

 <b>DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY</b>	<i>Policy Sponsor:</i> Senate	<i>Approval Date:</i> Senate: June 9, 2014
	<i>Responsible Units:</i> University Secretariat, Office of the Vice- President Academic and Provost	<i>Revisions:</i> Senate: June 12, 2017 May 13, 2019

## Senate Reviews of Faculties: Policy and Procedures

### A. Background & Purpose

Reviews of Faculties are a significant responsibility of the Dalhousie University Senate. By such reviews, the University demonstrates accountability to its communities and supports continuous improvement of Faculties. Senate reviews of Faculties are also a crucial component of Dalhousie’s quality assurance activities, which are reported to the Board of Governors, the Government of Nova Scotia, and the Maritime Provinces Higher Education Commission. Reviews of Faculties must, therefore, be evidence based.

Related Policies:

Faculty Reviews of Academic Units and Programs: Policy and Procedures (Draft in development) Policy on Quality Assurance, Maritime Provinces Higher Education Commission, May 2005

### B. Application

This policy governs Senate reviews of all Dalhousie University Faculties and, subject to adaptation and approval by the Senate Planning and Governance Committee (SPGC), also serves as the terms of reference for Senate reviews of the College of Continuing Education, the College of Sustainability, the University Libraries, and academic relationships with affiliated institutions.

### C. Definitions

In this Policy:

“Dean” means the Dean of the Faculty under review;

“Draft Report” means the draft of the Review Committee report described in section F.7.a;

“Faculty member” means an individual with an academic appointment of 50% or greater full-time equivalent at Dalhousie University, and in the case of the Faculty of Medicine, includes an individual with a continuing appointment with annual academic career development;

“Final Report” means the final Review Committee report described in section F.7.d;

“Review Committee” means the Senate review committee established under section F.2 to conduct a review of a Faculty under this Policy.

“SPGC” means the Senate Planning and Governance Committee;

#### **D. Policy**

1. Senate reviews of Faculties are conducted in a manner that supports academic planning institutionally and in the Faculty under review.
2. Senate reviews of Faculties provide an assessment, with evidence, of the following factors:
  - a. **Institutional Alignment:** How closely aligned are the Faculty’s plans with institutional strategies and plans (e.g., Dalhousie strategic directions, equity, diversity and inclusion, academic plan, research plan, international strategy)?
  - b. **Planning Processes:** How successful are the Faculty’s current planning processes? This relates both to strategic planning and implementation, and to program and curricular planning and evaluation.
  - c. **Quality Indicators:** What quality indicators are used regularly by the Faculty, and what do these indicate in relation to progress since the last Senate Review?
  - d. **Equity, Diversity and Inclusion:** How effective are the Faculty’s plans to increase equity, diversity and inclusion? What progress has been made since the last Senate Review?
  - e. **Governance, Organizational, Management and Administrative:** How effective and efficient are the governance, organizational, management and administrative policies, structures and processes within the Faculty, including human resource management, employment equity and inclusion for faculty and staff throughout recruitment and career development (including tenure and promotion), leadership development, and financial management?
  - f. **Undergraduate Program Review Mechanisms:** What processes are in place to ensure regular undergraduate program reviews, how effective are these processes,

and how appropriate are responses and actions relating to recommendations stemming from such reviews? How do these review mechanisms assess equity, diversity, and inclusion within programs and in the culture of undergraduate programs?

- g. **Graduate Program Review Mechanisms:** How effective is the Faculty's relationship with the Faculty of Graduate Studies for the purposes of graduate program reviews, and how appropriate are responses and actions relating to recommendations stemming from such reviews? How does the Faculty, in consultation with FGS, assess equity, diversity, and inclusion within graduate programs?
  - h. **Program Portfolio Rationale.** Is there a clear, evidence-based rationale for the current portfolio of programs offered entirely within the Faculty or in collaboration with others? What gaps in the portfolio should be addressed in the short, medium or long term, based on evidence relating to Dalhousie's Strategic Plan, and to programming and curricular needs that address diversity and inclusion?
  - i. **Accreditation Reviews:** If the Faculty has accredited programs, how appropriate are responses and actions relating to recommendations stemming from accreditation reviews?
  - j. **Academic Career Progression:** What evidence has been provided by the Faculty as it relates to Tenure and Promotion Standards and standards for those with continuing appointment with annual academic career development?
  - k. **Faculty Budget:** How well integrated is the Faculty planning and budgeting; including its multi-year budget?
  - l. **Relationships and Collaborations:** What factors characterize the Faculty's relationships with other Dalhousie Faculties and units (e.g., services to students and instructors, libraries) and with its external communities? What plans are in place to strengthen such relationships and build new relationships/collaborations?
  - m. **Physical Facilities:** How appropriate and adequate are the physical facilities for the Faculty's purposes? What processes are used to evaluate use of space in support of the Faculty's programs, and what plans are in place to ensure appropriate facilities are available to fulfil the Faculty's strategic academic goals?
- 3. Senate reviews of Faculties take place on a cyclical basis, typically on a seven-year cycle approved by SPGC. In the intervening period, Deans will provide updates to SPGC, biannually, or as requested by SPGC.
  - 4. Apart from the regular schedule of Senate reviews of Faculties, Senate may also undertake a special review based on a matter or matters relevant to the scope of the Senate Reviews.

