St. Thomas University

POLICY:	**Department/ Program External Review Policy**
Effective Date:	1998
Revised Date:	October 15, 1998; April 20, 2006; May 2011; November 24, 2022
Review Date:	June 2029
Approving Body:	St. Thomas University Senate
Authority:	Act creating St. Thomas University
Implementation:	Office of the Dean of Humanities and the Dean of Social Sciences
Contact:	Vice-President (Academic and Research)
Applies to:	University Departments and Programs

1.0   Reason for Policy

This policy outlines the procedures and practices for Departmental and Program reviews, which are to be undertaken every five to seven years, by every Department and Program that offers a major, including interdisciplinary programs that offer a major. In the case of Departments and Programs which offer more than one major, each major requires an External Review. Interdisciplinary programs that are associated with a Department or Program should be evaluated as a subsidiary of that Department or Program when it is undergoing a review.

2.0   Policy Statement

2.0.1.   Preamble

Reviews are intended to be constructive evaluations of our program offerings. As such, they should highlight a Department/ Program's strengths while identifying areas for improvement. They involve a period of self-reflection (self-study), an external evaluation (site visit), and program revisions as an outcome of the review process (action plan development and execution). Regularly undertaking external reviews on a five-to-seven-year rotation will ultimately serve the best interests of Departments and Programs, as well as St. Thomas, by providing a framework for evaluating the extent to which we are meeting agreed-upon regional standards.

2.0.2. Function

The External Review Coordinating Committee (ERCC) coordinates the external review process and ensures the External Review Team's recommendations are written as yes-no motions that can be voted on first by the Department/ Program and then by Senate. The committee monitors the Department/ Programs' progress in preparing the self-study, and their responses to the External Review recommendations and submits to Senate progress on the implementation of approved recommendations. The ERCC Committee conducts its work in accordance with this Policy on External Reviews.

It is expected that Departments and Programs will jointly share the responsibility of successfully undertaking external reviews with this committee and the Deans. This policy lays out each group's responsibilities, which involve a multi-year process. Usually, the first year is a planning and reflection year for the Department/ Program wherein they develop and submit a comprehensive, student-centred, self-study to the ERCC. The second year involves an external review team's site visit and the Department/ Program's initial response to the Review Team's report and the development of an action plan to implement Senate-approved recommendations. The third and subsequent years often require a series of actions to achieve the Senate-approved recommendations.

2.0.3. Membership

1. The **ERCC** is composed of six (6) members:
    (a) The Dean of Humanities and the Dean of Social Sciences, who act as co-Chairs;
    (b) Four (4) faculty members — who are, or have been, Chairs or Directors of Departments or Programs. Members will serve for two-year terms.

2.0.4. The **Review Team**:

(a) Normally consists of two members, external to St. Thomas University, who are appointed from a list of nominees submitted by the Department or Program under review.

(b) The Department/ Program under review provides a ranked list of names and contact information of six possible external candidates based on ensuring the potential reviewers have relevant expertise to review the curriculum and can enable building a Review Team with:
    i.   gender balance;
    ii.   representation from Atlantic Canada;
    iii. the presence of administrative experience — nominees should have had some experience as Department Chairs or have previously held administrative roles.

(c) The list of potential reviewers must not include anyone who is in a real or perceived conflict of interest based on close personal or professional ties to any member of the Department/ Program under review.

(d) The list shall explain why each nominee would make a good reviewer. Please note, no

UNB colleagues are eligible to be members of the review team as the Review Team may comment on STU's Department/ Program's relationship with the corresponding UNB Department/ Program, as part of the review.

(e) To ensure the transparency of the process and the usefulness of the External Review, the Review Team shall be selected from different institutions and from diverse backgrounds. If necessary, the ERCC will reorder the ranked list to ensure both diversity and the composition balance outlined in (b) above is achieved.

