

Brock University

Institutional Quality Assurance Processes

(March 2016)

Senate Academic Review Committee

Initial Approval Dates: Senate (#590 Continued) - June, 2, 2011
Quality Council - May 16, 2011

Approval Dates of Revisions: Senate (# 641 - May 25, 2016)
Quality Council - March 24, 2016

Next Revision: Fall 2020

NOTE: revision of this IQAP is subject to ratification by the Quality Council.

An electronic version of this IQAP along with various documentation that support the Quality Assurance process at Brock University can be accessed through the Quality Assurance website located at: <http://www.brocku.ca/vp-academic/quality-assurance>.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. OVERVIEW	4
1.1. Program	5
1.2. New Program	5
1.3. Major Modifications	6
1.4. Joint and Inter- Institutional Degrees	7
1.5. Expedited Approvals	7
1.6. Certificates and Diplomas	8
2. CYCLICAL REVIEWS	10
2.1. General Framework	10
2.1.1. Non Department/Centre Based Programs	10
2.1.2. Accreditation Reviews	11
2.2. Timeframe	11
2.3. Process Summary	12
2.4. Manual	13
2.5. Evaluation Criteria	13
2.5.1. Objectives	13
2.5.2. Admission Requirements	14
2.5.3. Curriculum	14
2.5.4. Teaching and Assessment	14
2.5.5. Resources	14
2.5.6. Quality Indicators	14
2.5.7. Quality Enhancement	15
2.5.8. Additional Graduate Program Criteria	15
2.6. Schedule	15
2.7. Preparation of Self Study	16
2.8. The Review Committee	16
2.9. List of Interviewees	17
2.10. Site Visit and Report	18
2.11. Comments/Responses	19
2.11.1. Academic Unit Response	19
2.11.2. UPC/SGSC Response	20
2.11.3. Decanal Response	20
2.12. Final Assessment Report	20
2.13. Quality Council Submission	21
2.14. Publication of Results	21
2.15. Monitoring of Review Results	21
2.16. Report to Board of Trustees	21
3. NEW PROGRAM APPROVALS	22
3.1. General Framework	22
3.2. Timeframe	22
3.3. Process Summary	22
3.4. Statement of Intent	24
3.5. Evaluation Criteria	24
3.5.1. Objectives	25
3.5.2. Admission Requirements	25
3.5.3. Structure	25
3.5.4. Program Content	25
3.5.5. Mode(s) of Delivery	25
3.5.6. Assessment of Teaching and Learning	25
3.5.7. Student Demand	26

3.5.8. Societal Need	26
3.5.9. Resources for all Programs.....	26
3.5.10. Resources for Graduate Programs Only	26
3.5.11. Resources for Undergraduate Programs Only	26
3.5.12. Quality and Other Indicators.....	27
3.5.13. Program Duplication.....	27
3.5.14. Fields in a Graduate Program (optional)	27
3.6. Program Proposal Brief	27
3.7. Reviewers	27
3.8. List of Interviewees	28
3.9. Site Visit and Report	29
3.10. Proponents Response	30
3.11. UPC/SGSC Response	30
3.12. Decanal Response	30
3.13. Program Proposal Brief Revision	30
3.14. Assessment	30
3.15. Publication of Results	31
3.16. Report to Board of Trustees	31
3.17. Subsequent Processes	31
4. MODIFICATIONS TO EXISTING PROGRAMS	32
4.1. Request for Major Modification	32
4.2. Assessment	32
5. APPROVAL AND REVIEW OF JOINT PROGRAMS	34
6. PROGRAM DISCONTINUATION	36
6.1. Request for Program Discontinuation	36
6.2. Assessment	36
6.3. Communication	36

Acronyms

ARC - Senate Academic Review Committee
AVPA - Associate Vice President, Academic
COU - Council of Ontario Universities
FAR - Final Assessment Report
GDLE - Graduate Degree Level Expectations
IA&P - Institutional Analysis and Planning
IQAP - Internal Quality Assurance Processes
MTCU - Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities
OCAV - Ontario Council of Academic Vice Presidents
PPB - Program Proposal Brief
RMM - Request for a Major Modification
QAF - Quality Assurance Framework
QC - Quality Council
SGSC - Senate Graduate Studies Committee
SOI - Statement of Intent
UDLE - Undergraduate Degree Level Expectations
UPC - Senate Undergraduate Program Committee

1. OVERVIEW

Senate is Brock University's chief academic decision-making body. It determines the educational policy of the institution and monitors the academic quality of all programs. Senate also has a major role in ensuring the operating budget's consistency with the educational policy. A continuous process of quality assurance related to existing and new programs is critical to the discharge of these responsibilities. The University's procedures and guidelines governing academic review are set out in this document, the Internal Quality Assurance Process (IQAP).

The processes described in this IQAP are necessitated by the Council of Ontario Universities (COU). The COU established a Quality Assurance Framework (QAF) for all Ontario universities and an agency to administer that framework: the Ontario Universities Council for Quality Assurance (or Quality Council (QC)). The Quality Council oversees, coordinates and audits the quality assurance processes within each Ontario University (see: <http://www.oucqa.ca/>). The QC has three major functions. First, the council approved the initial IQAP developed by each university in Ontario; now, all changes or revisions to any IQAP must also be approved by the QC. Second, the council receives Final Assessment Reports for each cyclical review of existing programs. Third, the council is charged with the approval of new program proposals prior to submission to the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities (MTCU) for funding.

In this context, Senate established a special committee to administer the University's IQAP: the Academic Review Committee (ARC). The IQAP describes all of the processes by which existing academic programs are reviewed, modified or terminated, and by which new programs are introduced, at the University. Hence, ARC is responsible for the coordination, monitoring and implementation of all aspects of these processes. ARC is directly accountable and responsible to Senate through the Provost and Vice-President, Academic, an *ex officio* member of Senate. ARC regularly reports to Senate through the Provost with updates and/or recommendations for the consideration of Senate. The mandate of the Academic Review Committee can be found at: http://www.brocku.ca/university-secretariat/facultyhandbook/section2#_genIndex46.

Responsibility for the conduct of academic reviews, major modifications to existing programs and the evaluation of new academic programs lies with the Provost. The Provost shall be the "authoritative contact" between Brock University and the Quality Council.

Brock's IQAP will apply to the consideration of all graduate and undergraduate academic programs (see definition below), delivered in either a face-to-face or hybrid or online setting, including any offered jointly or in collaboration with other institutions. All graduate diploma programs that include credit courses, are covered by this policy.

The IQAP replaces:

- the previous internal system in place for the review of existing undergraduate programs, overseen and audited by the Undergraduate Program Review and Audit Committee (UPRAC) of COU; and,
- the previous external system in place for the cyclical review and introduction of new graduate programs, overseen by the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies (OCGS).

Throughout this document, the following definitions will apply:

1.1. Program (e.g., a major, honours, pass)

An identified set and sequence of courses, and/or other units of study, research and practice, with defined learning outcomes, within an area of disciplinary or interdisciplinary study, which is completed in full or partial fulfillment of the requirements for the awarding of a degree, and is recorded on the student's academic record.

1.2. New Program

Any degree, degree program, or program of specialization, currently approved by Senate or equivalent governing body, which has not been previously approved for that institution by the Quality Council, its predecessors, or any intra-institutional approval processes that previously applied. A change of name, only, does not constitute a new program; nor does the inclusion of a new program of specialization where another with the same designation already exists (e.g., a new honours program where a major with the same designation already exists). To clarify, a 'new program' is brand-new: that is to say, the program has substantially different program requirements and substantially different learning outcomes from those of any existing approved programs offered by the institution. Examples of what constitutes a 'new program' are provided in the Quality Assurance Guide. [<http://oucqa.ca/resources-publications/guide-to-quality-assurance-processes/>]

Not-for-credit and for-credit undergraduate certificate programs are not subject to approval or audit by the Quality Council.

All new programs (undergraduate and graduate) are subject to the procedure governing new program proposals and subject to external approval by the Quality Council. The approval process for new programs requires external consultants. The New Program Approval Protocol applies to new undergraduate degrees, undergraduate specializations and majors (for which a similar specialization/major is not already approved), graduate degrees and diplomas, collaborative graduate programs and new fields in a graduate program. However, the protocols for these approvals vary as follows:

The Protocol for New Degree Program Approvals applies to new undergraduate degrees, undergraduate honours specializations and majors (for which a similar specialization/major is not already approved), graduate degrees, joint degrees and intra/inter-institutional degree programs (dual credential, collaborative and combined degrees) when a new parent program at the University is being proposed in conjunction with the intra/inter-institutional degree). New degree programs require external (Quality Council) approval.

