PSI APPLICATION FOR MOVING TO CAQC DELEGATED REVIEW STATUS WITH QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESS AUDITS

PSI NAME:

Date of Application

***Note to Applicants: The Applicant PSI is responsible for completing a concise, comprehensive, and reflective application for DRS/QAPA Status that responds to all eligibility criteria. Applications should not exceed 20 pages plus relevant appendices.***

# INTRODUCTION

*The Applicant should provide a brief introduction to the Institution, its history of degree-granting status, quality assurance processes, governance, and future plans.*

# ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA FOR DRA/QAPA

*The Applicant should provide a brief rationale with supporting evidence (links to policies or reference to appended policies) that indicate how the Applicant meets the Eligibility Criteria in the Organizations Handbook. These Criteria have been divided into discrete questions for Applicants.*

## COMPREHENSIVE EVALUATION HISTORY

1. Does the institution have a record of at least one (1) CAQC or PCAB Comprehensive Organizational Evaluation having been found satisfactory by Council?

## PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT AND QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESSES

1. Does the institution have robust internal program development and quality assurance processes?

## INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY FOR DRS

1. Does the institution demonstrate that they have:
	1. Policies and procedures for developing, approving, and reviewing high quality degree programs?
	2. Rigorous governance approval processes aligned with policy and the PSLA for the approval and review of programs?
	3. Mechanisms for internal and external peer review?
	4. A record of submitting to CAQC quality program proposal?
	5. A record of successful implementation of new degree programs?

## PROGRAM REVIEW CAPACITY AND HISTORY

1. Does the institution, in reviewing existing degrees, demonstrate that they have:
	1. A record of cyclical program reviews (normally at least three cyclical program reviews completed and submitted to Council with results found satisfactory by Council prior to application) based on appropriate institutional policy and procedures for cyclical reviews of degree programs?
	2. Capacity to produce a reflective self-study
	3. Ability to select appropriate Independent Academic Experts?
	4. Evidence of responding effectively to the external review?
	5. Evidence of developing, implementing, and monitoring a sound and accountable action plan?

## PROGRAM EVALUATION PROCESSES

1. In addition to cyclical program reviews, does the institution have ongoing program evaluation processes, such as annual reviews or curricular reviews, that result in a record of continuous improvement in curriculum, pedagogy, scholarly activity and other aspects of degree programs?

## STRATEGIC PROGRAM ASSESSMENT PROCESSES

1. Does the institution have a forward-looking strategic process for program and organizational assessment, informed by appropriate self-studies and advice offered by external expert reviewers?

## TEACHING AND LEARNING CULTURE & FACULTY EVALUATION

1. Does the institution have rigorous evaluation policies and procedures for faculty and instructional staff that support a culture of a robust commitment to teaching and learning effectiveness and scholarly activity?

## EXTERNAL EVALUATIONS FOR DRS APPLICATION

1. Has the institution included reports of at least two (2) Independent External Evaluators (see Degree Handbook for Independent Academic Experts) who have assessed the institution’s readiness to move toward its ownership of quality assurance in monitoring degree programs? How has the institution responded to these reports and planned to address weaknesses or areas of improvements (if any were noted)?

# CONCLUSION / SUMMARY