2.0.5. Responsibilities of the External Review Coordinating Committee, Departments and Programs under review, and the External Review Team

The ERCC and Deans oversee the undertaking of external reviews, following the model timeline outlined in Appendix A, by:

(a) Tracking what Departments and Programs have been reviewed and informing Department Chairs and Directors of the schedule of reviews.

(b) Meeting with Departments and Chairs at the outset of the review process to explain the procedures and expectations of an external review.

(c) Undertaking in collaboration with Departments and Programs the activities outlined below in Committee Procedures.

(d) Providing support, as required, throughout the review and implementation process.

As part of the review process, Departments and Programs:

(a) Develop a comprehensive self-study following the guidelines provided in Appendix B.

(b) When requested provide the Office of the Dean of Social Sciences or Dean of Humanities with supplementary materials.

(c) Use the guidelines provided under Appendix C to organize the exact itinerary of the site visit, including room bookings and any food ordering.

(d) Participate fully in the Review Team's site visit.

(e) Develop an action plan, with target dates, to implement the approved recommendations.

(f) Meet the timeline and deadlines established in this policy document.

(g) Provide annual progress updates on the implementation of the action plan.

External Review Team members:

(a) Examine the Department/ Program's self-study document and relevant supplementary resources provided under Appendix D materials.

(b) Participate in a two-day site visit, where they meet with and interview various stakeholders in the Department/ Program and University.

(c) Within four weeks of the site visit, write a report following the guidelines outlined in Appendix E, providing the results of their site visit and documentation review.

(d) Make recommendations for follow-up action to strengthen the Department/ Program's offerings. Recommendations should be divided according to having

monetary and non-monetary implications; and be written as yes/no motions to be voted on in the Department/Program and Senate.

2.0.6.   Committee Procedures

(a) Reviews shall normally occur every five to seven years. Appendix F provides an outline of the rigorous program review regularly undertaken by the School of Social Work to ensure their program continues to meet industry standards. To comply with St. Thomas's External Review policy, and in accordance with MPHEC guidelines, professional programs, such as the School of Social Work, which are subject to such mandatory external review procedures by their professional organization for ongoing accreditation can substitute the accreditation review for the University review process. They need only submit a copy of their External Review documents, the accreditation agency's report, and its response to the report to the ERCC, who will file it with Senate.

(b) As previously noted, external reviews are multiyear processes. In April prior to the beginning of year one — i.e. thirteen months in advance of the submission of the self-study — the ERCC shall inform the Chair/ Director that their self-study is due the following year by May 31st.

(c) By July 31st of year one, to facilitate a mentoring process, the ERCC and/or the appropriate Dean will meet with the Department/ Program Chair/ Director to review the timetable and expectations of the external review process.

(d) By May 31st of year one (i.e. the academic year prior to the site visit), the Department/ Program will provide both a self-study document which meets the criteria laid out in Appendix B of this policy document *and* the list of potential reviewers as a separate list — see guidelines under Article 2.04 Review Team — to the appropriate Dean.

(e) By September 30th of the site visit year (year 2), the ERCC will review the self-study documents for completeness and advise the Deans on how to proceed with the list of potential reviewers.

(f) After the potential reviewers rank order is approved, the appropriate Dean will begin contacting them to build the Review Team. As soon as the Review Team membership is confirmed and the site visit dates have been established, the Dean's Office will liaise with the Review Team members to make travel and local arrangements.

(g) At this stage, the appropriate Dean will send the list of documents outlined in Appendix D Materials to each member of the Review Team.

(h) The Chair/ Director of the Department/ Program under review will work with their Department and Departmental Assistant to finalize the itinerary of the visit, book meeting rooms, and food as needed. Appendix C: Sample Itinerary for the Review Team's Site Visit and the guidance provided directly below will ensure the

development of a comprehensive schedule.