The Protocol for New Programs with Expedited Approvals applies to new graduate diplomas, new fields to existing graduate degrees, and joint degrees and intra/inter-institutional degree programs (dual credential, joint, and conjoint degrees) when a parent program already exists.

The introduction of new minors, concentrations or options, within a program (which do not require Quality Council approval) are handled internally through the annual calendar submission process, overseen by the Senate Undergraduate Program Committee (UPC) or Senate Graduate Studies Committee (SGSC), respectively.

1.3. Major Modifications

The Quality Assurance Framework defines major modifications as changes including one or more of the following program changes:

- (a) requirements for the program that differ significantly from those existing at the time of the previous cyclical program review;
- (b) significant changes to the learning outcomes;
- (c) significant changes to the faculty engaged in delivering the program and/or to the essential physical resources as may occur, for example, where there have been changes to the existing mode(s) of delivery.

Application of the QAF criteria listed above will determine when proposed changes are considered "major." In addition, Brock considers other kinds of changes to be substantive and to require submission to ARC for review as major modifications. For example:

- (a) deletion or merging of programs;
- (b) renaming of programs;
- (c) changes in admission or progression requirements;
- (d) substantial alterations to a program (in terms of approved requirements, learning outcomes and/or required resources) which effectively reorganize the program, impact another Faculty, or result in significant additional resource requirements;
- (e) changes to program content that affect the learning outcomes but do not meet the threshold for a "new program";
- (f) changes in program regulations with broad implications;
- (g) changes to the faculty delivering the program (e.g., a large proportion of the faculty retires; new hires alter the areas of research and teaching interests);
- (h) changes that run counter to the University's academic plan(s);
- (i) the introduction of a new option (e.g., new research-related exit requirement, course-only option at the master's level) in a graduate program;
- (j) the offering of an existing program substantially online where it had previously been offered in face-to-face mode (or *vice versa*);
- (k) changes to the bridging options for college diploma graduates;
- (l) significant change in the laboratory/seminar/tutorial components of a program or to full- or part-time program options;
- (m) the introduction or deletion of a work experience, co-op option, internship or practicum, or portfolio as a program requirement;
- (n) the creation, deletion or re-naming of a field in a graduate program; and
- (o) other changes that may result in additional or reduced resource requirements.

Major modifications to existing programs do not require submission of a Proposal Brief to the Quality Council except when the University requests endorsement of the Quality Council, through the expedited review process. (Section 1.5)

Modifications to existing minors, concentrations and options (which do not require Quality Council approval) are handled internally through the annual calendar submission process, overseen by the UPC or SGSC, respectively.

The institutional arbiter in defining what constitutes a major as opposed to a minor program change will be the Provost in consultation with ARC. Major modifications must be reported to the Quality Council (QC) and to the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities (MTCU) annually.

1.4. Joint and Inter-Institutional Degrees

For the purposes of this document:

- (a) joint degree programs are programs of study offered in conjunction with another institution in which successful completion of the requirements is confirmed by a single degree document;
- (b) dual credential programs are programs of study offered by Brock and one or more universities or by Brock and a college or institute, including Institutes of Technology and Advanced Learning, in which successful completion of the requirements is confirmed by a separate and different degree/diploma document being awarded by each of the participating institutions; and
- (c) conjoint programs are programs of study, offered by a postsecondary institution that is affiliated, federated or collaborating with Brock University for which a single degree document signed by both institutions is awarded.

For all inter-institutional programs in which all partners are institutions within Ontario, the Quality Council's standard for New Program Approval and Cyclical Program Review Processes will apply to all elements of the program regardless of which partner offers them, including Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology and Institutes of Technology and Advanced Learning. For joint and collaborative programs in which some partners are institutions outside of Ontario, the elements of the programs contributed by the out-of-province partner will be subject to the quality assurance processes in their respective jurisdictions. The Quality Council will maintain a directory of bodies whose post-secondary assurance processes are recognized and accepted as being comparable to our own. In cases where such recognition is not available, the Quality Council will determine, on a case-by-case basis, the appropriate action to be taken on quality assurance if the collaboration is to be permitted to proceed.

1.5. Expedited Approvals

In cases of expedited reviews, the Office of the AVPA submits a Senate approved proposal brief together with the rationale for the change or new program to the Quality Council. The proposal is reviewed based only on applicable elements of the quality assurance criteria that would be employed for a full review. The appraisal and approval processes are significantly reduced.

The Quality Assurance Framework allows for expedited approval in the following situations:

- (a) a proposal for a new graduate Collaborative Program;

- (b) a proposal for a new for-credit Graduate Diploma. Note that Graduate diploma programs require Quality Council Expedited Approval (no external reviewers required) prior to their adoption. Once approved, such programs will be incorporated into the university's schedule for cyclical reviews as part of the parent program;
- (c) an institution requests endorsement of the Quality Council to declare a new Field in a graduate program;
- (d) major modifications to an existing program for which the institution requests Quality Council review.

The Quality Council's Appraisal Committee reviews the submission, conferring with the University and receiving further information as needed. The Appraisal Committee then decides:

That the University proceed with the proposed changes/new programs.

OR

That it consult further with the University over details of interest or concern regarding the proposed changes/new programs. Normally, these subsequent consultations will be brief and affirmative in their outcome.

1.6. Certificates and Diplomas

Certificates (comprised of undergraduate level credits) are awarded at the undergraduate level only. Diplomas (comprised of graduate-level credits) are awarded only at the graduate level.

Table 1 - Summary of Approval Level Required For New Programs and Changes to Existing Programs

Proponents considering the introduction of a new, joint dual or collaborative program should consult with the Office of the AVPA early in the development stage of the program for clarification on the level of approval required. A new, joint, dual or collaborative program may fit the criteria for a new program, in which case it would be subjected to external review and QC approval. Articulation agreements are not generally within the scope of the IQAP and would not require external review or QC approval.

Program Type	ARC	Senate	External Reviewers	QC Approval
New Undergraduate Programs	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Undergraduate Certificates, Minors	No	Yes, via UPC	No	No
Major Modifications ¹	Yes	Yes	No	Yes, if requested ³
Joint Programs	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Dual Credential Programs ⁴	Yes	Yes	Maybe	Yes ³
Conjoint Programs ⁴	Yes	Yes	Maybe	Yes ³
Graduate Collaborative Programs	Yes	Yes	No	Yes ³
New Graduate Programs	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Graduate Diploma	Yes	Yes	No	Yes ³
Graduate Field ²	Yes	Yes	No	Yes ³

NOTES:

1 - The University may submit major modifications to existing programs to the Quality Council for an Expedited Review.

2 - If a graduate program wishes to advertise that a field has been approved by the Quality Council, it must be submitted for an Expedited Review.

3 - Follows the Expedited Review Process

4 - Approval process when an existing parent program exists. If a new parent program is being proposed the process follows that of a new program.

2. CYCLICAL REVIEWS

2.1. General Framework

Programs in the University will be subject to an academic review on a periodic basis such that all will be reviewed over a period of eight years. The process will be scheduled in such a way as to review the academic unit responsible for a program (or group of programs) concurrently with the program review. Where both exist, the undergraduate program will be reviewed at the same time as the graduate program. Many factors contribute to the collegial and scholarly life of the unit, including the academic and administrative complement, research and scholarly activity, infrastructure, and governance. These all bear on the quality of academic programs and the broad educational experience of students. Reviews are thus intended to ensure and improve quality in all of these aspects.

For the purposes of this IQAP, a program is defined as a set of courses, with defined learning outcomes, approved by Senate to constitute all or part of the requirements for a degree designation offered by Brock University.

The Academic Review Committee (ARC) shall oversee academic reviews. The Terms of Reference and composition of ARC are set out in Faculty Handbook II: 9.13 (see http://www.brocku.ca/university-secretariat/facultyhandbook/section2#_genIndex49).

Academic Reviews shall be carried out under the general supervision of the Provost and the appropriate Deans. For undergraduate reviews, the appropriate Dean(s) shall be the Dean(s) of the Faculty (or Faculties) within which the academic unit resides. For graduate reviews, the appropriate Deans shall be both the Dean of Graduate Studies and the Dean(s) of the relevant Faculty (or Faculties).

