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CONTACT INFORMATION

If you have any questions regarding the program’s IQAP, inquires can be directed to **iqap@mcmaster.ca****.**

**Undergraduate Programs**

**Amy Gullage**

**Lead Educational Developer, Curriculum Development**

**gullaga@mcmaster.ca**

**Julianne Simpson**

**Quality Assurance Specialist**

**simpjul@mcmaster.ca**

**Kim Dej**

**Vice Provost, Teaching and Learning**

**vptl@mcmaster.ca**

**Graduate Programs**

**Stephanie Baschiera**

**Associate Registrar & Graduate Secretary**

**baschie@mcmaster.ca**

**Christina Bryce**

**Assistant Graduate Secretary**

**cbryce@mcmaster.ca**

**Steve Hranilovic**

**Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies**

**deangrad@mcmaster.ca**

MEETING INFORMATION

It is required that all reviewers visit at the same time, normally for two days. As appropriate, the review team shall meet with the following:

* Chair or Director;
* Full-time faculty members (a broad cross section, in groups);
* Part-time faculty members (a broad cross section, in groups);
* Program students (units should encourage a broad cross section of students to participate in a meeting with the review team);
* Departmental/program support staff;
* Associate Dean;
* Dean;
* Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning and/or Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies;
* Provost and Vice-President (Academic), if available;
* Additional meetings may be scheduled at the request of the external review team, Chair of the department or individuals.

ROLES & OBLIGATIONS

The roles and obligations of the review team include:

* to identify and comment on the program’s notably strong and creative attributes;
* to describe the program’s respective strengths, areas for improvement, and opportunities for enhancement;
* to recommend specific steps to be taken to improve the program, distinguishing between those the program can itself take with existing resources and those that require external action;
* to recognize the University’s autonomy to determine priorities for funding, space, and faculty allocation; and,
* to respect the confidentiality required for all aspects of the review process.

REVIEWERS’ REPORT

The review team will submit, to the Office of the Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning and/or the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies, a co-authored report, including an Executive Summary, for the program(s) under review, normally within four weeks of the visit. The report will normally be written primarily by the external reviewers and then sent to the internal reviewer for their review and comment. The review team’s report should address the substance of both the Self-Study Report and the evaluation criteria set out in the Self-Study Report. The intent of these reports is to be formative and constructive. The reports are intended to provide counsel rather than prescriptive courses of action. In the case that the self-study addresses more than one program, for example when a self-study describes both an undergraduate and graduate programs, reviewers in their report must make specific reference to each program described in the self-study. The Office of the Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning and/or Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies will circulate the report to the appropriate Chair(s) and Dean(s). It is up to the discretion of the Chair to circulate the report more widely.

**Reviewers are required 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.**

Any commentary on issues such as faculty complement and/or space requirements made by the reviewers must be directly tied to issues of program quality and/or sustainability.

The confidential section, if used, is only forwarded to the Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning and/or Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies to determine the appropriate course of action.

Based on information gained from the on-site review, the Self-Study, consultation with members of the program and the University, independent assessments and all material submitted as part of the program review, the review team is expected to provide feedback on the following evaluation criteria and list any recommendations relevant to that section. However, the review team is not restricted to the following issues/questions.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Please provide an Executive Summary of the Reviewers’ Report, which highlights the strengths and weakness or the program and lists the recommendations being made to the programs. An Executive Summary will be posted on the IQAP website as part of the Final Assessment Report for each review.

***Executive Summary:***

***Program Strengths:***

***Program Areas for Enhancement:***

***List of Recommendations for [Program]:***

# PROGRAM

Comment on the consistency of the program with McMaster’s mission and academic plan; whether the program learning outcomes are clear, appropriate and aligned with the undergraduate or graduate Degree Level Expectations.

McMaster’s Current Priorities and Strategic Mandate Agreement should be at the forefront of program design. This information can be found in the links provided below:

1. **McMaster’s Strategic Mandate Agreement:**

[**https://ira.mcmaster.ca/app/uploads/2020/11/McMaster-SMA3-Agreement-August-31-2020-SIGNED-FINAL.pdf**](https://ira.mcmaster.ca/app/uploads/2020/11/McMaster-SMA3-Agreement-August-31-2020-SIGNED-FINAL.pdf)

1. **McMaster’s current priorities:**

[**https://president.mcmaster.ca/app/uploads/2021/05/Institutional-Priorities-and-Strategic-Framework\_FINAL\_5May21.pdf**](https://president.mcmaster.ca/app/uploads/2021/05/Institutional-Priorities-and-Strategic-Framework_FINAL_5May21.pdf)

***Comments:***

***Specific Recommendations (where applicable):***

# ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS

Comment on whether the admission requirements (including any alternative requirements) are appropriately aligned with the program learning outcomes (and/or Degree Level Expectations) established for completion of the program. Note whether any alternative requirements, or processes for accessible and equitable admission are satisfactory.

***Comments:***

***Specific Recommendations (where applicable):***

# CURRICULUM

Comment on:

* how the curriculum reflect the current state of the discipline or area of study and extent to which a comparative review of the state of the discipline informs the curriculum;
* evidence of significant innovation or creativity in the content and/or delivery of the program (e.g. experiential learning, blended learning, co-operative education);
* the appropriateness and effectiveness of the modes of delivery at meeting program learning outcomes;
* and how teaching in the program prioritizes areas of accessibility and removes barriers to learning.

***Comments:***

***Specific Recommendations (where applicable):***

# TEACHING AND ASSESSMENT

Comment on the appropriateness and effectiveness of the current methods of assessment in demonstrating achievement of the program learning outcomes, as well as the extent to which the program(s) assess graduating student achievement of the program learning outcomes. Please also note how programs are assessing the overall effectiveness of the program quality on an ongoing basis.

***Comments:***

***Specific Recommendations (where applicable):***

# RESOURCES TO MEET PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS

Comment on appropriateness and effectiveness of the program’s use of existing human, physical and financial resources; opportunities for more efficient use of existing resources. If applicable, please discuss the role of adjunct or part-time faculty.

***Comments:***

***Specific Recommendations (where applicable):***

# QUALITY INDICATORS

Please provide context and commentary on the data that the program has provided. The Quality Assurance Framework suggests that programs provide ***context and commentary*** on some of the following data (if available):

1. **Faculty:** qualifications; research and scholarly record; class sizes; percentage of classes taught by permanent or non-permanent (contractual) faculty; numbers, assignments and qualifications of part-time or temporary faculty.
2. **Students:** applications and registrations; attrition rates; time-to-completion; final-year academic achievement; graduation rates; academic awards; student in-course reports on teaching.
3. **Graduates:** rates of graduation; employment six months and two years after graduation; postgraduate study; alumni reports on program quality when available.

 Additional Graduate Program Criteria:

### Time-to-Completion

In addition to the data that is provided centrally by the Institutional Research and Analysis (IRA) office, the program should also provide a narrative on how students’ time-to-completion is both monitored and managed in relation to the program’s defined length and requirement*.*

### Quality and Availability of Graduate Supervision

Please evaluate the quality and availability of graduate supervision using the template provided below.

### Evidence of Faculty, Student and Program Quality

Please comment on the indicators used by the program to provide evidence of faculty, student and program quality

# PROGRAM ENHANCEMENT

1. Previous Concerns & Recommendations: Comment on any previous concerns and recommendations related to the program that, in the review team’s opinion should be addressed.
2. Quality Enhancement: Comment on any initiatives that have been undertaken to enhance the quality of the program (teaching, learning and/or research environments).
3. Areas of Improvement: Comment on any areas related to the program that, the review team’s opinion, hold promise for enhancement.
4. Areas of Enhancement: Comment on any areas for improvement related to the program that, in the review team’s opinion, should be addressed as priorities.

***Comments:***

***Specific Recommendations (where applicable):***

# SYSTEM OF GOVERNANCE

Comment on whether the Is the governance system used to assess the program and implement changes consultative and inclusive.

***Comments:***

***Specific Recommendations (where applicable):***

# ACADEMIC SERVICES

Comment on the appropriateness and effectiveness of academic services to the support the program(s) being reviewed.

#

# APPENDIX - CONFIDENTIAL

If there is any commentary or recommendations that the review team would like to provide on confidential areas, please complete the Appendix - Confidential document and submit it separately.