BACHELOR’S DEGREE PROGRAM EVALUATION   
SITE VISIT REPORT

{NAME OF PROGRAM AND ORGANIZATION}

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Program | {NAME OF PROGRAM} |
| Organization | {NAME OF ORGANIZATION} |
| Evaluation Team Members | 1. Chair: 2. Member: 3. Member: 4. Member: |
| Date of Evaluation/Site Visit |  |
| Date of Report Submission to CAQC |  |

# INSTRUCTIONS

**Delete all red instructing font once reviewed prior to submitting final draft.**

**Please review Degrees Handbook Section 4: Degree Program Standards for additional details on each Standard. Evidence for each Standard will be found in the Applicant’s PAPRS Submission (Part A), Part B, and affiliated appendices provide to the SVT by the CAQC Secretariat.**

**This report will be provided in PDF and Word to the Applicant. The Applicant will use the Response Boxes to reply in the Word Document.**

# REPORT GUIDELINES

*Reports of CAQC’s evaluation teams are prepared exclusively for the purpose of evaluating the quality of proposed post-secondary degree programs in Alberta and with consent of the respective institutions. All evaluation reports are based upon CAQC’s policies and procedures which are available to all participants of the review process. Reports of Council’s evaluation teams are only one form of information considered during the program approval process in Alberta, and Council may not accept or endorse all recommendations or comments contained in these reports.*

# EVALUATION TEAM MEMBERS

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Name | Role | Date of Final Review\* |
|  | Chair of the Program Evaluation Team |  |
|  | Member of the Program Evaluation Team |  |
|  | Member of the Program Evaluation Team |  |

*\* Each team member should enter the date of their final review of this document. Members of the Evaluation Team will be copied on the final submission of the Report from the Team Chair to Council, which indicates agreement of all members with the final report as submitted.*

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

***Provide a short summary of the evaluation and site visit.***

## Assessment Summary Table

*For each Standard, indicate whether the program fails, meets, or meets with conditions – see definitions, below.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Standards and IAE Report Requirements** | **Fails** | **Meets** | **Conditional** |
| 1. Degree design meeting Alberta requirements. | X | X | X |
| 1. Qualified faculty teaching in and participating in the ongoing development of program quality. |  |  |  |
| 1. Commitment to research, scholarship, and creative work. |  |  |  |
| 1. Sufficient resource capacity. |  |  |  |
| 1. Engaging and effective teaching and learning methodologies. |  |  |  |
| 1. Independent Academic Expert Reports (2) & Applicant Response are included (as required in Part B) and sufficient. |  |  |  |

## Overall Recommendation

The Site Visit Team ***recommends….***

**Include OVERALL RECOMMENDATION (sample wording):**

*The review team has concluded that the {PSI NAME’s PROGRAM NAME} proposal* ***[meets / does not meet]*** *the program evaluation criteria and standards set by CAQC, and that the program* ***[be approved subject to the conditions and recommendations noted herein / not be approved.]***

**Include any other comments the team wishes to make regarding major findings, broad conclusions, key impressions, etc.**

**Defining Assessment Criteria**

For each Standard the team is asked to assess whether the proposal fails to meet, meets, or meets with conditions the established criteria. The following guidelines are provided to better assist expert reviewers in determining which assessment is appropriate:

1. ***Meets or Exceeds the Criteria***

*The proposal meets the criteria without any revisions. As the criteria are minimum standards, expert reviewers can make suggestions to the CAQC and the institution through the report that may improve the proposal beyond the minimum standards indicated in the criteria. Institutions will not be required to implement these suggestions before or after receiving approval.*

1. ***Meets the Criteria with Conditions***

*In some cases, the proposal may meet the established criteria if additional information is provided, or with specific steps that can be completed with reasonable ease by the institution (e.g. hiring an additional faculty member). The team may provide advice to the CAQC and to the institution through the report that the proposal meets the criteria on the condition that specific actions are taken. The institution is expected to respond to any conditional requirements provided by the team and the CAQC will take the team’s advice and the institution’s response into consideration when making its recommendation to the Minister.*

*This assessment should only be applied if the team is confident the institution can meet or commit to meeting the criteria without extensive revisions to the proposal which might require an additional review by subject experts and/or Council members.*

1. ***Fails to Meet the Criteria***

*The proposal contains significant deficiencies to an extent that it fails to meet the established criteria. This assessment should be applied if the proposal has weaknesses that will require extensive time and resources on the institution’s part to make the necessary changes to meet the criteria. This could necessitate substantial revisions to the proposal and might require an additional review by subject experts and/or Council members.*

**Important!**

In providing an overall assessment of the proposal, the team is asked to keep in mind the following:

* A large number of conditional criteria may have the cumulative effect of an overall assessment of fail, particularly if the required changes become so encompassing that the institution would not be able to make the changes without significant revisions to its proposal or within a reasonable time frame, or if there are questions about whether the institution has the ability (e.g. expertise and/or resources) to meet the required conditions.
* If there are a number of conditional criteria, the team should advise Council whether it believes the institution will be able to meet the conditional requirements.

