

## **POLICY ON THE ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAMMES SUBMITTED UNDER THE NEW BRUNSWICK DEGREE GRANTING ACT**

### **INTRODUCTION**

By request of the New Brunswick Minister responsible for Post-secondary Education (hereinafter referred to as “the Minister”), the Maritime Provinces Higher Education Commission (hereinafter referred to as “the MPHEC”) assesses proposals for degree programmes submitted under the New Brunswick Degree Granting Act. The Act, adopted in March 2001, establishes a framework to evaluate the quality of programmes leading to a degree, offered by all public and private institutions, except those created by an Act of the NB legislature prior to the Act coming in force.

The designation process is made up of four key steps:

- (1) evaluation of the financial viability of the applicant and the degree programme;
- (2) assessment of the institution<sup>1</sup>;
- (3) assessment of the academic quality of the degree programme; and,
- (4) ministerial and government decision on designation.

The first step, administered by Business New Brunswick, involves verification of the viability of the business plan, including such things as budget provisions, financial plans, market potential and the financial stability of the applicant.

Normally, the second step involves an external institutional assessment to determine whether the institution has the necessary governance, policies, planning and financing in place to deliver a quality degree programme<sup>1</sup>.

The third step, carried out by the MPHEC, requires an external programme quality assessment to determine the suitability and quality of the proposed programme given its objectives, structure, institutional appropriateness, resources, stated student outcomes and their relevance.

In the final step, the Minister recommends designation to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council if the Minister believes that the applicant has met all of the applicable requirements. Designated institutions are required to submit their programmes for reassessment in the fifth year following designation and be re-designated every ten years.

This document outlines the MPHEC’s assessment criteria and procedures for organizations applying for designation under the New Brunswick Degree Granting Act.

**Please note** that all applications for designation are made to the Minister and not the MPHEC. It is the Minister who forwards the application to the MPHEC for a quality assessment. The MPHEC’s role is limited to conducting the quality assessment and providing advice to the Minister who in turn makes the final decision on all applications. Therefore, anyone wishing to submit an application under the Act should contact the Post-Secondary Affairs Branch of the Department of Post-Secondary Education, Training and Labour (hereinafter referred to as “the Department”). Prior to submitting an application, organizations are strongly encouraged to meet with officials from the MPHEC to go over the assessment information requirements and procedures and to clarify expectations. These preliminary meetings are important as the MPHEC will not engage in discourse with the applicant once the quality assessment process has been officially launched.

---

<sup>1</sup>Please note this is a new step: the policy and procedures are in development phase

## **SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS**

Proposals submitted by an institution (hereinafter referred to as “the applicant”) under the New Brunswick Degree Granting Act must be prepared according to the *Information Requirements for the Preparation of Proposals for Degree Programmes - Submitted under the New Brunswick Degree Granting Act* (Appendix 1).

Applicants are required to submit 10 paper copies and one electronic copy to the Department for use by the MPHEC. Upon receipt of a proposal the MPHEC will post the name of the programme, a brief description, and the name of the applicant on its website.

The MPHEC reserves the right to request from the applicant additional information which it deems necessary to conclude its assessment of the proposal. Proposals must meet all the information requirements in the *Information Requirements for the Preparation of Proposals for Degree Programmes - Submitted to the MPHEC for Assessment under the New Brunswick Degree Granting Act* (Appendix 1). If the applicant is unable to provide all of the information requirements, it must justify/document the omission.

The MPHEC appreciates that the information required by its information requirements may, if divulged, cause financial loss or gain to the institution or any other person. In such circumstances, the institution should attach the information as an appendix and identify it as proprietary information. In most instances, proprietary information is generally used by staff but it may be distributed to the Joint Association of Atlantic Universities (AAU) and MPHEC Academic Advisory Committee and to the MPHEC; it will also be circulated to consultants hired by the MPHEC to assess the proposed programme. In these instances, consultants will be required to sign a confidentiality agreement and must abide by the Laws of the Province of New Brunswick with respect to confidentiality. In every case, the information will always be identified as confidential when it is distributed.

**Please note** that the MPHEC reserves the right to modify its policies, procedures, criteria, and information requirements from time to time and will post current versions on its website. It is the applicant's responsibility to use current policies, procedures, criteria, and information requirements.

## **DISTRIBUTION OF PROPOSALS**

Upon receipt, programme proposals, not including appendices, are distributed to MPHEC members and institutions on the MPHEC's schedule for comment. Specifically, recipients have 10 working days from the date of distribution to forward any comments to the MPHEC's office. Stakeholders can request, by email (proposals@mphec.ca), an extension of five working days to forward their comments, provided that it informs the MPHEC within 10 working days from the date of distribution.

## **MARITIME DEGREE LEVEL QUALIFICATION FRAMEWORK**

The MPHEC provides detailed criteria for degree level standards (See Appendix 2 - Maritime Degree Level Qualifications Framework). It is the applicant's responsibility to ensure that the degree level standard and nomenclature is consistent with the type of programmes it wishes to offer and reflects generally acceptable Canadian standards.

