

## Review Committee Guidelines for External Reviews of Academic Units – Interdisciplinary Programs

Last revised: January 13, 2021

This document is meant as a guideline for reviewers of interdisciplinary programs to navigate the relevant parts of the External Review of Academic Units Policy and [Reviewer Guide](#). For a full breakdown of external review procedures, please see the [External Review of Academic Units Policy, AC1145](#) and the [External Review Checklist](#).

According to the External Review of Academic Units Policy, AC1145 2.00: “some programs without department-equivalent status (e.g. interdisciplinary inter/intra-faculty programs) [...] *may be attached to a home academic unit for the purpose of external review or may hold a free-standing external review* (the term academic unit as used in this policy may refer specifically to an academic program in this instance); the Associate Vice-President Academic Planning and disciplinary dean(s) determine the most appropriate option”.

### External Review Committee

A committee of three reviewers (two external, one internal) will be formed as the External Review Committee for each programs under review. The program director who oversee the program under review will nominate a member from outside the faculty/unit to serve as the internal reviewer. The internal reviewer may be a program director from another faculty.

### Guidance to External Review Committee on Key Areas to Address in the Report:

The review completed by the reviewer committee should address the following:

*Note: the numbers below refer to subsections of the External Reviews of Academic Units Reviewer Guide. Please reference the identified sections when crafting your response.*

- Executive Summary: please start with a 2-3 page summary of key findings, including a List of Recommendations with up to 8-10 recommendations to be implemented by the academic unit between now and the unit’s next external review in 7 years. The executive summary (including the recommendations) may be publically available; the unit is required to provide a formal response and action plan that addresses the recommendations.
- Quality of the academic program: Is the range and depth of curriculum appropriate? Comment on the suitability of program-level learning outcomes (1.4, 3.1, 3.2, 3.4, 3.5, 3.7, 4.2, 4.3)
- Quality of teaching and learning environment: Are the teaching methods appropriate? (1.4, 3.3.)
- Opportunities for research-enriched and community-engaged education and experiential learning, including co-op and work placements, internships, and practica (3.8, 3.9, 3.10, 3.11, 5.1)
- Overall administrative, organizational, and governance structure (1.5, 1.6, 1.7, 1.8)
- Student advising (3.12, 3.13)
- Advice on marketing and promotion to students (2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 4.1)
- Sustainability and financial considerations (6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4)
- Challenges and opportunities
- Additional Questions identified by the Academic Unit, Dean, or AVPAP

**After the Site Visit**

- External Review Committee completes report (8-10 weeks after review site visit);
- Within 6-8 weeks of receiving the final report, the program director completes a response along with the Action Plan document and sends them to the Faculty Dean for review. The Dean completes a separate response.
- The Faculty Dean sends both responses (program director response and decanal response) to the AVPAP, along with the completed Action Plan document.
- Follow-up meetings with the AVPAP, Faculty Dean, Chair/Director and Dean of Graduate Studies (for programs with graduate components) will be scheduled as per the AC1145 policy.