



**Institutional Quality Assurance Process
(IQAP)**

LAURENTIAN UNIVERSITY INSTITUTIONAL QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESS (IQAP)

Ratified by the Quality Council June 2011

IQAP 2.0 Revised Version Approved by ACAPLAN : January 2017

IQAP 2.0 Revised Version Approved by Senate : 17 January 2017

IQAP 2.0 Sent to Quality Council – returned for modifications

IQAP 2.1 Revised version approved by ACAPLAN: June 2017

IQAP 2.1 Revised version approved by Senate: 22 June 2017

IQAP 2.1 Sent to Quality Council – returned for modifications

IQAP 2.2 Revised version approved by ACAPLAN: March 2018

IQAP 2.2 Revised version approved by Senate : March 2018

IQAP 2.2 Sent to Quality Council – returned for modifications

IQAP 2.3 Revised version approved by ACAPLAN: May 2018

IQAP 2.3 Revised version approved by Senate : June 2018

IQAP 2.3 Approved by Quality Council: June 2018

IQAP 2.4 Revised version approved by ACAPLAN: May 2019

IQAP 2.4 Revised version approved by Senate : June 2019

IQAP 2.4 Approved by Quality Council: August 2019

IQAP 2.5 Revised version approved by ACAPLAN: November 2020

IQAP 2.5 Revised version approved by Senate : December 15, 2020

IQAP 2.5 Approved by Quality Council: January 22, 2021

Table of Contents

1.0 - Introduction.....	5
1.1 - Federated, Affiliate and Other Partnerships.....	7
1.2 – Arm’s Length.....	7
1.3 Institutional Manual.....	8
2.0 - Process for New Program Approval.....	9
Flow Chart 1: Process for New Program Approval.....	13
2.1 - Process for New Program Approval (Hearst).....	14
2.2 - Review and Approval Process for New Graduate Programs – NOSM.....	15
Table 1: Review and Approval Process for new NOSM Graduate Programs	15
2.2.1 External Review Process.....	18
2.2.2 External Reviewer’s Report.....	18
3.0 - Process for Major Modification to Existing Programs.....	19
4.0 - Process for Cyclical Review of Existing Programs.....	23
4.1 - Process for Cyclical Review of Existing Programs (Hearst).....	28
4.2 - Programs with an Accreditation.....	29
4.3 - Cyclical Review of the Northern Ontario Medical School (NOSM) Programs.....	30
Table 2: Cyclical Review of Existing Programs: NOSM Review and Appraisal Process	32
Appendix A : Template for New Program	36
Appendix B – Evaluation Criteria.....	50
Appendix C – Template for Major Modification to Existing Programs.....	52
Appendix D - Core and Non-Core Programs.....	64
Attachment 1: Program Approval Categories.....	64
Attachment 2: Information the University Should Consider in Certifying Criteria Have Been Met.....	65
Attachment 3: 2009-2010 Program Approvals Certification Form.....	68
Attachment 4: 2009-10 Program Developments Report.....	69
Attachment 5: Program Approval Summary.....	70
Appendix E - Guidelines for the Program Self-Study, Existing Programs.....	72
Appendix F - Guidelines for the review of ongoing programs.....	78

Appendix G - Definitions.....81

Appendix H - Ontario Council of Academic Vice Presidents (OCAV) Guidelines for
University Undergraduate Degree Level Expectations.....88

Appendix I - OCGS Degree Level Expectations for Graduates of Each Credential.....91

Appendix J - TEMPLATE FOR REVIEWERS' REPORT FOR NEW PROGRAMS94

Appendix K - TEMPLATE FOR REVIEWERS' REPORT ON EXISTING PROGRAMS96

Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP)
Laurentian University

1.0 - Introduction

Laurentian University's Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP) is designed to be in compliance with the Quality Assurance Framework adopted by the publicly-assisted universities of the Province of Ontario.

The Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents (OCAV) has established the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (the Quality Council). The purpose of the Quality Council is to assure the relevant stakeholders—including students, faculty members, administrators, other educational institutions throughout the world, employers, governments and the public at large—that the undergraduate and graduate programs in Ontario universities meet high standards of quality. The Council operates at arm's length from universities and governments, to ensure its independence. Nevertheless, in establishing the Quality Council, OCAV has acknowledged that academic standards, quality assurance and program improvement are, in the first instance, the responsibility of the universities themselves.

This IQAP replaces the previous procedures for undergraduate program review (under UPRAC, the Undergraduate Program Review Audit Committee) and graduate program review (under OCGS, the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies). This IQAP becomes effective upon approval by the Quality Council (similarly for any revisions of this document). Under some circumstances, undergraduate and graduate programs may be reviewed together.

This IQAP derives its authority and legitimacy from the Quality Council, and also from the Academic Senate of Laurentian University, the body responsible for academic matters at the University. The authoritative contact between the IQAP and the Quality Council is the Provost. The Senate establishes that its Academic Planning Committee (ACAPLAN), chaired by the Provost, is responsible for the application and execution of the IQAP, and for the assurance of curricular quality assessment at Laurentian University. In fulfilling this responsibility, ACAPLAN works cooperatively with the Vice-presidents, the Deans, the Council of English Language Programs (CELP), le Conseil des programmes en français (CPF), the Faculty Councils and the academic units.

