accompany the data package provided by the OIA and other data sources. Units are not required to answer all of questions below, but are encouraged to select questions that support the focus of their unit, the themes they want to highlight in the self-appraisal, and the feedback they want to elicit from the review team regarding program challenges and changes. If applicable, units with programs participating in accreditation processes may choose to adapt some of the documentation prepared for the accreditation review, supplemented by any additional material required by the unit review. This should be discussed with the Deputy Provost in advance of the review taking place. If this option is selected, a summary of the accreditation report should be provided to the review team.

Programs that have undergone the Teaching and Learning Curriculum Review process or a Faculty of Graduate Studies Program Reviews may append those review documents to the unit review. A high-level summary of recommendations or action plans should be discussed as part of the unit review.

UNDERGRADUATE TEACHING AND LEARNING

Undergraduate enrolment and recruitment

Enrolment statistics for undergraduate programs as well as trends and projections:

- Undergraduate enrolments
- Average entering grades, retention and time to completion rates, degrees awarded
- Recruitment, retention and completion rates of international students
- Recruitment, retention, and completion rates of Indigenous students
- Discuss if the distribution of student enrolment is appropriate in light of program quality and student demand.
- Student involvement in unit governance processes

Curriculum development

- How does the unit determine whether the programs offered are current, meaningful and relevant to students and society?
- How does the unit align with university plans to increase both breadth and depth for undergraduate education?
- Consider program requirements, pre-requisites and electives. Discuss opportunities for students to engage in undergraduate research, co-op, service learning, and internationalization activities.
- Discuss extra- and co-curricular opportunities such as student clubs, lectures, research symposia etc. if appropriate.
- Which competencies are graduating students in the unit's programs expected to have?
- Append the results of the most recent curriculum reviews and discuss how the unit is continuously and systematically improving its curricula.
- Discuss NSSE results and the unit's strategies to address them.
- How are learning outcomes for each program articulated and defined?
- Describe the opportunities for undergraduate experiential learning.
- How does the unit integrate research experiences within its programs?

Instructional modes and assessment of learning

- Please explain where learning takes place, e.g. in lectures, seminars, labs, or in community-, land- and field-based settings.
- Discuss how the unit encourages and supports diverse methods of teaching and to what extent these are systematically integrated into the unit's programs.
- What are the signature pedagogies for programs in the unit? (Signature pedagogy refers to the forms or styles of teaching and instruction that are common to specific disciplines, areas of study, or professions.)
- How does the unit foster interdisciplinary in its programs?
- How are student learning and engagement assessed to ensure high-quality learning?
- How is work-integrated learning incorporated into the curriculum?

Teaching development and effectiveness

- Discuss how teaching development for academic staff and graduate student teaching assistants is supported and recognized.
- List faculty participation in relevant professional development programs.
- Discuss how teaching excellence is recognized (teaching awards and recognition)
- Discuss how teaching effectiveness is defined and assessed using available data on the quality and effectiveness of teaching and learning, including USRIs, peer reviews, NSSE data, etc.
- How does the unit assess quality of teaching within the unit and of individual faculty members in the FTPC process?

Student advising

- Explain the student advising system in the unit.

GRADUATE AND POSTDOCTORAL EDUCATION

To demonstrate the extent and quality of graduate education in the unit, provide a brief description of the graduate programs offered, highlighting program history, changes since the last review, recent program innovations and future plans to improve graduate programs.

Graduate enrolment and recruitment

- Recruitment strategies for domestic, international and indigenous students
- Retention, time to completion and graduation rates for graduate students
- Degrees awarded
- Admission requirements
- Number of student applications and offers (if applicable to the unit's practices)
- Numbers in each program over previous 5 years, with breakdown by gender, international and Indigenous status
- Numbers and percentages of supervisors in the complement of faculty members
- Average number of students per supervisor

Curriculum

- Reflect on how graduate curricula in the unit have been evolving in response to student demand and to disciplinary developments, how graduate programs in the unit align with university priorities and strategies and how programs have incorporated any recent trends in graduate education.
- In addition to the discussion of the data provided by OIA, present and discuss changing program regulations, curricula, examinations and committees, approach to interdisciplinarity, pedagogy, learning outcomes, engagement of diverse student populations, practicums and off-campus placements.
- How do programs compare to others across Canada?