(i) The Review Team's site visit will normally last two days and provide the team with the opportunity to meet full and part-time faculty, current and former students, university officials, a faculty member outside of the Department, and appropriate external groups, according to the following procedures:

    i. The Review Team's first meeting will be breakfast with the Vice-President (Academic and Research) and the appropriate Dean.

    ii. The first on-campus meeting will be with the Chair/ Director of the Department/ Program under review.

    iii. The Review Team will meet one-on-one, for an equal amount of time, with all Full-time members of the Department/ Program, and if possible, with the Department as a whole.

    iv. All Regular Appointment and contract part-time faculty will have the opportunity to meet with the Review Team as a group.

    v. The Review Team will have lunch with several students pursuing the Major or Honours degree option, ideally at various levels of the program (i.e. 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 4th year students).

    vi. The Review Team will meet with the Administrative Assistant, and with a representative from the Harriet Irving Library.

    vii. The Review Team will meet with a STU faculty member belonging to a Department/ Program other than the one under review. This person could be a member of the ERCC but need not be. The faculty member will not be involved in any other aspect of the review process, but they can provide the. Review Team with a wider perspective of campus activities.

    viii. The Department/ Program may opt to include a campus tour in the itinerary; requests should be sent to STU Admissions for a student ambassador to lead the tour.

    ix. The Review Team will meet with appropriate external groups identified in the Department/ Program's self-study.

    x. At the end of their second day of meetings, the Review Team will meet once again with the Chair/ Director of the Department/ Program and/or the whole Department, depending upon the Review Team's preference, to summarize and/or clarify any issues pertaining to the Review.

    xi. In the afternoon of the final day, two hours shall be blocked off for a two-hour session during which time the Review Team may begin structuring their Final Report and recommendations.

(j) The schedule shall be finalized and sent to the appropriate Dean at least one week in advance of the site visit, so they can share the itinerary with the Review Team before their arrival.

(k) Within one month of the site visit's completion, the Review Team shall submit its

final report and recommendations to the appropriate Dean.

(l) The Dean shall share the Review Team's report and recommendations with the ERCC, who within four weeks of its receipt, will review the recommendations and ensure that non-monetary recommendations are phrased as yes/no motions for the Department/ Program to consider and later the University Senate.

(m) The Department/Program has four weeks to provide a written response to the Review Team's final report and the monetary and non-monetary recommendations. Their written assessment outlining their rationale for accepting or rejecting the Review Team's recommendations will be sent to the ERCC, via the appropriate Dean.

(n) The ERCC will send the Department/ Program self-study, the Review Team's final report and recommendations, and the Department/ Program's written response to the report and recommendations to Senate for review and discussion (this will normally occur within ten (10) weeks of having received the final report from the Review Team).

(o) Department/ Program Reviews will be integrated into the regular Senate meeting agenda, as a standing agenda item. Given all Senate documents are published online, all external review documents will continue to be available on the STU Senate page.

(p) Normally, all faculty members of the Department/Program under review shall attend the Senate meeting at which the Senate considers their report.

(q) At Senate, the appropriate Dean will present the non-monetary motions from the Review Team's report for discussion.

(r) Senate shall vote to accept or reject non-monetary recommendations.

(s) After the Senate meeting in which their external review is discussed, the Department/ Program will have eight (8) weeks to develop and table with the ERCC an action plan that establishes activities to be undertaken, by whom, the envisioned timeline, and measures of success to address the accepted motions.

(t) Thereafter, the Department/ Program will report annually to the ERCC on May 15th on their progress towards the implementation of their action plan. The Department/Program report will include all curricular changes which have been approved by Senate during the preceding year.

(u) By May 15th, the University President will provide a report to the ERCC on all the monetary motions of the external reviews undertaken in a given year. The President's report should include the criteria for assessing changes to allocations of established positions recommended by the external reviews. This report will be filed with Senate as part of the ERCC's annual report in June.

(v) The ERCC's annual report will be presented at the June Senate meeting. The ERCC report will share the University President's response to monetary issues, provide Department/ Program progress reports on the implementation of their action plans,

and include a summary of Department/ Program curricular changes approved throughout the year.

