Policy on the assessment of programs Submitted under the New Brunswick Degree Granting Act

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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 programs submitted under the New Brunswick Degree Granting Act. The Act, adopted in March 2001, establishes a framework to evaluate the quality of programs 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 program;
(2)   assessment of the institution;
(3)   assessment of the academic quality of the degree program; 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 program.

The third step, carried out by the MPHEC, requires an external program quality assessment to determine the suitability and quality of the proposed program 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 programs 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.

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 Programs - 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 program, 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 Programs - 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 program. 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, program 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 programs 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 program meets these criteria (see Appendix 3):

1. Clearly defined **program objectives and structure**, including references to optimum program length, as well as a demonstration that the program name and credential granted adequately capture the program content ("truth in advertising").
2. Clearly defined **anticipated student outcomes** at the program 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 program.
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 program. Each external expert should be identified and their written assessment or comments on the proposed program should be included.
5. Evidence of an **environmental scan** to identify similar, equivalent or comparable programs 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 program review** policies and procedures.
10. Evidence of expertise in the chosen **delivery mode**.
11. Proposals for **new graduate programs** 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 program. Academic environment is characterized, in the context of program 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 programs (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 program;
    - an appropriate structure (such as an Office of Graduate Studies) to support the program, especially in the case of a doctoral program; and
    - in the case of research-based (master's and doctoral) degree programs, an appropriate academic environment is further characterized by
        - ➢ a strong research focus within the unit proposing the program (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 program represents necessary duplication, or market demand demonstrably justifies further capacity.
    c. The nature of the proposed program is such that it can best be offered at the institution in question.
    d. Employability, and student demand for such a program favour the implementation of the proposed program.

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, program 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 program, 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 programs); 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 programs (e.g., as chair of a department with graduate programs, graduate program 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 program committee or Board connected to the applicant within the past seven years or who have submitted a letter of support for the proposed program.
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 program 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 programs 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 program 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 program 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 program, if effectively delivered, appears to correspond with the standards usually associated with the proposed credential[1]; or
(2)   the proposed program 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 program, 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.

---

[1] 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.

TIMEFRAME Please note that the timeframe and fees noted below are outdated. Please call the MPHEC office at 506-453-2844 for updated information on our assessment timeframe and anticipated costs.

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)

INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS FOR THE PREPARATION OF PROPOSALS FOR DEGREE PROGRAMS 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. PROGRAM IDENTIFICATION

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

2. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

Description of:

2.1   Program objectives. Explain how the course and curriculum requirements will be integrated to contribute to the intended objectives of the program.
2.2   Overall program 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 program, i.e., compulsory vs. optional; brief description of the course (for example, calendar entry). Program 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 program interrelate to provide a cohesive program of study. In the case of undergraduate program 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 program 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 program quality and ensures appropriate learning outcomes.
2.8   Other special requirements such as thesis, practicum, apprenticeship, etc.
2.9   Method of program delivery (e.g. traditional classroom, distance education, co-operative education or a combination).
2.10   In the case of a graduate program, whether a program is a research-based program or professional program, 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 program 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 program."

3.1   Identification of learning outcomes and their relevance to the proposed program, 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 program, such as further education or graduate study, employability, licensing, accreditation, etc.

3.3   Identification of other outcomes and their relevance to the proposed program, such as team building, leadership, social citizenship, etc.

3.4   Evidence that the program 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 program 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 program is expected to be fully operational) of the proposed program:

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 programs, including the elimination or the reduction of the scope of programs to accommodate the new program.
    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.

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 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 institutionfrom 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 program for the first five years (or the time frame in which the program 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 PROGRAMS 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 programs in the region and elsewhere as appropriate."

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

5.2   Relationship existing programs in the same organization

5.3   Comparison of the proposed program with other comparable programs offered elsewhere in the Maritimes and in Canada and rationale for the introduction of an additional program, 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 program 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 program need and program design.

6.2   The program 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 program 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. PROGRAM 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 programs 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 program.

8. PROGRAM 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 program."

8.1   Description of the institutional program 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 program. Each internal and external expert should be identified and their written assessment or comments on the proposed program appended to the proposal. Examples of experts include: employers, professional associations, program 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 program review policies and procedures. ”

9.1   Describe the organization's evaluation procedure and cycle that would follow the implementation of the program. 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 programs 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 program 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 PROGRAM

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

Proposals for new graduate programs 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 program. Academic environment is characterized, in the context of program 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 programs (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 program;
- an appropriate structure (such as an Office of Graduate Studies) to support the program, especially in the case of a doctoral program; and
- in the case of research-based (master's and doctoral) degree programs, an appropriate academic environment is further characterized by
  - a strong research focus within the unit proposing the program (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 program 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 program is such that it can best be offered at the institution in question.

d. Employability and student demand for such a program favour the implementation of the proposed program.