Student learning

- Give an overview of the academic requirements in the graduate programs offered in the unit and how they reflect commitments to student learning in the strategic plans of the university and the unit.
- Provide a critical evaluation of pedagogy and learning outcomes in the graduate programs being offered by the unit.
- Discuss the engagement of diverse student populations (e.g. international, Indigenous students).
- Include faculty awards for excellence in graduate teaching, mentoring and supervision.
- Describe practicums, off-campus placements, internships and innovative supervisory and mentorship arrangements designed to maximize student learning.

Research training and mentorship

- Identify what training/mentorship is provided for graduate-student supervisors as well as for Graduate Program Directors.
- Describe the quality of graduate supervision mentoring support and assessment in the unit.
- List any faculty awards that are made available for excellence in graduate student teaching and supervision.

- Explain how graduate students get trained and mentored as future researchers and teachers and how they are familiarized with their roles and responsibilities.
- Explain how student progress is monitored.

Graduate Student Engagement

- Work and social space for students
- Access to resources and computers
- Program administrators (FTE)
- Unit-wide activities involving graduate students
- Student participation in unit governance

Graduate student funding

- How are graduate students funded in the unit and which proportion of the total unit budget is used for graduate student support?
- Summarize funding sources for graduate students including policies on minimum funding levels, allocation strategies for TA appointments, conference travel or other relevant funding.
- Discuss total and per capita amount, types and sources of student funding in the previous 5 years, including funds for internal and external scholarships, TAs, RAs, other campus employment, and bursaries if possible.
- Disciplinary comparisons can be included if available as well as the distribution of funding across programs in the unit.

Graduate student research success

- Student success rates in Tri-council scholarship competitions and other relevant grants
- Publication and conference presentation records of graduating students

Post-graduation indicators of student success

- Outcomes of the most recent Canadian Graduate and Professional Survey (CGPSS)
- Known career paths for graduates of previous 5 years

Postdoctoral Fellows

Provide an overview of the number of postdoctoral fellows over the past five years, demographics, disciplinary expertise, sources of funding, scholarly activity, general support and oversight of their development.

RESEARCH, SCHOLARSHIP AND INNOVATION

This section should provide an overview of the research strengths, strategic research priorities, research infrastructure and metrics for benchmarking research performance. This section will be supported by centrally provided data as well as by metrics appropriate for the unit's disciplines in order to assess scholarly productivity relative to appropriate peer units. The specific issues to be addressed are:

- What are the unit's existing and emerging areas of excellence? Which steps are being taken to align strengths to priorities?
- How does the unit contribute to innovation and innovation transfer?

- How does the unit compare, using objective benchmarks, to similar peer comparators across Canada? International benchmarks may apply if valid comparative data are available.
- How does the unit assess the quality of research programs within the unit and of individual faculty members in the FTFC process?
- How has the unit's research funding changed since the last review? Discuss Tri-council and CFI funding, other federal and provincial research initiatives and programs, and sponsored research revenue compared to other U15 universities.
- Describe progress in research productivity and related metrics including:
 - Awards and honours: endowed professorships, fellowships, awards, editorships of journals;
 - Research dissemination: including but not limited to, refereed publications, presentations, proceedings, creative performance/works/exhibitions, patents, invention disclosures and citations;
 - Knowledge translation, contributions to the profession, research infrastructure, numbers of research trainees, postdoctoral fellows, research associates.
 - Collaborations and Teams: involvement in collaborative, interdisciplinary or international projects and research teams.

PARTNERSHIPS

This section should identify and describe the key partnerships external and internal to the university maintained by the unit and address the rationale for these partnerships and their strategic roles. In particular, this section should discuss how these partnerships enhance the core mission, priorities and strategic plans of the unit and how they contribute to delivering on the university strategies and plans, including the Indigenous Strategy, the International Strategy, the Strategic Research and Academic Plans.