This IQAP outlines three processes:

1. Process for New Program Approval
 - New programs must be submitted to the Quality Council for approval.
2. Process for a Major Modification to Existing Programs
 - *The IQAP identifies what a Major Modification is.
 - Major modifications do not have to be submitted to the Quality Council for approval (with the exception to the addition of a new field to a graduate program) but the institution may choose to do so under an expedited process.
3. Process for Cyclical Review of Existing Programs
 - Laurentian University is responsible for cyclical reviews, and must report the outcomes to the Quality Council.

A fourth process exists in the Quality Assurance framework, namely an Audit Process, under which the Quality Council examines each university's adherence to its approved processes in the first three categories. The Quality Council itself is responsible for establishing the Audit Process.

PROGRAM TYPOLOGY AND QUALITY COUNCIL (QC) INVOLVEMENT

Program Type (See Appendix G For Definitions)	IQAP	New Program Approval	Expedited Approval Process	Cyclical Program Review	Audit Sample Eligibility
Diploma: Graduate for-credit	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
Degree Program (Undergraduate And Graduate)	Yes	Yes	Yes, if Graduate Collaborative Program or Field Addition	Yes, for Graduate	Yes, for Graduate
Program of Specialization, e.g. major, honours, specialization	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Emphasis, Option, Minor or similar	Yes	Only if part of new Program	No	No	No
Major Modification (Annual reports to The QC on all Major Modifications)	Yes	N/A	Yes, only if QC approval requested by University or if it is a Field Addition	N/A	Yes

1.1 - Federated, Affiliate and Other Partnerships

Laurentian University operates in partnership with its three Federated Universities (University of Sudbury, Thorneloe University and Huntington University) whose academic departments offer courses leading to Laurentian University degrees. All Laurentian University academic regulations apply to these programs and each institution has representation on Senate. In addition, Laurentian University offers its degree programs at various College sites including St-Lawrence College, Northern College, Sault College, Cambrian College and Collège Boréal; again all Laurentian University academic regulations apply to these programs and they are reviewed through Laurentian University. Laurentian University is also responsible for the programs at the Université de Hearst, an affiliate. Laurentian University also has a unique partnership with Lakehead University to offer the degree programs of the Northern Ontario School of Medicine (NOSM), and we have established a separate protocol for the evaluation of the NOSM program.

- A) For our Federated partners, the normal Laurentian IQAP process is followed. Each Federated University has a different collective agreement than Laurentian, as well as some financial autonomy. The Federated Universities' course offerings are highly integrated in the Laurentian offerings, and students on campus in Sudbury are free to take courses from any of the Federated Universities or Laurentian. Ultimately, the Laurentian Senate deals with the academic aspects of the Federated Universities' programs. Given this reality, the Laurentian IQAP has an additional step for Federated Universities which includes the University President. The Federated University Presidents have important information to provide to both new program and cyclical reviews as they can speak to the financial aspects of the program, such as hiring or replacement of new faculty members.
- B) L'Université de Hearst is 600 km away from the Sudbury campus. Degrees are jointly attributed by Laurentian and Hearst. L'Université de Hearst receives funding directly from MAESD, independently from Laurentian University. Students can apply directly to Hearst. That being said, the Laurentian Senate is responsible for the academic quality of programs in Hearst. Given the structure of Hearst, where programs are run independently from Laurentian once approved, an adjusted IQAP process was required in order to better serve the quality assurance purposes of the exercise. The process used for Hearst programs includes an important role by both Laurentian and Hearst to reflect the academic and fiscal realities of both institutions.
- C) Laurentian University has a large number of collaborative programs with colleges around the province. These collaborations follow the same curriculum as its equivalent Laurentian program, and as such would follow the Laurentian IQAP.
- D) The Northern Ontario School of Medicine (NOSM) serves as the Faculty of Medicine of Lakehead University, Thunder Bay and Faculty of Medicine of Laurentian University, Sudbury. The School offers an M.D. program, and other programs for physicians. NOSM is governed by the Senates of both Laurentian and Lakehead. NOSM has its own Board, as well as a committee structure of its own for curriculum questions. Given these multiple differences with normal programs at Laurentian, a specific IQAP structure must be developed for both new programs being proposed, or for cyclical reviews of existing programs.

1.2 – Arm's Length

The reviewers will be at arm's length from the program under review, and be active and respected in their field. (See the [QAF Guide - Choosing Arm's Length Reviewers](#) for information and examples.)

In summary, “Arm’s length does not mean that the reviewer must never have met or even heard of a single member of the program. It does mean that reviewers should not be chosen who are likely, or perceived to be likely, to be predisposed, positively or negatively, about the program. Arm’s length means that reviewers/consultants must not be close friends, current or recent collaborators, former supervisors, advisors or colleagues.