11.1 Using the following table, list (1) the academic staff to be involved in the program, 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 program 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 program 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 program 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 program, that a strong research focus exists within the unit proposing the program (as evidenced by grants, publications and seminars, etc.).

11.4   In the case of research-based degree programs, 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 program.

11.6   In the case of research-based degree programs, how the program 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 programs.

11.8   Description of student financial support available, especially in the case of a doctoral program, 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 programs (undergraduate and as relevant, graduate) at the submitting institution.

11.10   Information confirming that the proposed program 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 program 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 program.

12.   NOMINEES FOR EXTERNAL CONSULTANTS

As part of the program 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 programs);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 programs (e.g., as chair of a department with graduate programs, graduate program 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 program

committee or Board connected to the applicant within the past seven years or who have submitted a letter of support for the proposed program.

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

MARITIME DEGREE LEVEL QUALIFICATIONS FRAMEWORK

1. UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMMES

1.1 Description of Degree Categories

The following descriptions are intended to capture the most general aspects of each degree level. It is to be understood, however, that each degree and degree level applies to an extremely broad spectrum of disciplines and programme types. Some general and honours/specialization bachelor degrees are in fields that are very practically oriented (e.g., archaeology, chemistry, geology, microbiology, zoology), while some applied programmes are in disciplines that are heavily knowledge and research based (e.g., applied psychology, applied mathematics, applied linguistics, agricultural and applied economics). The applied/non-applied distinction at this level is designed to capture the essential features of the differences between these two types of programmes while respecting the fact that, whether a programme is intended to prepare an individual either for immediate practice/employment in a field of practice or for further study in a discipline, each must meet a substantial and common set of outcomes that have historically been and continue to be critical to and shared by both types of programmes within a degree-level educational environment.

BACCALAUREATE DEGREE: GENERAL	BACCALAUREATE DEGREE: MAJOR/ DOUBLE MAJOR/ADVANCED MAJOR	BACCALAUREATE DEGREE: HONOURS/SPECIALIZATION	BACCALAUREATE DEGREE: PROFESSIONAL AREA OF STUDY	BACCALAUREATE DEGREE: APPLIED AREA OF STUDY
1. Overall Programme Design and Outcome Emphasis				
General Baccalaureate degree programmes are normally designed to require some conceptual sophistication, and specialized knowledge in at least one discipline or field. Such programmes typically require less intensive disciplinary specialization than an honours or specialization programme and less preparation for employment in a field of practice than a programme in an applied area of study.	Baccalaureate degree programmes in this category are normally designed to require more conceptual sophistication, specialized knowledge, and intellectual autonomy than a general degree programme, and a disciplinary knowledge. This is the case in both applied and non-applied areas of study. Students learn by doing, with a focus on deepening their mastery of the knowledge and methods of the discipline in a lesser degree than at the honours/specialization level of study. Such programmes normally do not require the preparation of a terminal research paper, thesis, project exhibition, or other research-based or performance-based exercises that demonstrate methodological competence and capacity for independent intellectual/creative work, but do require a solid discipline based foundational knowledge in which to do so if desired. Note: In some instances in the Maritime University System, the term "advanced major" is also used to denote "honours" within a four-year degree structure, however, in this category it denotes a " major" within a four-year degree structure. i.e. Bachelor of Arts Major/Advanced Major in History.	Baccalaureate degree programmes in this category are normally designed to require more conceptual sophistication, specialized knowledge, and intellectual autonomy than a general degree programme, and a deeper and broader disciplinary knowledge than a baccalaureate degree in an applied area of study. Students will engage in independent and scholarly research aspects of an honours degree, with a focus on deepening their mastery of the knowledge and methods of the discipline. Such programmes normally require students to prepare, under supervision, a terminal research paper, thesis, project, exhibition, or other research-based or performance-based exercises that demonstrate methodological competence and capacity for independent intellectual/creative work.	