Sample Template for Reviewers' Reports
New Programs
[date]

External Reviewers' Report on the (INSERT DEGREE) Program in (INSERT PROGRAM NAME) at (INSERT UNIVERSITY)

Reviewer 1

Name:

University Address:

Reviewer 2

Name:

University Address:

Internal Reviewer (if used)

Name:

Department:

1. OUTLINE OF THE VISIT

Was the site visit: In person: ☐   Virtual site visit: ☐   Desk Review: ☐

If the review was conducted either virtually or via desk review, was this format agreed to by both external reviewers?   Yes ☐   No   ☐

Was sufficient rationale provided by the Provost/Provost's delegate for an off-site visit?

Yes ☐   No ☐

For those reviews that included an in-person or virtual visit, please indicate the following (or insert the site visit schedule below:

- Who was interviewed?
- What facilities were seen?
- Comment on any other activities relevant to the appraisal.
- **Or: insert the site visit schedule below**

In order to continuously improve the effectiveness and efficiency of site visits/virtual site visits, please comment on the following:

- How effective was the proposal brief in preparing you for the visit/virtual site visit?

- How could the logistics of the visit/virtual site visit be improved?

2. EVALUATION CRITERIA

Please provide commentary on the following evaluation criteria:

2.1 Objectives of the program

- Are the program's objectives clearly described?

- Is the degree nomenclature appropriate, given the program's objectives?

- Are the program's objectives consistent with the institution's mission and academic plans?

2.2 Program Requirements

NOTE: The Quality Assurance Framework requires a clear distinction between program objectives, program-level learning outcomes, and Degree Level Expectations. See the Guidance on Program Objectives and Program-level Learning Outcomes for details on the distinction.

- Is the program's structure and the requirements to meet the program objectives and program-level learning outcomes appropriate?

- Do the program's structure, requirements and program-level learning outcomes ensure students meet the institution's Undergraduate or Graduate Degree Level Expectations?

- Does the (proposed) mode of delivery facilitate students' successful completion of the program-level learning outcomes?

- Does the curriculum address the current state of the discipline or area of study?

2.3 Program requirements for graduate programs only :

- Does the program length ensure that students can complete the program-level learning outcomes and requirements within the proposed time period?

- Are graduate students required to take a minimum of two-thirds of the course requirements from among graduate-level courses?

- For research focused graduate programs, are the nature and suitability of the major research requirements for degree completion appropriate?

2.4 Assessment of teaching and learning

NOTE: Programs should ensure that the plans for monitoring and assessing student achievement provide an assessment of students currently enrolled as well as post-graduation metrics. Please see Guidance on Assessment of Teaching and Learning for further details and examples of measures for assessing teaching and learning that meet the requirements of the Quality Assurance Framework.

- Are the methods used to assess student achievement of the program-level learning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations appropriate and effective?

- Are the plans in place to monitor and assess the following, both appropriate and effective?

  i. The overall quality of the program;
  ii. Whether the program is achieving in practice its proposed objectives;
  iii. Whether its students are achieving the program-level learning outcomes; and
  iv. How the resulting information will be documented and subsequently used to inform continuous program improvement.

2.5   Admission Requirements

- Are the program's admission requirements appropriate, given the program objectives and program-level learning outcomes?

- Are there any applicable alternative admission requirements, including how the program recognizes prior work or learning experience, and if so, are they appropriate?

2.6   Resources

Given the program's class sizes and cohorts as well as its program-level learning outcomes:

a) Is the number and quality of core faculty who are competent to teach and/or supervise sufficient to achieve the goals of the program and foster the appropriate academic environment?

b) When adjunct/sessional faculty play a large role in the delivery of the program, is their role appropriate? Are plans in place to ensure the sustainability of the program and the quality of student experience and if so, are these suitable?

c) Is the provision of supervision of experiential learning opportunities adequate, if applicable?

d) Taking into consideration implications for other existing programs at the university, is the administrative unit's planned use of existing human, physical and financial resources appropriate?

   NOTE: External Reviewers are not expected to assess the financial viability of a program, and internal budgets are not under the purview of the External Review of a New Program Proposal. Provide a general assessment of the administrative unit's planned use of existing financial resources.

e) Are there adequate resources available to sustain the quality of scholarship and research activities produced by students, including library support, information technology support, and laboratory access?

2.7   Resources for Graduate Programs Only:

Given the program's planned/anticipated class sizes and cohorts as well as its program-level learning outcomes:

- Does the faculty have the recent research or professional/clinical expertise needed to sustain the program, promote innovation and foster an appropriate intellectual climate?

- Where appropriate to the program, is financial assistance to students sufficient to ensure adequate quality and numbers of students?

- Are supervisory loads adequately distributed, in light of the qualifications and appointment status of the faculty?

2.8   Quality and other indicators

- Comment on the quality of the faculty (e.g., qualifications, funding, honours, awards, research, innovation and scholarly record, appropriateness of collective faculty expertise to contribute substantively to the program and commitment to student mentoring).

- Comment on any other evidence that the program and faculty will ensure the intellectual quality of the student experience.

3. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

- Include any additional assessment of the New Program Proposal as a whole, as appropriate.

- Comment on any other issues, as applicable.

4. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Provide a brief summary of the review. Please include commentary on any clearly innovative aspects of the proposed program together with recommendations on any essential or otherwise desirable modifications to it, as applicable.

Recommendations that are clear, concise, and actionable are the most helpful for universities as they prepare to launch new programs. Include specific steps to be taken on any essential or otherwise desirable modifications to the proposed program.

NOTE: The responsibility for arriving at a recommendation on the final classification of the program belongs to the Appraisal Committee. Individual reviewers are asked to refrain from making recommendations in this respect.

Recommendation 1:

Recommendation 2:

Recommendation 3:

[Add more as required.]

Signature: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____