



Quality Assurance Processes

Guidance for Review Team Nominations

Under Queen's University Quality Assurance Processes (QUQAP), cyclical reviews for undergraduate and graduate programs, as well as all proposals for new undergraduate and graduate programs, are subject to review by at least two (2) external reviewers and one (1) internal reviewer. Additional reviewers are optional and not required.

To help in selecting the review team, programs must submit nominations for eight (8) external reviewers, three (3) internal reviewers and professional reviewers if requested. Academic units may make additional nominations at their discretion.

EXTERNAL REVIEWERS

External reviewers are associate or full professors who have the required academic, administrative, and pedagogical expertise to review the program(s). Please be aware that the QUQAP advises that the composition of the review committee should include at least one reviewer at an Ontario university, and one reviewer from outside the province (QUQAP 2.5.1.1.4 and 6.7.1.1.5). As such, the submitted list should include nominees that reflect this guidance. External reviewers will be evaluated based on the following criteria:

1. Their status as scholars in the discipline, specifically as demonstrated via their academic record.
2. Their academic administrative experience in roles involving program administration, such as undergraduate or graduate program coordinator, department chair, director of

schools/research centers, associate dean, or dean. Reviewers with experience at the associate dean level or above will be ranked higher.

3. Their pedagogical experience, research contributions, and educational leadership, including knowledge of the role that program-level learning outcomes and the methods for assessing student achievement of these outcomes play within the Ontario quality assurance context. Reviewers with direct experience in curriculum development, program assessment, and program innovation (i.e., significant program improvements or modifications, including structure, delivery, or assessment, to better meet the needs of students and society) are especially well-suited and will be ranked higher.

Meeting these criteria will allow a reviewer to provide the most value to reviews of new program proposals and existing programs. (QUQAP 2.5.1.1.2 and 6.7.1.1.3)

For interdisciplinary programs, reviewers should be nominated so that the external review team has sufficient and appropriate disciplinary expertise to cover the disciplinary fields of the program(s).

ARM'S LENGTH REQUIREMENT/CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Reviewers must be at [arm's length](#) from the program under review. This means that reviewers are not close friends, current or recent collaborators, former supervisors, advisors, or colleagues. It is best practice that reviewers have not participated in previous reviews of the program. If this is not possible, then no more than one reviewer may have participated previously.

To maintain this arm's length requirement in departmentalized faculties, the Faculty Office will be the main point of contact for reviewers when arranging and coordinating site visits. While developing a list of nominees, the academic unit is encouraged to contact review team nominees to assess their willingness and potential availability to participate in the review; however, further contact is strongly discouraged. (QUQAP 6.7.2.2)

EXAMPLES OF WHAT MAY VIOLATE THE ARM'S LENGTH REQUIREMENT

External reviewer nominee:

- Was a previous member of the program or department under review (including being a visiting professor).
- Received a graduate degree from the program under review.
- Is a co-author and research collaborator with a member of the program, within the past seven years, and especially if that collaboration is ongoing.
- Is close family, friend or in a relationship with a faculty member in the program.

- Is 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.

EXAMPLES OF WHAT MAY NOT VIOLATE THE ARM'S LENGTH REQUIREMENT

External reviewer nominee:

- 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.
- Was the 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.
- Was the 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 their bachelor's degree from the university (especially if in another program).
- Was a 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.

INTERNAL REVIEWERS

Internal reviewer nominees must have experience in the structure and administrative policies at Queen's University (QUQAP 2.5.1.2.3 and 6.7.1.2.3) but must not be closely involved in the academic unit or Faculty/School. (QUQAP 2.5.1.2.4 and 6.7.1.2.4). They should be experienced in curriculum development and providing constructive program critiques. The role of the internal reviewer is to provide insight about Queen's so that recommendations made by the review team are grounded in an understanding of how changes are implemented at a decentralized university like Queen's.

PROFESSIONAL REVIEWERS (OPTIONAL)

Professional reviewers may be requested by the program, subject to approval from the relevant Dean(s) and the Provost, or delegate. (QUQAP 2.5.1.3.1 and 6.7.1.3.1) Nominees must be appropriately qualified and selected from relevant industries or professions. (QUQAP 2.5.1.3.2 and 6.7.1.3.2)