# INTRODUCTION

*Include any introductory comments the team wishes to make such as an overview of Site Visit, context of Site Visit, and reference to any organizational context relevant to the Program Evaluation.*

Council invited…..

On Date X….

On Date Y…

The Team would like to….

The Team recommends that…

***Sample wording:***

This report is an evaluation of and recommendation on the proposal by {PSI} to offer a Bachelor of {PROGRAM NAME} degree. The report was prepared by the Program Evaluation Site Visit Team (the team) whose members are listed on the title page. The team was tasked with conducting a review of the proposed degree program. The report has been prepared for the Campus Alberta Quality Council (CAQC).

The report is based on a review of {PSI NAME’s} proposal (PAPRS Proposal known as Part A, Part B, and related documents) provided before and during a site visit that was conducted via meetings on {DATES}. The meetings that constituted the site visit were well-organized and informative, and provided the team with ample opportunity to explore issues and address concerns raised by the documentation (see Site Visit Schedule in Appendix B). The team is grateful to {PSI NAME} for setting up the technology for the review and …

# EVALUATION OF CAQC DEGREE STANDARDS

## Standard 1: Degree Design

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Degree design meeting Alberta requirements.** |
| **AREAS OF FOCUS** |
| 1. Focus and Nomenclature 2. Admission Standards 3. Credit/semesters Architecture 4. Breadth and Depth 5. Program Learning Outcomes 6. Degree Oversight and Recognition |

**The Program:**

\_\_\_\_\_\_ fails to meet the criteria

\_\_\_\_\_\_ meets or exceeds the criteria

\_\_\_\_\_\_ meets criteria on the condition that the Conditions/Recommendations below are addressed.

### Rationale for Determination

The rationale is….

### Conditions/Recommendations

1. Condition 1
2. Condition 2…

### Team Comments & Applicant PSI Response

|  |
| --- |
| **Standard 1: Criteria for Assessment and ERT Comments** |
| 1. The name of each degree must:    * accurately reflect the program of study and its emphasis (and have long-term meaning/relevancy) and,    * where appropriate, meet the standards of related accrediting, regulatory or professional bodies;    * the curriculum of the degree (program of study) is consistent with the degree name   *Refer to PAPRS Proposal, Part A, Program of Study (Appendix to Part A) and Part B additional Program Information.* |
| **Site Visit Team Comments** |
| **Applicant PSI Response** |
| 1. Admission Standards: The Admission, Progression, and Graduation requirements for the proposed degree:    * meet the criteria set by Council and are comparable to other degrees in the same area (Part A).    * the Grading Scale is appropriate for the level of study (Part B).   *Refer to PAPRS Proposal Part A and Part B for information.* |
| **Site Visit Team Comments** |
| **Applicant PSI Response** |
| 1. Credit/Semesters Architecture: The Applicant has clearly detailed the proposed degree’s architecture (credit/semesters) in alignment with Council’s expectations and the ACF/CDQF.   *Refer to PAPRS Proposal Part A and Part B for information.* |
| **Site Visit Team Comments** |
| **Applicant PSI Response** |
| 1. Breadth and Depth: The Program Structure and Design demonstrate the proposed degree has an appropriate balance between core requirements, specialized courses, and elective/breadth courses, including alignment of teaching strategies. The Institution has sufficient courses (at the junior and senior level) to support breadth in the degree. If the proposal deviates from the standards expected, the applicant has provided a sufficient rationale.   *Refer to Part A for Program of Study; Part B for detailed curriculum mapping.* |
| **Site Visit Team Comments** |
| **Applicant PSI Response** |
| 1. Program Learning Outcomes: Program learning outcomes (and course learning outcomes) are comparable to programs of similar length and level with appropriate progression and assessment to ensure student achievement. (Part B, curriculum mapping; Part A, Program of Study). PLOs align directly with teaching methods and assessment strategies (Part B). For degrees that include laddering credentials, the PLOs are mapped for all credentials.   *Refer to Part A, Appendix Program of Study, and Part B, Curriculum Map Tables.* |
| **Site Visit Team Comments** |
| **Applicant PSI Response** |
| 1. Degree Oversight and Recognition: Program curricula, assessment and general oversight are the responsibility of academically qualified persons and units (departments, schools, faculties, etc.). For degrees with an external regulatory/accrediting body or process, the applicant has demonstrated that the program meets the requirements of that body.   *Refer to Part A for Accreditation; Part A for Institutional Capacity; Part B for Implementation Plans.* |
| **Site Visit Team Comments** |
| **Applicant PSI Response** |