## **ASSESSMENT CRITERIA**

The following represents the list of assessment criteria; proposals must clearly identify how the proposed programme meets these criteria (see Appendix 3):

1. Clearly defined **programme objectives and structure**, including references to optimum programme length, as well as a demonstration that the programme name and credential granted adequately capture the programme content (“truth in advertising”).
2. Clearly defined **anticipated student outcomes** at the programme level and a demonstration of their relevance, including (1) learning outcomes, (2) graduate outcomes, and (3) other outcomes, as deemed appropriate/relevant in the context of a particular programme.
3. Evidence of the **adequacy of resources** (human, physical and financial) and references to the various sources of funding.
4. Evidence of the **involvement of peers and experts**, normally external to the institution in the development of the proposed programme. Each external expert should be identified and their written assessment or comments on the proposed programme should be included.
5. Evidence of an **environmental scan** to identify similar, equivalent or comparable programmes in the region and elsewhere as appropriate.
6. Evidence of linkages to the **labour market**.
7. Evidence of **need**, as documented by, among other things, analysis of the evolution of the discipline: labour market analysis; demand for graduates; consultation with potential employers and professional organization(s). This evidence should rely on external sources such as leading scholars, government agencies, employers, professional organizations, etc.
8. Evidence of **student demand**.
9. Evidence of **ongoing programme review** policies and procedures.
10. Evidence of expertise in the chosen **delivery mode**.
11. Proposals for **new graduate programmes** are assessed through all previously listed assessment criteria as well as the following criteria:
  - a. Existence of an academic environment that supports scholarship such as original research, creativity and the advancement of professional knowledge, as relevant to the proposed programme. Academic environment is characterized, in the context of programme assessment at the graduate level, as follows:
    - a critical mass of research-active faculty and of graduate students;
    - sufficient breadth of disciplinary expertise among faculty;
    - an appropriate support network of related programmes (normally undergraduate and, where relevant, graduate);
    - capacity to provide a choice of advanced-level graduate courses;
    - evidence of sufficient library resources (as evidenced by holdings ratio among other measures) and access to scholarly communications for a graduate-level programme;
    - an appropriate structure (such as an Office of Graduate Studies) to support the programme, especially in the case of a doctoral programme; and
    - in the case of research-based (master’s and doctoral) degree programmes, an appropriate academic environment is further characterized by

- a strong research focus within the unit proposing the programme (as evidenced by peer reviewed grants and publications, as well as seminars, research colloquia etc.);
  - evidence of faculty's ability to provide long-term supervisory capacity and supervisory committee membership; and
  - a demonstration that an appropriate level of student financial support is available.
- b. The proposed programme represents necessary duplication, or market demand demonstrably justifies further capacity.
  - c. The nature of the proposed programme is such that it can best be offered at the institution in question.
  - d. Employability, and student demand for such a programme favour the implementation of the proposed programme.

**Please note that:** These criteria are a guide and assessors are not limited to, or by, these standards. The MPHEC may provide applicants with a specific list of criteria for their assessments beyond these published standards.

### **ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES**

1. The proposal is forwarded by the New Brunswick Minister responsible for Post-Secondary Education to the MPHEC for an academic quality assessment.
2. Upon receipt, programme proposals, not including appendices, are distributed to institutions on the MPHEC's schedule as well as MPHEC members and staff for comment.
3. The name of the programme, a brief description and the name of the submitting institution are posted on the MPHEC's website.
4. Staff prepares an analysis of the proposal and identifies any issues.
5. In the event that the proposal is missing information, the applicant will be asked to provide the missing information.
6. The AAU-MPHEC Academic Advisory Committee will normally meet prior to submitting the proposal to external consultants to discuss the proposal and any comments received as per (2) above, select the consultants, and identify specific areas to be addressed by the external consultants in their report(s).
7. The Committee selects a minimum of three consultants who possess:
  - an advanced academic credential related to the subject area under review (normally at the terminal level in the field);
  - any required or desired professional credentials and/or related work experience of substantial depth and range;
  - relevant academic experience such as administration, teaching, curriculum design and/or quality assessment experience (e.g., as appraisers for accrediting bodies or as reviewers of degree programmes); and
  - at least one consultant will have expertise in the proposed delivery mode.

Other desirable qualities include:

- is an active scholar, normally at the rank of full professor;
- has experience in graduate teaching, and, as appropriate, in graduate thesis supervision or in graduate clinical or applied studies supervision; and
- is experienced in the administration of graduate programmes (e.g., as chair of a department with graduate programmes, graduate programme coordinator, chair of the graduate committee,