External reviewers/consultants should have a strong track record as academic scholars and ideally should also have had academic administrative experience in such roles as undergraduate or graduate program coordinators, department chair, dean, graduate dean or associated positions. This combination of experience allows a reviewer to provide the most valuable feedback on program proposals and reviews.” (QAF)

Reviewers cannot be current or recent collaborators, former supervisors, advisors or colleagues of members of the unit/program. Arm’s length does not mean that the reviewer must never have met or even heard of a member of the program. It does mean that reviewers should not be chosen who are likely, or perceived to be likely, to be predisposed to view the program or unit either positively or negatively.

Reviewer/Faculty relationships that may violate the arm’s length requirement:

- A previous member of the program or department under review (including being a visiting professor).
- Received a graduate degree from the program under review.
- A regular co-author and research collaborator with a member of the program, within the past seven years, and especially if that collaboration is ongoing.
- Close friend or family relationship with a member of the program.
- A regular or repeated external examiner of dissertations by doctoral students in the program.
- The doctoral supervisor of one or more members of the program.

1.3 Institutional Manual

The present document will act as the Institutional Manual (QAF 4.2.8) for Laurentian University’s IQAP process.

2.0 - Process for New Program Approval

All the steps are compulsory. The proposal may be stopped at any step, if not approved.

In what follows, the plural is understood when appropriate.

The sequence of approval for a new program is:

1. Proposal initiated by a department/school/planning group
2. Submission to the Dean
3. Submission to the Provost's office
4. External review
5. Response by initiators and by the Dean to the external review
6. Submission to and approval by the relevant Faculty Council
7. If the new program is at the graduate level, submission to and approval by the Graduate Council
8. Submission to and approval by the Council of English Language Programs (CELP) or Conseil des programmes en français (CPF), as appropriate
9. Submission to and approval by the Academic Planning Committee (ACAPLAN)
 - a) must consult with the Budget Committee and other appropriate university bodies to assess resource needs and availability
10. Submission to and approval by Senate
11. Once it is approved at Senate, a notice can be sent out to announce the intention to offer the new program pending approval by the Quality Council. No offers of admission can be made until the program is approved by the Council.
12. Submission to and approval by the Quality Council
13. If the new program is "Non-Core," submission to the Provincial Government for funding
14. Program reported to the Board of Governors, for information
15. Program instituted within thirty six months of Quality Council approval
16. Ongoing program monitored by the Dean
17. Cyclical review within eight years of first enrolment.

An explanation of these steps follows

1. The initial proposal by the department/school/planning group is made according to the "New Program Template" which is attached as Appendix A to this IQAP. The new program proposal must address the evaluation criteria detailed in Appendix B. The responses required by the template cover the areas noted by the Quality Council, and in some cases go beyond those areas. The proposal may be modified as the process continues. A proposal for a new program may be initiated by any group in the University, including the Vice-President, Academic and Provost.

2. The Dean reviews the proposal, to be sure that it fully meets the requirements of the template and of the IQAP. At this early stage, the Dean may consult informally with any bodies on the campus, including the Faculty Council, the Budget Committee and/or the Provost (and the Dean of Graduate Studies for graduate programs). The Dean may send the proposal back to its originators, for amendments. The Dean may decline to advance the proposal to the next step, on the grounds that it does not correspond to the priorities of the University, and/or that funding and other resources are not available, and/or that quality is weak. When the Dean is satisfied that the proposal is strong, he/she proceeds to step 3.

3. The Provost, in consultation with the Dean (and the Dean of Graduate Studies if appropriate), appoints the review committee. In the case of reviews restricted to undergraduate programs, there must be at least one external member of the committee; when graduate programs are reviewed, there must be at least two external members. The unit must propose the names of at least four (4) external reviewers by October 15th. In appointing the external reviewers, the Provost considers this list, but is not restricted to it. The external reviewers are to be active and respected in their field, and normally associate or full professors with program management experience. They will also be arm's length to the program (Section 1.2). In proposing names, the unit and/or the Provost may consult widely, including from among senior administrators and experienced colleagues at other universities.

4. External review of new graduate program proposals must incorporate an on-site visit. External review of new undergraduate program proposals are normally conducted on-site, but may be conducted by video-conference or an equivalent method if the external reviewer is satisfied that the off-site option is acceptable. The reviewers are normally associate or full professors, or the equivalent, with program management experience, and are at arm's length from the program under review (see 1.2 for definition of Arm's length). In finding outside reviewers, the Dean may consult widely, including from the unit making the proposal or from among senior administrators and experienced colleagues at other universities.

The reviewers normally provide a joint report that appraises the standards and quality of the proposed program, and addresses the criteria and questions set out in the template (see Appendix J).

5. The initiators of the proposal respond in writing to the external report. Part of the response may include amendments to the original proposal. The response is sent to the Dean, who adds his or her response. The Dean may require the initiators to amend their response, or to elaborate upon it. The Dean forwards all responses to the relevant Faculty Council.

6. The Faculty Council considers the proposal, the external review and the responses to the review, and makes a recommendation. The recommendations can include approval, amendment, or rejection. The Faculty Council may decline to advance the proposal to the next step or make a recommendation that it be approved.

