

Office of the Vice-president (Academic) and Pro Vice-Chancellor

March 31, 2005

Dr. A. Collins ,
Dean, Faculty of Education
Dear Dr. Collins:

The Planning and Budget Committee of Senate considered the action plan that resulted from the Academic Program Review for the Faculty of Education at its January 12<sup>th</sup>, 2005 meeting. The PBC wishes to express its appreciation to the Faculty for its participation in the APR process and for undertaking all the work that this process requires.

The primary purpose of formal academic program reviews is to give units of the University an opportunity to engage in formative self-assessment and to obtain the advantages of commentary and advice from experts from the discipline in question. The role of PBC is to monitor the process and develop a body of knowledge that is useful in making broad strategic recommendations and providing sound budgetary advice to the University. It is not the role of the Committee to determine allocations to individual units, but we can sometimes offer advice or make potentially useful observations.

An anticipated outcome of the process is a plan that clarifies how best to achieve the Faculty's objectives with the resources available to it. From the standpoint of the University, the process also provides a measure of accountability to the whole institution and the public that supports us. The following observations were made by the Committee during the course of its discussions about these reviews:

- The Faculty of Education has made great progress in recent years and the Faculty should take pride in its accomplishments.
- There appears to be a variety of views among stakeholders regarding the internship program. Further examination and discussion of this issue between the Faculty, Government and the NLTA seems warranted.
- Recommendation 5 regarding the streamlining of undergraduate programs and courses and recommendation 9 regarding the consideration of a postdegree elementary program appeared to have particular merit.

. . /2

 The Faculty should give additional consideration to how it might improve communication, both internally, with students, the NLTA, the Department of Education and alumni.

As part of the APR process there is an expectation that academic units take a forward-looking view regarding a vision and goals for the coming years. Like a number of reviews considered by the Committee recently, PBC found this review to be somewhat lacking in future focus and would have liked to have seen more about the vision for the Faculty and what you hope to accomplish in the next five years. In light of your recent accomplishments, this should not be difficult.

Once again, I would like to express the appreciation of PBC for undertaking this challenging and very important process. I offer my support and that of the Committee as you address the issues outlined in the review. We look forward to seeing your one year update in January, 2006.

Sincerely yours,

H.E.A. Campbell

Vice-President (Academic)