- member of an SSHRC/NSERC/CIHR scholarship committee, member of a faculty or university graduate or research council or committee).
8. The Committee may, but is not required to, select at least one consultant from the list of nominees provided by the applicant. The Committee will not consider nominations of individuals who are in conflict of interest or have an inherent bias (whether real or perceived), for example, anyone who has served on any programme committee or Board connected to the applicant within the past seven years or who have submitted a letter of support for the proposed programme.
  9. Each consultant is asked to provide a report (as appropriate, the consultants may be required to prepare a joint report) on which the MPHEC could make a recommendation to the Minister. See Appendix 3 for a copy of the Generic Terms of Reference.
  10. Each report is to be based on:
    - a. A one- to two-day site visit organized by the applicant and the consultants.
    - b. The assessment of the programme proposal submitted by the organization, as well as any other pertinent information provided to or requested by the consultant.
    - c. The consultant's expertise in the field and knowledge of similar programmes elsewhere in Canada or in North America.
  11. The consultants' reports are forwarded to the applicant for response.
  12. The Committee reviews the reports prepared by the consultants and the applicant's response to the reports and makes a recommendation based on these, as well as any other documents obtained during the assessment process.
  13. The Committee will not normally engage in programme development with the applicant. However, it may, in exceptional cases, elect to forward to an applicant proposed changes to a proposal, particularly in cases where the Committee believes a programme proposal is strong and requiring only minor changes. The case being, the applicant is provided the option to make the proposed changes, otherwise, it must provide a rationale for not making any or all proposed changes.
  14. The Committee then forwards its final recommendation to the MPHEC. Both the Committee's recommendation and the MPHEC's advice are forwarded to the Minister.
  15. Following the Minister's announcement of its decision, the MPHEC will document its recommendation and the Minister's decision on its website and in its annual report.
  16. In addition, the MPHEC and Academic Advisory Committee's assessment and all discussions of the proposal throughout the process are documented in the minutes of the Committee and MPHEC, which will remain confidential until the Minister notifies the applicant of the final decision and simultaneously advises the MPHEC that the Minister's decision has been communicated to the applicant.

## **ASSESSMENT OUTCOMES**

The MPHEC's advice will conclude with one of two possible answers:

- (1) the proposed programme, if effectively delivered, appears to correspond with the standards usually associated with the proposed credential<sup>2</sup>; or

---

<sup>2</sup>The MPHEC in exceptional cases may recommend approval of a programme proposal to the Minister on the condition that minor changes are made to the proposal.

(2) the proposed programme does not appear to correspond with the standards usually associated with the proposed credential.

The MPHEC may offer other advice as it deems appropriate and necessary to assist the Minister in its decision.

The MPHEC will submit along with its advice to the Minister the following documentation:

- the consultants' Terms of Reference
- the consultants' reports
- the applicant's response to the consultants' reports
- any modifications made to the proposal by the applicant as a result of the process
- and any other document the MPHEC deems necessary to assist the Minister in its decision.

## **LIMITATIONS**

The MPHEC shall remain the sole owner of the advice it provides to the New Brunswick Minister responsible for Post-secondary Education until such time that its advice is forwarded to the Minister where the advice will remain confidential until the Minister notifies the applicant of the final decision and simultaneously advises the MPHEC that the Minister's decision has been communicated to the applicant. Following the Minister's announcement of its decision, the MPHEC will document its recommendation and the Minister's decision on its website and in its annual report.

In addition, the MPHEC and Academic Advisory Committee's assessment and all discussions of the proposal throughout the process are documented in the minutes of the Committee and MPHEC, which will remain confidential until the Minister notifies the applicant of the final decision and simultaneously advises the MPHEC that the Minister's decision has been communicated to the applicant.

The MPHEC's assessment and advice to the Minister cannot be represented as the approval or the accreditation of a programme, the accreditation of the institution or the approval of the degree granting status by the applicant.

If, for any reason, the MPHEC is convinced that the applicant is unwilling or unable to supply the required information for the MPHEC to fulfill its obligations and responsibilities, the MPHEC may terminate the assessment process.

All proposals and supporting documentation are subject to the provisions of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act. In accordance with the provisions of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, an applicant should identify any information in its application for which the applicant claims confidentiality. The MPHEC cannot guarantee confidentiality, as disclosure may be required pursuant to the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.

## **TIMEFRAME**

The assessment process, from the time the MPHEC receives a proposal to the submission of the MPHEC's advice to the Minister, takes an average of four to six months to complete. The timeframe will vary depending on the types of issues which arise during the process, on completeness of the proposal, and on the schedule of the AAU-MPHEC Academic Advisory Committee and MPHEC meetings (both meet approximately 5 times per year). It is important to note that this timeframe does not include the time for the Minister to advise the applicant of its decision.

The timeframe is extended during the Christmas and summer holidays; specifically the assessment process is suspended between December 1 and January 5 and June 20 and August 5. (Exact dates subject to annual review)

## **FEES**

The MPHEC will invoice the Department for all expenses associated with the MPHEC's assessment. This cost includes staff time and disbursements (consultants' fees and expenses, and any other expense directly related to the assessment). The Department is responsible for recovering these costs from the applicant.

The charge for an assessment will vary with each application, depending on the number of reviewers, the length and complexity of the review, and associated travel, accommodation, and meeting or communication costs, and whether the applicant's response to the external consultants' reports requires further assessment. In general, the costs do not normally exceed \$60,000.

(Original policy approved: June 25, 2003; Revised policy approved: October 23, 2006)

## APPENDIX 1

### INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS FOR THE PREPARATION OF PROPOSALS FOR DEGREE PROGRAMMES SUBMITTED UNDER THE NEW BRUNSWICK DEGREE GRANTING ACT

**The MPHEC acknowledges that not all the information requested will be available for each and every proposal. The absence of information must, however, be noted and explained. The key is to address the assessment criteria listed below.**

#### 1. PROGRAMME IDENTIFICATION

- 1.1 Applicant(s) - Name and Address
- 1.2 Contact name
- 1.3 Programme name and level
- 1.4 Degree(s) granted
- 1.5 Proposed starting date
- 1.6 Brief description of programme (to be posted on website)

#### 2. PROGRAMME DESCRIPTION

This section of the proposal must provide the information necessary to meet the following assessment criterion: “clearly defined programme objectives and structure, to include references to optimum programme length, as well as a demonstration that the programme name and credential granted adequately capture the programme content (“truth in advertising”).