7. A proposal for a new graduate program is next submitted to the Graduate Council which considers the proposal from the point of view of academic quality, the external review and the responses to the review, and makes a recommendation. The recommendations can include

approval, amendment, or rejection. The Graduate Council may decline to advance the proposal to the next step or make a recommendation that it be approved.

8. The Council of English Language Programmes (CELP) and/or the Conseil des programmes en français (CPF) consider the proposal from the point of view of academic quality. At the committee's discretion, it may invite the initiators and/or the Dean and/or the Federated University's President to consult, in person. The committee may approve, or it may ask for amendments. If amendments are sought, they may be brought back directly to the committee, without going through the previous steps. The committee has the authority to reject the proposal, and stop it from proceeding further.

9. ACAPLAN is the Academic Planning Committee of the Academic Senate. ACAPLAN considers the proposal in its widest context. It may deal with the academic merits, and it also considers such questions as whether the program fits into the priorities of the institution, and whether sufficient resources can be made available for the success of the program. At the committee's discretion, it may invite the initiators and/or the Dean and/or the Federated University's President to consult, in person. ACAPLAN determines whether the program falls into the "core" undergraduate arts and sciences category, as specified by the Ministry of Colleges and Universities, or the "non-core" category (see Appendix D). ACAPLAN may approve, ask for amendments, or reject. If it rejects, the proposal may not go forward. ACAPLAN may approve subject to some conditions; for example, it may approve subject to the approval of the Budget Committee.

10. If it approves the proposal, ACAPLAN brings a motion to Senate. Senate is the final on-campus approval authority. If approved by Senate, the proposal goes to the Quality Council. Once it is approved at Senate, a notice can be sent out to announce the intention to offer the new program pending approval by the Quality Council. No offers of admission can be made until the program is approved by the Council.

11. The Quality Council establishes its own procedures for consideration and approval. Those procedures include an appeals process. Laurentian University may make an appeal to, or request a meeting with, the Appraisal Committee for reconsideration within 60 days. If the proposal is denied, the university must wait a minimum of one year before submitting a revised proposal to the Quality Council.

12. "Non-Core" programs must be submitted to the Ministry of Colleges and Universities of the Province of Ontario, to seek funding for enrolled students.

13. While the Senate, not the Board of Governors, has the authority to approve new programs, the Board is to be informed of program approvals. There is a standing item on the Board agenda for this purpose, and the Provost is available at a Board meeting to answer questions.

14. The program must begin within 36 months of approval by the Quality Council; otherwise the approval lapses. In the case of "non-core" program proposals (see #11 above), the beginning will await approval by the Ministry of Colleges and Universities that funding will be provided for enrollments in the program.

15. For all new programs, the Dean establishes a monitoring process to last for at least the first four years of the program, through annual reports and updates provided to the Dean by the Program Head. While the Dean has discretion as to how to proceed, the monitoring process must include consideration of student enrollments and persistence in the program.

16. Normally a new program will be subject to a formal review, under the terms of this IQAP, within 7 years of its institution, but in no cases in more than 8 years.

Flow Chart 1: Process for New Program Approval

2.1 - Process for New Program Approval (Hearst)

All the steps are compulsory. The proposal may be stopped at any step, if not approved.

In what follows, the plural is understood when appropriate.

The sequence of approval for a new program is:

1. Proposal initiated by a group in Hearst
2. Submission and approval of the Hearst Senate
3. External review. The Vice-President at Hearst submits a list of external reviewers to the Academic Vice-President and Provost, who determines the composition of the panel. Reviews will need to be arm's length (Section 1.2)
4. Response by initiators, the Hearst Senate, and by the Vice-President at Hearst to the external review
5. Submission to the appropriate faculty council, and approval
6. If the new program is at the graduate level, submission to and approval by the Graduate Council
7. Submission to and approval by the Council of English Language Programs (CELP) or Conseil des programmes en français (CPF), as appropriate
8. Submission to and approval by the Academic Planning Committee (ACAPLAN)
9. Submission to and approval by Senate.
10. Once it is approved at Senate, a notice can be sent out to announce the intention to offer the new program pending approval by the Quality Council. No offers of admission can be made until the program is approved by the Council.
11. Submission to and approval by the Quality Council.
12. If the new program is "Non-Core," the Université de Hearst must submit to the Provincial Government for funding
13. Program reported to the Board of Governors, for information
14. Program instituted within thirty six months of Quality Council approval
15. Ongoing program monitored by the Vice-President at Hearst
16. Cyclical review within 7 year, but no more than 8, of first enrolment.

2.2 - Review and Approval Process for New Graduate Programs - NOSM

The Northern Ontario School of Medicine (NOSM) serves as the Faculty of Medicine of Lakehead University, Thunder Bay and Faculty of Medicine of Laurentian University, Sudbury. The review and approval of the Northern Ontario School of Medicine's new graduate programs will follow the steps outlined below, which have been agreed upon by both Lakehead University and Laurentian University. Table 1 outlines this process.

