UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN

Academic Programs Committee of Council

COMMITTEE WORKSHEET
for Evaluation of Program Proposals

Program

Discussion Leaders:

Program Proposal Document -- please note any missing components:

1. ☐ **Proposal Identification**
2. ☐ **Type of change**

3. **Rationale**

   ☐ **P**rogram objectives ☐ Need for the program ☐ Demand ☐ Uniqueness ☐ Expertise of the sponsoring unit

   ☐ Relationship to college plans and to SPR or other review recommendations

4. **Description of Program Characteristics**

   ☐ Draft Calendar entry ☐ Consultation Form with Registrar

5. **Resources**

   ☐ Impact on resources used by existing programs ☐ Whether the program be handled within the existing

   resources of the department or college ☐ How any required new resources will be found

   ☐ Memo from Dean about resources

   Consultation Forms if required for ☐ Library ☐ Information Technology ☐ Physical Requirements

6. **Relationships and Impact of Implementation**

   Impact ☐ on department activities ☐ on students ☐ on other departments or colleges;

   Consultation process; ☐ Consultation memos

7. **Budget**

   ☐ Whether budget allocations within the department or the college will change

   ☐ Consultation with College Financial Analyst ☐ Budget Form if required

Program Justification
- Is the rationale and objectives for the program or the change in program clearly stated?
- Is the program unique in content and/or approach?
- Is the program relevant to the mission and objectives of the University?
- Is there evidence of demand for the program?
- Is the program appropriate to a university?

Nature of the Program
- Is the curriculum designed to meet the objectives of the program?
- Do the instructional methods and philosophies match the program objectives?
- Does the program encourage the development of broadly informed, reflective and literate minds capable of independent and critical thinking?
- Does the program include opportunities for synthesis, application, and integration of knowledge within and between disciplines?
- Is the program current, both in content and modes of instructional delivery, and responsive to changes in the discipline?
- Does the curriculum reflect the goals of education equity?
- Does the curriculum provide sufficient flexibility to individual students to choose courses according to their own interests within and outside their major discipline (e.g. electives)?
- Does the program meet or exceed accreditation and/or national standards (if they exist)?
- Is the proposed program comprehensive and cohesive?

Relationships
- How does the program relate to existing programs? Is there duplication? If so, is there justification for proceeding?
- Has there been consultation with other Colleges/departments/units or interested parties and is there evidence of their support? If there is a lack of support, is there justification to proceed?
- Has the transition between the new and previous programs been articulated and its impact on students been considered?
- Is the program within the domain of expertise and administrative purview of the sponsoring unit?
- What response to the proposal, if any, has been provided by professional associations or the community?

Resources
- Are there sufficient numbers of appropriately qualified faculty and staff to support the program?
- Are the necessary resources and structures available to support the program (e.g. space, laboratories, library, computing, equipment and administrative structure)?
- Is another program being deleted by the sponsoring unit as part of the proposal? Are there other internal trade-offs?
- Budgetary areas: full costing of resource requirements (capital and start-up costs; permanent operating costs); sources of funding; enrolment (tuition revenue) - enrolment increases and decreases in courses in the sponsoring college/department, and in courses in the other colleges/departments

Overall
- Given the information supplied, the responsibility to balance academic and fiscal considerations, and the University's overall objectives, plans, and priorities, should this proposal be recommended to Council for approval?
- What are the College's plans for its future direction or development (in this area)? How does this proposal fit into college and university plans?
- How will this proposal foster excellence in teaching, research, scholarly and artistic work, public service and extension?
- How does the College propose to evaluate the effects of implementing this proposal?
- What is the likely impact of the proposed program on the sponsoring College /Department?
- What is the likely economic impact, if any, of this proposed program on the Province?
- What is the track record of the sponsoring college(s) in managing their academic and fiscal affairs (as evidenced by recent systematic program reviews and graduate program reviews)?
- Should the Committee request a post-approval program review?

Any Other Issues?