Description of:

- 2.1 Programme objectives. Explain how the course and curriculum requirements will be integrated to contribute to the intended objectives of the programme.
- 2.2 Overall programme structure.
- 2.3 Admission requirements, standards, and promotion and graduation standards
- 2.4 Courses (Include list with course name and number, whether existent or planned, its status in the programme, i.e., compulsory vs. optional; brief description of the course (for example, calendar entry). Programme duration should be stated, as well as justified. The course descriptions should be comparable to those found in any current university calendars and detailed outlines may be required for core or capstone courses. A discussion of prerequisite courses that may be required is also pertinent. It is important to demonstrate how the thematic structure and the mechanics of the programme interrelate to provide a cohesive programme of study. In the case of undergraduate programme show how the courses build in complexity and are applicable to practice in the field.
- 2.5 The type and frequency of assessment of student learning.
- 2.6 In programs with an applied focus, how the programme ensures the appropriate balance of theory and practice, including the appropriate work experience, field placements, or internship dimensions either required by the profession or material to the quality of education.

- 2.7 How the institution plans or maintains the currency of the programme quality and ensures appropriate learning outcomes.
- 2.8 Other special requirements such as thesis, practicum, apprenticeship, etc.
- 2.9 Method of programme delivery (e.g. traditional classroom, distance education, co-operative education or a combination).
- 2.10 In the case of a graduate programme, whether a programme is a research-based programme or professional programme, thesis-based or course-based.
- 2.11 Evidence that the degree will be recognized and accepted by other post-secondary institutions, employers, professional and licensing bodies.

### **3. Student Outcomes and their Relevance**

This section of the proposal must provide the information necessary to meet the following assessment criterion: “clearly defined anticipated student outcomes at the programme level and a demonstration of their relevance, including (1) learning outcomes, (2) graduate outcomes, and (3) other outcomes, as deemed appropriate/relevant in the context of a particular programme.”

- 3.1 Identification of learning outcomes and their relevance to the proposed programme, such as critical thinking skills, breadth and depth of knowledge, attitudes, beliefs, analytical/problem-solving skills, occupation/licencing/accreditation requirements, communication skills, writing skills, etc. If applicable, provide evidence that the proposed learning outcomes are in line with the requirements of professional and accrediting bodies in their field of practice.
- 3.2 Identification of graduates’ outcomes and their relevance to the proposed programme, such as further education or graduate study, employability, licensing, accreditation, etc.
- 3.3 Identification of other outcomes and their relevance to the proposed programme, such as team building, leadership, social citizenship, etc.
- 3.4 Evidence that the programme meets or exceeds the student outcome standards appropriate to the degree-level standard. Specify not only how students will meet student outcomes for the general degree level standards but also for the student outcomes that are specific/relevant to the program's field of study. For example critical thinking may be a bench mark for a general Bachelor’s Degree but a Bachelor’s Degree in Business Administration may emphasize the development of leadership and interpersonal skills. It is the applicant’s responsibility to determine and demonstrate the proposed learning outcomes of a degree in a specific field of study. Please refer to the Maritime Degree Level Framework (Appendix 2).

#### 4. RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

This section of the proposal must provide the information necessary to meet the following assessment criterion: "Evidence that appropriate resources (human, physical and financial) necessary to develop and deliver the programme are in place or will be in place, including references to the various sources of funding."

Considering the first five years (or the time frame in which the programme is expected to be fully operational) of the proposed programme:

##### 4.1. Physical Resource Implications

- 4.1.1 Description of the extent to which current resources in terms library, space, equipment, etc. would be used, including a detailed list of available physical and human support facilities, e.g., laboratories, instruments, computer backup, technician backup, etc.
- 4.1.2 Additional resources needed in the same areas.
- 4.1.3 Impact of the use of these resources on other programmes, including the elimination or the reduction of the scope of programmes to accommodate the new programme.
- 4.1.4 Estimate of resource needs and allocation beyond the first five years.

##### 4.2 Human Resource Implications

- 4.2.1 A list of the academic staff involved, including rank, the highest degree held by each professor and the name of the university that granted it, the specific field in which each professor excels by virtue of his/her previous experience, education or juried research, the name of other post-secondary or research institutions with which each professor is affiliated as a teacher, administrator or researcher, full-time or part-time status, the courses taught by each professor. (This could be covered by submitting the c.v. of each professor; written consent to share the CV's of faculty must be provided)

The following summary table should be completed for all faculty members.

