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1. **OUTLINE OF THE REVIEW**

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

* Who was interviewed
* What facilities were seen
* Any other activities relevant to the appraisal

1. **EVALUATION CRITERIA**

**NOTE:** Reviewers are asked to provide feedback on each of the following Evaluation Criteria.

### 2.1 Objectives

* Consistency of the program with the institution’s mission and academic plans.
* Clarity and appropriateness of the program’s requirements and associated learning outcomes in addressing the institution’s own graduate Degree Level Expectations.
* Appropriateness of degree nomenclature.

### 2.2 Admission requirements

* Appropriateness of the program’s admission requirements for the learning outcomes established for completion of the program.
* Sufficient explanation of alternative requirements, if any, for admission into a graduate, second-entry or undergraduate program, such as minimum grade point average, additional languages or portfolios, along with how the program recognizes prior work or learning experience.
* Projected enrolments (admission standards and procedures should ensure that the students have the capacity and the preparation to meet the challenge of the program effectively)

### 2.3 Structure

* Appropriateness of the program's structure and regulations to meet specified program learning outcomes and degree level expectations.
* A clear rationale for program length that ensures that the program requirements can be reasonably completed within the proposed time period.

### 2.4 CURRICULUM REQUIREMENTS & PROGRAM CONTENT

* Ways in which the curriculum addresses the current state of the discipline or area of study.
* Ways in which the specified courses and research requirements map into the programmatic Learning Outcomes
* Identification of any unique curriculum or program innovations or creative components.
* For research-focused graduate programs, clear indication of the nature and suitability of the major research requirements for degree completion.
* Evidence that each graduate student in the program is required to take a minimum of two-thirds of the course requirements from among graduate level courses.

### 2.5 Mode of delivery

Comment on the appropriateness of the proposed mode(s) of delivery to meet the intended program learning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations.

### 2.6 Assessment ofteaching and learning

* Appropriateness of the proposed methods for the assessment of student achievement of the intended program learning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations.
* Completeness of plans for documenting and demonstrating the level of performance of students, consistent with the institution’s statement of its Degree Level Expectations.

### 2.7 Resources for the program

* Adequacy of the administrative unit’s planned utilization of existing human, physical and financial resources, and any institutional commitment to supplement those resources, to support the program.
* Participation of a sufficient number and quality of faculty who are competent to teach and/or supervise in the program.
* Evidence that there are adequate resources to sustain the quality ofscholarship and research activities, including library support, information technology support, and laboratory access.
* Evidence that 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, evidence that financial assistance for students will be sufficient to ensure adequate quality and numbers of students.
* Evidence of how supervisory loads will be distributed, and the qualifications and appointment status of faculty who will provide instruction and supervision.

### 2.8 Quality and other indicators

* Evidence of quality of the faculty (*e.g.*, qualifications, research, innovation and scholarly record; appropriateness of collective faculty expertise to contribute substantively to the proposed program).
* Evidence of a program structure and faculty research that will 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 and to comment on the appropriateness of each of the areas of the program (fields) that the university has chosen to emphasize, in view of the expertise and scholarly productivity of the faculty.

1. **OTHER ISSUES**

**Summary and Recommendations**

* brief summary of the review;
* comments on any innovative aspects of the proposed program;
* numbered recommendations that are clear, concise and actionable. Include specific steps to be taken on any essential or desirable modifications to the proposed program.

**Note:** the responsibility for arriving at a recommendation on the final classification of the program rests with the University and the Quality Council. However, recommendations to improve the proposed program are appreciated.

**Recommendation 1:**

**Recommendation 2:**

**Recommendation 3:**

(insert more as required)