York University Quality Assurance Procedures (YUQAP) Cyclical Program Review

Review Committee Report on

[name(s) of program(s)]

*Please provide feedback, as appropriate, on the evaluation criteria, the quality indicators, and measures, as outlined below. Information and data about the quality indicators and outcome measures is provided in the Self-Study documents.*

*If the review involves related undergraduate and graduate programs, please provide feedback specific to each program. This program-specific feedback may be provided in a single report, separate recommendation sections, or in separate reports.*

**Date**:

**Members of the Review Committee (Name, rank, university, and unit/department/program):**

1. **Outline of the Visit**
	* Who was interviewed
	* What facilities were seen
	* Any other activities relevant to the appraisal
2. **General Objectives of the Program**
	* Are the general objectives of the program clear and are they consistent with University and Faculty missions and academic plans?
3. **Program Curriculum, Structure and Learning Outcomes**
* Does the curriculum reflect the current state of the discipline or area of study? If applicable, comment on the appropriateness of any significant innovation or creativity in the content and/or delivery of the program.
* Are the program requirements and learning outcomes clear, appropriate and in alignment with the relevant degree level expectations? Is there a clear curriculum mapping to the program level expectations?
* Comment on the appropriateness of the program curriculum and structure to support the program learning outcomes. For undergraduate programs, comment on the nature and suitability of students’ final-year academic achievement in the program. For research-focused graduate programs, comment on the nature, and suitability of the major research requirement(s).
* Are the methods and criteria for assessing student achievement appropriate and effective relative to the program learning outcomes?
* For graduate programs, comment on the appropriateness of the program length, including on how students’ time-to-completion is supported and managed to ensure that the program requirements are completed within the expected time period(s).
* Comment on the appropriateness of the mode(s) of delivery to meet the program learning outcomes.
* Please comment on the courses offered, including availability, class sizes, and the proportion of courses taught by full-time faculty, retired faculty, and contract faculty. For graduate programs, special attention should be paid to the expectation that students should be able to meet complete at least two-thirds of their coursework requirements through graduate-level courses.
1. **Admissions and enrolment**
	* Are the admission requirements appropriately aligned with the program learning outcomes?
	* Comment on applications and intake with regards to trends, opportunities, and challenges.
2. **Students**

For undergraduate and graduate programs comment on how the program is confronting enrolment and retention trends. Please include any observations on the academic supports available to students within the program or at the university, as well as the programs evaluation and response to student self assessments, NSSE results, course evaluation results.

For graduate programs in particular, please comment on the time to completion and any other opportunities or challenges, for example, challenges degree requirement sequencing as well as the number and timing of withdrawals. Special attention should be paid to the quality and availability of graduate supervision.

Comment, as appropriate, on the graduate student funding opportunities, including the availability of funding through faculty research grants, as well as student success in provincial and national scholarships, competitions, and awards.

For both undergraduate and graduate programs, comment on the appropriateness any initiatives in place to foster the professional development of students in the program, including transferable or career-oriented skills, as well as the employment (or status) of recent graduates from the program. For graduate programs, comment on the scholarly output of graduates of the program.

1. **Resources**

Keeping in mind the institution’s autonomy in determining academic and budgeting priorities for funding, space, and faculty allocation, comment on the appropriateness and effectiveness of the academic unit’s use of existing human, physical and financial resources in delivering its program(s), as well as the appropriateness and effectiveness of academic services to support the program(s) being reviewed. With respect to faculty resources, special attention should be paid to the appropriateness of any plans for future development, particularly in relation to the program objectives, area(s) of focus, learning outcomes, student need/demand, and graduate-level supervisory capacity.

Faculty complement: The Review Committee, in reviewing the CVs provided, is 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(s) that the university has chosen to emphasize, in view of the expertise and scholarly productivity of the faculty. References to individual faculty members should be avoided.

1. **Library**

Comment on the appropriateness and effectiveness of the academic unit’s use of, as well as the appropriateness and effectiveness of their relationship with, the Library. Further comment on the aligned activities, services, and collections provided by the Library is used to support the program(s) being reviewed.

1. **Quality Enhancement and Program Renewal**

Given the information contained in the Program Brief, as well as discussions held at the site visit, comment on the appropriateness of areas identified as requiring improvement, those that hold promise for enhancement, and any initiatives or changes planned and/or taken to enhance the quality of the program and the associated learning and teaching environment.

1. **Other Areas for Discussion**
2. **Summary and Recommendations**

Reviewers are asked to make at least three recommendations for specific steps to be taken that will lead to the continuous improvement of the program, distinguishing between those the program can itself take and those that require external action.

As a reminder, while the external reviewers’ report may include commentary on issues such as faculty complement and/or space requirements when related to the quality of the program under review, recommendations on these or any other elements that are within the purview of the university’s internal budgetary decision-making processes must be tied directly to issues of program quality or sustainability.