

### Proposed External Reviewers for New Programs

**Faculty:**

**Program:**

**Date:**

Reviewers must be external to the University, be tenured or equivalent and active and respected in their field, have suitable disciplinary expertise, qualifications, and program management experience, including an appreciation of pedagogy and learning outcomes, and be at arm’s length from the program under review. Please see page two for additional guidance on choosing external reviewers. For all programs, two external reviewers are required.

Please provide below **a ranked list of at least 5 (five)** external reviewers for your new program review accompanied by a complete rationale and brief biographical statement. Once completed and signed by the Dean, please submit the form to the Centre for Institutional Quality Enhancement ([CIQE@ontariotechu.ca](mailto:CIQE@ontariotechu.ca)) for review by the Provost.

1.	Name:
	Contact Information:
	Rationale and brief biographical statement:
2.	Name:
	Contact Information:
	Rationale and brief biographical statement:
3.	Name:
	Contact Information:

	Rationale and brief biographical statement:
4.	Name:
	Contact Information:
	Rationale and brief biographical statement:
5.	Name:
	Contact Information:
	Rationale and brief biographical statement:

<b>Signature of Dean:</b>		<b>Date:</b>
<b>Signature of Provost:</b>		<b>Date:</b>

## GUIDELINES ON ARM'S LENGTH AND THE SELECTION OF EXTERNAL 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 (<https://oucqa.ca/guide/choosing-arms-length-reviewers-2-2-1-and-5-2-1/>).*

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 may 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 may 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.

### ADDITIONAL ADVICE FOR CHOOSING EXTERNAL REVIEWERS/CONSULTANTS

External reviewers should have a strong track record as academic scholars in the discipline 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 value to reviews of new program proposals and existing programs.

It is also important that the external reviewers have an appreciation of pedagogy. Further, there should be at least one person within the membership of the Review Committee who understands and appreciates the role that program-level learning outcomes and the methods for assessing student achievement of these outcomes, plays within the Ontario context. For example, including a Chair of Curriculum, Teaching and

Learning (or equivalent) as a member of the Review Team can provide critical external perspective and expertise.