# Date: Program: Department:

**External Consultants:**

**1)**

**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 2.1.3.

**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. Are the program’s objectives clearly described?
2. Is the degree nomenclature appropriate, given the program’s objectives?
3. Are the program’s objectives consistent with the institution’s mission and academic plans?

## Program Requirements

1. Is the program’s structure and the requirements to meet the program objectives and program-level learning outcomes appropriate?
2. Do the program’s structure, requirements and program-level learning outcomes ensure students meet the institution’s Undergraduate or Graduate Degree Level Expectations?
3. Does the (proposed) mode of delivery facilitate students’ successful completion of the program-level learning outcomes?
4. Does the curriculum address the current state of the discipline or area of study?
5. In what ways does the program action commitments to Equity, Diversity, Inclusion (EDI), decolonization and Indigenization?

**Assessment of Teaching and Learning**

1. Are the methods used to assess student achievement of the program-level learning outcomes and Western Degree Outcomes appropriate and effective?
2. Are the plans in place to monitor and assess the following, both appropriate and effective?
3. The overall quality of the program;
4. Whether the program is achieving in practice its proposed objectives;
5. Whether its students are achieving the program-level learning outcomes; and
6. How the resulting information will be documented and subsequently used to inform continuous program improvement.

## Admission Requirements

1. Are the program’s admission requirements appropriate, given the program objectives and program-level learning outcomes?
2. Are there any applicable alternative admission requirements, including how the program recognizes prior work or learning experience, and if so, are they appropriate?

## Resources

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

1. 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?
2. 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?
3. Is the provision of supervision of experiential learning opportunities adequate, if applicable?
4. 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.*

1. 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?

## Quality and Other Indicators

1. 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).
2. Comment on any other evidence that the program and faculty 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, in view of the expertise and scholarly productivity of the faculty.

## Other Issues

1. Include any additional assessment of the New Program Proposal as a whole, as appropriate.
2. Comment on any other issues, as applicable.

**Summary and Recommendations**

1. Provide a brief summary of the review;
2. Comment on any unique and/or innovative aspects of the proposed program; and
3. Make at least three 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 applicable)

### Signature:

**Signature:**

**Date:**