Baccalaureate degree programmes in this category are normally designed to require a level of conceptual sophistication, specialized knowledge, and intellectual autonomy similar to that in an honours or specialization degree programme but with the disciplinary content oriented to a professional field of practice. Students must complete applied components of the curriculum with a focus on preparing for entry into a professional field of practice. Such programmes incorporate a blend of theory and practice, and normally include a terminal project or other practice-based exercises intended to develop and demonstrate the student's readiness for employment in the professional field of practice. Professions are often practiced within a regulatory framework, and programmes may require accreditation by a regulatory body or professional association.	Baccalaureate degree programmes in this category are normally designed to require a level of conceptual sophistication, specialized knowledge, and intellectual autonomy similar to that in an honours or specialization degree programme but with the disciplinary content oriented to an occupational field of practice. Students must complete applied components of the curriculum with a focus on preparing for entry into a occupational field of practice. Such programmes incorporate a blend of theory and practice, and normally include a terminal project or other practice-based exercises intended to develop and demonstrate the student's readiness for employment in the occupational field of practice.
2. Preparation for Employment and Further Study				
In addition to personal and intellectual growth, the programmes may prepare students for some second-entry professional degree programmes, employment in a variety of fields, or advanced entry into an honours or specialization programme of study in the field. Normally these programmes do not prepare students for direct entry into graduate study.	In addition to personal and intellectual growth, the programmes may prepare students for some second-entry professional degree programmes, employment in a variety of fields, or advanced entry into an honours or specialization programme of study in a field or discipline, or qualifying year to graduate study. Normally these programmes do not prepare students for direct entry into graduate study, however could lead to: 1) a qualifying year of study to graduate study; 2) as a entry to honours certificate for upgrading one's current baccalaureate level of study; and 3) direct entry into post-baccalaureate Professional undergraduate degrees such as a Post-Baccalaureate two-year Bachelor of Education, LLB, M.D. D.V.M., etc.	In addition to personal and intellectual growth, honours and specialization programmes are primarily designed to prepare students for entry into graduate study in the field, second-entry professional degree programmes, or employment in a variety of fields.	In addition to personal and intellectual growth, the programmes are primarily designed to prepare students for employment in the field of practice, second-entry professional degree programmes, or, depending on the content of the programme and the field, entry into either graduate study or bridging studies for an appropriate graduate programme.	In addition to personal and intellectual growth, the programmes are primarily designed to prepare students for employment in the field of practice, second-entry professional degree programmes, or, depending on the content of the programme and the field, entry into either graduate study or bridging studies for an appropriate graduate programme.
3. Length of Programme				
They are typically six to eight semesters in duration (normally 90 to 120 credits, or the equivalent).	They are typically six to eight semesters in duration (normally 90 to 120 credits, or the equivalent with at least 6 - 8 courses (four of which are beyond the second year of study) designated in a subject area/discipline in the case of a Major within a three-year degree programme or 8 - 10 courses (six of which are beyond the second year of study) designated in a subject area/discipline in the case of a major and/or advanced major in a four-year degree programme.	They are typically eight semesters in duration (normally 120 credits, or the equivalent).	Classroom instruction is typically eight semesters or more in duration (normally 120 credits, or the equivalent, and may be supplemented by required professional experience (e.g., supervised practica or internships). This includes second level bachelor's programmes such as post-baccalaureate B.Ed. Programmes, and first professional degrees (such as LLB, etc.); normally 30-90 credits.	Classroom instruction is typically eight semesters in duration (normally 120 credits, or the equivalent) and may be supplemented by required workplace experience (e.g., two to four supervised co-operative work terms).