- a) Activities undertaken by the academic unit that serve the wider community, such as public lectures, community service learning programs, involvement in community learning initiatives, outreach initiatives, including alumni engagement, industry partnerships, and where applicable, an overview of cultural events.
- b) International partnerships and the purpose they serve in the areas of research, teaching, and learning.
- c) Partnerships with Indigenous communities, institutions, and schools to foster indigenous engagement.

BUDGET

Summarize the unit budget, supported by high-level data included in the appendices. The questions to be addressed are:

- Is the available budget appropriately allocated within the unit to drive areas of priority and to deliver on key responsibilities? (Note that this question addresses how funds are allocated and not the total funding available to support the mission of the unit).
- What alternative sources of funding, other than University operating funds, are being used to support the unit?
- What alternative sources of funding could be explored to enhance the performance of the unit?

- What processes are used within the unit to monitor spending, allocate funds and ensure compliance? Are the current processes transparent and consistently applied?

FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE

Summarize the physical infrastructure that supports the academic enterprise of the unit. Include a centrally provided table in the Appendix that describes the spaces assigned to the unit. The key questions to be addressed in this section are:

- What are the major facilities and infrastructure elements administered by the unit?
- What processes are used to allocate space and infrastructure within the unit?
- How does the unit ensure that space is efficiently and appropriately used?
- How are research and educational infrastructure supported by the unit?
- What are the high-level priorities of the unit's Space Plan?

DATA PACKAGE

The data package will form an Appendix to the self-study. It will consist of figures and tables provided by the Office of Institutional Analysis. The unit may choose to supplement the OIA data with additional data required to support statements and conclusions in the self-study document, as appropriate. The data included are those used in the standard set of faculty performance metrics along with institutional metrics related to measuring academic and research plan progress as well as others that are specific to the unit. Please note: data packages should be of reasonable length – pick only key metrics to supplement written information.

APPENDIX II: INFORMATION FOR THE REVIEW TEAM

LOGISTICAL INFORMATION

The review team will receive copies of the self-appraisal document and other materials approximately one month before the site visit. Reviewers are invited to be in touch with the Deputy Provost with any concerns, questions, or requests for additional information. Documentation will be circulated in electronic format for easy retrieval.

The Review Coordinator will arrange travel and hotel accommodations. Reviewers may make their own travel arrangements if they wish. The University of Calgary will assume costs for economy class airfare only.

Reviewers are encouraged to arrive in Calgary in time for a working dinner to review questions, plan the approach, and decide how to proceed during the site visit. The working dinner will be scheduled the evening before the site visit (i.e., arrival at Calgary International Airport no later than 4:00 pm).

Reviewers should leave Calgary no earlier than the evening of the second day of the site visit. The closing meeting will normally take place from 4 – 5 pm, so departures from the Calgary International Airport should be no earlier than 7:00 pm

The University will assume costs for accommodation and meals. The University does not cover the costs of alcohol. Members of the review team will be paid an honorarium for their participation.

Original receipts or email versions of receipts are required for reimbursement of any out-of-pocket expenses (parking, ground transportation, baggage fees, airfare, and meals).

INFORMATION RELATED TO SITE VISIT CONSULTATIONS:

The unit review is a data-driven, transparent process.

Meetings with senior administration at the outset and at the end of the visit are designed to situate the unit under review within the university's plans and priorities.

The self-appraisal is the centerpiece of the review process.

The consultations with faculty, students, and staff of the unit under review provide additional information to the reviewers and attendees' perspectives should be considered in the larger context of the review and self-study.

The site visit will take place over two full days. The information gathered during those two days will, together with the self-appraisal, inform the final review report.