## Standard 2: Faculty

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Qualified faculty teaching in and participating in the ongoing development of program quality.** |
| **AREAS OF FOCUS** |
| 1. Number of Faculty/Continuing Faculty 2. Terminal degree or equivalent |

**The Program:**

\_\_\_\_\_\_ fails to meet the criteria

\_\_\_\_\_\_ meets or exceeds the criteria

\_\_\_\_\_\_ meets criteria on the condition that the Conditions/Recommendations below are addressed.

### Rationale for Determination

The rationale is….

### Conditions/Recommendations

1. Condition 1
2. Condition 2…

### Team Comments & Applicant PSI Response

|  |
| --- |
| **Standard 2: Criteria for Assessment and ERT Comments** |
| 1. Number of Faculty/ Continuing Faculty:    * The number of continuing/full-time faculty meet the expectations of Council.    * The balance between full-time/continuing faculty and part-time/contract faculty meets the expectations of Council.    * The Academic Staffing Plan meets the minimum requirements in the CAQC Degrees Handbook.   *Refer to Part B for Academic Staffing Plan, Implementation Plan, and Part B Appendices for Faculty CVs.* |
| **Site Visit Team Comments** |
| **Applicant PSI Response** |
| 1. Terminal Degree or Equivalent:    * Faculty meet the qualifications expected by Council (minimum: Masters; desirable: Doctoral or appropriate terminal credential).    * Council recognizes that faculty may be academically or experientially qualified; in most degrees, the majority of faculty will be Academically Qualified.   *Refer to Part B for Academic Staffing Plan, Implementation Plan, and Part B Appendices for Faculty CVs.* |
| **Site Visit Team Comments** |
| **Applicant PSI Response** |

## Standard 3: Research & Scholarship

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Commitment to research, scholarship, and creative work.** |
| **AREAS OF FOCUS** |
| 1. Student exposure to/participation in scholarly activity/research 2. Opportunities for/evidence of ongoing research, scholarship, and creative work |

**The Program:**

\_\_\_\_\_\_ fails to meet the criteria

\_\_\_\_\_\_ meets or exceeds the criteria

\_\_\_\_\_\_ meets criteria on the condition that the Conditions/Recommendations below are addressed.

### Rationale for Determination

The rationale is….

### Conditions/Recommendations

1. Condition 1
2. Condition 2…

### Team Comments & Applicant PSI Response

|  |
| --- |
| **Standard 3: Criteria for Assessment and ERT Comments** |
| 1. Student exposure to/participation in scholarly activity/research: The proposal demonstrates that students will have adequate exposure to research, scholarship, or creative work as part of their program. This may include evidence such as:    * Research active /Creatively performing scholars are teaching the majority of degree-level courses and integrating their practice within the curriculum (i.e., modelling for students);    * Courses offer students the opportunity to engage in independent research or creative activity under faculty supervision;    * Courses (or workshops/supports offered on campus) provide students with skills to engage in research or creative activity;    * Opportunities within the program exist for undergraduate participation in faculty research projects;    * Opportunities within the institution exist for student participation in applied or community-based research projects;    * Opportunities within the institution exist for student participation in work-integrated learning with a research focus;    * Where opportunities for undergraduate participation in faculty scholarship are not available, students are offered a capstone course where independent research is supervised by a faculty member.   *Refer to Part B and faculty CVs.* |
| **Site Visit Team Comments** |
| **Applicant PSI Response** |
| 1. Opportunities for/evidence of ongoing research, scholarship, and creative work    * The majority of faculty teaching in a degree program must demonstrate active scholarship or creative activity outputs within a five-year period (see Organizations Handbook for Scholarly Activity).    * Faculty are reviewed within a system for the regular evaluation and rewarding of scholarly or creative activity.    * Faculty in a degree have a workload commensurate with expectations for scholarly activity.    * Normally, this would be demonstrated through faculty teaching not more than 4 courses per major term or semester. However, institutions may demonstrate capacity in different ways to show that time and space for scholarship are clearly and adequately provisioned in the faculty workload model used by the institution for the proposed program in alignment with any relevant collective bargaining agreements (e.g., in respect to number of courses, unique sections, course size, pedagogical considerations, delivery model, workload averaging).    * At the program level, the academic unit (e.g., a program area, department, faculty, school), supports faculty research in addition to supports offered institutional (reviewed during Organizational or Comprehensive Evaluations – see Organizations Handbook).    * For degrees with an applied or professional focus, faculty also maintain continuing academic and professional competence and accreditation in their discipline or field appropriate to the specific degree program.   *Refer to Part B and faculty CVs.* |
| **Site Visit Team Comments** |
| **Applicant PSI Response** |