Cyclical academic reviews are required under the Quality Assurance Framework. The Provost, as the authoritative contact with the QC, ensures that the reviews are conducted in a timely manner and communicates the results, upon completion of each review, to the Council.

A listing of programs offered by Brock University which are subject to the cyclical review process, as defined in this IQAP, can be found on the University's Quality Assurance website at: <http://www.brocku.ca/vp-academic/quality-assurance>.

2.1.1. Non-Department/Centre based Programs

All non-Department/Centre based programs, i.e. those operated at the Faculty level, e.g. Bachelor of Arts in General Humanities, Applied Health Sciences Graduate Program, etc., are subject to cyclical reviews.

The cyclical review of discipline based programs, e.g. Policing and Criminal Justice, Applied Health Sciences Graduate Program, Interdisciplinary PhD in Humanities, will follow the same process and standards applicable to Department/Centre based programs as outlined in the IQAP.

The cyclical review of non-discipline based programs, e.g. Bachelor of Arts in General Humanities, Bachelor of Arts in Social Sciences, Bachelor of Science, Integrated Studies, will be subject to the same process and standards applicable to

Department/Centre based programs as outlined in the IQAP. The only modification to the IQAP necessary to review such non-discipline based program will involve the makeup of the review team for the program.

As discipline specific reviewers for this type of program may not be easily identified, the composition of the review team will consist of two internal reviewers with knowledge of interdisciplinary programs and one external reviewer with expertise in interdisciplinary studies. Details of the review of non-discipline based programs will be coordinated between the Dean(s) of the host Faculty(s) and the Office of the AVPA at the time the program is confirmed for review.

For such non-discipline based programs, the identification of specific learning outcomes is required and will reflect the program of study being followed and the needs of the individual learner. Mapping the curriculum of such programs to a 'standard' may not be feasible and as a result such programs will have identified very broad program level learning outcomes, linked to degree level expectations, which will be augmented by the actual course level learning outcomes comprising the program of study being followed.

2.1.2. Accreditation Reviews

The Quality Assurance Framework indicates that the Brock University IQAP may allow for and specify the substitution or addition of documents or processes associated with the accreditation of a program, for components of the institutional program review process, when it is fully consistent with the requirements established in the Framework. A record of substitutions or additions and the grounds on which it was made, will be eligible for audit by the Quality Council.

Well in advance of the accreditation review, the Office of the AVPA will be provided with a copy of the accreditation review template to compare with the Brock IQAP. The AVPA, in consultation with ARC and the Dean(s), will review the guidelines for the accreditation process, the degree of alignment with the IQAP, and determine what additional materials or processes may be necessary to ensure compliance with the IQAP.

The outcome of the comparison and discussion may be that:

- 1) The accreditation review will be accepted as meeting all the criteria for a cyclical program review. The final report of the accrediting body will be submitted to ARC and a FAR drafted for Senate's consideration; or,
- 2) The accreditation review will be accepted as meeting most of the criteria for a cyclical program review. The program will be required to submit some supplementary information directly to ARC along with the final report of the accrediting body, to aid in drafting a FAR for Senate's consideration; or,
- 3) The accreditation review will not sufficiently meet the requirements of the cyclical program review and the IQAP process will proceed as scheduled.

2.2. Timeframe

Ideally, program review is an ongoing process that begins two years in advance of a site visit, for which a unit prepares a Self Study, and continues through to the next review eight years in the future. The process begins with the Provost confirming with

the Deans the list of programs to be reviewed. A detailed timeline and summary of the process follows.

2.3. Process Summary

Two Years in Advance of the Program Review (e.g. during the 2015-2016 academic year)

January 2016	Provost, in consultation with the Dean(s), shall confirm the programs to be reviewed.
February	Provost reports to Senate the Schedule of Program Reviews two years in advance of the site visit.
March	Unit Heads of confirmed programs contacted. Lead Author of Unit Self Study identified.
March-April	Student Survey instruments developed by IA&P in consultation with unit.

One Year in Advance of the Program Review (e.g. 2016-2017)

May-June 2016	Student Survey Instruments for program finalized with IA&P.
Oct. - Nov October	Student Surveys administered by IA&P. Orientation session for all units scheduled for review in the next academic year. Unit begins work on the Self Study.
November	IA&P provides unit with current and historical data as a starting point for development of the Self Study.
January 2017	IA&P provides Unit with student survey results. Self Study development continues. IA&P forwards additional data as available.
April	ARC readers assigned for review of draft Self Study.

Year of Program Review (e.g. 2017-2018)

May 2017	Self Study development continues.
June-Oct September 1	Draft Self Study reviewed by ARC reader. Unit submits list of proposed reviewers, including a brief profile of each nominee, to the Office of the AVPA. Unit submits list of names of those individuals to be interviewed by the reviewers to the Office of the AVPA.
2 weeks 2 weeks	Reviewers ranked by Dean(s). Provost selects reviewers in consultation with the Dean(s). Reviewers contacted by the Office of the AVPA and upon confirmation logistics for the site visit developed.
October 15 Oct - Dec	Office of the AVPA sets up schedule for site visit. Self Study submitted to the Office of the AVPA. ARC considers the Self Study, lead author and Dean(s) attend ARC meeting where Self Study is discussed. Identification of required changes/additions/modifications to be completed by Unit before re-submission to ARC. ARC approves Self Study. On approval of the Self Study, the membership of the review team will be communicated to the unit and the relevant Dean(s). Self Study Sent to Reviewers.
November Jan- Apr 2018	Internal Reviewers Orientation. Site Visit, timing dependent on reviewers availability. Reviewers' Report submitted to the Office of the AVPA, 4 weeks after site visit. Timing varies for each unit, dependent on date for the site visit.

Upon receipt, Reviewers' Report is sent to the Unit, UPC and/or SGSC for response. Responses due 4 weeks after receipt. Dean(s) provided with copy of Reviewers' Report.
 Dean(s) responds on receipt of Unit and UPC/SGSC responses.
 Draft Final Assessment Report (FAR) developed, based on internal responses.
 ARC considers Draft FAR. Dean(s) and Unit representative attend ARC meeting, modifications/changes made.

1st Year following Program Review (e.g. 2018-2019)

May - Dec 2018 Revised FAR considered by ARC (Dean(s) and Unit representative attend ARC meeting).
 Draft FAR circulated to Unit, Dean(s) and other units, as needed, for comment.
 ARC recommends Revised FAR to Senate for approval.

Upon Approval
 Upon Approval
 June 2019 FAR posted on the VP, Academic website.
 FAR forwarded to Quality Council.
 Report on program reviews/changes sent to the Board of Trustees for information.

One, two and three years after FAR Approval by Senate

April 1 2020 Dean submits Annual FAR Implementation Report(s).
 May-June FAR Implementation Reports reviewed by ARC.
 September ARC reports annually to Senate on Status of Implementation.

Four Years after FAR Approval by Senate (e.g. 2022-2023)

April 1, 2023 Unit submits "Four-Year Report" on academic review to ARC.
 Apr-May ARC approves Four-Year Report.
 May-June Four-Year Report submitted to Senate for Approval.
 Upon Approval Four-Year Report posted on the Provost website.
 Upon Approval Four-Year Report sent to Quality Council.
 June 2023 Four-Year Report sent to Board of Trustees for information.

2.4. Manual

The Office of the AVPA publishes a Self Study Manual that will provide administrative details with respect to review policies and practices (see <http://www.brocku.ca/vp-academic/quality-assurance>).

The manual provides guidance on the preparation of rigorous, objective and reflective Self Studies and serves to reinforce the potential benefits that can accrue from an effective Self Study. It will also identify responsibilities for the collection, aggregation and distribution of institutional data and outcome measures required for Self Studies, and specify the format required. In the instance of a discrepancy between the IQAP and the Manual, the IQAP will take precedence.

2.5. Evaluation Criteria

The Self Study for the review of existing undergraduate or graduate programs must address each of the evaluation criteria set out below.

2.5.1. Objectives

- Program is consistent with the institution's mission and academic plans.