<b>Name, Rank, and Status</b>	<b>Highest Degree held and university that granted it and year obtained</b>	<b>Specialty</b>	<b>Source of Grants received</b>	<b>Grants Total amount last 3 years</b>	<b># of refereed publications last 5 years</b>
e.g. John Doe Associate Part-time	PhD University X 1979	Business managem ent	University Provincial National	\$18,500	10

4.2.2 Describe the organization's policy with regard to Faculty, including:

- academic/professional credentials required of present and future faculty teaching courses in the program;
- academic/professional credentials required of faculty acting as research/clinical/exhibition supervisors;
- the requirement to have on file evidence supplied direct to the institution from the granting agency of the highest academic credential and any required professional credential claimed by faculty members;
- faculty selection process;
- the regular review of faculty performance, including student evaluation of teaching and supervision;
- the means for ensuring the currency of faculty knowledge in the field;
- faculty teaching and supervision loads;
- faculty availability to students; and
- other professional development of faculty including the promotion of curricular and instructional innovation as well as technological skills, where appropriate.

*Note: Relevant policies should be appended.*

4.2.3 Estimate of human resource needs and allocation beyond the first five years.

#### 4.3 Financial Implications

4.3.1 Full and incremental costs of the programme for the first five years (or the time frame in which the programme is expected to be fully operational), broken down by major cost areas, academic salaries, other salaries, equipment, library acquisitions, space, etc.

4.3.2 Expected sources of revenue to cover the costs.

4.3.3 Expectations in terms of additional capital or operating funding.

### 5. RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PROGRAMMES AND INSTITUTIONS

This section of the proposal must provide the information necessary to meet the following assessment criteria: "evidence of an environmental scan to identify similar or equivalent or comparable programmes in the region and elsewhere as appropriate."

5.1 Priority within the applicant's structure and core business.

5.2 Relationship existing programmes in the same organization

5.3 Comparison of the proposed programme with other comparable programmes offered elsewhere in the Maritimes and in Canada and rationale for the introduction of an additional programme, if a similar one is already offered in the region.

## **6. LINKAGES TO THE LABOUR MARKET**

This section of the proposal must provide the information necessary to meet the following assessment criterion “evidence of linkages to the labour market”.

If the proposed programme relates to a certified occupation or a particular industry, complete this section.

- 6.1 Evidence of linkages to the labour market should be provided; this includes, but is not limited to, evidence of consultation with respect to both programme need and programme design.
- 6.2 The programme should normally have the benefit of an advisory industry group. It should comprise a variety of employers and practitioners from the relevant field(s). This group would provide advice on programme design and marketplace requirements. Describe the full composition of the group, stating the names of all members and indicating whether they represent employers or practitioners.

## **7. PROGRAMME NEED**

This section of the proposal must provide the information necessary to meet the following assessment criteria: “evidence of need” and “evidence of student demand.”

- 7.1 The social (local, regional, national) need(s) met by graduates from such programmes as documented by, among other things, analysis of the evolution of the discipline, labour market analysis, demand for graduates, etc. This evidence should rely on external sources (leading scholars, government agencies, employers, professional organizations, etc.).
- 7.2 Consultation with employers and/or professional organizations as to the current and anticipated job market; employability data.
- 7.3 Student demand.
- 7.4 Clientele (expected enrolment, enrolment limits or expected maximum enrolment, and clientele sources).
- 7.5 Evidence of the value added by the programme.

## **8. PROGRAMME DEVELOPMENT PROCESS**

This section of the proposal must provide the information necessary to meet the following assessment criterion: “evidence of the involvement of peers and experts, normally external to the institution in the development of the proposed programme.”

- 8.1 Description of the institutional programme development process leading to the submission of the proposal.
- 8.2 Provide a list and explanation of the nature of consultations that have occurred in the development of the programme. Each internal and external expert should be identified and their written assessment or comments on the proposed programme appended to the proposal.

Examples of experts include: employers, professional associations, programme advisory committee(s), peer reviewers, academic consultants.

8.3 Description of response to comments from peers and experts.

8.4 Description of any accreditation requirements.

## **9. EVALUATION POLICY**

This section of the proposal must provide the information necessary to meet the following assessment criterion: Evidence of ongoing programme review policies and procedures. ”

9.1 Describe the organization’s evaluation procedure and cycle that would follow the implementation of the programme. This procedure should include graduate follow-ups. In particular, the policy should include the frequency and time line of the evaluation process; identify the coordinating unit responsible for the overall management of the assessment process and for defining the assessment criteria, and determine the procedures and areas of responsibilities to ensure a proper follow-up to a review.

Note: Please include as appendices any relevant policies.

## **10. DELIVERY MODE**

This section of the proposal must provide the information necessary to meet the following assessment criterion: “Evidence of expertise in the chosen delivery mode.”

10.1 Indication to which delivery mode(s) will be used (traditional classroom, technologically-mediated or other, and in what proportion).

If on-line learning is a delivery method to be used in this program,

10.2 Description of the organization's policies, guidelines and practices pertaining to technology-based, computer-based, and web-based learning modes of delivery to ensure:

- faculty have sufficient technical and pedagogical expertise
- prospective students are notified of the required level of preparation (technical knowledge, motivation, and independence);
- student protection measures (intellectual property, privacy);
- reliable, sufficient, and scalable course-management systems;
- accessible technical assistance for students and faculty;
- appropriate hardware, software, and other technological resources and media; and
- well-maintained and current technology and equipment;
- sufficient infrastructure to support existing services and expansion of online offerings
- sufficient opportunities to interact with faculty and other students (For graduate programmes especially).