APPENDIX III: REVIEW REPORT TEMPLATE

****UNIT NAME** UNIT REVIEW REPORT**

The site visit of the unit review team for the ****unit name**** took place from ****dates****. The unit review team consisted of:

Name, Position, Institution

Name, Position, Institution

Name, Position, Institution

Name, Position, Institution

GENERAL COMMENTS FROM THE REVIEW TEAM

Please provide general comments on the strengths of the unit and general observations that may not otherwise be captured in the review report.

KEY QUESTIONS

During the opening meeting, the Provost will provide key questions to help guide the unit review. Please provide comments, observations and recommendations to the questions in this section.

Examples of areas of focus from previous reviews include:

- Faculty culture and identity
- Administrative/governance structure within the unit
- Positioning of research institutes
- Size of the unit – growth opportunities
- Overall program mix
- Assessment of overall strength of the unit

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1:

Review team comments

Recommendation 2:

Review team comments

Recommendation 3:

Review team comments

CONCLUSION

Concluding remarks and any additional comments from the review team.

APPENDIX IV: SAMPLE SCHEDULE FOR SITE VISIT



Unit Name: Faculty of
Names and Institutions of review team:

Participants are reminded to maintain confidentiality of all discussions in sessions with the review team

SITE VISIT TEMPLATE. THIS IS ONLY AN EXAMPLE. THE DATES FOR THE SITE VISIT WILL BE DISCUSSED WITH THE DEAN AND THE PROVOST'S OFFICE AFTER THE INFORMATION MEETING. UNITS ARE INVITED TO MAKE CHANGES TO THE SCHEDULE TO FIT THEIR SPECIFIC NEEDS. THE ONLY MEETINGS THAT CANNOT BE CHANGED ARE THE WORKING DINNERS AND THE OPENING AND CLOSING MEETINGS.

DAY, DATE

6:00 pm	Review Committee Working Dinner - Review team only	Off campus – organized by Provost's Office
---------	--	--

DAY, DATE

8:00 a m – 8:45 a m	Opening Meeting: Members of review team, Provost, Deputy Provost. Senior Director, Academic and International Strategies Breakfast Provided by Provost's Office	Location within unit
9:00 a m – 10:00 a m	Dean	
10:00 a m – 10:15 a m	BREAK – refreshments provided by Provost's Office	
10:15 a m – 11:00 a m	Space & Facilities Tour and/or Presentation: Dean, Campus Planning, Appropriate faculty personnel	
11:00 a m – 12:15 p m	Administrative, support and technical staff	
12:15 p m – 1:15 p m	Community Stakeholders or Alumni Lunch provided by Provost's Office	
1:15 p m – 2:15 p m	Faculty* (*Can be organized in way that makes sense to the unit, for example by Teaching, Research, Planning, Grad, Undergrad).	
2:15 p m – 3:15 p m	Faculty *	
3:15 p m – 3:30 p m	BREAK – refreshments provided by Provost's Office	
3:30 p m – 4:30 p m	Associate Deans/Department Heads	
4:30 p m – 5:30 p m	Undergraduate students	
6:30 p m	Review team Working Dinner - Review team only	Off campus - Organized by Provost's Office

DAY, DATE (Second day of Site Visit)

8:00 am – 9:00 am	Breakfast with Alumni – Breakfast provided	Location within unit
9:00 am – 10:00 am	Meeting with Graduate Students	
10:00 am – 10:15 am	BREAK – refreshments provided	
10:15 – 11:30 am	Meeting with Research Team	
11:30 am – 12:30 pm	Individual meetings – 15 minutes each.	
12:30 pm – 1:00 pm	Review Team Lunch. Lunch provided.	
1:00 pm – 4:00 pm	Review Team working session – No appointments	
2:30 pm – 2:45 pm	Break – refreshments provided	
4:00 – 5:00 pm	Closing Meeting: Review Team, Provost, Deputy Provost, Dean of unit, Dean of Grad Studies, VP Research, authors of self-appraisal document. Refreshments provided	

APPENDIX V: TEMPLATE FOR MID-CYCLE REVIEW

UNIT REVIEWS – MID-CYCLE REPORT
Faculty Name
Date

Recommendation	Status/Timeline	Comments
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		