- Program requirements and learning outcomes are clear, appropriate and align with the Faculty's statement of the Undergraduate Degree Level Expectations (UDLE) and/or Graduate Degree Level Expectations (GDLE). Explicit learning outcomes, for both undergraduate and graduate programs being reviewed, mapped to the program curricula, must be developed by the unit and included in the Self Study document.
 - To assist in developing this aspect of their Self Study units are directed and encouraged to contact the Centre for Pedagogical Innovation to seek assistance in facilitating the completion of the required curriculum map. Evidence of this consultation and facilitation must be clearly indicated in the Self Study.
- 2.5.2. Admission Requirements
- Admission requirements are appropriately aligned with the learning outcomes established for completion of the program.
- 2.5.3. Curriculum
- The curriculum reflects the current state of the discipline or area of study.
 - Evidence of any significant innovation or creativity in the content and/or delivery of the program relative to other such programs.
 - Mode(s) of delivery to meet the program's identified learning outcomes are appropriate and effective.
- 2.5.4. Teaching and Assessment
- Methods for assessing student achievement of the defined learning outcomes and degree level expectations are appropriate and effective.
 - Appropriateness and effectiveness of the means of assessment, especially in the students' final year of the program, in clearly demonstrating achievement of the program learning objectives and the institution's (or the Program's own) statement of Degree Level Expectations.
- 2.5.5. Resources
- Appropriateness and effectiveness of the academic unit's use of existing human, physical and financial resources in delivering its program(s). In making this assessment, reviewers must recognize the institution's autonomy to determine priorities for funding, space, and faculty allocation.
- 2.5.6. Quality Indicators
- While there are several widely-used quality indicators or proxies for reflecting program quality, units are encouraged to include available measures of their own which they see as best achieving that goal.
 - Outcome measures of student performance and achievement are of particular interest, but there are also important input and process measures which are known to have a strong association with quality outcomes. Indicators that may be used, where relevant, include the following:
 - a. **Faculty Complement:** clearly identify core and participating faculty, their qualifications, research and scholarly record; class sizes; percentage of classes taught by permanent or non-permanent (contractual) faculty; assignments and qualifications of part-time or temporary faculty;

- b. **Current Students:** applications and registrations; retention rates; time-to-completion; final-year academic achievement; graduation rates; course evaluations; and
- c. **Graduates:** rates of graduation, employment six months and two years after graduation, postgraduate study, "skills match" and alumni reports on program quality when available.

2.5.7. Quality Enhancement

- Initiatives taken to enhance the quality of the program and the associated learning and teaching environment. This will include the disposition of concerns and recommendations raised in previous reviews, and areas identified through the conduct of the Self Study that require attention and/or that hold promise for enhancement.
- Attention will also be paid to those academic services that directly contribute to the academic quality of the program(s) under review.

2.5.8. Additional Graduate Program Criteria

- Evidence that students' time-to-completion is both monitored and managed in relation to the program's defined length and program requirements.
- Quality and availability of graduate supervision, supervisory capacity.
- Definition and application of indicators that provide evidence of faculty, student and program quality, for example:
 - a. **Faculty:** funding, honours and awards, and commitment to student mentoring;
 - b. **Students:** admission averages, scholarly output, success rates in provincial and national scholarships, competitions, awards and commitment to professional and transferable skills;
 - c. **Program:** evidence of a program structure and faculty research that will ensure the intellectual quality of the student experience.
- Sufficient graduate level courses that students will be able to meet the requirement that two-thirds of their course requirements be met through courses at this level.

2.6. Schedule

The Provost, in consultation with the Deans, shall determine an eight-year schedule for the review of all programs and shall identify the academic units responsible for those programs. Under very exceptional circumstances, a Dean may request, in writing, either the review of a particular program or a delay in a scheduled review.

The Provost, in consultation with the Deans, shall confirm by January 31st, two years in advance of the site visit, the programs to be reviewed and shall report this information to the February meeting of Senate.

By March 1st, the academic unit will have identified a lead author and shall establish a committee, comprised of faculty, staff and students, to develop its Self Study. The composition of the Committee shall be reported to the Dean(s) and the AVPA.

In October, one year in advance of the site visit, the Office of the AVPA will conduct an orientation session for those responsible for Self Studies in academic units and

programs designated to be reviewed in the subsequent year. This session will include a review of the process, the required contents of the Self Study document and the nature of the data being provided to inform the review process.

In January Institutional Analysis and Planning (IA&P) will provide the unit with student and alumni survey results. Following the November 1 headcount report, IA&P will provide each academic unit with historical and current data as a starting point for inclusion and analysis in the unit's Self Study.

2.7. Preparation of the Self Study

The Self Study prepared by the Unit provides the foundational document by which the reviewers will undertake their evaluation of the academic quality of the programs offered. As such, the Self Study should be broad-based, reflective, forward-looking and will include a critical analysis of the Unit and the academic programs offered. Under the leadership of a Lead Author a committee comprised of faculty, staff and students, in consultation with all faculty, staff and students associated with the program, prepares an effective Self Study that meets the above goal. The input of others deemed to be relevant and useful, such as graduates of the program, representatives of industry, the professions, practical training programs and employers must also be included.

At the end of the academic year immediately preceding the year of the scheduled site visit, a member of ARC will be identified as the main reader of the unit's Self Study. The reader serves as a conduit to ARC and works with the lead author to ensure that the Self Study addresses all of the evaluation criteria contained in Section 2.5 of the IQAP.

It is expected that the Unit will consult with the relevant Dean(s) during the development of the Self Study. Prior to submission to the Office of the AVPA, a copy of the Self Study will be provided to the relevant Dean(s).

The completed Self Study is to be submitted to the Office of the AVPA by October 15. The lead author, or a unit representative, and the relevant Dean(s) attend ARC meetings where the Self Study is discussed.

The Self Study shall be confidential to the Reviewers, Deans, ARC and the Office of the AVPA and others as appropriate.

2.8. The Review Committee

For each review there shall be established a Review Committee which shall normally consist of:

- either one or two external reviewers for an undergraduate program review, two external reviewers for reviews of graduate programs (at least one of whom will be from outside Ontario), and two external reviewers for the integrated review of an undergraduate and graduate program (one from outside Ontario); and
- one internal reviewer who is a Brock faculty member from outside the Faculty (or interdisciplinary group) engaged in the program. This faculty

member is not required to have knowledge of the discipline, need not be someone familiar with the operation of the program under review should be at “arm’s length” and have experience in program development and delivery. He/she actively participates in the review; however the main task of writing the Reviewers’ Report shall fall to the external reviewers. In advance of the site visit, all internal reviewers will be invited to an orientation session.

Additional discretionary members may be assigned to the Review Committee where ARC so decides. Such additional members might be appropriately qualified and experienced individuals selected from industry or the professions, and/or, where consistent with the institution’s own policies and practices, student members.

Reviewers shall be at “arm’s length” from the program and to avoid the appearance of a conflict of interest, the reviewers should not:

- be a close friend or relative of a member of the unit undergoing the review;
- have been a research supervisor of a member of the unit, within the past six years;
- have been a graduate student of a member of the unit within the past six years;
- have collaborated with a member of the unit within the past six years or have plans to collaborate with them in the immediate future; or
- have been a visiting scholar/teacher in the unit in the past six years,

Full disclosure of all past affiliation(s) is required to assist in reviewer selection and to ensure an “arm’s length” relationship. The reviewers will be associate or full professors, or the equivalent, with program management experience.

By September 1st, the Unit shall develop and submit to the Office of the AVPA a list of at least six potential external reviewers and four potential internal reviewers, along with a brief profile on their area of expertise and qualifications for the task (if known). From this list the Dean(s) will be asked to provide a ranking of the nominees. Subsequently, the Provost, in consultation with the Dean(s), shall select a final Review Committee. On approval of the Self Study by ARC, the membership of the review team will be communicated to the Unit and the relevant Dean(s).

2.9. List of Interviewees

By September 1st, the unit shall prepare and submit, to the Office of the AVPA, a list of names of those individuals to be interviewed by the reviewers. The Office of the AVPA will coordinate the scheduling of meetings between those identified by the Unit and the reviewers for the site visit.

Interviewees shall include:

- Chair/Director
- all faculty associated with the Unit (including cross-appointed and limited term faculty, if appropriate);
- administrative staff associated with the Unit;

- a representative sample of students associated with the program (with no faculty present);
- representatives of the Library;
- faculty from cognate disciplines;
- for units with Co-op programs, representatives of the Co-op Office;
- the Provost;
- the relevant Dean(s); and,
- others as deemed appropriate.