## E. Administrative Structure

1. Authority: This policy falls under the authority of Senate and is administered by the Office of the Provost and Vice-President Academic and the University Secretariat. The Provost and Vice-President Academic may delegate their responsibilities under this policy to an Associate Vice-President Academic.
2. Review Committee: A Review Committee is a committee comprising diverse faculty members, student(s) and members of the broader community, established under section F.2 to conduct a review of a Faculty in accordance with this policy.
3. Record-keeping: The record keeping pertaining to this policy will be the responsibility of the University Secretariat and will follow the Secretariat's Records Management Policy.
4. Administrative support for the Review Committee: Administrative support for the Review Committee will be provided by the Office of the Provost and Vice-President Academic
5. Reporting: SPGC will provide an annual summary report of reviews to Senate.

**F. Procedures**

1. Schedule: On recommendation of the Provost and Vice-President Academic, the SPGC shall approve the schedule of reviews to be conducted within each academic year and shall provide a three-year rolling schedule of planned reviews. Reviews typically take place in the fall and winter terms, although in appropriate circumstances, they can also take place in the spring and summer terms.
2. Appointment of the Review Committee: The Review Committee shall be established prior to the commencement of a review following the process set out in this section. Appointments shall be made in consideration of the principles of equity and inclusion recognized by the University at the time of the review. On the recommendation of the Provost and Vice-President Academic:
  - a. the Senate Planning and Governance Committee shall appoint the Chair, who shall be a tenured faculty member or equivalent with a primary appointment in a Faculty other than the one undergoing review, and three to five additional faculty members whose primary appointment is in a Faculty other than the one undergoing review; and
  - b. The members appointed under subsection F.2.a shall appoint one or two students, normally one undergraduate and one graduate nominated by the student societies within the Faculty under review, and as appropriate, a member of the community, ensuring that the majority of the Review Committee members shall be faculty members.

3. Reviews shall be conducted in accordance with the timelines set out in Appendix 1, and shall comprise five components:
  - a. Self-Study;
  - b. External Review;
  - c. Assessment by Review Committee;
  - d. Submission of the Review Committee report; and
  - e. Consideration of the Review Committee report.
  
4. Self-Study:
  - a. The Office of the Provost and Vice-President Academic shall set a deadline for the Faculty's submission of a self-study. The self-study shall provide an assessment, including evidence, of the factors identified in section D.2.
  - b. No less than three months prior to the deadline for submission of the Faculty's self-study, the Office of Institutional Analysis and Research shall submit to the Office of the Provost and Vice-President Academic, for relay to the Faculty under review, a standard package of data relevant to the factors identified in section D.2 above. This data is required to inform the development of the self-study.
  - c. Upon request by the Dean or the Review Committee Chair, and in consultation with the Office of the Provost and Vice-President Academic, to the extent possible, Dal Analytics will engage in customized data research and reporting for the Faculty under review.
  - d. The Faculty shall submit the self-study to the Provost and Vice-President Academic who shall review it to ensure that it meets the requirements of this policy. The self-study shall be forwarded to the Review Committee.
  
5. Review Committee Process:
  - a. Before commencing their review, the Review Committee shall consult with the Chair of Senate, the Dean, the Provost and Vice-President Academic, the Vice-President Finance and Administration, the Vice-Provost Student Affairs, the Vice-President Research, and the Dean of Graduate Studies to identify specific issues that should be addressed in the review.

- b. The Review Committee shall widely communicate its existence to all faculty and staff, and to all student societies within the Faculty under review, to indicate its purpose and encourage input into the review process through individual and group meetings and written submissions.
- c. In addition to the information provided by the Faculty, the Review Committee shall collect other pertinent information, including written and oral input from individuals and groups within and, where appropriate, outside the university.
- d. The Review Committee will meet with the Dean, faculty, staff, students (graduate and undergraduate), and, where applicable, representatives external to the Faculty or university (e.g., other Deans, the University Librarian, representatives of professional organizations).
- e. The Review Committee shall identify any factors over and above those listed in Section D2 that it would like the external reviewers to consider.
- f. The Review Committee shall prepare a report as set out in section 7.