Table 1: Review and Approval Process for new NOSM Graduate Programs

1	INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF – NEW GRADUATE PROGRAM PROPOSAL NOSM	RESPONSIBILITY FOR STEP IN THE PROCESS
i.	NOSM Graduate Studies Committee develops new Program based on the Evaluation Criteria (Section 2.1 Quality Assurance Framework) and prepares the Program Proposal Brief (Section 2.2.5 Quality Assurance Framework) with input from NOSM Academic Council and consultation with the Deans of Graduate Studies and other relevant academic units at Lakehead and Laurentian Universities	Dean NOSM
ii.	Proposal Brief submitted by the Dean of NOSM to Provosts of Lakehead and Laurentian Universities for approval	Provosts Lakehead and Laurentian Universities
iii.	Selection and appointment of External Reviewers for the site visit: Selection: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dean NOSM provides Provosts with a list of at least 4 qualified external reviewers • Qualified external reviewers are normally associate or full professors, or the equivalent, that are at arm's length from the program under review (Section 2.2.6, Quality Assurance Framework) • Provosts rank the external reviewers based on respective University process • Dean NOSM, in consultation with the Provosts, identifies a minimum of 2 external reviewers for the External Evaluation 	Dean NOSM, Provosts Lakehead and Laurentian Universities

iv.	Site visit itinerary arranged with input from the Provosts. The roles and responsibilities of the External Reviewers (i.e. the Review Team) are detailed in Sections 2.2.1 and 2.2.2	Dean NOSM, Provosts Lakehead and Laurentian Universities
v.	Reviewers' Report received	Provosts Lakehead and Laurentian Universities
vi.	Internal response to the Reviewers' Report prepared by NOSM Graduate Studies Committee in consultation with NOSM Academic Council, Deans of Graduate Studies at Lakehead and Laurentian and submitted to the Dean NOSM	Dean NOSM
vii.	Provosts review the internal response to External Reviewers' Report and any changes to the Proposal Brief and provide feedback to Dean NOSM	Provosts Lakehead and Laurentian Universities, Dean NOSM
viii.	Proposal Brief brought to Academic Council NOSM for review and approval	Graduate Studies Committee NOSM
ix.	Proposal Brief brought to Joint Senate Committee for review and approval	Academic Council NOSM
x.	Proposal Brief brought to Senates of both Universities for approval	Chair Joint Senate Committee
xi.	Senates of both Universities approve Program Proposal subject to Quality Council approval	Senates of Lakehead and Laurentian Universities
xii.	New Program documentation submitted to the Quality Council Appraisal Committee* (Final Proposal Brief, Reviewer Report, Letters of support –Provosts and Dean NOSM)	Provosts Lakehead and Laurentian Universities

2	QUALITY COUNCIL APPROVAL PROCESS	
i.	Quality Council Appraisal Committee reviews documentation and may seek further input/information from the Dean NOSM and Provosts	Dean NOSM, Provosts Lakehead and Laurentian Universities
ii.	Final decision of the Quality Council is conveyed to the Institutions by the Quality Council's Secretariat within 45 days of receipt of final and complete submission. Note: University can appeal an unsatisfactory recommendation by the Appraisal Committee to the Quality Council.	
iii.	Quality Council approves motion as per QAF 2.3.4. Decision is forwarded to both Universities who will notify the Dean NOSM	Provosts Lakehead and Laurentian Universities
3	FOLLOW UP PROCESS ONCE QUALITY COUNCIL APPROVAL HAS BEEN RECEIVED	
I	Final Program Proposal and Quality Council decision reported to NOSM Academic Council as an item of information	Dean NOSM NOSM Graduate Studies Committee NOSM Academic Council
ii.	Final Program Proposal and Quality Council decision reported to Joint Senate Committee as an item of information	Joint Senate Committee
iii.	Quality Council decision reported as an item of information to Lakehead and Laurentian Universities Senates**	Chair of Joint Senate Committee Dean NOSM
iv.	Implementation - After a new program is approved to commence, the program will begin within thirty-six	Dean NOSM

	months of the date of approval; otherwise the approval will lapse. (Quality Assurance Framework Section 2.4.2)	
v.	Ongoing program monitoring	Dean NOSM
vi.	Cyclical Program Review scheduled 7 years, no more than 8, from program start (Quality Assurance Framework Section 2.4.1)	Office of the Provost

* Subject to the approval of the Provosts and Vice-Presidents (Academic), the Universities may announce their intention to offer a new graduate program in advance of approval by the Quality Council. When such announcements are made in advance of Quality Council approval, they must contain the following statement; “Prospective students are advised that offers of admission to a new program may be made only after the Universities’ own quality assurance processes have been completed and the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance has approved the program.” (Quality Assurance Framework Section 2.2.11)

** If the recommendation from the Quality Council is to defer the program for one year while the Institutions respond to specific issues, then the new program calendar submission will be forwarded to NOSM Academic Council and Graduate Studies Committee for a second review and approval.

2.2.1 External Review Process

An external review will be arranged. External review of new graduate program proposals must incorporate an on-site visit. There will be at least two externals for new graduate program reviews.