2.0.7. Annual Timeline

External Review TIMELINE

April:
Deans inform Chairs & Directors they have self-study due May 31st in *following* year

July: ERCC/ Deans meet with Chairs & Directors to review procedures

May 31
Completed self-studies & supporting documents submitted to ERCC

List of potential reviewers accompany review

June-September
ERCC review study, may seek follow-up, confirm rank order of reviewers

September-October
Deans confirm reviewers, organize travel, send material

October-March
SITE VISITS

Note: Departments prepare itinerary, which is shared with Review Team at least one week in advance of site visit

Post-site visit — each step has four weeks

Reviewers send report
ERCC reviews report & recommendations
Department responds to report and recommendations

| STAGE 01 | STAGE 02 | STAGE 03 | STAGE 04 | STAGE 05 |

ERCC sends Senate
Department/ Program self-study, external reviewers' report, recommendations, and Departmental response

Department/ Program builds an action plan
After Senate has received and debated the recommendations, the Department builds an action plan to achieve recommendations approved at Senate. Action plan is sent to ERCC for review.

Department pursues action plan
Department reports annually to ERCC on May 15th outlining progress. Reports include any curricular changes throughout the year. ERCC annually submits comprehensive university-wide report to June Senate meeting.

3.0 Accountability

The Dean of Humanities and the Dean of Social Sciences will be responsible for communication, and administration of this policy.

4.0 Secondary Documents

Appendix A: Model Timeline for External Review Process

Appendix B: Guidelines for Department/ Program Self-Study Document

Appendix C: Sample Itinerary for Review Team's Site Visit

Appendix D: List of Materials to be provided to the Review Team

Appendix E: Guidelines for the Review Team's Final Report

Appendix F: External Review Process for the School of Social Work

Appendix G: Template for Department/ Program Reports to ERCC

5.0 Review

This policy shall normally be reviewed every seven (7) years and the next review is scheduled for June 2029.

APPENDIX A: Model Timeline for External Review Process

Date	Task	Responsibility
April 30 (13 months in advance)	Appropriate Dean informs Chair/ Director their Department/ Program self-study is due in 13 months.	**Office of the Deans**
Year before site visit		
July-August	To provide mentorship, Chairs and Directors collectively meet with ERCC to review policy and establish timetable	**Office of the Deans**
September-May	Department and Program members compile Self-Study, with the Chair or Director taking the leadership role	**Department/Program**
May 31	Self-Study *and* names and credentials of potential reviewers are submitted to ERCC	**Department/Program**
Year of site visit		
September 30	ERCC reviews Department/ Program Self-Study, and seeks clarification or addition of materials if necessary and advises Dean(s) on how to proceed with the list of potential reviewers	**ERCC**
October-November	Confirm External Review Teams and site visit dates	**Office of the Deans**
4-6 weeks before site visit	Submit items identified in Appendix D to Review Team and make travel arrangements	**Office of the Deans**
	Develop site visit timetable as outlined in Appendix C, share within one-week of the site visit	**Department/Program Chair/Director**
November – April	**Site Visits –** (2-day schedule) – occur	**Department/Program and Office of the Deans**
One month after site visit	Review Team submits report and recommendations to the Office of the Deans	**Review Team**
Within 3-weeks of Review Team Report	Review of report and questions (if any) are posed to the Review Team for clarification	**ERCC**
Within 4-weeks of receiving report	Submission of report and recommendations to Department/ Program	**Office of the Deans**
Within 4-weeks of receiving report	Department/ Program submits response to recommendations, action plan and timeline for implementing non-monetary items to ERCC	**Department/Program**

Within 2-weeks of receiving Dept/ Program response	Submit Self-Study, Review Teams Final Report and recommendations, Department/ Program written response, and motions to Senate	**ERCC**
May 15th	After Senate meetings, appropriate Dean sends recommendations that carry financial implications to President. President sends response on all financial recommendations from the year's reviews to ERCC by May 15th.	**Appropriate Dean/ President**
	Departments/ Programs develop action plans and implementation timelines; and send annual updates on their implementation of recommendations embedded in action plans, plus curricular changes over the year to the ERCC.	**Department/Program**
June	ERCC submits annual report to Senate sharing the University President's response to monetary issues, action plans and Department/ Program progress reports on implementation of their action plans, and include a summary of Department/ Program curricular changes approved throughout the year.	**ERCC**

