UTQAP Template

Cyclical Review Report

**Framework for UTQAP reviews:**

UTQAP processes support a structured approach for creating, reflecting on, assessing and developing plans to change and improve academic programs and units in the context of institutional and divisional commitments and priorities.

The University of Toronto (U of T), in its [Statement of Institutional Purpose](https://governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/secretariat/policies/institutional-purpose-statement-october-15-1992) (1992), articulates its mission as a commitment "to being an internationally significant research university, with undergraduate, graduate, and professional programs of excellent quality." Thus “quality assurance through assessment of new program proposals and review of academic programs and units in which they reside is a priority for the University…:

The quality of the scholarship of the faculty, and the degree to which that scholarship is brought to bear in teaching are the foundations of academic excellence. More generally, all of the factors that contribute to collegial and scholarly life—academic and administrative complement, research and scholarly activity, infrastructure, governance, etc.—bear on the quality of academic programs and the broad educational experience of students. ([Policy for Approval and Review of Academic Programs and Units](https://governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/secretariat/policies/academic-programs-and-units-policy-approval-and-review-june-24-2010) (2010))

The University’s approach to quality assurance is built on two primary indicators of academic excellence: the quality of the scholarship and research of faculty; and the success with which that scholarship and research is brought to bear on the achievement of Degree-Level Expectations.

These indicators are assessed by determining how our scholarship, research and programs compare to those of our international peer institutions and how well our programs meet their Degree-Level Expectations.

Reviews provide the opportunity to celebrate successes, identify areas where we can do better and vigorously pursue improvements.

**Review Report:**

Independent expert review is foundational to the Cyclical Program Review process. The Review Report addresses the Terms of Reference to provide insights and recommendations that inform the continuous improvement of the academic program(s) and academic unit(s) under review. Reflecting this commitment to continuous improvement, the final review report is considered a public document and 1) will be circulated within the unit; 2) may be posted on the unit’s website; and 3) will be shared with external reviewers at the time of the next review.

|  |
| --- |
| Issues that are addressed through existing, specific University procedures are considered **out of scope** for UTQAP reviews (e.g., individual Human Resources issues, specific health and safety concerns). **Any such issues raised at any point during a review process** (self-study, site visit, review report) **must immediately be brought to the attention of the commissioning officer and routed through appropriate University channels for resolution**. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **As Commissioning Officer, I confirm that:**   * The Report addresses the Terms of Reference, which reflect the requirements outlined in the UTQAP, including the program evaluation criteria. * I have brought to the attention of the reviewers any clear factual errors in the report and the reviewers have corrected these. * I have brought to the attention of the reviewers any omitted UTQAP requirements. | |
| Commissioning Officer\*: [insert name] | Report Accepted as Final on [insert date] |

|  |
| --- |
| **Reviewers are asked to provide a Report that:**   * Responds to the Terms of Reference, which reflect the requirements outlined in the UTQAP, including the program evaluation criteria. * Recognizes the institution’s autonomy to determine priorities for funding, space and faculty allocation. Any commentary or recommendations on issues that are within the purview of the university’s internal budgetary decision-making processes (e.g., such as faculty complement and/or space requirements) must be tied directly to issues of program quality or sustainability. * Respects the confidentiality required for all aspects of the review process. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Program(s) under review: | Commissioning officer to insert from Terms of Reference |
| Division/unit under review OR division/unit in which program(s) is housed: | Commissioning officer to replace text in left column and insert appropriate information in this column to match Terms of Reference |
| Commissioning officer: | Commissioning officer to insert from Terms of Reference |
| Date of scheduled review: | Commissioning officer to insert from Terms of Reference |
| Reviewers’ names and affiliations: | Commissioning officer to insert |

# Summary & Overall Assessment

Please provide a summary of your findings, focusing on the assessment of the division/unit and the program(s) under review relative to the best in Canada/North America and internationally, including areas of strength and opportunities.

# Findings

Based on your reading of the self-study and discussions during the site visit, please address all the Terms of Reference (appended) as follows:

* **Confirm that you have considered each of the Terms of Reference in relation to each academic program and/or academic unit listed in the Terms of Reference.**
* Comment on the program(s)/unit(s) respective **strengths, areas for improvement** and **opportunities for enhancement**. In so doing, please:
  + Identify the **distinctive attributes** of each program listed in the Terms of Reference
  + Identify and commend any **notably strong and creative attributes**
  + Provide evidence of any **significant innovation or creativity** in content and/or delivery relative to other such programs
* Ensure that the findings address, for each program listed in the Terms of Reference, the quality of each academic program and the learning environment of the students in each program.
* Note: Unless a specific program or group of programs is specified, the assumption will be that findings apply to all programs listed in the Terms of Reference.

# Recommendations

Please make at least three recommendations for specific steps to be taken that will lead to the continuous improvement of each academic program/unit listed in the Terms of Reference, distinguishing between those the program/unit can itself take and those that require external action.

Please clarify when a recommendation applies to more than one program/unit.

Please endeavour to distinguish between observations or suggestions (which can be included in “Findings”) and formal recommendations (which should be included here). The Dean and unit/program will be required to provide a public response to every recommendation listed in this section.

Terms of Reference (appended for reference)

Commissioning officer to append