2.10. Site Visit and Report

The Office of the AVPA shall forward the approved Self Study and any related materials to the reviewers.

The reviewers shall conduct an on-site visit, preferably at the same time. The length of the on-site visit will normally be two days but three days when required (e.g., for larger units or for combined reviews), with a portion of the second/third day allocated to preliminary preparation of their report.

The Office of the AVPA, in consultation with the relevant Dean(s), shall provide an on-site orientation for the Reviewers. The purpose of this orientation is to ensure that the reviewers:

1. Understand their role and obligations;
2. Identify and commend the program's notably strong and creative attributes;
3. Describe the program's respective strengths, areas for improvement and opportunities for enhancement;
4. Recommend specific steps to be taken to improve the program, distinguishing between those the program can itself take and those that require external action;
5. Recognize the University's autonomy to determine priorities for funding, space, and faculty allocation; and,
6. Respect the confidentiality required for all aspects of the review process.

In accordance with the evaluation criteria outlined above (Section 2.5), the reviewers will be invited to:

- assess, from an external point of view, the validity of the Self Study as an analysis of the program and its current condition; and,
- provide an external perspective on the program in terms of its comparability with similar programs elsewhere, its stature on a national scale, and its success in producing excellent graduates.

An Outcome Category is assigned individually to each program at the conclusion of the review as follows:

Excellent Quality	The program is of excellent quality with strong student demand and a national or international reputation for producing high quality graduates. Few changes are required. There will be a commitment to maintain the leadership role of the program and perhaps enhance program
----------------------	---

	strength.
Good Quality	The program shows academic vigour and continuing student demand. The program is progressive and produces good quality graduates. With attention to minor weaknesses, it will maintain its place as a standard program of the University.
Good Quality With Concerns	The program shows continuing vitality. The review has identified weaknesses that must be addressed. There is confidence that implementation of the action plan will address the reviewers' concerns and move the program to Good Quality status. There will be a commitment to maintain program strength.
Non-Viable	The program has shown fundamental deficiencies and little academic vitality over an extended period. No realistic plan is available to improve the program to Good Quality. The program will be recommended for closure.

Within four weeks of the site visit, the reviewers shall submit their report to the Office of the AVPA,

The report should be organized as follows:

- Executive Summary
- Outcome Category (See above)
- Outline of the Visit
- Program Strengths
- Feedback on each of the Evaluation Criteria within Section 2.5 of the IQAP
- Other Issues
- Recommendations
- Confidential Recommendations/Comments

A report template is available and is provided to the reviewers to assist in drafting their report.

The Reviewers' Report will not be treated as a public document, however any and all recommendations shall be treated as public information. Also, if deemed warranted by the reviewers, they may submit confidential recommendations and/or comments relating to personnel issues or other matters specifically involving individuals. These will be treated as confidential to the Dean(s), the academic unit and ARC.

The Office of the AVPA will distribute copies of the Reviewers' Report to the academic Unit, the Dean(s), ARC, and UPC and/or SGSC (as appropriate), with the exclusion of any confidential recommendations/comments as appropriate.

2.11. Comments/Responses

2.11.1. Academic Unit Response

The academic unit shall develop a response, within four weeks of receiving the report, to the comments, observations and recommendations contained in the Reviewers'

Report and shall submit that response to the Office of the AVPA, who shall then submit it to ARC.

If the reviewers have submitted confidential recommendations, the unit response, if any, will be treated as confidential to the Dean(s) and ARC.

2.11.2. UPC/SGSC Response

The UPC or SGSC shall be invited to provide comment on the Reviewers' Report and shall submit any such comments to the Office of the AVPA (normally within four weeks of receiving the report). In formulating their response to the Report, UPC and SGSC shall address the reviewer's recommendations and how they align with respect to current policies, procedures and guidelines of the University. As well UPC and SGSC are to address the broader implications that implementation of the specific recommendations, which lie outside the evaluation criteria (Section 2.5) used by ARC in its assessment of the program, would have on the institution as a whole.

2.11.3. Decanal Response

Upon receipt, copies of the Unit response and the responses from UPC and/or SGSC, as appropriate, will be forwarded to the Dean(s).

After consultation with the Provost and the academic unit, the relevant Dean(s) shall submit to the Office of the AVPA his/her/their responses to:

- the recommendations advanced by the reviewers; and
- the unit's response to the Reviewers' Report.

This response will also describe:

- any changes in organization, policy or governance that would be necessary to meet the recommendations;
- the resources, financial and otherwise, that would be required in supporting the implementation of selected recommendations; and
- a proposed timeline for the implementation of any of those recommendations.

2.12. Final Assessment Report

After examining all materials submitted by the unit, the Dean(s), and the appropriate Senate Committee (UPC or SCGS), ARC shall prepare a draft Final Assessment Report.

This report will:

- identify the significant strengths of the program;
- assign an outcome category
- identify opportunities for program improvement and enhancement;
- summarize responses to each recommendation;
- identify and explain the circumstances relating to any recommendations that will not be implemented;
- set out and prioritize the recommendations that are selected for implementation;
- include an Implementation Plan that identifies:
 - who will be responsible for approving the recommendations set out in the Final Assessment Report;

- who will be responsible for providing any resources made necessary by those recommendations;
- who will be responsible for acting on those recommendations; and
- the timelines for acting on and monitoring the implementation of those recommendations.

At each meeting where ARC considers the draft FAR for a given cyclical review, a representative of that unit and the relevant Dean(s) shall be invited to attend and to participate in the discussion and address any questions raised.

Prior to the FAR being forwarded to Senate for approval, the Unit, Dean(s) and any other academic or administrative offices identified in the implementation plan of the FAR will be asked to review and provide comment to ARC.

The Final Assessment Report (excluding confidential information) shall be submitted to Senate for consideration.

2.13. Quality Council Submission

After approval of the Final Assessment Report by Senate, the Office of the AVPA will submit all required documentation to the Quality Council.

2.14. Publication of Results

Following Senate approval, the FAR will be posted on the University Quality Assurance website. Other documents (Self Study, Reviewers' Report and responses to the Reviewers' report) will not be made publically accessible.

2.15. Monitoring of Review Results

Annually following Senate approval of the FAR, each Dean shall provide to ARC a FAR Implementation Report describing the status in implementing recommendations for their respective units that have undergone a cyclical review. At a fall meeting of Senate ARC will report on the FAR Implementation Reports received and post them on the University Quality Assurance website.

Within four years of the date of Senate approval of the Final Assessment Report, the unit will submit to ARC a report documenting the implementation of the various recommendations noted in the Final Assessment Report.

Upon approval, ARC will report to Senate on Four-Year Reports received and post them on the University Quality Assurance website.

2.16. Report to Board of Trustees

The Provost shall report annually to the Board of Trustees the results of all program reviews.

3. NEW PROGRAM APPROVALS

3.1. General Framework

The review and assessment of new programs to be introduced by the University is mandated by the Quality Council and as such, all new programs will be subject to an academic assessment prior to being offered. The Provost, as the authoritative contact with the Quality Council, communicates the results of the assessment process to the Quality Council upon Senate's approval of the new program. In addition, the Provost also forwards any new program proposals, approved by the Quality Council, to MTCU.

For the purposes of this IQAP, a new program is defined in Section 1.2.

ARC shall oversee the appraisal of new programs. The Terms of Reference and composition of ARC are set out in Faculty Handbook II: 9.13. (see: http://www.brocku.ca/university-secretariat/facultyhandbook/section2#_genIndex46)

The appraisal of new programs shall be carried out under the general supervision of the Provost and the appropriate Deans. For new undergraduate programs, the appropriate Dean(s) shall be the Dean(s) of the Faculty (or Faculties) within which the proposed program will reside. For new graduate programs, the appropriate Deans shall be both the Dean of Graduate Studies and the Dean(s) of the relevant Faculty (or Faculties).

3.2. Timeframe

A Statement of Intent (SOI) can be submitted at any time by any group of individuals intending to introduce a new program. The timeframe from submission of the SOI to approval by Senate will take on the order of 18 months. Proponents are advised to plan their submission accordingly.

