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Template for External Reviewers’ Reports on Undergraduate Programs
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External Reviewers’ Reports on the (INSERT DEGREE) Program in (INSERT PROGRAM NAME) at the University of Ottawa

1. Outline of the visit

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. Provide feedback on each of the following evaluation criteria:

2.1 Objectives

- Is the program consistent with the institution’s mission and academic plans?
  For your information, please consult the website http://www.uottawa.ca/about/vision

- Are the program requirements and associated learning outcomes clear, appropriate, and in alignment with the University’s statement of Undergraduate Degree Level Expectations?

2.2 Admission standards and procedures

- Are admission requirements appropriately aligned with the learning outcomes established for completion of the program?

- Is there sufficient explanation of alternative requirements, if any, such as minimum grade point average, additional languages or portfolios, along with how the program recognizes prior work or learning experience?

2.3 Structure

- Are the program structure and regulations appropriately aligned with the specified program learning outcomes and degree level expectations?

- Do the structure and regulations permit a student to complete the program within the proposed time period?
2.4 Curriculum

• Does the curriculum reflect the current state of the discipline or area of study?

• What evidence is there of any significant innovation or creativity in the content and/or delivery of the program relative to other programs?

2.5 Mode of delivery

• Comment on the appropriateness and effectiveness of the mode(s) of delivery in meeting the program’s identified learning objectives.

2.6 Assessment of teaching and learning

• Are the methods used to assess student achievement of the defined learning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations appropriate and effective?

• Comment on the student satisfaction with the program (teaching evaluation, results of the Undergraduate Program Evaluation Survey).

2.7 Resources

Assess the adequacy of the academic unit’s planned utilization of existing human, physical and financial resources, and any institutional commitment to supplement those resources, to support the program. More specifically, comment on the following:

2.7.1 Human resources

• Are there a sufficient number and quality of faculty competent to teach and/or supervise in the program?

• Does the faculty have the recent research or professional/clinical expertise needed to sustain the program, promote innovation, and foster an appropriate intellectual climate?

2.7.2 Library and laboratory resources:

• Comment on the adequacy of on-campus and off-campus library resources, both holdings and services (In making this judgment, the reviewer needs to take into consideration any co-operative collection development agreements between libraries and the extent to which such agreements are being executed as intended);

• Comment on the appropriateness of laboratory facilities and equipment;

2.7.3 Physical Resources

• Comment on adequacy of office space, laboratories, or other special facilities for students such as access to computers, e-mail, and the internet, on or off the campus.
Outcomes
Comment on
- Undergraduate employment rates after six months and two years after graduation
- Admission to Graduate studies

3. Curriculum Requirements, Examinations and Student Evaluation Procedures
- Including, in the case of certain professional programs, preparation for practice.

4. Innovative Features

With respect to either content or approach, we invite you:

- To identify and commend the program’s notably strong and creative attributes.
- To describe the program’s respective strengths, areas for improvement, and opportunities for enhancement.

5. Recommendations

You will appraise the standards and quality of the program as set out in the Evaluation Criteria. You will also be invited to acknowledge any clearly innovative aspects of the program together with recommendations on any essential or otherwise desirable modifications to it.

In addition to commenting on the way in which the program conforms (or not) to the Evaluation Criteria, we invite you:

- To recommend specific steps to be taken to improve the program, distinguishing between those that the program can itself take and those that require external action.
- To understand and recognize the institution’s autonomy in determining priorities for funding, space, and faculty allocation.
Additional questions specific to this review

NOTE: A number of additional questions may have been identified in the letter emailed to you by the University upon your acceptance of the invitation to conduct the review. You are requested to address each of these as a line item within this section of your report.

IMPORTANT NOTES:

1. 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.

2. The responsibility for arriving at a recommendation on the final classification of the program belongs to the Senate Committee on the Evaluation of Undergraduate Programs (SCEUP). Individual reviewers are asked to refrain from making recommendations in this respect.

April 1st, 2014 (MB)