

Proposed External Reviewers for Program Reviews (UG/GR)

FACULTY: <FACULTY>
 PROGRAM: <PROGRAM NAME(S)>
 DATE: <DATE>

Reviewers must be tenured or equivalent, be active and respected in their field, have program management experience, and be at arm’s length (guidelines below) from the program under review.

- For **undergraduate programs**, two reviewers are required, with both being external to the university. At least one of the reviewers must currently be at a Canadian post-secondary institution.
- For **graduate programs**, two reviewers are required, with both being external to the university. At least one of the reviewers must currently be at a Canadian post-secondary institution. A third reviewer, internal to Ontario Tech and external to the program, may additionally be included.

Please provide below **a ranked list of at least five** external reviewers for your program review accompanied by a rationale for selection and detailed biographical statement. Once completed and signed by the Dean, please submit the form to the Centre for Institutional Quality Enhancement (CIQE@ontariotechu.ca) for review and approval by the Provost.

1.	Name:
	Contact Information:
	Rationale for selection (disclose potential conflict of interest, if necessary):
	Detailed biographical statement outlining their academic expertise, administrative experience, accomplishments, and research:
2.	Name:
	Contact Information:
	Rationale for selection (disclose potential conflict of interest, if necessary):

	Detailed biographical statement outlining their academic expertise, administrative experience, accomplishments, and research:
3.	Name:
	Contact Information:
	Rationale for selection (disclose potential conflict of interest, if necessary):
	Detailed biographical statement outlining their academic expertise, administrative experience, accomplishments, and research:
4.	Name:
	Contact Information:
	Rationale for selection (disclose potential conflict of interest, if necessary):
	Detailed biographical statement outlining their academic expertise, administrative experience, accomplishments, and research:
5.	Name:
	Contact Information:
	Rationale for selection (disclose potential conflict of interest, if necessary):

	<p>Detailed biographical statement outlining their academic expertise, administrative experience, accomplishments, and research:</p>
6.	<p>Name:</p> <hr/> <p>Contact Information:</p> <hr/> <p>Rationale for selection (disclose potential conflict of interest, if necessary):</p> <hr/> <p>Detailed biographical statement outlining their academic expertise, administrative experience, accomplishments, and research:</p>
7.	<p>Name:</p> <hr/> <p>Contact Information:</p> <hr/> <p>Rationale for selection (disclose potential conflict of interest, if necessary):</p> <hr/> <p>Detailed biographical statement outlining their academic expertise, administrative experience, accomplishments, and research:</p>
8.	<p>Name:</p> <hr/> <p>Contact Information:</p> <hr/> <p>Rationale for selection (disclose potential conflict of interest, if necessary):</p>

Detailed biographical statement outlining their academic expertise, administrative experience, accomplishments, and research:

Signature of Dean:

Date:

Signature of Provost:

Date:

GUIDELINES ON ARM'S LENGTH IN THE SELECTION OF REVIEWERS

Reproduced below are guidelines on the definition of "arm's length" to aid in the selection of reviewers for new programs and program reviews prepared by the [COU Quality Council](#) (October 2010).

Best practice in quality assurance ensures that reviewers are at arm's length from the program under review. This means that reviewers/consultants are not close friends, current or recent collaborators, former supervisor, advisor or colleague.

Arm's length does not mean that the reviewer must never have met or even heard of a single member of the program. It does mean that reviewers should not be chosen who are likely, or perceived to be likely, to be predisposed, positively or negatively, about the program. It may be helpful to provide some examples of what does and does not constitute a close connection that would violate the arm's length requirement.

Examples of what does not violate the arm's length requirement:

- Appeared on a panel at a conference with a member of the program
- Served on a granting council selection panel with a member of the program
- Author of an article in a journal edited by a member of the program, or of a chapter in a book edited by a member of the program
- External examiner of a dissertation by a doctoral student in the program
- Presented a paper at a conference held at the university where the program is located
- Invited a member of the program to present a paper at a conference organized by the reviewer, or to write a chapter in a book edited by the reviewer
- Received a bachelor's degree from the university (especially if in another program)
- Co-author or research collaborator with a member of the program more than seven years ago
- Presented a guest lecture at the university
- Reviewed for publication a manuscript written by a member of the program

Examples of what does violate the arm's length requirement:

- A previous member of the program or department under review (including being a visiting professor)
- Received a graduate degree from the program under review
- A regular co-author and research collaborator with a member of the program, within the past seven years, especially if that collaboration is ongoing.
- Close family/friend relationship with a member of the program
- A regular or repeated external examiner of dissertations by doctoral students in the program
- The doctoral supervisor of one or more members of the program
- A previous external reviewer for a Cyclical Program Review or a New Program Proposal in the department/unit in question.

ADDITIONAL ADVICE FOR CHOOSING EXTERNAL REVIEWERS/CONSULTANTS

External reviewers/consultants should have a strong track record as academic scholars and ideally should also have had academic administrative experience in such roles as undergraduate or graduate program coordinators, department chair, dean, graduate dean or associated positions. This combination of experience allows a reviewer to provide the most valuable feed-back on program proposals and reviews.