

AP&P Reading Groups

**AP&P Ensures that**

- Reviews take place in line with U of T policies/guidelines
- Provost’s Office has managed the process appropriately
- All issues regarding academic program quality have been addressed or there is a plan to address them

**Reading Group Questions**

- Does the **summary** accurately tell the story of the **full review**?
- Does the Dean’s **administrative response** adequately address all the issues identified?
- Are there any questions, comments or **substantive** issues that the committee should consider?

**AP&P can recommend a follow-up report**

- Concerns may be raised in an external review report that requires a long and sustained period of response.
- A follow-up **one-year** report may be requested in order to ensure that improvements are made

**Full review report**

Written by external reviewers	Reviewers <b>write their</b> report after reading the <b>self-study</b> and visiting with faculty, students and staff during the site visit	Reviewers are active and respected in their field; associate or full professors with program management experience; from peer institutions offering high-quality programs in the field under review	Addresses the terms of reference
-------------------------------	---	---	----------------------------------

**Summary**

Written by the Office of the Vice-Provost Academic Programs	Written after the full <b>Review Report</b> has been received	Full and accurate;	Identifies <b>key issues</b> in the <b>Review Report</b>
---	---	--------------------	--

**Administrative Response & Implementation Plan [Relatively new: incl. table summarizing responses to recommendations]**

Written by the Dean who consults with the program and/or unit under review	Written at the request of the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs; Addresses the issues identified in the <b>Review Report</b>	Describes the resources, financial and otherwise, that would be provided in supporting the implementation of selected recommendations	Proposes a timeline for the implementation of recommendations; responds to the key elements of the <b>program’s/unit’s response</b>
--	--	---	---

**Self-Study**

- Written by degree program(s) and/or unit under review
- Written before the external reviewers' site visit
- Broad-based, reflective and forward-looking report that includes critical self analysis; assessment of strengths/challenges; the range of activities ; future plans
- Addresses the terms of reference

**Program/Unit Response (departmentalized Faculties/Divisions only)**

- Written by degree program(s) and/or unit under review
- **Written at the request of** the Dean; part of the Dean’s consultation on the **Administrative Response**
- Responds to the **Review Report**

AP&P Reading Groups

Example of	Scenario	Reading Group Action
<p>Questions a reading group might want to ask the Dean or unit/program representative after reading the administrative response and implementation plan</p>	<p>An administrative response mentions that changes to the qualifying exam were being considered in response to review recommendations.</p>	<p>Question: Will students be consulted as part of the process of changing the qualifying exams?</p>
	<p>An administrative response does not mention efforts in place to address time-to-completion even though the full review report observes that this is a challenge for the program.</p>	<p>Question: What efforts are in place to improve time-to-completion in the doctoral program?</p>
	<p>A review report is overall very positive, commending a program for a number of innovations and unique delivery model; however, the report raises a broader question about the program’s isolation from broader Faculty. The administrative response does not touch on this broader question.</p>	<p>Question: Is anything being planned to address the reviewers’ comments around the program’s isolation from the broader Faculty?</p>
	<p>The administrative response outlines plans to increase interactions between faculty and students by promoting departmental initiatives on social media. However, the administrative response doesn’t mention the possibility of using common spaces to support such interactions, even though the review report comments on lack of conference rooms and student spaces.</p>	<p>Question: Could the Dean comment on whether common spaces might be made available to support faculty student interaction, in addition to the strategies already outlined in the administrative response?</p>
<p>Issues warranting a request for a follow up report.</p>	<p>The administrative response clearly addresses the reviewers’ recommendations by describing specific plans for new hiring, curriculum revisions and curriculum mapping, and new staffing. However, also in response to the reviewers’ recommendations, the administrative response outlines significant longer term plans to change the structure through which the program is currently offered.</p>	<p>Request a one-year follow-up to address the medium to long-term development of the program, including the eventual establishment of an EDU and independence from the present home Department.</p>