## Standard 4: Resources

|  |
| --- |
| **(4) Sufficient resource capacity.** |
| **AREAS OF FOCUS** |
| The Program has sufficient resources to implement and sustain the program and recognizes elements that may be phased in during implementation.   1. Faculty 2. Curriculum Development 3. Facilities and Infrastructure 4. Library Resources 5. Student Supports |

**Based on the evidence provided, the Program:**

\_\_\_\_\_\_ fails to meet the criteria

\_\_\_\_\_\_ meets or exceeds the criteria

\_\_\_\_\_\_ meets criteria on the condition that the Conditions/Recommendations below are addressed.

### Rationale for Determination

The rationale is….

### Conditions/Recommendations

1. Condition 1
2. Condition 2…

### Team Comments & Applicant PSI Response

|  |
| --- |
| **Standard 4: Criteria for Assessment and ERT Comments** |
| 1. Faculty: Sufficient qualified faculty to development, implement, and sustain the program as evidenced by the Staffing Plan, Implementation Plan, and Faculty CVs.   *Refer to Part B – Academic Staffing Plan, Implementation Plan, and Faculty CVs. Additional information may be in Part A Institutional Capacity.* |
| **Site Visit Team Comments** |
| **Applicant PSI Response** |
| 1. Curriculum Development: Resources to develop curriculum fully prior to implementation or in a phased approach. This may include hiring qualified faculty prior to program approval.   *Refer to Part B Implementation Plan and Academic Staffing Plan for information on courses that need to be phased in or developed or need to hire faculty with specific expertise to develop curriculum.* |
| **Site Visit Team Comments** |
| **Applicant PSI Response** |
| 1. Facilities and Infrastructure: Appropriate classroom, laboratory, research, and other spaces specific to the program.   *Refer to Part B for Facilities and Infrastructure* |
| **Site Visit Team Comments** |
| **Applicant PSI Response** |
| 1. Library Resources: Student and Faculty access to sufficient library resources (quality, quantity, and currency) to support research at the student and faculty level.   *Refer to Part B for Library Resources.* |
| **Site Visit Team Comments** |
| **Applicant PSI Response** |
| 1. Student Supports: Student supports appropriate to the specific needs of the program, if any are required beyond those evidenced in the Organizational Evaluation.   *Refer to Part B for Student Supports including Non-Academic Staffing Requirements.* |
| **Site Visit Team Comments** |
| **Applicant PSI Response** |

## Standard 5: Teaching & Learning

|  |
| --- |
| **(5) Engaging and effective teaching and learning methodologies.** |
| **AREAS OF FOCUS** |
| 1. Curriculum Design and Maps 2. Teaching Strategies 3. Institutional Support 4. Assessment of Learning 5. Assessment of Teaching 6. Program Review |

**The Program:**

\_\_\_\_\_\_ fails to meet the criteria

\_\_\_\_\_\_ meets or exceeds the criteria

\_\_\_\_\_\_ meets criteria on the condition that the Conditions/Recommendations below are addressed.

### Rationale for Determination

The rationale is….