3.3. Process Summary

Phase I - Statement of Intent Phase

Anytime	Proponent prepares a Statement of Intent (SOI) and submits it to the Office of the AVPA. SOI is posted on the University Quality Assurance website, for a 21 day consultation period, with notice sent to the University community requesting comments.
4 weeks following the posting period	Proponents and Dean(s) attend ARC meeting where SOI is considered. The Proponents will be asked to address comments received during the posting period. ARC determines whether the program meets the appropriate criteria and confirms the resources (financial, human and physical) required for the program are identified and committed/confirmed. On the basis of its evaluation of the SOI, ARC will: i. request the Proponents to revise and resubmit the SOI; or, ii. approve the SOI with the Proponents directed to develop a Program Proposal Brief (PPB); or, iii. reject the SOI.
Upon Approval	PPB developed by Proponents.

NOTE: The time from approval of the SOI to submission of the PPB will vary for each individual program. Approved SOIs will expire 24 months after approval if a PPB is not submitted.

Phase II - Program Proposal Brief Phase

Upon Approval of the SOI Within 2 years of SOI approval	PPB developed by Proponents. During development of the PPB the Proponents consult with the relevant Dean(s). Proponent submits PPB to the Office of the AVPA. Proponent submits: 1) a list of proposed reviewers (external and internal), including a brief profile of each nominee; and 2) a list of interviewees, to the Office of the AVPA.
2 weeks 2 weeks	Reviewers are ranked by the Dean(s) . Provost selects reviewers in consultation with the Dean(s) . Reviewers contacted by the Office of the AVPA and upon confirmation logistics for site visit developed. PPB sent to the relevant Dean(s) by the Office of the AVPA for review and comment (SOI and any comments received during the posting period are provided). ARC considers the PPB. Proponent and Dean(s) attend ARC meeting where PPB is discussed. Identification of required changes/ additions/modifications to be completed by Proponents. On the basis of its evaluation of the PPB, ARC will: i. approve the PPB; or, ii. request the Proponents to revise the PPB for resubmission; or, iii. Reject the PPB. On approval of the PPB, the membership of the review team will be communicated to the Proponents and the relevant Dean(s). Office of the AVPA sets schedule for site visit. PPB forwarded to Reviewers.
November Jan - Apr Feb - May	Internal Reviewer Orientation. Site Visit, timing dependent on Reviewers' availability. Reviewers' Report submitted to the Office of the AVPA, 4 weeks after site visit. Upon receipt, the Office of the AVPA forwards Reviewers' Report to the Proponents, Dean(s), UPC and/or SGSC. Timing varies for each review, dependent on date for the site visit. Proponent, UPC or SGSC submit responses to the Reviewers' Report to the Office of the AVPA, within 4 week of receipt. Dean(s) responds on receipt of Proponents and UPC/SGSC responses. Proponents in consultation with the Dean(s) submits a revised PPB to ARC ARC considers the revised PPB, in the context of the Reviewers' Report and the responses from UPC, SGSC with input from the relevant Dean(s). (Dean(s) and Proponent attend ARC meeting). On the basis of its evaluation of the PPB ARC will: i. request the Proponents to revise and resubmit the PPB; or, ii. approve the PPB and recommend to Senate for approval; or, iii. reject the PPB. If further changes are required, the Proponents will submit a revised PPB to the Office of the AVPA for approval. ARC submits to Senate the final PPB and seeks Senate approval to go forward to the Quality Council for final approval. Proponents prepare a draft calendar submission for UPC or SGSC.
Upon Approval	ARC forwards the final PPB, together with supporting documentation to the Quality Council.
Upon Approval	Subsequent to receiving the Quality Council's response, ARC reports to UPC or SGSC, which will review the new program's calendar copy and bring the final calendar copy forward to Senate for approval and commencement of the program.
Upon Approval	Program added to the list of programs for cyclical review. Once the Quality Council has approved the program to commence, the program will be submitted to MTCU for approval and funding (if eligible)

3.4. Statement of Intent

Any unit or group of units intending to introduce a new program must first submit a Statement of Intent (SOI) to the Office of the AVPA.

A Statement of Intent shall include:

- a description of the program, clearly stating the purpose, structure and pedagogical rationale, including an explanation for the degree nomenclature;
- details of the existing and new resources, especially space needs, required to mount the program;
- an explanation as to how the program fits with the University's academic plan;
- evidence of consultation with all academic units affected;
- evidence of consultation regarding space needs for the proposed program;
- evidence of student demand including projected enrollments;
- evidence of societal need;
- evidence that any duplicative similarities to existing programs, internally, provincially or nationally, are justifiable for reasons of public funding;
- certification from the relevant Dean(s) that the new degree/major is an appropriate and desirable addition to the academic programs of the University. For new undergraduate programs, the relevant Dean(s) shall be the Dean(s) of the Faculty (or Faculties) within which the program will reside. For new graduate programs, the appropriate Deans shall be both the Dean of Graduate Studies and the Dean(s) of the relevant Faculty (or Faculties); and,
- any participating department(s)/centre(s) must provide evidence indicating the extent to which they are prepared to contribute.

For programs intending to commence in September of any given year, the SOI must be submitted at least 18 months in advance, i.e. by March 1st, in order to ensure sufficient time for completion of the review process.

On receipt of a SOI for a New Program, it will be posted for a 21 day consultation phase to the University community.

Normally, within four weeks of the close of the consultation phase, the program Proponents will be invited to attend an ARC meeting to present the SOI and address comments received as a result of the consultation phase.

On the basis of its evaluation of the SOI, ARC will:

- i. request Proponents to revise and resubmit the SOI; or,
- ii. approve the SOI with the Proponents directed to develop a Program Proposal Brief (PPB); or,
- iii. reject the SOI.

If the SOI is rejected by ARC, the Proponents must wait 24 months before resubmitting the SOI.

Approved SOIs will expire 24 months after approval if a PPB is not submitted.

3.5. Evaluation Criteria

If the Statement of Intent is approved by ARC, the unit(s) shall prepare a Program Proposal Brief which will address the following criteria:

3.5.1. Objectives

- Consistency of the program with the institution's mission and academic plans.
- Clarity and appropriateness of the program's requirements and associated learning outcomes in addressing the institution's undergraduate or graduate Degree Level Expectations.
- Appropriateness of degree nomenclature.

NOTE: Proponents are advised that a curriculum map that links course learning outcomes to articulated program learning outcomes mapped to the DLEs must be included in the Proposal Brief. As part of this process, Proponents must also document and demonstrate the methods by which the performance level of students, based on the learning outcomes, will be assessed.

3.5.2. Admission Requirements

- Appropriateness of the program's admission requirements for the learning outcomes established for completion of the program.
- Sufficient explanation of alternative requirements, if any, for admission into a graduate, second-entry or undergraduate program, such as minimum grade point average, additional language requirements or portfolios, along with how the program assesses and recognizes prior work or learning experience.

3.5.3. Structure

- Appropriateness of the program's structure and regulations to meet specified program learning outcomes and degree level expectations.
- For graduate programs, a clear rationale for program length that ensures that the program requirements can be reasonably completed within the proposed time period.

3.5.4. Program Content

- Ways in which the curriculum addresses the current state of the discipline or area of study.
- Identification of any unique curriculum or program innovations or creative components.
- For research-focused graduate programs, clear indication of the nature and suitability of the major research requirements for degree completion.
- Evidence that each graduate student in the program is required to take a minimum of two-thirds of the course requirements from among graduate level courses.

3.5.5. Mode(s) of Delivery

- The appropriateness of the proposed mode(s) of delivery in meeting the program's intended learning outcomes and degree level expectations.

3.5.6. Assessment of Teaching and Learning

- Appropriateness of the proposed methods for the assessment of student achievement of the intended program learning outcomes and degree level expectations.

