



University
of Windsor

Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP)

Instructions for Proposed Reviewers for Cyclical Program Review

Under the provincial *Quality Assurance Framework*, a review committee must be established for each program undergoing a cyclical program review.

The review committee will include, as a minimum, two **external** reviewers and one **internal** facilitator (the internal facilitator is not from the program under review and will be chosen by the AVPA).

Each program undergoing a cyclical review must submit the names of **at least 8 external reviewer candidates** to the Quality Assurance office. No more than half of the nominees should be from Ontario.

Please use the Template provided.

The nominees will be invited by the Office of Quality Assurance and two candidates from those that have been accepted will be chosen by the AVPA. As well one internal facilitator will be selected by AVPA to serve on the review committee. One of the external reviewers will act as chair of the committee.

Summary of the reviewer process steps:

- The AAU Head (or designate) surveys faculty members for names of potential nominees who meet **both** the arm's length and expertise requirements (listed below).
- The AAU submits a list of names and then the Office of Quality Assurance will contact the reviewers to determine if they are willing to serve on the review team. If so they will be asked to submit a CV.
- The Office of Quality Assurance will issue a formal invitation and the AVPA will choose two candidates from those that have accepted the invitation.
- The Office of Quality Assurance will notify the AAU of the selected reviewers. **The AAU should NOT contact or correspond with the reviewers directly.** All communication with potential reviewers must be through the Office of Quality Assurance. If it is brought to the attention of Quality Assurance office that the reviewers have been in contact with the AAU under review the reviewer(s) will be replaced.

Eligibility criteria for reviewer nominees:

1. **EXPERTISE:** Reviewers should be well-respected and professionally active teachers and scholars in their disciplines, and **must have first-hand administrative and/or program assessment experience**
2. **ARM'S LENGTH:** Best practice in quality assurance ensures that reviewers are at arm's length from the program under review. This means that reviewers/consultants are not close friends, current or recent collaborators, former supervisor, advisor or colleague.



- Arm's length does not mean that the reviewer must never have met or even heard of a single member of the program. It does mean that reviewers should not be chosen who are likely, or perceived to be likely, to be predisposed, positively or negatively, about the program. It may be helpful to provide some examples of what does and does not constitute a close connection that would violate the arm's length requirement.

Examples of what may not violate the arm's length requirement:

- Appeared on a panel at a conference with a member of the program
- Served on a granting council selection panel with a member of the program
- Author of an article in a journal edited by a member of the program, or of a chapter in a book edited by a member of the program
- External examiner of a dissertation by a doctoral student in the program
- Presented a paper at a conference held at the university where the program is located
- Invited a member of the program to present a paper at a conference organized by the reviewer, or to write a chapter in a book edited by the reviewer
- Received a bachelor's degree from the university (especially if in another program)
- Co-author or research collaborator with a member of the program more than seven years ago
- Presented a guest lecture at the university
- Reviewed for publication a manuscript written by a member of the program

Examples of what may violate the arm's length requirement:

- A previous member of the program or department under review (including being a visiting professor)
- Received a graduate degree from the program under review
- A regular co-author and research collaborator with a member of the program, within the past seven years, and especially if that collaboration is ongoing
- Close family/friend relationship with a member of the program
- A regular or repeated external examiner of dissertations by doctoral students in the program
- A recent doctoral supervisor (past several years) of one or more members of the program
- A previous external reviewer for a Cyclical Program Review or a New Program Proposal in the department/unit in question. Whilst this is preferable, in cases where it is not ideal, at least one of the external reviewers must not have previously reviewed a program in the department/unit.