Maritime Provinces Higher Education Commission   **Commission de l'enseignement supérieur des Provinces maritimes**

MARITIME DEGREE LEVEL QUALIFICATIONS FRAMEWORK

1. UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMMES

1.2 Degree Level Standards

The focus of these degree level standards is on the expectations of graduates of each credential. The standards stipulate the demonstrable transferable learning skills and level of mastery of a body of specialized knowledge in eight dimensions. The shades of distinction between degrees are determined by the capacity of the graduate at each level to act competently, creatively and independently, and by their proximity to the forefront of a discipline and/or profession. Among other things, the degree level standards: (a) guide applicant decisions on the degree standard for their proposals; (b) provide clear learning outcome standards to instructional and programme designers; (c) mitigate any inconsistencies in peer judgement; and, (d) foster an environment propitious for credit transfer and credential recognition.

BACCALAUREATE DEGREE: GENERAL	BACCALAUREATE DEGREE: MAJOR/DOUBLE MAJOR/ADVANCED MAJOR	BACCALAUREATE DEGREE: HONOURS/SPECIALIZATION	BACCALAUREATE DEGREE: PROFESSIONAL AREA OF STUDY	BACCALAUREATE DEGREE: APPLIED AREA OF STUDY
This degree is awarded to students who have demonstrated:	*This degree is awarded to students who have demonstrated:*	*This degree is awarded to students who have demonstrated:*	*This degree is awarded to students who have demonstrated:*	*This degree is awarded to students who have demonstrated:*
1. Depth and Breadth of Knowledge in the Field				
a. A general knowledge and understanding of: • the principal assumptions, methodologies and applications of the discipline; • the main fields within the discipline; and • the discipline's relationship with other disciplines; b. An ability to evaluate and interpret new material relevant to the discipline's well-established framework of knowledge; and c. Some detailed knowledge in specialized areas;	a. A specialized knowledge and a foundational level of critical understanding of: • the principal assumptions, methodologies and applications of the discipline and the field of practice and of the way in which these have developed • the main fields within the discipline; and • the discipline's relationship and interaction with other disciplines; primarily but not only as these relate to a limited mastery of the discipline, at least some of which is informed by developments made and or established in the discipline; and b. An ability to interpret, critically evaluate, and apply, existing material relevant to the discipline.	a. A specialized knowledge and critical understanding of: • the principal assumptions, methodologies and applications of the discipline and the field of practice and of the way in which these have developed; • the main fields within the discipline; and • the discipline's relationship and interaction with other disciplines;à primarily but not only as these relate to mastery of the discipline, at least some of which is informed by developments at the forefront of the discipline; and b. An ability to interpret, critically evaluate, and apply, new material relevant to the discipline.	a. A specialized knowledge and critical understanding of: • the principal assumptions, methodologies and applications of the discipline and the field of practice and of the way in which these have developed; • the main fields within the discipline; and • the discipline's relationship and interaction with other disciplines; primarily but not only as these relate to mastery of the field of professional practice, at least some of which is informed by developments in or needs of the field of practice and/or trends in the discipline; and b. An ability to interpret and to critically evaluate and apply new material relevant to the field of professional practice.	a. A specialized knowledge and critical understanding of: • the principal assumptions, methodologies and applications of the discipline and the field of practice and of the way in which these have developed; • the main fields within the discipline; and • the discipline's relationship and interaction with other disciplines; primarily but not only as these relate to mastery of the field of occupational practice, at least some of which is informed by developments in or needs of the field of practice and/or trends in the discipline; and b. An ability to interpret and to critically evaluate and apply new material relevant to the field of occupational practice.
2. Depth and Breadth of Knowledge Outside the Field				
a. A more than introductory knowledge of the distinctive assumptions and modes of analysis of a discipline outside their main field of study and of the society and culture in which they live and work.	a. A more than introductory knowledge of the distinctive assumptions and modes of analysis of a discipline outside their main filed of study and of the society and culture in which they live and work.	a. A more than introductory knowledge of the distinctive assumptions and modes of analysis of a discipline outside their main field of study and of the society and culture in which they live and work.	a. A more than introductory knowledge of the distinctive assumptions and modes of analysis of a discipline outside their main field of study and of the society and culture in which they live and work.	a. A more than introductory knowledge of the distinctive assumptions and modes of analysis of a discipline outside their main field of study and of the society and culture in which they live and work.
3. Conceptual and Methodological Awareness				