- Completeness of plans for documenting and demonstrating the level of performance of students, consistent with the institution's statement of its degree level expectations.
- 3.5.7. Student Demand
- Evidence that there is a demand for the new degree/program on the part of potential students. This will include projected enrolment levels (and the bases for those projections), application statistics, projected origins of student demand (e.g., domestic or international), and the duration of the projected demand.
- 3.5.8. Societal Need
- Evidence that there is a need for graduates of the proposed degree/major on the part of society. This may include the availability of positions upon graduation (e.g., by letters from potential employers or governmental agencies). In the case of professional programs, their congruence with the regulatory requirements of the profession must be assessed.
- 3.5.9. Resources for All Programs
- Adequacy of the administrative unit's planned utilization of existing human, physical and financial resources, and any institutional commitment to supplement those resources, to support the program.
 - Clearly identified core and participating faculty complement delivering the program.
 - Participation of a sufficient number and quality of faculty who are competent to teach and/or supervise in the program.
 - Evidence that there are adequate resources to sustain the quality of scholarship produced by undergraduate students as well as graduate students' scholarship and research activities, including library support, information technology support and laboratory access.
- 3.5.10. Resources for Graduate Programs Only
- Evidence that faculty have the current and relevant research or professional/clinical expertise needed to sustain the program, promote innovation and foster an appropriate intellectual climate.
 - Where appropriate to the program, evidence that financial assistance for students will be sufficient to ensure adequate quality and numbers of students.
 - Evidence of how supervisory loads will be distributed, and the qualifications and appointment status of faculty who will provide instruction and supervision.
- 3.5.11. Resources for Undergraduate Programs Only
- Evidence of and planning for adequate numbers and quality of:
 - faculty and staff to achieve the goals of the program; or
 - plans and the commitment to provide the necessary resources in step with the implementation of the program;
 - planned/anticipated class sizes;
 - provision of supervision of experiential learning opportunities (if required); and,
 - the role of adjunct and part-time faculty.

3.5.12. Quality and Other Indicators

Definition and use of indicators that provide evidence of quality of the faculty (e.g., qualifications, research/scholarly activity or creative work, innovation and scholarly record; appropriateness of collective faculty expertise to contribute substantively to the proposed program).

Evidence of a program structure and faculty research that will ensure the intellectual quality of the student experience.

3.5.13. Program Duplication

The Proponents must provide convincing evidence that any duplicative similarities to existing programs in Ontario/Canada are justifiable for reasons of public funding.

3.5.14. Fields in a Graduate Program (optional)

If a graduate program wishes to have a Quality Council endorsed field, the following statement is required:

The master's program comprises the following fields:... *[list, as applicable]*

The PhD program comprises the following fields: ... *[list, as applicable]*

3.6. Program Proposal Brief

The Office of the AVPA publishes a Program Proposal Brief Manual that will provide administrative details with respect to review policies and practices (see <http://www.brocku.ca/vp-academic/quality-assurance>).

The manual provides guidance on the preparation of rigorous, objective and reflective Program Proposal Brief and serves to reinforce the potential benefits that can accrue from an effective Brief. The Manual specifies the format required for the Brief and the contents to be included. In the instance of a discrepancy between the IQAP and the PPB Manual, the IQAP will take precedence.

The Proponents shall submit the PPB to the Office of the AVPA. Upon receipt and prior to its consideration by ARC, the PPB shall be forwarded to the relevant Dean(s) for review and comment. After consideration, ARC shall:

- i. approve the PPB; or,
- ii. request the Proponent to revise the PPB for re-submission; or,
- iii. reject the PPB.

Proponents of a new program and the relevant Dean(s) shall be invited to attend the ARC meetings where the PPB is discussed.

The PPB will be treated as confidential to the relevant Dean(s), the reviewers, ARC, the Office of the AVPA and others as appropriate.

3.7. Reviewers

At the time of submission of a PPB the Proponents will provide the Office of the AVPA with a list of six potential external reviewers and four potential internal reviewers to undertake the appraisal, along with a brief profile on their area of expertise and

qualifications for the task (if known). From this list the Dean(s) will be asked to provide the Provost with a ranking of the nominees prior to the Provost making the final selection of the Review Committee.

For each review there shall be established a Review Committee which shall normally consist of:

- either one or two external reviewers for a new undergraduate program, or two external reviewers for a new graduate program (at least one of whom will be from outside Ontario); and
- one internal reviewer who is a Brock faculty member from outside the Faculty (or interdisciplinary group) proposing the program. This faculty member need not be someone familiar with the operation of the proposed program (still at “arm’s length”) but will have experience with program development and delivery. He/she actively participates in the review; however the main task of writing the Reviewers’ Report shall fall to the external reviewers. In advance of the site visit the Internal Reviewer shall be invited to an orientation session.

Additional discretionary members may be assigned to the Review Committee where ARC so decides. Such additional members might be appropriately qualified and experienced people selected from industry or the professions.

Reviewers shall be at “arm’s length” from the participants in the proposed program and to avoid the appearance of a conflict of interest, the reviewers should not:

- be a close friend or relative of a participant in the proposed program;
- have been a research supervisor of a participant in the proposed program, within the past six years;
- have been a graduate student of a participant in the proposed program within the past six years;
- have collaborated with a participant of the proposed program within the past six years or have plans to collaborate with them in the immediate future; or,
- have been a visiting scholar/teacher in the unit in the past six years.

Full disclosure of all past affiliation(s) is required to assist in the selection and to ensure an “arm’s length” relationship. The reviewers will normally be associate or full professors, or the equivalent, with program management experience.

The external review of a new graduate program must incorporate an on-site visit. The external review of a new undergraduate program proposal will normally be conducted on site.

Once confirmed the membership of the Review Committee will be communicated to the Proponents and the relevant Dean(s).

3.8. List of Interviewees

At the time of submission of the PPB, the Proponents shall prepare and submit, to the Office of the AVPA, a list of names of those individuals to be interviewed by the reviewers. The Office of the AVPA will coordinate the scheduling of meetings between those individuals identified and the reviewers during the site visit.

Interviewees shall include:

- all faculty to be associated with the proposed program (including cross-appointed and limited term faculty, if appropriate);
- administrative staff to be associated with the program;
- if possible, a representative sample of students who might be associated with the program;
- representatives of the Library;
- faculty from cognate disciplines;
- the Provost;
- the relevant Dean(s), and
- others as deemed appropriate.

3.9. Site Visit and Report

The Office of the AVPA shall forward the approved PPB and any related materials to the reviewers.

The Office of the AVPA, in consultation with the Proponents and the relevant Dean(s), shall establish a time frame for the review.

The reviewers shall conduct an on-site visit, preferably at the same time. The length of the on-site visit normally will be two days, with a portion of the second day allocated to preliminary preparation of their report. In consultation with the relevant Dean(s), the Office of the AVPA shall provide an on-site orientation session for all reviewers and provide them with guidelines for the conduct of the review.

The reviewers will normally provide a joint report that appraises the standards and quality of the proposed program and addresses the criteria set out in Section 3.5 above, including the associated faculty and material resources. They will also be invited to acknowledge any clearly innovative aspects of the proposed program together with recommendations on any essential or otherwise desirable modifications to it. The reviewers may submit recommendations and/or comments relating to personnel issues or other matters specifically involving individuals that will be treated as confidential.

The reviewers shall submit their report to the Office of the AVPA, normally within four weeks of the site visit. The Reviewers' Report will remain confidential to the Proponents, the Dean(s), the Provost and ARC.

The Reviewers' Report should be organized according to the evaluation criteria listed in Section 3.5 above, with particular attention to learning outcomes, modes of delivery, and suggested improvements to the program. A report template is available and is provided to the reviewers to assist in drafting their report.

Upon receipt the Reviewers' Report the Office of the AVPA will distribute copies of the Report to:

- the Proponents;
- either the UPC (for undergraduate programs) or the SGSC (for graduate programs);

- the relevant Dean(s); and
- ARC.

3.10. Proponents Response

Within four weeks of receiving the Reviewers' Report the Proponents shall develop a response to the comments, observations and recommendations contained in the report and shall submit that response to the Office of the AVPA.

The Proponents response will be treated as a public document. However, if the reviewers have submitted confidential comments, the Proponents response, if any, to those comments will be treated as confidential to the Dean(s) and ARC.

3.11. UPC/SGSC Response

Within four week of receiving the Reviewers' Report UPC or SGSC shall develop a response to the comments, observations and recommendations contained in the report and submit such a response to the Office of the AVPA. In formulating their response to the Report, UPC and SGSC shall address the reviewer's recommendations and how they align with respect to current policies, procedures and guidelines of the University. As well UPC and SGSC are to address the broader implications that implementation of the specific recommendations, which lie outside the evaluation criteria (Section 3.5) used by ARC in its assessment of the program, would have on the institution as a whole.

3.12. Decanal Response

The Office of the AVPA will forward the Proponents and UPC/SGSC responses to the relevant Dean(s), who, after consultation with the Provost, shall submit to the Office of the AVPA his/her/their responses to:

- the recommendations advanced by the Reviewers; and the unit's response to the Reviewers' Report; and will describe:
- any changes in organization, policy or governance that would be necessary to meet the recommendations;
- the resources, financial and otherwise, that would be provided in supporting the implementation of selected recommendations; and
- a proposed timeline for the implementation of any of those recommendations.