The reviewers will normally be Associate or Full Professors, or the equivalent, with program management experience, will be qualified by discipline and experience to review the program(s) and will be at arm’s length from the program under review (Section 1.2). External reviewers should be active and respected in their field.

2.2.2 External Reviewer’s Report

The Reviewers will be provided with the Lakehead Report Guide (found on the Lakehead University Provost’s QA webpage) developed to appraise the standards and quality of the proposed program and based on the quality assurance evaluation criteria for new program reviews. They will also be invited to acknowledge any clearly innovative aspects of the proposed program along with recommendations on any essential or otherwise desirable modifications. The Report Guide questions may be supplemented by others deemed appropriate by the Review Team for the program under consideration. At the start of the site visit, the Report Guide will be reviewed with the Review Team to ensure that they:

- a) Understand their role and obligations;

- b) Identify and commend the program's notably strong and creative attributes;
- c) Describe the program's respective strengths, areas for improvement, and opportunities for enhancement;
- d) Recommend specific steps to be taken to improve the program, distinguishing between those the program can itself take and those that require external action;
- e) Recognize the Institution's autonomy to determine priorities for funding, space, and faculty allocation, and
- f) Respect the confidentiality required for all aspects of the review process.

The Review Team will normally spend two days visiting the Academic Unit, and will meet with prospective students, faculty and staff within the Unit (the length of the visit may be extended for reviews involving multiple programs). In addition, the Review Team will meet with the Dean and Chair/Director/Coordinator responsible for the program(s), the Chair/Director/Coordinator of any collateral units (for joint or inter-departmental programs), the Dean of Graduate Studies when a graduate program is involved, the Provost, and others as recommended by the Dean(s). Opportunities to visit teaching, learning and research facilities will be provided.

The Reviewer(s) shall submit one report to both Provosts (Laurentian and Lakehead) within six weeks following the site visit.

3.0 - Process for Major Modification to Existing Programs

From the Quality Assurance Framework:

Major modifications include the following program changes:

- a) (Examples of) **Requirements that differ significantly from those existing at the time of the previous cyclical program review**
 - The merger of two or more programs
 - New bridging options for college diploma graduates
 - Significant change in the laboratory time of an undergraduate program
 - The introduction or deletion of an undergraduate thesis or capstone project
 - The introduction or deletion of a work experience, co-op option, internship or practicum, or portfolio
 - At the master's level, the introduction or deletion of a research project, research essay or thesis, course-only, co-op, internship or practicum option
 - The creation, deletion or re-naming of a field in a graduate program
 - Any change to the requirements for graduate program candidacy examinations, field studies or residence requirements

- Major changes to courses comprising a significant proportion of the program (may be defined in quantitative terms; typically, institutions have chosen one-third)
- b) (Example of) **Significant changes to the learning outcomes**
- Changes to program content, other than those listed in a) above, that affect the learning outcomes, but do not meet the threshold for a 'new program'
- c) (Examples of) **Significant changes to the faculty engaged in delivering the program and/or to the essential resources as may occur, for example, when there have been changes to the existing mode(s) of delivery (e.g. different campus, online delivery, inter-institutional collaboration)**
- 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
 - A change in the language of program delivery
 - The establishment of an existing degree program at another institution or location
 - The offering of an existing program substantially online where it had previously been offered in face-to-face mode, or vice versa
 - Change to full- or part-time program options, or vice versa
 - Changes to the essential resources, where these changes impair the delivery of the approved program
- d) The addition of a new field to an existing graduate program. This modification is subject to an optional **Expedited Approval**. Note that institutions are not required to declare fields for either master's or doctoral programs

The following are not Major modifications:

- The approval of an articulation agreement with a college
- Changes in admission requirements that are a result of changes in the high school curriculum

Although Major modifications (except for additional fields in a graduate program) do not normally require a review by the Quality Council, ACAPLAN may, at its discretion, seek such approval. In such cases, the evaluation criteria will be parallel to those for a new program (see Appendix B).

Programs who are bringing forward changes to their existing curriculum **and are unsure if the changes meet the threshold for a Major Modification** should consult with the Vice-President Academic and Provost **or his/her delegate** in order to determine if the proposed changes **indeed** constitute a Major Modification.

There are three ways of triggering the Major Modification clause. All of these require the form in Appendix C to be completed.

- a) If the curriculum changes to an existing program are deemed to be a major modification **the program** will follow steps 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 of the procedures in Section 2.0 for programs at the Sudbury campus, or steps 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 of Section 2.1 for Hearst programs. During this review process, the old program continues to operate.
- b) A proposal to develop an emphasis, an option or a pathway within an existing program follows steps 1, 2, 3, 6, 7 and 8 in Section 2.0 for Laurentian programs, or steps 1, 2, and 6 in Section 2.1 for Hearst programs. In such cases, the evaluation criteria will be parallel to those for a new program (see Appendix B). During this review process, the old program continues to operate.
- c) When significant change occurs to the current or forecasted faculty complement or resources of the program, as identified by the VPAP:
 - i. The VPAP shall alert the program Coordinator/Chair/Director and the relevant Dean(s) about the possibility that admissions to all or parts of the program (specialization / major / minor / concentration) may be temporarily suspended, and provide two (2) weeks to the program to respond.
 - ii. If the program Coordinator/Chair/Director and the relevant Dean(s) agree that admissions to all or parts of the program need to be temporarily suspended, the VPAP will send this directive to the Registrar no later than by 1 August for the upcoming academic year and communicate this decision to ACAPLAN.
 - iii. If any of the program Coordinator/Chair/Director and the relevant Dean(s) disagree that admissions be temporarily suspended because of resource issues, the issue of suspending admissions will be addressed at an upcoming meeting of ACAPAN which shall make a recommendation to the VPAP on the topic no later than 1 July.