APPENDIX B: Guidelines for Department/ Program Self-Study Document

The Department/Program Chair or Director will take the lead responsibility for the preparation of the self-study. The Self Study is to be developed in light of the University's Mission Statement, Strategic Plan, Research Strategic Plan, and the learning objectives identified in the University's 'Goals of the Liberal Arts' document. The Self-Study should be student-centered, as its primary goal is to assess the quality of student learning. It will serve as the focal instrument of the external review process and shall contain a description of the strengths, weaknesses, and future directions of the Department/ Program.

The Self-Study shall cover the period since the last review (or seven years, whichever is greater). It is to be prepared by the Department/ Program and is to be submitted to the ERCC via the appropriate Dean by May 31st of the year *prior* to the site visit taking place. If the Self-Study is not provided as expected, the appropriate Dean will meet with the Department to identify barriers to the completion of the Self-Study and establish an action plan to ensure compliance.

The following components should be included in the Self-Study:

1.1 Objectives

Explain the Department/Program's objectives, discussing in what ways, and to what extent, they are consistent with the University's Mission Statement, Strategic Plan, Strategic Research Plan, and the learning objectives identified in the University's 'Goals of the Liberal Arts' document.

1.2 Development and Evaluation

1.2.1   Describe how the objectives of the Department/Program integrate and promote the University's Goals of the Liberal Arts and are responsive to new developments in the discipline and advances in knowledge.

1.2.2   Describe the Department/Program's procedure for ongoing and effective self-evaluation.

1.2.3   Describe actions taken by the Department/Program in response to the recommendations of the previous external review and the effect of those outcomes on program delivery and student learning.

1.3 Curriculum

1.3.1   Describe the Department/ Program's curriculum by addressing: organizing principles; the provisions for minors, majors, and honours (where applicable); and courses offered in the previous five years, including the term taught, course number, name, and instructor (indicate whether they were full- or part-time faculty), the respective caps and enrollments, and a representative sample of syllabi from each level of the program.

1.3.2   Explain how the curriculum is consistent with the stated objectives of the Department/Program**.**

1.3.3   Address how Department/ Program's activities relate to Experiential Learning, Digital Literacy and other university priorities;

1.3.4   Provide as an Appendix a synopsis of Senate-approved curriculum changes implemented since the last external review, with an assessment of their impact on the Department/ Program's offerings.

1.3.5   Identify future directions and curricular changes the Department/ Program would like to initiate and provide a rationale for undertaking such changes.

1.3.6   Reflect on the social impact of the Department/ Program's curriculum in terms of local, national, and/or international outreach.

1.4 Students

Student input and feedback are to be included in the self-study document through focus group research, surveys, and one-on-one interviews if appropriate. Integrating the findings from students, expand on the following:

1.4.1   Describe how well the curriculum meets the expectations of the students.

1.4.2   Describe how well the instruction meets the expectations of the students.

1.4.3   Describe the extent to which students meet the objectives of the Department/ Program as described in 1.2.1.

1.4.4   Describe the practices for advising students pursuing minors, majors, and honours (if applicable). Address student satisfaction with the Department/ Program's academic advising.

1.4.5   With data derived from the University's Office of Institutional Research, describe enrolment and attrition rates, including the number of students graduating with minors, majors, and honours.

1.5 Pedagogy

1.5.1   Comment on the Department/ Program's strengths and weaknesses regarding teaching practices and describe plans for improvements in this area, if any.

1.5.2   Describe mentoring mechanisms (whether formalized or not) among faculty members within the Department/Program, with respect to teaching practices.