Note: Please include as appendices any relevant policies.

10.3 Description of how on-line learning methods or other features of on-line courses contribute to and enhance the creation of academic community among students and between students and faculty.

- 10.4 If programme to be delivered using traditional classroom, provide description of class room space (size, equipment on site, location, etc)

**11. ADDITIONAL ASSESSMENT CRITERIA AND INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS IN THE CASE OF A PROPOSAL FOR A NEW GRADUATE PROGRAMME**

In addition to addressing all the information requirements identified within Sections 1 through 10 of these Information requirements, a proposal for a graduate-level programme must meet the following information requirements and assessment criteria.

Proposals for new graduate programmes are assessed through all previously listed assessment criteria as well as the following criteria:

- a. Existence of an academic environment that supports scholarship such as original research, creativity and the advancement of professional knowledge, as relevant to the proposed programme. Academic environment is characterized, in the context of programme assessment at the graduate level, as follows:
- a critical mass of research-active faculty and of graduate students;
  - sufficient breadth of disciplinary expertise among faculty;
  - an appropriate support network of related programmes (normally undergraduate and, where relevant, graduate);
  - capacity to provide a choice of advanced-level graduate courses;
  - evidence of sufficient library resources (as evidenced by holdings ratio among other measures) and access to scholarly communications for a graduate-level programme;
  - an appropriate structure (such as an Office of Graduate Studies) to support the programme, especially in the case of a doctoral programme; and
  - in the case of research-based (master's and doctoral) degree programmes, an appropriate academic environment is further characterized by
    - a strong research focus within the unit proposing the programme (as evidenced by peer reviewed grants and publications, as well as seminars, research colloquia, etc.);
    - evidence of faculty's ability to provide long-term supervisory capacity and supervisory committee membership; and
    - a demonstration that an appropriate level of student financial support is available.
- b. The proposed programme is non-duplicative of offerings elsewhere in the region or represents necessary duplication, or market demand demonstrably justifies further capacity.
- c. The nature of the proposed programme is such that it can best be offered at the institution in question.
- d. Employability and student demand for such a programme favour the implementation of the proposed programme.
- 11.1 Using the following table, list (1) the academic staff to be involved in the programme, and (2) the research support accorded to professors in the past with a record of publications, especially in refereed journals.

Name, Rank, and Status	Highest Degree held and university that granted it and year obtained	Specialty	Source of Grants received	Grants Total amount last 3 years	# of refereed publications last 5 years
e.g. John Doe Associate Part-time	PhD University X 1979	Business management	University SSHRC	\$18,500	10

11.2 Include the CVs prepared according to the guidelines below for all academic staff to be directly involved in the programme as an appendix to the proposal. **Note:** Written consent to share the CV's of faculty must be provided.

Guidelines for the preparation of faculty curriculum vitae:

- 11.2.1 Name: with rank, status (tenured, contract, etc.).
- 11.2.2 Degrees: designation, institution, department, year.
- 11.2.3 Employment history: dates, rank/position, department, institution/firm, including current full-time position and link to the programme under review.
- 11.2.4 Academic honours: such as F.R.S., F.R.S.C., Governor General's Award, honorary degrees, or equivalent.
- 11.2.5 Scholarly and professional academic activities: past 7 years only (e.g., executive and editorial positions but **not** memberships; **invited** presentations at national or international conferences. Please do not list manuscript and grant application reviews).
- 11.2.6 Graduate supervision: career numbers - master's/doctoral; completed/in progress. Please distinguish between supervision, co-supervision and supervisory committee membership and distinguish between supervision in the programme under review and in other programs, if appropriate. Provide a list of the theses or projects supervised (not participation on supervisory committees) during the last seven years with name of student, title of thesis or project (specify), date of first registration and date of completion.
- 11.2.7 Graduate courses: past 7 years, by year.
- 11.2.8 **External** research funding: past 7 years only, by year, indicating source (granting councils, industry, government, foundations, other external); amount; purpose (operating, travel, publication, equipment, etc.); if group grant, indicate the number of grantees and whether principal or co-applicant.

11.2.9 **Internal** research funding. This includes university funds, SSHRC minor grants awarded through the university, etc.

11.2.10 Publications

11.2.10.1 Life-time summary (count) according to the following categories:

- scholarly books
  - authored
  - edited
- chapters in books
- papers in refereed journals
- papers in refereed conference proceedings
- major invited contributions and/or technical reports
- abstracts and/or papers read
- others (e.g., workshops presented, other types of publications)

11.2.10.2 Details for the past 7 years (same categories as above), in chronological order. Please give full citation, including page numbers for books, chapters and journal articles and names of authors in the order in which they appear on the publication.

