



## Proposed External Reviewers for Cyclical Program Reviews and New Programs

Faculty:

Program:

Date:

---

Please indicate which mode of delivery you are requesting for the site visit:

☐ **In-Person:** These are typically preferred because they allow for better rapport building, informal conversations, and tours of campus/program facilities.

☐ **Virtual:** These may be considered if there are logistical considerations, like the location of ideal reviewers or challenges in engaging stakeholders. If a virtual visit is preferred, please provide rationale in box below. This modality will require Provost approval.

[input rationale here]

Provost approval for virtual visits

Signature:

Date:

## **Guidelines for Nominating External Reviewers**

External reviewers must:

- be tenured, or equivalent
- be active and respected in a field relevant to the program review
- have program creation or program management experience, with at least 1 with an understanding of pedagogy and methods for assessing student achievement of learning outcomes
- have other related experience (membership in related organizations, connections to relevant industry, etc)
- have no conflicts of interest (examples included below)

Two external reviewers will be selected to participate in your program review, both being external to the institution, and at least one of them being from an Ontario post-secondary institution. For graduate program reviews, a third reviewer may be added, internal to Ontario Tech and external to the program.

### **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, and 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
- A recent doctoral supervisor (past several years) 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. Whilst this is preferable, in cases where it is not ideal, at least one of the external reviewers must not have previously reviewed a program in the department/unit.

## External Reviewer Nominations

The rationale for each nomination must include the reviewers' disciplinary expertise, program creation or program management experience (e.g. experience as a program coordinator, chair, dean, etc.), as well as any other related experiences (e.g., membership in relevant organizations, connections to a relevant industry, etc.) in support of their selection. **Research bios should be avoided as the sole means to answer this section.** Please include at least 1-2 proposed reviewers who have an understanding of pedagogy and an awareness of practice in educational approaches to learning outcomes as demonstrated by current or past roles such as chair of curriculum, teaching and learning, program director, member of a curriculum committee, etc.

*Please note: external reviewers for new programs will be required to submit a CV demonstrating the above competencies as a requirement of the Quality Council submission package.*

1.	Name:	
	Institution:	
	Contact Information:	
	Rationale for nomination (summary of Qualifications):	
	Disclosure of potential conflicts of interest:	

2.	Name:	
	Institution:	
	Contact Information:	
	Rationale for nomination (summary of Qualifications):	
	Disclosure of potential conflicts of interest:	

3.	Name:	
----	-------	--

	Institution:	
	Contact Information:	
	Rationale for nomination (summary of Qualifications):	
	Disclosure of potential conflicts of interest:	

4.	Name:	
	Institution:	
	Contact Information:	
	Rationale for nomination (summary of Qualifications):	
	Disclosure of potential conflicts of interest:	

5.	Name:	
	Institution:	
	Contact Information:	
	Rationale for nomination (summary of Qualifications):	
	Disclosure of potential conflicts of interest:	

6.	Name:	
	Institution:	
	Contact Information:	
	Rationale for nomination (summary of Qualifications):	
	Disclosure of potential conflicts of interest:	

7.	Name:	
	Institution:	
	Contact Information:	
	Rationale for nomination (summary of Qualifications):	
	Disclosure of potential conflicts of interest:	

8.	Name:	
	Institution:	
	Contact Information:	
	Rationale for nomination (summary of Qualifications):	

	Disclosure of potential conflicts of interest:	
--	--	--

#### Proposed External Reviewers Approval

Dean's Signature:	Date:
Provost's Signature:	Date: