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**SUMMARY**

*Please provide a brief synopsis of your review (2-4 paragraphs) that addresses the following*:

* What is the overall assessment of the quality of the program? *Describe.*
* What are the chief strengths of the program? What are its major challenges and weaknesses, if any?
* Provide a summary of your recommendations. *Please include the full list of recommendations in Section 4.*

# 1. DETAILS OF THE SITE VISIT

## 1.1 Outline of the Visit

* With whom did you meet?
* What facilities were seen?
* Discuss any other activities relevant to the appraisal.

## 1.2 Effectiveness

*In order to continuously improve the effectiveness and efficiency of site visits, please comment on the following:*

* How effective was the self-study in preparing you for the visit?
* How could the logistics of the visit be improved?

# 2. EVALUATION CRITERIA

## 2.1 Objectives

*For the following Yes/No questions, if ‘No’, please explain.*

* Is the program consistent with the [University of Waterloo’s mission](https://uwaterloo.ca/strategic-plan/) and relevant academic strategic plans?
* Are the program requirements and learning outcomes
	+ in alignment with the University of Waterloo’s [Undergraduate](https://uwaterloo.ca/academic-quality-enhancement/degree-level-expectations-dles/undergraduate-degree-learning-expectations-udles) or [Graduate](https://uwaterloo.ca/academic-quality-enhancement/degree-level-expectations-dles/graduate-degree-learning-expectations-gdles) Degree Level Expectations?
	+ clear and appropriately communicated?
* How do the program name and credential earned (e.g., BA, MSc, PhD, etc.)
	+ reflect the content of the program?
	+ advance the program’s objectives?

## 2.2 Admission requirements

*For the following Yes/No questions, if ‘No’, please explain.*

* Are admission requirements appropriately aligned with the learning outcomes established for completion of the program?
* *For undergraduate programs, if applicable,* is there a meaningful path for entry outside of standard 1st year entry (e.g., 2+2 programs or programs that require prior study)? Are there appropriate alternate admission requirements, such as minimum grade point average, additional languages or portfolios, prior work or learning experience?

## Curriculum

*For the following Yes/No questions, if ‘No’, please explain.*

* Does the curriculum reflect the current state of the discipline or area of study?
* Is there evidence of any significant innovation, distinctiveness or creativity in the content and/or delivery of the program relative to peer programs?
* Are the modes of delivery appropriate and effective to meet with program’s identified learning outcomes?

## Teaching and Assessment

*For the following Yes/No questions, if ‘No’, please explain.*

*All programs are expected to map the courses and related academic elements to the program learning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations (*[*UDLEs*](https://uwaterloo.ca/academic-quality-enhancement/degree-level-expectations-dles/undergraduate-degree-learning-expectations-udles) *or* [*GDLEs*](https://uwaterloo.ca/academic-quality-enhancement/degree-level-expectations-dles/graduate-degree-learning-expectations-gdles)*). This section intends to evaluate these relationships.*

* Are learning outcomes:
* aligned with program goals?
* achievable in the time allotted?
* appropriately reinforced and measured through listed assessments?

* Is there a clear relationship between diverse academic elements: core courses, electives, and other program elements?
* Are majors, minors, options, specializations and fields sufficiently differentiated?
* For undergraduate programs, is there a well-defined progression from introductory level to proficiency in content, skills, and values across courses and years?
* For graduate programs, is there translation from foundational to program-level outcomes?
* Are the program’s structure and regulations appropriate so that students are able to meet specified program learning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations?
* Do assessment methods appropriately and effectively show student achievement of program learning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations?

## Resources

*For the following Yes/No questions, if ‘No’, please explain.*

* Is the academic unit’s (or units’) use of existing resources (e.g., human, physical) appropriate and effective in delivering its program? (*NOTE: Reviewers are encouraged to articulate and demonstrate the value added of any additional resources - e.g., new academic elements such as offering a new degree, or improved delivery of existing offerings, etc.)*
* Is there a sufficient number and quality of faculty effectively contributing to the program delivery through teaching and supervision?
* Are the academic support services (e.g., library, co-op, technology, etc.), related to the program appropriate and effective?

## Quality Indicators

*Comment on the following measures program quality.*

**With regards to the faculty complement**, comment on:

* Their qualifications, research and scholarly record

***NOTE:*** *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 in view of the expertise and scholarly productivity of the faculty.*

**With regards to teaching**, comment on:

* Evidence that the faculty scholarship is embedded in the program structure and delivery
* Percentage of classes taught by permanent or non-permanent (contract) faculty, as well as the number, assignments and qualifications of part-time or temporary faculty.
* Class sizes
* Course evaluations

**With regards to students**, comment on:

* Applications and registrations; attrition rates, times-to-completion; graduation rates; academic awards; and the quality of the student’s academic experience.

**With regards to graduates of the program**, comment on:

* Rates of graduation; employment after six months and two years after graduation; post graduate study; alumni reports on program quality (if available and permitted by FIPPA).

## Additional Graduate Program Criteria

*For the following Yes/No questions, if ‘No’, please explain.*

* Are students’ time-to-completion both monitored and managed in relation to the program’s identified length and program requirements?
* Is the quality and availability of graduate supervision sufficient?

*Comment on the following quality indicators used to provide evidence of faculty, students and program quality:*

**With regards to faculty**, comment on:

* + Funding; honours and awards; commitment to student mentoring.

**With regards to students,** comment on:

* + Grade-level for admission; scholarly output; success rates in provincial and national scholarships; competitions; awards and commitment to professional and transferable skills.

## 2.8 Quality Enhancement

Comment on initiatives taken to enhance the quality of the program and the associated learning and teaching environment, as reflected in 2.6 and 2.7.

# 3. TOPICS FOR ADVICE

## 3.1 Advice on Identified Weaknesses and Challenges

Please identify how the program could improve on their identified challenges/threats and weaknesses, as included in the ‘Advice on Identified Weaknesses and Challenges’ section at the end of the Self-Study.

## 3.2 Insights from External Reviewers

Please respond to the items listed under the ‘Request for Insights from External Reviewers’ section at the end of the self-study.

# 4. RECOMMENDATIONS

List your recommendations, in priority order.

1. …

**Signature: Date:**

**Signature: Date:**