a. A knowledge of the main methods of enquiry in their subject(s) that enables the student to: • evaluate the appropriateness of different approaches to solving problems using well-established ideas and techniques in the field of study, and • devise and sustain arguments and/or to solve problems using these methods.	a. A conceptual understanding that enables the student to: • evaluate the appropriateness of different approaches to solving problems using well-established ideas and techniques in the field of study; • devise and sustain arguments using established ideas and techniques, and • describe and comment upon particular aspects of current research in the discipline.	a. A conceptual understanding that enables the student to: • devise and sustain arguments, and/or to solve problems, using ideas and techniques, some of which are at the forefront of a discipline; and • describe and comment upon particular aspects of current research or equivalent advanced scholarship in the discipline and how these are relevant to the evolution of the discipline.	a. A conceptual understanding that enables the student to: • devise and sustain arguments, and/or to solve practice-related problems, using ideas and techniques, some of which are at the forefront of a discipline or field of practice; and • describe and comment upon particular aspects of current research or equivalent advanced scholarship in the discipline and/or profession and how these are relevant to the field of professional practice.	a. A conceptual understanding that enables the student to: • devise and sustain arguments, and/or to solve practice-related problems, using ideas and techniques, some of which are at the forefront of a discipline or field of practice; and • describe and comment upon particular aspects of current research or equivalent advanced scholarship in the discipline and/or profession and how these are relevant to the field of occupational practice.
4. Level of Analytical Skill				
a. The ability to review, present, and interpret quantitative and qualitative data (as appropriate to the area of study): • develop lines of argument; and • to make sound judgements in accordance with the major theories, concepts and methods of the subject(s) of study.	a. The ability to review, present, and to conduct a limited evaluation of qualitative and quantitative data (as appropriate to the area of study) to: • develop lines of argument; • make sound judgements in accordance with the major theories, concepts and methods of the subject of study; and • apply underlying concepts, principles, and techniques of analysis, mostly within the context in which they were first studied and implemented.	a. The ability to review, present, and critically evaluate qualitative and quantitative data (as appropriate to the area of study) to: • develop lines of argument; • make sound judgements in accordance with the major theories, concepts and methods of the subject of study; and • apply underlying concepts, principles, and techniques of analysis, both within and outside the context in which they were first studied and implemented.	a. The ability to review, present, and critically evaluate qualitative and quantitative data (as appropriate to the area of study) to: • develop lines of argument; • make sound judgements in accordance with the major theories, concepts and methods of the subject of study; and • apply underlying concepts, principles, and techniques of analysis, both within and outside the context in which they were first studied and practiced, particularly within a professional field of practice.	a. The ability to review, present, and critically evaluate qualitative and quantitative data (as appropriate to the area of study) to: to: • develop lines of argument; • make sound judgements in accordance with the major theories, concepts and methods of the subject of study; and • apply underlying concepts, principles, and techniques of analysis, both within and outside the context in which they were first studied and practiced, particularly within an occupational field of practice.
5. Level of Application of Knowledge				
a. The ability to use a basic range of established techniques to analyse information evaluate the appropriateness of different approaches to solving problems related to their area(s) of study and/or work and propose solutions to problems arising from that analysis; b. The ability to make limited use of scholarly reviews and primary sources (e.g., refereed research articles and/or original materials) appropriate to their discipline; c. The ability to develop an appreciation for ethical considerations; and d. The ability to develop a capacity and life-long desire for learning.	a. The ability to use a range of established techniques and bodies of knowledge to initiate and undertake a critical analysis of arguments, assumptions, abstract concepts and data; b. The ability to apply the methods and techniques of the discipline to extend their disciplinary understanding and knowledge; c. The ability to form questions to achieve a solution - or to identify a range of solutions - to a problem or clearly defined research project; d. The ability to carry out clearly defined discipline related projects; e. The ability to make critical use of scholarly reviews appropriate to their discipline; f. The ability to develop an appreciation for ethical considerations; and g. The ability to develop a capacity and life-long desire for learning.	a. The ability to use a range of established techniques and bodies of knowledge to initiate and undertake critical analysis of arguments, assumptions, abstract concepts and data; b. The ability to apply the methods and techniques of the discipline to extend their disciplinary competence; c. The ability to frame appropriate questions to achieve a solution – or to identify a range of solutions – to a problem or research question; d. The ability to initiate and carry out discipline related projects; e. The ability to make critical use of scholarly reviews and primary sources (e.g., refereed research articles and/or original materials) appropriate to their discipline; f. The ability to develop appreciation for ethical consideration; and g. The ability to develop a capacity and life-long desire for learning.	