6. External Reviewers:

- a. In consultation with the Dean, the Provost and Vice-President Academic shall provide the Review Committee with a list of potential external reviewers from outside the University. The Review Committee shall select external reviewers (normally two) from this list in consultation with the Dean. If the Review Committee and the Dean are unable to reach an agreement on external reviewers, the SPGC will select reviewers from names proposed separately by the Review Committee and by the Dean.
- b. The external reviewers shall undertake a review of the Faculty taking into consideration the factors identified in section D.2 and those identified by the Review Committee in section F.5.e.
- c. The external reviewers shall conduct a site visit of 2-3 business days, during which time they will interview individuals and groups, and tour the Faculty's facilities.
- d. Within two weeks of the site visit, the external reviewers shall submit to the Provost and Vice-President Academic a single report, based on the interviews, tour, and review of materials. The report is to provide commentary and explicit recommendations.

- e. External reviewers will be paid an honorarium and reimbursed for travel expenses from the University Secretariat as per University travel policies.

7. Review Committee Report:

- a. Based upon its review of the self-study, the external reviewers' report, data provided by the Office of Institutional Analysis and Research, and the oral and written submissions and other materials it has received, the Review Committee shall prepare a confidential Draft Report, with the view that the final report will be made public. The Draft Report shall:
  - i. address all matters identified in section D.2;
  - ii. contain explicit recommendations to the Faculty, to the University and to other bodies as appropriate;
  - iii. attach the external reviewers' report as an Appendix; i v . include a table of contents; and
  - v. include an executive summary that includes the recommendations.
- b. The Review Committee Chair shall submit the Draft Report to the Office of the Provost and Vice-President, who shall ensure the Draft Report meets the requirements of this policy. The Draft Report shall then be forwarded it to the Dean.
- c. Within two weeks of receiving the Draft Report, the Dean shall review the Draft Report and identify any errors of fact and personal references that should be removed. The Dean shall keep the Draft Report confidential except to the extent necessary to confirm fact or correct errors.
- d. Once fact-checked, the Senate Review Committee report will be made broadly available to all members of the Faculty under review for information. Senate Review Committee reports do not include statements by or about any named individuals, with the exception of academic leaders.
- e. Within two weeks of receiving the Dean's comments, the Review Committee shall finalize the report and submit the Final Report, which shall contain all of the elements set out in section F.7.a., to the Office of the Provost and Vice-President Academic.
- f. The Provost and Vice-President Academic shall ensure that the Final Report meets the requirements of this policy, and shall then forward the Final Report to the Chair of Senate.

8. Response to the Report:

- a. The Chair of Senate shall forward the Final Report to the Dean, along with an action plan form which will provide the structure and mechanism for the Faculty's response to the Final Report.
- b. The Dean shall make the Final Report available to all members of the Faculty and shall coordinate the Faculty's response to it. The Dean shall forward to the Chair of Senate the Faculty's completed action plan form, together with a letter from the Dean, if desired, within six weeks from the date of receipt of the Final Report.

The Dean and members of the Review Committee shall be invited to meet with the SPGC to discuss the Final Report, the Faculty's response and its proposed action plan. The Review Committee Chair or designate will present the Final Report and recommendations.

- c. The SPGC shall consider the Final Report, paying particular attention to university wide implications. The SPGC may:
  - i. report to Senate as set out in section F.8.e.;
  - ii. identify additional recommendations and report to Senate as set out in section F.8.e;
  - iii. send the Final Report back to the Review Committee for further consideration; or
  - iv. reject the Final Report and constitute a new Review Committee.
- e. The SPGC shall advise Senate of the completion of the review and the Faculty's response to the Final Report. The SPGC will highlight to Senate recommendations of particular significance and any actions recommended to or required of Senate. The Final Report will be made available to members of Senate. Following the Senate discussion, the confidential Senate Faculty Review Report, Response and Action Plan will be available to all faculty and staff on a password protected site for information only.
- f. Normally, twelve months following the last discussion of the Final Report at SPGC, the Dean shall provide a status update to SPGC on actions taken based on the recommendations made in the Final Report and by SPGC. The Provost and Vice-President Academic shall also report on the outcome of the review particularly in relation to university-wide recommendations or those that may have impact on units outside the Faculty reviewed.



- g. Following the status report from the Dean and the Provost and Vice-President Academic, the SPGC may make recommendations to Senate on matters arising from the status report.

**Appendix 1: Timeline Models for Senate Reviews of Faculties**

	<b>Self-Study preparation and writing</b>	<b>Review Committee work</b>	<b>External Reviewers Visit</b>	<b>Review Committee submission of Report</b>	<b>SPGC meeting with Dean &amp; Review Committee</b>
<b>Model #1</b>	September to December	January to April	March	April	September
<b>Model #2</b>	January to April	September to December	November	December	February
<b>Model #3</b>	May to August	September to December	November	December	February