*Note: For some faculty members (e.g., in the performing arts) it may be more appropriate to list exhibitions/performances, by year (for the past seven years), indicating the nature of the exhibition/performance (e.g., juried; local/national/international; public/competition; and so forth).*

- 11.3 Additional information required to demonstrate that a critical mass of research-active faculty exist, that the current (or planned) faculty complement provides sufficient breadth of disciplinary expertise, and, in the case of a research-based programme, that a strong research focus exists within the unit proposing the programme (as evidenced by grants, publications and seminars, etc.).
- 11.4 In the case of research-based degree programmes, a demonstration of faculty's ability to provide long-term supervisory capacity and supervisory committee membership.
- 11.5 Description/evidence that an appropriate structure(s) (such as an Office of Graduate Studies) are in place to support the programme.
- 11.6 In the case of research-based degree programmes, how the programme provides sufficient opportunities and support for research and other scholarly activity as well as interaction with other scholars should be evident.
- 11.7 A more detailed list of available physical and human support facilities, e.g., library resources (holdings ratios among other measures)/access to scholarly communications; laboratories,

instruments, computer backup, technician backup, graduate student services, etc. than would be given for undergraduate programmes.

- 11.8 Description of student financial support available, especially in the case of a doctoral programme, including a description of available sources (including amounts) for financial student support.
- 11.9 Evidence of the existence of an appropriate support network of related programmes (undergraduate and as relevant, graduate) at the submitting institution.
- 11.10 Information confirming that the proposed programme is non-duplicative of offerings elsewhere in the region or represents necessary duplication, or market demand demonstrably justifies further capacity.
- 11.11 Information to demonstrate that the nature of the proposed programme is such that it can best be offered at the institution in question.
- 11.12 Any other information the submitting institution believes would assist the MPHEC in completing its assessment of the proposed new graduate programme.

## **12. NOMINEES FOR EXTERNAL CONSULTANTS**

As part of the programme proposal, the applicant is asked to nominate three to six individuals from whom the MPHEC may, but is not required to, select as an external consultant. In making its nominations, the applicant is asked to keep in mind the following criteria. Nominees should possess:

- an advanced academic credential related to the subject area under review (normally at the terminal level in the field);
- any required or desired professional credentials and/or related work experience of substantial depth and range;
- relevant academic experience such as administration, teaching, curriculum design and/or quality assessment experience (e.g., as appraisers for accrediting bodies or as reviewers of degree programmes);and
- at least one consultant will have expertise in the proposed delivery mode

### Other desirable qualities include:

- is an active scholar, normally at the rank of full professor;
- has experience in graduate teaching, and, as appropriate, in graduate thesis supervision or in graduate clinical or applied studies supervision; and
- is experienced in the administration of graduate programmes (e.g., as chair of a department with graduate programmes, graduate programme coordinator, chair of the graduate committee, member of an SSHRC/NSERC/CIHR scholarship committee, member of a faculty or university graduate or research council or committee).

The Committee will not consider nominations of individuals who are in conflict of interest or have an inherent bias (whether real or perceived), for example, anyone who has served on any programme committee or Board connected to the applicant within the past seven years or who have submitted a letter of support for the proposed programme.

12.1 Nominate three to six individuals from whom the MPHEC may select as an external consultant, including:

- Name
- Title
- Affiliation
- Telephone Number
- Email Address

**APPENDIX 2**

**MARITIME DEGREE LEVEL QUALIFICATIONS FRAMEWORK**

### **APPENDIX 3**

#### **GENERIC TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR EXTERNAL REVIEWERS**

##### **FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSALS SUBMITTED UNDER THE NEW BRUNSWICK DEGREE GRANTING ACT**

1. Each consultant is asked to provide a report (as appropriate, the consultants may be required to prepare a joint report) on which the Commission could make a recommendation to the New Brunswick Minister responsible for Postsecondary Education.
2. The report is to be based on:
  - a) A one- to two-day site visit organized by the applicant and the consultant(s).
  - b) The assessment of the programme proposal submitted by the organization, as well as any other pertinent information provided to or requested by the consultant.
  - c) The consultant's expertise in the field and knowledge of similar programmes elsewhere in Canada or in North America.
3. The report will range from five to fifteen typewritten pages.
4. Standard elements of the assessment will include:
  - a) Assessment of programme content, structure, and requirements in relation to normally accepted and expected standards of similar programs and graduates, in Canada and elsewhere, as well as in relation to programme title and credential awarded. The assessment will include a comment on the appropriateness of the proposed level of study to respond to identified needs, as well as the appropriateness of the proposed delivery mode(s).
  - b) As appropriate, a comparison with other comparable programmes. How does the proposed programme compare with other similar programmes offered elsewhere in the Maritimes and in Canada? An assessment of the need for the proposed programme? What are the value-added characteristics of the programme?
  - c) Assessment of the adequacy of human resources available for the areas of specialization identified and for programme implementation and operation, (i.e. number and quality of faculty, both current and proposed). Specifically, the report should provide answers to:
    - Is there an appropriate distribution of expertise and strengths for the proposed programme?
    - Does the faculty complement provide (or will it provide) sufficient depth and breadth of research expertise and linkages with both the national (or international, as appropriate) research community and practitioners to provide an appropriate intellectual environment for students, given the programme area?
    - In your view, can the current faculty complement successfully operate the proposed programme?
    - If new faculty are to be hired, are the position requirements and the selection process adequate.
    - Assessment of faculty evaluation and selection processes.
  - d) Assessment of the adequacy of physical resources available for programme implementation and operation, taking into account projected enrolments (i.e., library holdings, budget allocation, etc). Specifically, are the academic and support staff, library, space, equipment, etc. adequate for the proposed programme. In addition, comment on the adequacy of the available physical and human support facilities, e.g., laboratories, instruments, computer backup, technician backup, etc. If new/additional facilities are