a. The ability to use a range of established techniques and bodies of knowledge to initiate and undertake critical analysis of arguments, assumptions, abstract concepts and data; b. The ability to apply the methods and techniques of the discipline and practice-related experience to extend their professional competence; c. The ability to frame appropriate questions to achieve a solution – or to identify a range of solutions – to a problem in a professional context; d. The ability to initiate and carry out professional projects; e. The ability to make critical use of scholarly and professional reviews and primary sources (e.g., refereed research articles and/or original materials) appropriate to their discipline and field of practice; f. The ability to develop an appreciation for ethical considerations; and g. The ability to develop a capacity and life-long desire for learning.	a. The ability to use a range of established techniques and bodies of knowledge (to initiate and undertake critical analysis of arguments, assumptions, abstract concepts and data; b. The ability to apply the methods and techniques of the discipline and practice-related experience to extend their occupational competence; c. The ability to frame appropriate questions to achieve a solution – or to identify a range of solutions – to a problem in an occupational context; d. The ability to initiate and carry out occupational projects; e. The ability to make critical use of scholarly and professional reviews and primary sources (e.g., refereed research articles and/or original materials) appropriate to their discipline and field of practice; f. The ability to develop an appreciation for ethical considerations; and g. The ability to develop a capacity and life-long desire for learning.
6. Professional Capacity/Autonomy				
a. Qualities and transferable skills necessary to: • employment requiring the exercise of personal responsibility and decision-making in defined areas of accountability; and • acting effectively with peers and under guidance of qualified practitioners. b. The ability to identify and address their own learning needs in changing circumstances, and to select an appropriate programme of further study.	a. Qualities and transferable skills necessary for: • employment requiring the exercise of initiative, responsibility and accountability in a personal context in defined areas of accountability; • acting effectively with peers and under guidance of qualified practitioners; • some appreciation of leadership and management skills required directly related to employed position; and • decision-making in straightforward and somewhat unpredictable contexts. • The ability to manage their own learning in changing circumstances, both within and outside the discipline, and to select an appropriate programmeme for further study or for profession development.	a. Qualities and transferable skills necessary for: • employment requiring the exercise of initiative, responsibility and accountability in both personal and group contexts; • developing leadership and management skills; and • decision-making in complex and unpredictable contexts. b. The ability to manage their own learning in changing circumstances, both within and outside the discipline, and to select an appropriate programme of further study.	a. Qualities and transferable skills necessary for: • employment requiring the exercise of initiative, responsibility and accountability in both personal and group contexts; • developing leadership and management skills; and • decision-making in complex and unpredictable contexts. b. The ability to manage their own learning in changing circumstances, both within and outside the discipline and profession, and to select an appropriate programme of further study.	a. Qualities and transferable skills necessary for: • employment requiring the exercise of initiative, responsibility and accountability in both personal and group contexts; • developing leadership and management skills; and • decision-making in complex and unpredictable contexts. b. The ability to manage their own learning in changing circumstances, both within and outside the discipline and occupation, and to select an appropriate programme of further study.
7. Level of Communication Skills				
a. The ability to communicate the results of their study/work accurately and reliably, orally and in writing, to non-specialist audiences using structured and coherent arguments.	a. The ability to communicate information, arguments, and analysis accurately and reliably, orally and in writing, to specialist and non-specialist audiences, using structured and coherent arguments.	a. The ability to communicate information, arguments, and analyses accurately and reliably, orally and in writing, to specialist and non-specialist audiences, using structured and coherent arguments, and where appropriate informed by key concepts and techniques of the discipline.	a. The ability to communicate information, arguments, and analyses accurately and reliably, orally and in writing, to employers, team members, clients, consumers, and others, using structured and coherent arguments, and where appropriate informed by key concepts and techniques of the discipline and/or field of practice.	a. The ability to communicate information, arguments, and analyses accurately and reliably, orally and in writing, to employers, team members, clients, consumers, and others, using structured and coherent arguments, and where appropriate informed by key concepts and techniques of the discipline and/or field of practice.
8. Awareness of Limits of Knowledge				
a. An understanding of the limits to their own knowledge and how this might influence their analyses and interpretations.	a. An understanding of the limits to their own knowledge and ability, and an appreciation of the uncertainty, ambiguity and limits to knowledge and how this might influence analyses and interpretations.	a. An understanding of the limits to their own knowledge and ability, and an appreciation of the uncertainty, ambiguity and limits to knowledge and how this might influence analyses and interpretations.	a. An understanding of the limits to their own knowledge and ability, and an appreciation of the uncertainty, ambiguity and limits to knowledge and how this might influence analyses and interpretations.	a. An understanding of the limits to their own knowledge and ability, and an appreciation of the uncertainty, ambiguity and limits to knowledge and how this might influence analyses and interpretations.

