**Cyclical Program Review - Independent Academic Expert Report Template**

# INTRODUCTION TO THE TEMPLATE

Institutions conducting Cyclical Program Reviews are required to engage a minimum of two (2) Independent Academic Experts in the process and as part of the Program Review Site Visit.

A minimum of two qualified Independent Academic Experts are expected to evaluate the self-study, visit the campus, and conduct onsite interviews, and prepare a single report identifying program strengths and weaknesses, and make recommendations for enhancing program quality.

Please see the CAQC Handbook for information on selecting Independent Academic Experts for Cyclical Program Reviews and *Appendix F* for Terms of Reference for IAEs.

The following is provided as a template for IAE Reports for Cyclical Program Reviews. Institutions create their own templates that address these areas and/or add additional components to this template to suit the program under review.

# CYCLICAL PROGRAM REVIEW – IAE REPORT TEMPLATE

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **INSTITUTION** |  |
| **PROGRAM UNDER REVIEW** |  |
| **NAMES OF REVIEWERS** |  |
| **DATE OF REVIEW** |  |

## Executive Summary or Introduction

Having reviewed the full program proposal including Part A, Part B, and associated appendices per the IAE Terms of Reference, the following report is provided for inclusion in the final program review submission to CAQC.

## Content of the Review

### QUALITY STANDARDS

1. Does the program continue to meet national and international quality standards for degree programs, including Council’s Program Standards for quality degrees in Alberta as established in the CAQC Handbook and the expectations of the Canadian Degree Qualifications Framework (including appropriate academic breadth and depth)?

### LEARNING OUTCOMES AND PATHWAYS

1. Does the program continue to offer similar learning outcomes and opportunities for future employment and/or studies as those offered to graduates of similar programs at Canadian post‑secondary institutions?

### NEEDS OF LEARNERS

1. Does the program demonstrate an understanding of the needs of learners in the program (including the quality of the student experience and learning environment (including the face-to-face and virtual environment and support systems)?

### FACULTY

1. Does the institution have a sufficient number of appropriately qualified faculty who demonstrate evidence of scholarly activity as outlined in Council’s Handbooks? Has the institution maintained a culture of scholarship commensurate with its status as a Canadian degree-granting institution?

### ACADEMIC RESOURCES

1. Does the institution have both the academic resources (e.g., supporting disciplines) and the infrastructure (e.g., classrooms, information resources, labs, offices, equipment, etc.) to sustain the program?

### ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORTS

1. What is the nature of the administrative support for the program (e.g., academic counseling, academic leadership)?

### PROGRAM DEMANDS AND INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE

1. Have institutional administrators and faculty continued to make realistic assessments of demands created by the program and address any areas of concern (e.g., finances, adequacy of current and proposed faculty resources, workloads, support for scholarship of faculty, etc.)?

### PROGRAM STRENGTHS, WEAKNESSES, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the program? What recommendations, if any, should be made to improve the program?

## Conclusion