1.6 Administration

Provide a clear plan for the administration of the Department/Program. This plan shall address academic governance, policy and decision-making procedures, communication within the Department/Program, communications with students and the wider public, and where appropriate management of resources.

1.7 Resources
1.7.1 **Faculty**

Describe the scholarly/professional qualifications and contributions of faculty and how those qualifications and contributions relate to the delivery of the Department/ Program's curriculum.

1.7.2 **Support Staff**
Describe and assess the adequacy of staff to meet the needs of the Department/ Program.

1.7.3 **Equipment**
Describe and assess the adequacy of equipment required to carry out Department/ Program objectives.

1.7.4 **Space**
Describe and assess the adequacy of space available to the Department/ Program.

1.7.5 **Library**
Describe the adequacy of library holdings and access for curriculum delivery.

1.8 Faculty Research

1.8.1 Describe the research record of full-time members of the Department/ Program since the previous External Review.

1.8.2 Describe the long-term research plans of every full-time member of the Department/ Program.

1.8.3 Describe the relationship between teaching and research undertaken by full-time members of the Department/Program, if any.

1.8.4 CVs of full- and part-time faculty members outlining their accomplishments since the last external review (or over the last seven years, whichever is longer) are to be appended to the Self-Study.

1.9 Service
Describe the service records of the members of the Department/ Program. Include both service to the University and service of a professional nature to the profession or to the larger community.

1.10 Conclude with a discussion of the Department/ Program's vision and concerns for the next 5-years
Describe the management, vision, and leadership challenges confronting the Department in the next 5 years. Consider how your vision fits into the University's Strategic Plan and our Strategic Research Plan.

Once submitted, ERCC may request further information and analyses from the Department/ Program, including responses to specific questions they want the Review Team to address in light of the issues they express in their self-study.

APPENDIX C: Sample Itinerary for Review Team's Site Visit

Department/Program	
External Reviewers	
Site visit dates	

Day before Site Visit

Flight & Arrival Time	Reviewer	Hotel & Confirmation #

Site Visit, Day 1: DATE

Time	Activity	Location
8:00 – 9:00 am	Breakfast with VPAR and Dean	Hotel
9:00 – 9:30 am	Travel to campus, set up in meeting room	
9:30 – 10:00 am	Department Chair/Director Meeting: NAME	**Building & Room #**
10:00 – 10:30 am	Faculty Visit: NAME	
10:30 – 11:00 am	Faculty Visit: NAME	
11:00 – 11:15 am	BREAK	
11:15 – 11:45 am	Faculty Visit: NAME	
11:45 – 12:15 pm	Faculty Visit: NAME	
12:15 – 1:15 pm	**Lunch with Students**	
1:15 – 1:30 pm	BREAK	
1:30 – 3:00 pm	Campus Tour including the Harriet Irving Library	Make request to admissions for Student Ambassador to begin the tour from lunch location
3:00 – 3:15 pm	BREAK	
3:15 – 3:45 pm	Faculty Visit: NAME	
3:45 – 4:15 pm	Faculty Visit: NAME	

Time	Activity	Location
4:15 – 4:45 pm	Faculty Visit: NAME	
4:45 pm	Travel back to hotel by taxi	

Site Visit, Day 2: DATE

Time	Activity	Location
8:30	Taxi/travel to campus	
9:00 – 9:30 am	Meet with Departmental Assistant	**Building & Room #**
9:30 – 10:00 am	Meet with a full-time faculty member who is not a member of the Department/ Program under review	
10:00 – 11:00 am	Group meeting with Part-Time Faculty	
11:00 – 11:15 am	BREAK	
11:15 – 12:15 pm	Group meeting with Full-Time Faculty	
12:15 – 1:15 pm	Lunch	
1:15 – 2:00 pm	Meeting with HIL Representative	Harriet Irving Library
2:00 – 3:45 pm	Review Team begins drafting final report	
3:45 – 4:00 pm	BREAK	
4:00 – 4:30 pm	Closing meeting with Department/ Program and/or Chair/ Director	
4:30 pm	Review Team returns to hotel/airport	

APPENDIX D: List of Materials to be sent to the Review

Once dates of the site visit have been confirmed, four to six weeks in advance of the site visit, the Office of the Deans shall provide the Review Team with the Self-Study from the Department/ Program under review.

