

REVIEWERS' REPORT FOR NEW PROGRAMS

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

(REVIEWER 1)
UNIVERSITY ADDRESS

(REVIEWER 2)
UNIVERSITY ADDRESS

1. OUTLINE OF THE REVIEW

Please indicate whether this review was conducted by desk audit or site visit. For those reviews that included a site visit, please indicate the following:

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

2. EVALUATION CRITERIA

NOTE: Reviewers are asked to provide feedback on each of the following Evaluation Criteria ([Quality Assurance Framework 2021, Section 2.1.2](#)).

2.1 Program Objectives

- Clarity of the program's objectives
- Appropriateness of degree nomenclature given the program's objectives
- Consistency of the program's objectives with the institution's mission and academic plans

2.2 Program requirements

- Appropriateness of the program's structure and the requirements to meet its objectives and program-level learning outcomes
- Appropriateness of the program's structure, requirements and program-level learning outcomes in meeting the undergraduate or graduate Degree Level Expectations
- Appropriateness of the proposed mode(s) of delivery to facilitate students' successful completion of the program-level learning outcomes
- Ways in which the curriculum addresses the current state of the discipline or area of study

2.3 Program requirements for graduate programs only

- Clear rationale for program length that ensures that students can complete the program level learning outcomes and requirements within the proposed time
- 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
- For research-focused graduate programs, clear indication of the nature and suitability of the major research requirements for degree completion

2.4 Assessment of teaching and learning

- Appropriateness of the methods for assessing student achievement of the program-level learning outcomes and degree level expectations
- Appropriateness of the plans 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
- iv. How the resulting information will be documented and subsequently used to inform continuous program improvement

2.5 Admission requirements

- Appropriateness of the program's admission requirements given the program's objectives and program-level learning outcomes
- Sufficient explanation of alternative requirements, if applicable, for admission into a graduate, second-entry or undergraduate program, e.g., minimum grade point average, additional languages or portfolios, and how the program recognizes prior work or learning experience

2.6 Resources for all programs

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

- Participation of a sufficient number and quality of core faculty who are competent to teach and/or supervise in and achieve the goals of the program and foster the appropriate academic environment
- 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
- If required, provision of supervision of experiential learning opportunities
- Adequacy of the administrative unit's planned utilization of existing human, physical and financial resources, including implications for the impact on other existing programs at the university
- 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
- If necessary, additional institutional resource commitments to support the program in step with its ongoing implementation

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:

- 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, in light of qualifications and appointment status of the faculty

2.8 Quality and other indicators

- Evidence of 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)
- 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 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.

3. EQUITY, DIVERSITY, INCLUSION, AND DECOLONIZATION

Please comment on any consideration of the principles of equity, diversity, inclusion, and decolonization in the new program.

4. OTHER ISSUES

- Please highlight any unique curriculum or program innovation, creative components, or significant high-impact practices
- Please identify any other issues that may not be covered above

5. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Please provide a summary of your conclusions and include a numbered list of each of your recommendations.

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.

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____