### Conditions/Recommendations

1. Condition 1
2. Condition 2…

### Team Comments & Applicant PSI Response

|  |
| --- |
| **Standard 5: Criteria for Assessment and ERT Comments** |
| 1. Curriculum Design and Maps:    * Well-designed and developed curriculum plans, including clearly articulated course and program learning outcomes, are foundational to supporting teaching effectiveness.    * A curriculum map connecting Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) for both breadth and depth to specific courses and demonstrating student achievement of learning outcomes will support proposals (required in Part B).   *Refer to Part A, Part A Program of Study (Appendix), Part B Curriculum Maps.* |
| **Site Visit Team Comments** |
| **Applicant PSI Response** |
| 1. Teaching Strategies:    * The instructional methods, modes of delivery, and assessments of learning and feedback used should be aligned with articulated learning outcomes for the course or program, regardless of delivery mode (in-person, online, blended, or other).    * The pedagogical and/or andragogical strategies used in the program, including rationale and resource implications where possible, support teaching effectiveness and student achievement of Program Learning Outcomes within the context of the delivery modality.    * Engaged, active, experiential learning and, where appropriate, work-integrated learning, are effectively incorporated into the program design and aligned with delivery modality.   *Refer to Part A for delivery location; Part B Curriculum Maps and Teaching Effectiveness.* |
| **Site Visit Team Comments** |
| **Applicant PSI Response** |
| 1. Institutional Support:    * All those involved in course design and delivery are adequately trained and assisted in the pedagogy/andragogy and technology of effective teaching across various modalities and regardless of delivery mode (e.g. face-to-face versus online).    * Faculty are assisted and supported in transitioning from classroom to online teaching, or vice versa, and are assessed and mentored as they progress in their teaching.    * Academic staff are provided with an orientation to, and sufficient ongoing training/technical support for teaching effectiveness (including pedagogical approaches and assessment), any hardware and software resources required in the program.   *Refer to Part B.* |
| **Site Visit Team Comments** |
| **Applicant PSI Response** |
| 1. Assessment of Learning: The assessment methods used by faculty in the Program align with Course and Program Learning Outcomes and clearly demonstrate how students will be assessed for achievement of Course and Program Learning Outcomes.   *Refer to Part B* |
| **Site Visit Team Comments** |
| **Applicant PSI Response** |
| 1. Assessment of Teaching: Faculty are mentored and supported to teach effectively in different modalities (e.g., face-to-face versus blended versus online). Processes and structures are in place in the program/department/school to develop, support, assess (using multiple sources of evidence), and recognize/reward teaching effectiveness.   *Refer to Part B* |
| **Site Visit Team Comments** |
| **Applicant PSI Response** |
| 1. Program Review: Program curricula, assessment and oversight are the responsibility of academically qualified persons. The presentation, management, and evaluation of the program are the responsibility of staff with appropriate academic qualifications.  *This may be evaluated through linked policies in Part B in alignment with Degrees Handbook Section 5 for Cyclical Program Review.*   *Refer to Part B* |
| **Site Visit Team Comments** |
| **Applicant PSI Response** |

## Independent Academic Expert Reports

With Part B, Applicants provide two (2) reports from Independent Academic Experts who review the Program and provide their expert assessment based on the criteria in the Handbook. The Applicant also provides their response to both IAE Reports and indicates what, if any, changes they have made to the Program based on these reports.

**The Program:**

\_\_\_\_\_\_ fails to meet the criteria

\_\_\_\_\_\_ meets or exceeds the criteria

\_\_\_\_\_\_ meets criteria on the condition that the Conditions/Recommendations below are addressed.

### Rationale for Determination

The rationale is….

### Conditions/Recommendations

1. Condition 1
2. Condition 2…

### Team Comments & Applicant PSI Response

|  |
| --- |
| **IAE Reports: Criteria for Assessment and ERT Comments** |
| 1. The Applicant has provided 2 (two) Independent Academic Expert reports and a description of each expert’s qualifications for each 4-year program proposal (CV provided for each). |
| **Site Visit Team Comments** |
| **Applicant PSI Response** |
| 1. The Reports of the IAEs (minimum 2) address all requirements of Council and provide insight into the quality and sustainability of the program/endorsement for the program. See IAE Report Template and Terms of Reference (Appendix) for full expectations. |
| **Site Visit Team Comments** |
| **Applicant PSI Response** |
| 1. The Applicant has provided evidence of thoughtful responses to the issues and recommendations raised in the reports of the (minimum 2) Independent Academic Experts. |
| **Site Visit Team Comments** |
| **Applicant PSI Response** |

# Appendix A: CONDITIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

***Include a collated list of all Conditions/Recommendations***

* ***Note any Conditions that must be met prior to program approval or program implementation***
* ***Note whether it is feasible for the Conditions to be met prior to the proposed Program Implementation Date***
* ***A significant number of Conditions may result in an overall recommendation of “Not Met” given timelines, resource implications, etc.)***
* ***Please ensure numbering is consistent with the Report and there are no duplicated Conditions or Recommendations***

## CONDITIONS:

1. xx

## RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. xx

# Appendix B: Site Visit Schedule

***Insert the Site Visit Schedule here.***