In addition to the Self-Study, the Review Team shall also be provided with the following items:
- A link to the MPHEC Policy on Quality Assurance;
- STU's Strategic Plan;
- STU's Strategic Research Plan;
- University's "Goals of the Liberal Arts" document;
- University's current full- and part-time Collective Agreements;
- A link to STU's current Academic Calendar;
- The University's viewbook, and recruitment brochures related to the Department/ Program;
- Department/ Program's flyer, handbook, and/or any other promotional materials;
- Department/ Program's previous Self-Study document;
- Final Report from the previous external Review Team;
- Department/ Program's response to the previous review;
- Senate decisions arising from the previous review;
- The President's responses to the previous review's monetary recommendations and any subsequent decisions of relevance to the recommendations made to the President;
- any additional pertinent materials requested by the Review Team.

E.1 Itinerary
An itinerary for the site visit shall be sent to the Review Team at least two weeks in advance of the site visit.

E.2 Areas of Review
The areas to be reviewed shall normally match those identified in the Department/ Program's Self Study, as described in Appendix B.

E.3 The Site Visit
E.3.1 The site visit shall normally last two days.

E.3.2 The site visit shall follow the schedule outlined in Appendix C. Notwithstanding, the Review Team may request additional information and may request to meet with any additional member of the academic community.

E.4 The Review Team's Final Report
E.4.1 At the end of the second day, a session of at least two hours shall be scheduled so that the Review Team may begin structuring their report while they are still together at St. Thomas.

E.4.2 The Review Team shall submit the Final Report with their recommendations to the ERCC, via the appropriate Dean, within a month after the site visit.

E.4.3 The Final Report shall include:
   a. The names of the Reviewers and their professional qualifications for undertaking the review;
   b. An executive summary of the general outcomes of the review, including the Department/ Program under review, site visit dates, and main findings;
   c. An overview of the scope and quality of the program under review, program priorities, strengths and weaknesses of the Department/ Program, singling out features of the program that are working well, and making recommendations for improving educational outcomes;
   d. An assessment of the extent to which current offerings adequately meet training needs — and reflection on courses that should be revised and new courses that should be added;
   e. An evaluation of how the Department/ Program's education activities relate to the goals of a liberal arts education, experiential learning, digital literacy and other university priorities;
   f. An appraisal of how the recommendations of the previous external review were addressed.
   g. Feedback on the scope, quality, and relevance of research activities;
   h. Reflection on the scope and nature of the Department's relationship with cognate academic Departments in the university, external bodies, or other affiliates;
   i. Comments on the strength and the morale of the faculty, learners, and staff;
   j. Comments on the social impact of the program in terms of outreach, and impact local, nationally, and/or internationally.

k. Discussion on whether or not the organizational structure of the Department is appropriate and effective;

l. An evaluation of whether the Department/ Program has adequate resources (budgets, space, faculty);

m. Commentary on the proposed vision for the future directions of the Department/ Program, including comments on the extent to which the Department/ Program clearly articulates a strategic academic plan that is consistent with the University's strategic and research plans.

n. Comments on the management, vision, and leadership challenges confronting the Department in the next 5 years.

o. Recommendations can be presented throughout the document, and a complete summary list will be provided near the end. Recommendations will:

    i. Be understood as guides that will provide faculty with future directions that will improve student learning.

    ii. Provide evaluative feedback that would improve any aspect of the program.

    iii. Be presented in clear resolutions that can be placed before the Department/ Program and Senate in the form of yes/no motions that can be approved or defeated when placed before them.

    iv. Be divided into monetary and non-monetary issues (as some recommendations may require no new resources while others do).

    v. It is non-monetary motions that will be discussed at the initial Senate meeting, when the self-study, Review Teams report, and the Department/ Program's written report is tabled. The monetary issues of all external reviews in a given year will be discussed at the June Senate meeting as the President's report on such issues will be included in the ERCC's annual report to be tabled in June of each year.

p. Provide feedback on the review process itself — What worked and what didn't and what kind of improvements should be made?