Maritime Provinces Higher Education Commission   Commission de l'enseignement supérieur des Provinces maritimes

2. GRADUATE PROGRAMMES

2.1 Description of Degree Categories

These descriptions are intended to capture the most general aspects of each level. It is to be understood, however, that each degree and degree level applies to an extremely broad spectrum of disciplines and program types.

MASTER'S DEGREE		DOCTORAL DEGREE	

1. Overall Programme Design and Outcome Emphasis

Professional	Research	Professional	Research
A professional master's degree programme builds on knowledge and competencies acquired during undergraduate study, and requires more specialized knowledge and intellectual autonomy than a bachelor's degree programme. Much of the study undertaken at the master's level will have been at, or informed by, the forefront of an academic or professional discipline. Students will have shown originality in the application of knowledge, and they will understand how the boundaries of knowledge are advanced through research. They will be able to deal with complex issues both systematically and creatively, and they will show originality in tackling and solving problems. Students will understand how professional practice is informed by research, and will have developed the skills necessary to keep apprized of the research literature, to evaluate the reliability of research findings and their relevance for professional practice, and to use research findings as a basis for professional practice. Profession-oriented master's programmes normally draw on students holding bachelor's degrees or first professional degrees from varied academic backgrounds and provide them with a selection of courses and exercises intended to prepare them for a particular profession or field of practice or, if they are already involved in the profession or field, to extend their knowledge base and skills as professionals/practitioners. Examples: MSW (Social Work), MHA (Health Administration), MPA (Public Administration), MHRM (Human Resource Management), M. Eng. (Engineering)	A master's degree programme builds on knowledge and competencies acquired during related undergraduate study, and requires more specialized knowledge and intellectual autonomy than a bachelor's degree programme. Much of the study undertaken at the master's level will have been at, or informed by, the forefront of an academic or professional discipline. Students will have shown originality in the application of knowledge, and they will understand how the boundaries of knowledge are advanced through research. They will be able to deal with complex issues both systematically and creatively, and they will show originality in tackling and solving problems. Research-oriented master's programmes are typically offered to graduates of related undergraduate or professional programmes in the field or to students who have taken bridging studies to equip them for graduate study in the field; the focus is on developing the research, analytical, methodological, interpretive and expository skills necessary for doctoral studies or for leadership in society. Typically, programmes are thesis-based and require the student to develop and demonstrate advanced research skills under supervision. Some programmes are course-based and require students to demonstrate the necessary research, analytical, interpretative, methodological and expository skills in course exercises. Examples: M.A. programmes in the humanities and social sciences; M.Sc. programmes, MASc. (Engineering)	A doctoral programme builds on the knowledge and competencies in a field or discipline acquired during prior study, usually at the graduate level. Study at the doctoral level is at the forefront of an academic or professional discipline. Holders of the doctoral degree must have demonstrated a high degree of intellectual autonomy, an ability to conceptualize, design and implement projects for the generation of significant new knowledge and/or understanding, and their ability to create and interpret knowledge that extends the forefront of a discipline, usually through original research or creative activity. Practice-oriented doctoral programmes are of a more applied nature, relate to a professional or creative activity and, where there is an internship or exhibition requirement, may also require a dissertation. Doctoral programmes with an orientation to practice typically involve more course work than doctoral programmes with a more theoretical or disciplinary focus. Such programmes lead to the award of a degree designation reflecting the field or discipline. Examples: Ed.D. (Education), Mus. Doc. (Music), Psy.D. (Psychology)	A doctoral programme builds on the knowledge and competencies in a field or discipline acquired during prior study, usually at the graduate level. Study at the doctoral level is at the forefront of an academic or professional discipline. Holders of the doctoral degree must have demonstrated a high degree of intellectual autonomy, an ability to conceptualize, design and implement projects for the generation of significant new knowledge and/or understanding, and their ability to create and interpret knowledge that extends the forefront of a discipline, usually through original research or creative activity. Research-oriented doctoral programmes focus on the development of the conceptual and methodological knowledge and skills required to do original research and to make an original contribution to knowledge in the form of a dissertation. In some fields an internship or exhibition component may be required, but without diluting the significance of the dissertation as the primary demonstration of mastery. Such programmes lead to the award of the Ph.D. Examples: Ph.D. (Psychology), Ph.D. (Education), Ph.D. (Music)

2. Preparation for Employment and Further Study

Graduates will have the qualities needed for employment in circumstances requiring sound judgment, personal responsibility and initiative, in complex and unpredictable professional environments. In the case of research-based programmes, graduates will have received the skills necessary to proceed with further graduate level study (i.e.: doctoral studies).	Holders of doctorates will have the qualities needed for employment requiring the ability to make informed judgements on complex issues in specialist fields, and innovation in tackling and solving problems.

3. Length of Programme

A master's programme is typically three to five semesters in duration.	A doctoral programme is typically three to five years in length, depending on the field and the speed at which individuals progress through requirements. It may involve course work of varying lengths aimed at cultivating further conceptual depth or breadth.

2. GRADUATE PROGRAMMES

2.2 Degree Level Standards

The focus of these degree standards is on the expectations of graduates of each credential. The standards stipulate the demonstrable transferable learning skills and level of mastery of a body of specialized knowledge in eight dimensions. The shades of distinction between degrees are determined by the capacity of the graduate at each level to act competently, creatively and independently, and by their proximity to the forefront of a discipline and/or profession. Among other things, the degree level standards: (a) guide applicant decisions on the degree standard for their proposals; (b) provide clear learning outcome standards to instructional and program designers; (c) mitigate any inconsistencies in peer judgement; and (d) foster an environment propitious for credit transfer and credential recognition.

