Sample Template for Reviewers' Reports

Existing 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: ☐   <u>Desk Review</u>: ☐

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 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. Please see the Guidance on Program Objectives and Program-level Learning Outcomes for details on the distinction.

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

- Are the program's structure, requirements and program-level learning outcomes appropriate in meeting the institution's Undergraduate or Graduate Degree Level Expectations?

- Is the mode of delivery appropriate in facilitating students' successful completion of the program-level learning outcomes?

- What are the ways in which the curriculum addresses the current state of the discipline or area of study?

2.3 Program requirements for graduate programs only:

- Is there a clear rationale for the program length that ensures that program requirements can be reasonably completed within the proposed time period?

- Is there evidence that graduate students required to take a minimum of two-thirds of the course requirements from among graduate-level courses?

- Is there a clear indication of the nature and suitability of the major research requirements for degree completion?

2.4 Assessment of teaching and learning

NOTE: In this section, the Self-study should again make a clear distinction between program-level learning outcomes, program objectives, and Degree Level Expectations. Additionally, 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?

- Appropriateness and effectiveness of the in place to monitor and assess:

  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 admission requirements appropriate, given the program's 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

NOTE: Recommendations on issues such as faculty complement, space requirements and/or other elements that are within the purview of the university's internal budgetary decision-making process must be tied directly to issue of program quality or sustainability.

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

a) Is there a sufficient 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 suitable? 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?

d) Comment on the administrative unit's planned use of existing human, physical and financial resources, including implications for other existing programs at the university.

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 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, is financial assistance to students sufficient to ensure adequate quality and numbers of students?

- Are supervisory loads adequately distributed, given 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).

  NOTE: Please avoid using references to individuals. Instead, aim to assess the ability of the faculty as a whole to deliver the program and focus on the areas of the program(s) that the university has chosen to emphasize, in view of the expertise and scholarly productivity of the faculty.

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

- Comment on students' grade-level for admission, scholarly output, success rates in provincial and national scholarships, competitions, awards, and commitment to professional and transferable skills, times-to-completion and retention rates.

2.9 Quality Enhancements

- Comment on any notably strong and creative attributes, describe the program's strengths and describe any significant innovation or creativity in the content and/or delivery of the program.

- Comment on any efforts made by the program to address concerns and recommendations raised in previous reviews, or for programs which have not yet been cyclically reviewed, comment on any steps taken to address any issues or items flagged in the monitory report for follow-up and/or items identified for follow-up by the Quality Council; and

- Comment on program-related data and measures of performance, including applicable provincial, national and professional standards (where available), with a notation of all relevant data sources.

3. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

- Please comment on:

  o The program's strengths, areas for improvement, and opportunities for enhancement;

  o The distinctive attributes of each discrete program documented in the self-study, in cases where more than one program/program level has been reviewed simultaneously; and

o   Any other issues/comments, as applicable.

4. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Provide a brief summary of the review. Please make at least three recommendations for specific steps to be taken that will lead to the continuous improvement of the program, distinguishing between those the program can itself take and those that require external action.

Recommendations that are clear, concise, and actionable are the most helpful as universities implement changes toward continuous improvement

Recommendation 1:

Recommendation 2:

Recommendation 3:

[add more as required]

Summary

Signature: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____