If admissions to any or all parts of a program are temporarily suspended, the program has the option of going through a Major Modification. In so doing, the program will follow steps 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 of the procedures in Section 2.0 for programs at the Sudbury campus, or steps 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 of Section 2.1 for Hearst programs.

As an outcome of the review, ACAPLAN may recommend one of the following:

- i) That the VPAP reopen admissions following changes to the curriculum, the faculty complement, or resources
- ii) That Senate suspend permanently the program or part of the program

In the event that no Major Modification report is submitted to ACAPLAN within six (6) months of the request, ACAPLAN will make a recommendation to Senate for permanent suspension of the program or part of program.

Laurentian University must file an annual report to the Quality Council which provides a summary of major program modifications that were approved through the university's internal process in the past year.

4.0 - Process for Cyclical Review of Existing Programs

Cyclical reviews of its programs are carried out by Laurentian University, using the standards established by the Quality Council, and reporting to the Quality Council. The Provost is responsible for the reviews, and for reporting on those reviews to the Quality Council.

Ongoing programs are normally reviewed every 7 years. ACAPLAN may call for a review at any time. In no case may a program go without a review for more than 8 years. As well as departmental programs, the review cycle includes all joint, multi-disciplinary, interdisciplinary, multi-sited and inter-institutional programs, and all modes of delivery. Multi- or interdisciplinary programs may be included within the review of the programs of an academic department. The office of the Provost establishes and makes available a schedule of reviews.

Normally, all the undergraduate and graduate programs offered by a department are reviewed at the same time. When Laurentian reviews different program levels (for example, graduate and undergraduate), program modes, or programs offered at different locations, it will normally address each program within a single omnibus report, taking care that the distinctive attributes of each discrete program are reviewed and reported on by the reviewers.

In some circumstances, the Provost, in consultation with the Dean of Graduate Studies, may determine that different programs offered by a department should be subject to different reviews.

Laurentian is responsible for ensuring the quality of all components of programs of study, including those offered: 1) in full or in part by its federated and affiliated institutions and 2) in partnership with other higher-education institutions (colleges and universities) through collaborative agreements.

Some professional programs at Laurentian University are subject to external accreditation. Every effort will be made to combine the accreditation assessments with the assessments provided for in this IQAP. When this happens, all the requirements of this IQAP must be met.

The sequence for the cyclical review of existing programs is:

1. The Provost informs the Dean and the program chair when a review is scheduled.
2. The program prepares a self-study.
3. The Dean reviews and approves the self-study.
4. The Provost, in consultation with the Dean, appoints a review committee.
5. Onsite visit organized by the Dean's office
6. The review committee submits a report.
7. The program responds to the report.
8. The Dean, and the Federated University President, where appropriate, responds to the report and to the program response.
9. When a graduate program is reviewed, the report and the responses are considered by the Graduate Council, which in turn writes a response to ACAPLAN
10. The report and the responses of the program, the Dean, the Federated University President, and the Graduate Council are reviewed by ACAPLAN.
11. ACAPLAN's set of commendations and recommendations are reported to Senate, for discussion.
12. An Executive Summary of the review, prepared by the Provost, is reported to the Board of Governors, for information.
13. ACAPLAN's report is posted on the University website, and submitted to Quality Council.

14. No later than 18 months after Senate submission, the program writes a report to ACAPLAN, on the actions it has taken in response to the review. The ACAPLAN report is sent to Senate for discussion.

An explanation of these steps follows.

1. The Provost maintains a list of every program in the University that will be subject to review, and the tentative date of the next review. These include programs of federated and affiliated institutions. A year before the self-study is due, the Provost informs the Dean and the program head of the program that the review will be due, and provides them with the necessary procedures, deadlines and guidelines. The Provost meets in person with the program head and the Dean, to answer questions and to stress the importance of the self-study being analytical and self-critical.
2. The self-study document is to be broad-based, reflective and forward-looking, and should include critical analysis. The self-study must be submitted to the Provost and to the Dean by October 15th. The guidelines for the self-study are included in Appendix E to this IQAP.
3. The Dean reviews the self-study, to assure that it is complete and analytical, and that it meets the appropriate guidelines. The Dean may return the self-study to the program for amendment. When the Dean is satisfied with the self-study, he/she informs the Provost.
4. The Provost, in consultation with the Dean, appoints the review committee. In the case of reviews restricted to undergraduate programs, there must be at least one external member of the committee; when graduate programs are reviewed, there must be at least two external members. At his/her discretion, the Provost may add external members. In the case of graduate programs, the Provost is encouraged to select one reviewer from outside Ontario. As per the self-study guidelines (see Appendix E), the unit must propose the names of at least four (4) external reviewers by October 15th. In appointing the external reviewers, the Provost considers this list, but is not restricted to it. The external reviewers are to be active and respected in their field, and normally associate or full professors with program management experience, and will be at arm's length to the program (Section 1.2). In proposing names, the unit and/or the Provost may consult widely, including from among senior administrators and experienced colleagues at other universities.