- required, comment on the description of the facilities, cost, process and timeline to acquire them.
- e) Assessment of the appropriateness of the organizational environment in providing this programme. Specifically, the report should comment on whether or not adequate procedures have been put in place for regular review and assessment of the quality of the programme? and quality of teaching?
  - f) Comment on the likely stability of the programme and the resources allocated to it.
  - g) Comment on the programme's anticipated student outcomes and whether these can be achieved for students in all proposed streams.
  - h) Opportunities presented by present and anticipated labour market trends to graduates of such programmes, given the proposed focus.
  - i) Comment on the support to faculty for research, inquiry and academic freedom.
  - j) Assessment of the organization's policies, guidelines and practices pertaining to technology-based, computer-based, and web-based learning modes of delivery to ensure:
    - faculty have sufficient technical and pedagogical expertise
    - prospective students are notified of the required level of preparation (technical knowledge, motivation, and independence);
    - student protection measures (intellectual property, privacy);
    - reliable, sufficient, and scalable course-management systems;
    - accessible technical assistance for students and faculty;
    - appropriate hardware, software, and other technological resources and media; and
    - well-maintained and current technology and equipment;
    - sufficient infrastructure to support existing services and expansion of online offerings
    - sufficient opportunities to interact with faculty and other students (For graduate programmes especially).
  - k) Description of how on-line learning methods or other features of on-line courses contribute to and enhance the creation of academic community among students and between students and faculty.

If programme to be delivered using traditional classroom,
  - l) Description of class room space (size, equipment on site, location, etc)
5. The consultant(s) is asked to comment, as appropriate, on the following assessment criteria which are used by the MPHEC to assess programmes submitted under the New Brunswick Degree Granting Act.
- 5.1 Clearly defined **programme objectives and structure**, including references to optimum programme length, as well as a demonstration that the programme name and credential granted adequately capture the programme content ("truth in advertising").

- 5.2 Clearly defined **anticipated student outcomes** at the programme level and a demonstration of their relevance, including (1) learning outcomes, (2) graduate outcomes, and (3) other outcomes, as deemed appropriate/relevant in the context of a particular programme.
- 5.3 Evidence of the **adequacy of resources** (human, physical and financial) and references to the various sources of funding.
- 5.4 Evidence of the **involvement of peers and experts**, normally external to the institution in the development of the proposed programme. Each external expert should be identified and their written assessment or comments on the proposed programme should be included.
- 5.5 Evidence of an **environmental scan** to identify similar or equivalent or comparable programmes in the region and elsewhere as appropriate.
- 5.6 Evidence of linkages to the **labour market**.
- 5.7 Evidence of **need**, as documented by, among other things, analysis of the evolution of the discipline: labour market analysis; demand for graduates; consultation with potential employers and professional organization(s). This evidence should rely on external sources such as leading scholars, government agencies, employers, professional organizations, etc.
- 5.8 Evidence of **student demand**.
- 5.9 Evidence of ongoing **programme review policies** and procedures.
- 5.10 Evidence of expertise in the chosen **delivery mode**.
- 5.11 Proposals for **new graduate programmes** are assessed through all previously listed assessment criteria as well as the following criteria:
  - a. Existence of an academic environment that supports scholarship such as original research, creativity and the advancement of professional knowledge, as relevant to the proposed programme. Academic environment is characterized, in the context of programme assessment at the graduate level, as follows:
    - a critical mass of research-active faculty and of graduate students;
    - sufficient breadth of disciplinary expertise among faculty;
    - an appropriate support network of related programmes (normally undergraduate and, where relevant, graduate);
    - capacity to provide a choice of advanced-level graduate courses;
    - evidence of sufficient library resources (as evidenced by holdings ratio among other measures) and access to scholarly communications for a graduate-level programme;
    - an appropriate structure (such as an Office of Graduate Studies) to support the programme, especially in the case of a doctoral programme; and
    - in the case of research-based (master's and doctoral) degree programmes, an appropriate academic environment is further characterized by
      - a strong research focus within the unit proposing the programme (as evidenced by peer reviewed grants and publications, as well as seminars, research colloquia etc.);

- evidence of faculty's ability to provide long-term supervisory capacity and supervisory committee membership; and
    - a demonstration that an appropriate level of student financial support is available.
  - b. The proposed programme represents necessary duplication, or market demand demonstrably justifies further capacity.
  - c. The nature of the proposed programme is such that it can best be offered at the institution in question.
  - d. Employability, and student demand for such a programme favour the implementation of the proposed programme.
6. Any other additional comments judged important or useful by the consultants.
7. The report should include a recommendation on one of the two following options (the recommendation(s) should be substantiated in the report):
- a. “If effectively delivered, the proposed programme appears to correspond to the standards usually associated with the proposed credential”; or
  - b. “The proposed programme does not appear to correspond to the standards usually associated with the proposed credential”; or
  - c. “With the recommended modifications and if effectively delivered, the proposed programme appears to correspond to the standards usually associated with the proposed credential.”
8. In addition, the report can include specific recommendations regarding periodic programme review, and other recommendations as the consultant would judge important and useful.