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**2)**

## Please use this form and headings to assist you in developing your report. Below are the Evaluation Criteria from [Western’s IQAP document](https://www.uwo.ca/pvp/vpacademic/iqap/resources/IQAP_Western%20U_2022.pdf) section 5.2.3.

**Outline of the Review**

Please indicate the following (the site visit schedule may be attached):

1. who was interviewed
2. what facilities were seen or visited
3. any other activities relevant to the review

## Evaluation Criteria (Reviewers are asked to provide feedback on each of the following)

## Program Objectives

1. consistency of the program with Western’s mission, values, strategic priorities, and academic plans;
2. clarity and appropriateness of the program’s requirements and associated learning outcomes in relation to the Western Degree Outcomes

## Program Requirements

1. Appropriateness of the program’s structure and the requirements to meet its objectives, the program-level learning outcomes and the Western Degree Outcomes;
2. Appropriateness and effectiveness of the mode(s) of delivery (e.g., classroom format, online, blended, community-engaged learning, problem-based, compressed part-time, multi-campus, inter-institutional) to facilitate students’ successful completion of the program-level learning outcomes;
3. Ways in which the curriculum addresses the current state of the discipline or area of study; and
4. Ways in which the program actions Western’s commitment to Equity, Diversity, Inclusion (EDI), decolonization and Indigenization.

## Assessment of Teaching and Learning

1. Appropriateness and effectiveness of the methods for assessing student achievement of the program-level learning outcomes and the Western Degree Outcomes or the graduate degree level expectations; and
2. Appropriateness and effectiveness of the plans to monitor and assess the overall quality of the program and how the resulting information is used to inform continuous program improvement.

## Admission Requirements

1. Appropriateness of the program’s admission requirements given the program’s objectives and program-level learning outcomes; and
2. If applicable, sufficient explanation of alternative requirements for admission into the program, e.g., minimum grade point average, additional languages or portfolios, and how the program recognizes prior work or learning experience.

## Resources

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

1. Participation of a sufficient number of qualified core faculty members who are competent to teach and/or supervise in and achieve the goals of the program and foster the appropriate academic environment;
2. If applicable, discussion/explanation of the role and approximate percentage of adjunct and part-time faculty/limited term appointments used in the delivery of the program and the associated plans to ensure the sustainability of the program and quality of the student experience;
3. If applicable, adequate supervision of experiential learning opportunities;
4. Adequacy of the academic unit’s utilization of existing human, physical, technology, and financial resources to support the program; and
5. Evidence that there are adequate resources to sustain the quality of scholarship and research activities produced by students, including library support, information technology support, and laboratory access.

## Quality and Other Indicators

1. Evidence of 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); and
2. Any other evidence that the program and faculty ensure the intellectual quality of the student experience.

**Note:** Reviewers are urged to avoid using references to individuals. Rather they are asked to assess the ability of the faculty as a whole to deliver the program in view of the expertise and scholarly productivity of the faculty.

## Quality Enhancement

1. Comment on notably strong and creative attributes in the content and/or delivery of the program;
2. Comment on efforts made by the program to address recommendations raised in previous reviews (where there was a previous review), and any other program developments shared; and
3. Comment on available program-related data and measure of student performance.

## Other Issues

Any other issues/comments, as applicable.

## Summary and Recommendations

1. Provide a brief summary of the review;
2. Make at least three recommendations that are clear, concise, and actionable. Include specific steps to be taken that will lead to the continuous improvement of the program, distinguishing between those the program can take itself and those that require support external to the program (e.g., Faculty or institutional-level).

**Note:** The responsibility for arriving at a recommendation regarding the final evaluation of the program rests with the University and the Quality Council. However, recommendations to improve the program are greatly appreciated.

## Recommendation 1:

## Recommendation 2:

**Recommendation 3:**

(insert more as applicable)
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