3.13. Program Proposal Brief Revision

The Proponents, in consultation with the relevant Dean(s), undertake a revision of the PPB, taking into consideration the Reviewers' Report and all responses received. The changes incorporated in the PPB in response to the comments received should be clearly identified in the revised document. The revised PPB is submitted to the Office of the AVPA.

3.14. Assessment

ARC considers the revised PPB, in the context of the Reviewers' Report and the responses received to the report. The Proponents and the relevant Dean(s) attend the ARC meeting where the revised PPB is discussed.

On the basis of its evaluation of the PPB, ARC will:

- i. request the Proponents to revise and resubmit the PPB; or,
- ii. approve the PPB and recommend to Senate for approval; or,
- iii. reject the PPB.

If further changes are required, the Proponents will resubmit the revised PPB to the Office of the AVPA.

ARC submits to Senate the final PPB and seeks Senate approval of the new program. Upon Senate approval, the Office of the AVPA will forward the final PPB, together with supporting documentation to the QC for approval.

At this time the Proponents should prepare a draft calendar submission for the new program to be forwarded to UPC or SGSC for consideration.

At this point Brock may announce its intention to offer the program, provided that clear indication is given that approval by the QC is pending and that no offers of admission will be made until and unless the program is approved by the QC.

3.15. Publication of Results

Following approval by Senate, the final Program Proposal Brief will be posted on the University Quality Assurance website.

3.16. Report to Board of Trustees

The Provost shall report annually to the Board of Trustees on all new programs approved by Senate and the Quality Council during the preceding year.

3.17. Subsequent Processes

After a new program is approved (by both the Quality Council and Senate) to commence, the program must begin within twenty-four months of the date of Senate approval.

Four years after admitting its first students, a new program must submit to ARC a progress report reflecting its Program Proposal Brief as approved by Senate and the Quality Council.

The first cyclical review for any new program will occur no later than eight years of the date of the program's initial enrolment in accordance with the University's academic review schedule.

4. MODIFICATIONS TO EXISTING PROGRAMS

4.1. Request for Major Modification

Any unit or group of units intending to propose major modifications to an existing program must first submit a Request for Major Modification to ARC. Should UPC or SCGS determine that a proposal received as part of the Calendar construction process constitutes a major modification, it shall refer that proposal to ARC for its consideration.

Proponents are reminded that for Major Modifications requiring an expedited review (See IQAP Section 1.5), the Request must address the applicable elements of the quality assurance evaluation criteria employed for a full review as defined in Section 3.5.

A Request for Major Modification shall include:

- a detailed description of the changes to the program;
- the pedagogical rationale for the changes being proposed;
- impact of changes on students;
- details of the resource implications (if any) of the changes;
- an explanation as to how the revised program would fit with the University's academic plan;
- evidence of consultation with all affected academic units; and
- certification from the relevant Dean(s) that the proposed changes are appropriate and desirable revisions to the academic program of the University and a commitment that the modification will be appropriately resourced. For undergraduate programs, the relevant Dean(s) shall be the Dean(s) of the Faculty (or Faculties) within which the program resides. For graduate programs, the appropriate Deans shall be both the Dean of Graduate Studies and the Dean(s) of the relevant Faculty (or Faculties).

A Request for Major Modification can be submitted at any time. However, Departments/Centres should be aware of internal University calendar deadlines.

Where possible ARC shall provide a response to the unit within four weeks of receipt of the request. A representative of the program requesting a Major Modification and the relevant Dean(s) will be invited to attend the ARC meeting where the request is discussed.

4.2. Assessment

ARC will examine and evaluate all materials submitted by the Department/Centre related to the Request for a Major Modification. On the basis of its evaluation of the Request, ARC will:

- i. recommend to Senate that the Request be approved, based on the Request meeting the University's quality assurance standards; or,
- ii. direct the Department/Centre to revise and resubmit the Request to ARC for subsequent evaluation; or,
- iii. reject the Request.

In the event that the Request is rejected by ARC, the Proponents must wait 24 months before resubmitting the Request for consideration.

Final approval of the Request for a Major Modification lies with Senate.

5. APPROVAL AND REVIEW OF JOINT PROGRAMS OFFERED BY TWO OF MORE INSTITUTIONS

The introduction of new and the review of existing joint programs and other inter-institutional programs shall be governed by the IQAPs of the participating institution(s) granting the degree. Partner institutions may, but are not required, to use joint IQAPs (which require the same approval process as IQAPs for individual institutions). Whether a joint, or separately approved IQAP is used, or whether the separate institutions prefer to build their joint processes into their separate IQAPs, the following are suggested for inclusion in the IQAP related to both new program approval and cyclical program reviews.

The Provost will work with the partner institution's counterpart office to ensure that the requirements of both institution's quality assurance policies and procedures will be met such that duplication is reduced and streamlines the process as much as possible. Specifically:

- The Self Study/Program Proposal Brief clearly explains how input was received from faculty, staff and students at each partner institution.
- There will be a single Self Study, for cyclical reviews, or single Program Proposal Brief for new program approvals.
- The selection of reviewers involves participation by each partner institution.
- Where applicable, selection of the "internal" reviewer requires joint input:
 - If practical it would include one internal from each partner institution; and
 - It could give preference to an internal reviewer who is from another Joint program, preferably with the same partner institution
- The site visit involves all partner institutions and preferably all sites (with exceptions noted below). Reviewers shall consult with faculty, staff and students at each partner institution as part of the site visit.
- Feedback on the Reviewers' Report is solicited from participating units in each partner institution, including the Dean(s).
- Preparation of a Final Assessment Report and an Implementation Plan requires input from each partner.
- There is a single Final Assessment Report and Implementation Plan which goes through the appropriate governance process at each partner institution.
- The Final Assessment Report and Implementation Plan are posted on each university's respective website
- Partner institutions agree on an appropriate monitoring process for the Implementation Plan.

NOTE: For all inter-institutional programs in which all partners are institutions within Ontario, the Quality Council's standard for New Program Approval and Cyclical Program Review Processes will apply to all elements of

program regardless of which partner offers them, including Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology and Institutes of Technology and Advanced Learning. For joint and collaborative programs in which some partners are institutions outside of Ontario, the elements of the programs contributed by the out-of-province partner will be subject to the quality assurance processes in their respective jurisdictions. The Quality Council will maintain a directory of bodies whose post-secondary assurance processes are recognized and accepted as being comparable to our own. In cases where such recognition is not available, the Quality Council will determine, on a case-by-case basis, the appropriate action to be taken on quality assurance if the collaboration is to be permitted to proceed.

6. PROGRAM DISCONTINUATION

6.1. Request for Program Discontinuation

A Request for Program Discontinuation can be submitted at any time to ARC. However, the academic unit should be aware of internal University calendar deadlines.

A Request for Program Discontinuation shall include:

- name of the program
- name of the academic unit
- date of submission
- rationale for the proposed discontinuation
- details of the resource implications
- termination Plan and timing for discontinuation
A phased closure plan and timeline for the program discontinuation, taking into account the requirements of those students currently enrolled in the program to allow them to meet requirements for graduation and how resources of the program (human, physical and fiscal) will be redistributed.
- evidence and documentation of consultation
- certification from the relevant Dean(s) that the proposed discontinuation is appropriate and in line with the strategic direction of the Faculty. For undergraduate programs, the relevant Dean(s) shall be the Dean(s) of the Faculty (or Faculties) within which the program resides. For graduate programs, the relevant Deans shall be the Dean of Graduate Studies and the Dean(s) of the relevant Faculty (or Faculties).

On receipt of a Request for Program Discontinuation by ARC, it will be posted for a 21 day consultation phase to the University community.

Normally within 4 weeks of the close of the consultation phase, a representative of the proposing unit and the relevant Dean(s) will be invited to attend an ARC meeting to present the request and address the comments received during the consultation.

6.2. Assessment

After examining all materials received ARC shall:

- i. recommend to Senate that the program be discontinued;
- ii. direct the Proponents to revise and resubmit the Request for Program Discontinuation; or,
- iii. reject the Request.

6.3. Communication

Upon Senate's approval of the Request for Program Discontinuation, the decision will be posted on the University Quality Assurance website and communicated to the Quality Council.