EVALUATION REPORT: APPLICATION FOR DRS

PSI NAME:

DATE OF PSI’S APPLICATION:

***Date of Submission of the Report:***

***Names of Report Authors/Evaluation Team Members***

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

*This section could provide a summary of the overall assessment of whether the institution has successfully met the criteria for Delegated Review Status, either in whole or in part.*

*This section can also be used to provide an introduction and/or any other comments the team wishes to make regarding major findings, broad conclusions, key impressions, etc.*

***Overall Recommendation***

***Sample Wording:*** *Based on involvement with the comprehensive evaluation, including a review of the PSI response to the report and the review of the PSI Audit Proposal, we believe that PSI* ***[has successfully met / has not met]*** *all of the Campus Alberta Quality Council (CAQC) criteria for Delegated Review Status and moving to Quality Assurance Process Audits. We recommend that the PSI* ***[be granted Delegated Review Status/be granted Delegated Review Status with the following Conditions / no be granted Delegated Review Status pending completion of ….]****.*

# ASSESSMENT OF CRITERIA FOR MOVING TO AUDIT STATUS

*The Audit Team/DRS Ad Hoc Committee will evaluate the proposal following the Eligibility Criteria in the Organizations Handbook. These Criteria have been divided into discrete questions for the purposes of this report. Council expects a brief (paragraph) analysis for each point. The report should not exceed 10 pages.*

## 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 who have assessed the institution’s readiness to move toward its ownership of quality assurance in monitoring degree programs?
   1. Has the institution responded sufficiently to any strengths, weaknesses, or areas of improvement noted in the External Reports?

# CONCLUSIONS AND REOMMENDATIONS

***Summary of the conclusions and collection of any Conditions or Recommendations.***