<h1 style="text-align:center">Criteria for Evaluation of Program Proposals
at the University of Saskatchewan</h1>

Based on procedural and policy documents as reported to or approved by Council from 1996 to 2012

Overall Framework for Program Evaluation

> Of primary importance to the University of Saskatchewan is that academic programs:
> - be of *high quality*
> - be in *demand* by students and the public
> - *use resources efficiently*
>
> In addition to the three primary characteristics related to quality, demand and resources, for some programs it is also important to consider:
> - the *unique* features of a program, and
> - the *relevance* of the program to Saskatchewan
>
> We must also keep in mind other of the *University of Saskatchewan Objectives* including our commitment to fair and equitable *access* to our programs, to *equity*, to *environmental responsibility*, and to an *international perspective* in our endeavours.

The University is committed to developing programs which exhibit the three primary characteristics above, recognizing that our present program strengths lie with the programs which exhibit those characteristics. Programs should be assessed so as to direct change both in terms of programming and resource allocation; i.e., to determine how/why they do not meet criteria and whether changes to remedy the situation are feasible.

The unique features of a program and its relevance to the province should be viewed as characteristics of secondary importance, having first established the quality of, demand for, and costs associated with a program. Certain core disciplines/programs represented within any university are not expected to be unique. However, it is still possible that instructional methods or particular sub-specializations might be described as unique within the province or region. On the other hand, being 'unique' assumes greater importance where the cost of delivering a program is high or demand for the program is low. The importance or relevance of a program to the province may relate to building on economic or other strengths which already exist. On the other hand, a program may serve as a nucleus contributing expertise and services which would otherwise be unavailable to the community.

Agreement June 2004 with the College of Graduate Studies and Research regarding procedures for review of graduate program proposals

With the goal of reducing duplication of effort, the Academic Programs Committee and the Dean of the College of Graduate Studies and Research have agreed to follow this procedure:

- College of Graduate Studies and Research (CGSR) will conduct a comprehensive and thorough review of the nature of the program, particularly the curriculum, the program requirements, the program rationale, the faculty credentials associated with the program delivery and a judgment of the faculty's ability to deliver the program, the program content, the relationships with other units who may be involved in program delivery, the budgetary requirements for program delivery, and the general

"fit" of the proposed program with other similar programs (in a provincial and national context) and with the requirements of the College. The process followed by the review, the nature of the discussions at college committees, interactions of the CGSR with the college or department making the proposal, committee and college observations and conclusions, and the general assessment should be documented in a comprehensive report which will be forwarded to the APC for its review. That report should include the following:

- a recommendation from the CGSR;
- a description of the process followed by the college in arriving at the recommendation;
- a description of the issues noted in the paragraph above;
- a description of the relationship of the proposal to recommendations arising from Systematic Program Review (if applicable); (where applicable, the acceptability of the response[i], particularly the action response for 'C-rated 'programs, from the CGSR will be provided, including the feasibility of continued admissions);
- a description of any concerns/issues arising at the CGSR committees reviewing the program and the responses provided (if any);
- a statement by the Dean on the relationship of the proposed program to other programs offered by the sponsoring unit, the track record of the sponsoring unit, a descriptive account of where and how the program fits, supports and/or enhances the initiatives identified in the CGSR and sponsoring college plan, and a statement on the relative priority attached to the proposal within the overall structure of graduate programs offered by the University of Saskatchewan.

Academic Programs Committee will review the program proposal to determine its general "fit" with the University's *Strategic Directions*, *Foundational Documents*, *Integrated Plan*, Systematic Program Review recommendations, any other Council-approved policies that might arise from time to time, and on its relationship and fit with the College of Graduate Studies and Research plan as well as the sponsoring unit's plan. In particular, the APC will focus its discussions on the program rationale and its relationship to the University's and college's stated priorities. In other words, the APC will rely heavily on the CGSR to conduct a thorough review of the program from the viewpoint of objective assessment, not advocacy. The APC will act primarily as a "review and assessment" body; APC will, however, reserve the right to review a proposal thoroughly should continued questions arise from the initial CGSR review

Worksheet is based on the following reference documents: Framework – April, 1996; APC review guide -- March, 1997; Graduate program review guide – June, 2004; Planning review guide – January, 1999; Dissolution of Budget Committee, creation of Planning & Priorities Committee, changes to Academic Programs Committee terms of reference