Recommended Practices for Reviewing Programs Offered Across Units and/or Divisions

Applicable to: Life Sciences, Rotman Commerce, Master of Science in Biomedical Communications, programs offered in association with Colleges (constituent and federated), Faculty of Arts and Science undergraduate programs in Music and Forestry

Not applicable to: Programs offered with external institutions (e.g., joint programs with Sheridan/Michener/Centennial; conjoint programs with the Toronto School of Theology; dual degrees); collaborative specializations; combined or double degree programs

The Commissioning Officer (in the case of decanal reviews) should work with the head of the unit(s) (see over for examples) involved in the offering of the program(s) under review throughout the review process, on the following:

✓ When establishing the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the review, confirm:
  ▶ which program(s) will be reviewed
  ▶ timing of the review
  ▶ any special terms beyond what is required under the University of Toronto Quality Assurance Process (UTQAP)

✓ When nominating reviewers, to ensure:
  ▶ disciplinary coverage
  ▶ appropriate graduate/undergraduate program expertise

✓ When announcing the review, to ensure that:
  ▶ all units involved in the offering of the program are aware of the site visit dates, names of the reviewers, ToR and program(s) included in the review

✓ During the development of the self-study, to ensure that:
  ▶ relevant information is provided to the reviewers about program design, requirements, innovations, faculty and other resources, demand, etc.
  ▶ standardized and supplementary data are included where appropriate
✓ When scheduling the site visit, to ensure:
  ▶ participation of the head(s) of the collaborating unit(s) and/or program(s)
  ▶ participation of relevant faculty, students and staff

✓ When managing the external reviewers’ report, ensure that:
  ▶ any report templates provided to reviewers cover all program(s) and ToR
  ▶ head(s) of collaborating unit(s) can flag factual error(s) before the report is finalized
  ▶ the report is shared with the collaborating unit(s)

✓ When preparing the administrative response to the review report, ensure:
  ▶ coordinated short-, medium- and long-term plans for implementing reviewers’ recommendations

✓ During the governance and reporting phases, ensure:
  ▶ finalization of the review summary and FAR/IP prepared by the VPAP office
  ▶ attendance at AP&P and Academic Board
  ▶ monitoring and following up on the implementation of recommendations

Examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program(s)</th>
<th>Commissioning Officer</th>
<th>Other Unit Heads to Involve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life Science undergraduate programs</td>
<td>Dean, Faculty of Medicine</td>
<td>Dean, Faculty of Arts and Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotman Commerce</td>
<td>Dean, Faculty of Arts and Science</td>
<td>Dean, Rotman School of Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Science in Biomedical Communications, MScBMC</td>
<td>Dean, Faculty of Medicine</td>
<td>Dean &amp; Vice-Principal Academic, University of Toronto Mississauga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music, BA (normally part of Music provostal review)</td>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>Dean, Faculty of Music; Dean, Faculty of Arts and Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate programs associated with constituent/federated Colleges</td>
<td>Dean, Faculty of Arts and Science</td>
<td>College Principal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>