E.4.4 The final report and all supporting documents will be housed online as part of the St. Thomas University Senate webpage.

APPENDIX F: External Review Process for the School of Social Work

Standards and Procedures for Accreditation by the
Canadian Association for Social Work Education (CASWE-ACFTS)

According to the *CASWE-ACFTS Standards for Accreditation* (2014), the CASWE accredits Baccalaureate and Master level social work programs. The standards are normative and support academic excellence for professional education, as well as the relevance of education programs to professional practice. The policies and standards are not aimed at the uniformity of social work education; instead, they are intended to promote the uniqueness and diversity of social work programs across Canada and enable them to better respond to their respective contexts and partners. The accreditation standards are organized to cover four domains:

1. Program mission and goals;

2. Program governance, structure and resources;

3. Program content: Curriculum and field education; and

4. Program evaluation/assessment.

Procedures for Accreditation (2014) is the responsibility of the CASWE-ACFTS' Commission on Accreditation (COA). The COA is responsible for all activities that are part of the accreditation process, including communicating with the School, informing the School about educational policies, standards and procedures for accreditation, organizing site visits, conducting reviews, and making decisions on the accreditation status.

The Accreditation process involves the following key activities:

1. Self-Study and an Application for Accreditation, including Pre-Accreditation, First Accreditation, or Re-Accreditation (by the School)

2. Review of a Self-Study Report and Application (by the COA)

3. Site visits (by the COA)

5. Review of Site Visit Reports (by the COA)

6. Decision-making by the COA

The accreditation process begins with a Program/School's self-evaluation, which results in a Self-Study Report submitted to COA for review. After the Self-Study has been received, the COA organizes a review of the documents and a Site Visit to conduct an assessment of the specific aspects of the Program in its immediate environment. Upon completion of a Site Visit, the Site Visit Team (two senior members of the social work faculty serving on the COA) submits a written report of their findings to the School for comment; both the report and the School's comments are submitted to the COA for a final review. The COA makes decisions regarding the accreditation of the program.

Re-Accreditation is granted to an accredited program that has adequately met the CASWE-ACFTS Standards for Accreditation. Re-Accreditation is granted for 8 years.

Re-accreditation with conditions is granted to an accredited program that has met the CASWE-ACFTS Standards for Accreditation with minor or moderate concerns/deficiencies that do not jeopardize the Program's ability to achieve Core Learning Objectives for Students. These concerns may be addressed within a period of time that is less than 4 years. The program is granted Re-Accreditation with Conditions for 2 to 4 years and is provided with a clear statement of conditions to be met in order to retain accreditation. During this period the Program is expected to address the concerns/deficiencies identified by the COA to become eligible for retaining accreditation status for an additional 4 to 6 years, not to exceed 8 years in total. If conditions are not met within the timelines, the Program must submit an application for re-accreditation within 6 months and have a Site Visit within a year.

For further information, and copies of the self-study and site visit requirements, see the following documents:

- https://caswe-acfts.ca/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/EPAS-2021.pdf

- https://caswe-acfts.ca/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/CASWE-ACFTS-Procedures-for-Accreditation-June-2016-3-Copie.pdf

APPENDIX G: Template for Department/ Program Reports to ERCC

To be submitted to the ERCC by May 15th of each year:

Department/ Program:		
Reporting Period:		
Action Items, implementation activities, and outcomes		
Action item	**Implementation activity**	**Outcome**
Senate Approved Curricular Changes		
Senate meeting	**Courses added/deleted**	**Description/rationale**

Add pages as required.