MASTER'S DEGREE	DOCTORAL DEGREE
This degree extends the skills associated with the Bachelor's degree and is awarded to students who have demonstrated:	*This degree extends the skills associated with the Master's degree and is awarded to students who have demonstrate:*
1. Depth and Breadth of Knowledge in the Field	
a. A systematic understanding of knowledge, and a critical awareness of current problems and/or new insights, much of which is at, or informed by, the forefront of their academic discipline, field of study, or area of professional practice.	1. A thorough understanding of a substantial body of knowledge which is at the forefront of their academic discipline or area of professional practice.
2. Depth and Breadth of Knowledge Outside the Field	
a. A sufficient breadth and depth of knowledge outside the field and/or discipline, as appropriate, for research projects or solutions to professional problems.	a. A sufficient breadth and depth of knowledge outside the field and/or discipline, as appropriate, for research projects or solutions to professional problems.
3. Conceptual and Methodological Awareness	
a. Originality in the application of knowledge, together with a practical understanding of how established techniques of research and inquiry are used to create and interpret knowledge in the discipline; b. Competence in a range of standard and specialized research or equivalent tools and techniques of enquiry; and c. A conceptual understanding that enables: • a critical evaluation of current research and advanced scholarship in the discipline; and • a critical evaluation of methodologies and, where appropriate, proposal of new hypotheses and/or interpretations.	a. The ability to conceptualize, design, and implement projects for the generation of new knowledge, applications, or understanding at the forefront of the discipline, and to adjust the project design in the light of unforeseen problems; b. A significant range of skills, techniques, tools, practices and/or materials which are associated with the field of learning; c. The ability to develop new skills, techniques, tools, practices, and/or materials; and d. A detailed conceptual and practical understanding of applicable techniques for research and advanced academic inquiry.
4. Level of Analytical Skill	
1. A comprehensive understanding and creative application of concepts, principles and techniques in their own research, advanced scholarship or field of practice; and 2. The ability to deal with complex issues and make judgements based on established principles and techniques.	a. The ability to make informed judgements on complex issues in specialist fields, often in the absence of complete data and sometimes requiring new methods or hypotheses; and b. The ability to create and interpret new knowledge, through original research, or other advanced scholarship, of a quality to satisfy peer review, extend the forefront of the discipline, and to merit publication.
5. Level of Application of Knowledge	
a. Self-direction and originality in tackling and solving problems; and b. The ability to act autonomously in planning and implementing tasks at a professional or equivalent level.	a. The capacity to: • undertake pure and/or applied research and development at an advanced level; and • contribute to the development of academic or professional skills, techniques, tools, practices, ideas, approaches, and/or materials.
6. Professional Capacity/Autonomy	
1. The ability to self-evaluate and take responsibility to continue to advance their knowledge and understanding, and to develop new skills to a high level; and 2. The qualities and transferable skills necessary for employment requiring the exercise of initiative and personal responsibility and accountability, decision-making in complex and unpredictable situations, and the independent learning required for continuing professional development.	a. The independence to remain academically and professionally engaged and current, including the ability to evaluate the broader implications of applying knowledge to particular contexts; and b. The qualities and transferable skills necessary for employment requiring the exercise of personal responsibility and largely autonomous initiative in complex and unpredictable situations, in professional or equivalent environments.
7. Level of Communication Skills	
a. The ability to communicate issues and conclusions clearly to specialist and non-specialist audiences.	a. The ability to communicate complex and/or ambiguous ideas and conclusions clearly and effectively to specialist and non-specialist audiences.
8. Awareness of Limits of Knowledge	
a. An appreciation of the complexity of knowledge and understanding and of the potential contributions made by diverse interpretations, methods, and disciplines.	a. A full appreciation of the complexity of knowledge and understanding and of the potential contributions made by diverse interpretations, methods, and disciplines.

Maritime Provinces Higher Education Commission   **Commission de l'enseignement supérieur des Provinces maritimes**

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 program 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 programs 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 program 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 program 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 programs. How does the proposed program compare with other similar programs offered elsewhere in the Maritimes and in Canada? An assessment of the need for the proposed program? What are the value-added characteristics of the program?
   c) Assessment of the adequacy of human resources available for the areas of specialization identified and for program 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 program?
      • 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 program area?
      • In your view, can the current faculty complement successfully operate the proposed program?
      • 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 program 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 program. 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 program. 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 program? and quality of teaching?

f) Comment on the likely stability of the program and the resources allocated to it.

g) Comment on the program'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 programs, 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 programs 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 program 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 programs submitted under the New Brunswick Degree Granting Act.

   5.1 Clearly defined **program objectives and structure**, including references to optimum program length, as well as a demonstration that the program name and credential granted adequately capture the program content ("truth in advertising").

   5.2 Clearly defined **anticipated student outcomes** at the program 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 program.

   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 program. Each external expert should be identified and their written assessment or comments on the proposed program should be included.

   5.5 Evidence of an **environmental scan** to identify similar or equivalent or comparable programs 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 **program review policies** and procedures.

5.10 Evidence of expertise in the chosen **delivery mode**.

5.11 Proposals for **new graduate programs** 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 program. Academic environment is characterized, in the context of program 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 programs (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 program;
- an appropriate structure (such as an Office of Graduate Studies) to support the program, especially in the case of a doctoral program; and
- in the case of research-based (master's and doctoral) degree programs, an appropriate academic environment is further characterized by
  - ➢ a strong research focus within the unit proposing the program (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 program represents necessary duplication, or market demand demonstrably justifies further capacity.

c. The nature of the proposed program is such that it can best be offered at the institution in question.

d. Employability, and student demand for such a program favour the implementation of the proposed program.

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 program appears to correspond to the standards usually associated with the proposed credential"; or

b. "The proposed program 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 program appears to correspond to the standards usually associated with the proposed credential."

8. In addition, the report can include specific recommendations regarding periodic program review, and other recommendations as the consultant would judge important and useful.