The full review team consists of the external member(s), two Laurentian University faculty members (one outside of the unit but from within the Faculty, a second from outside the Faculty), and one student representative from each language group from the unit. Note that in the case of a program offered exclusively by a federated university, the first Faculty representative is a member of a unit, other than the unit undergoing the review, within that federated university. The review team shall reflect the bilingual nature and, where appropriate, the tri-cultural mission of the University and reasonable gender balance. The linguistic policies of the unit must be reflected in the composition of the review team. The members from other universities must not have any past or current affiliation with the unit, or with members of the unit (e.g., supervisor, co-author, former student, etc.)

5. The review committee receives a copy of the self-study approximately one month before the on-site review, plus any other reports requested by the review team. At the beginning of the on-site review, the Provost meets with all members of the review team, both internal and external,

as well as the Dean and the Federated University President, if applicable. At the end of the on-site review, the Provost meets with the external reviewer(s) and the Dean and Federated University President, if applicable. The review team will also meet with faculty, staff, students and senior administrators (including the Dean, Vice-President, Academic and Provost, and Dean of Graduate Studies, and President (as available)).

6. The guidelines for the review committee's report are included in Appendix F to this IQAP. The Provost ensures that all members of the committee have these guidelines. The review committee's written report should be sent to the Provost six weeks after the site visit.
7. The Provost forwards the report to the Dean, to the unit or program under review and, where appropriate, to the Dean of Graduate Studies and Federated University President. The unit or program has one month's time from receipt of the report to formulate a response to it. The response is submitted to the Provost, with copies to the Dean and, if appropriate, the Dean of Graduate Studies and/or Federated University President.
8. The Dean, and Federated University President if applicable, responds to the review, and to the program's response. The Dean's response (and Federated University President's) is sent to the Provost and, where appropriate, to the Dean of Graduate Studies, with a copy to the unit or program.
9. When a graduate program is under review, the Graduate Council reviews all the documentation that relates to the graduate program—including the self-study, the report of the review team, and the responses to that report of the program and the Dean. The Graduate Council forwards its comments to ACAPLAN.
10. The Provost forwards the self-study, the review, and the responses by the program, the Dean, the Federated University President, and the Graduate Council to the Senate's Academic Planning Committee (ACAPLAN). ACAPLAN prepares a draft implementation plan. ACAPLAN then meets with the Dean, the Federated University President if applicable, and with members of the unit or program, to discuss the report. ACAPLAN then writes its own report, based on the documents submitted to it and the conversations at the committee. This report normally includes both commendations and recommendations. It identifies significant strengths of the program, it identifies opportunities for program improvement and enhancement, and it sets out and prioritizes the recommendations that are selected for implementation. The report may also include a confidential section, where personnel issues can be addressed. The report sets out who will be responsible for implementing the recommendations. ACAPLAN's report is transmitted to the program or unit, the Dean and those responsible for implementing the changes such as the Budget Committee or Federated University President for resource allocations.
11. ACAPLAN's report is submitted, for discussion purposes, to Senate. It appears as a regular item on the agenda, and the Provost is available to answer questions.
12. ACAPLAN's report is submitted, for information purposes, to the Board of Governors. It appears as a regular item on the agenda, and the Provost is available to answer questions.
13. ACAPLAN's report and follow-up reports are posted on the University website, and submitted to Quality Council.

14. No later than 12 months after Senate submission, the Provost informs those responsible for implementing the changes that a follow-up report will be required. No later than 18 months after Senate submission, those responsible for implementing the changes writes a report to the Dean and to ACAPLAN, on the actions it has taken in response to the review. If ACAPLAN does not find the response satisfactory, it may ask the program for further actions. The report is sent to Senate for discussion.

As a result of the external reviewers' report, at step 10, if ACAPLAN feels that the program is in a precarious state, it can take one of the following steps to ensure high quality is maintained:

- a) Recommend that the VPAP temporarily suspend admissions to the program until such a time as the concerns are adequately addressed
- b) Recommend to Senate that the program be terminated

Public Access: The self-study, the review report and the responses to the review report are kept in the Provost's office, and are available upon request (except for sections marked confidential). ACAPLAN's report is posted on the website.

Accreditation Reviews: The Provost will decide whether a program review, under the terms of this IQAP, may be combined with an accreditation review of a program. When it does, the criteria of both the program review and the accreditation review must be met – see Section 4.2.

Flow Chart 2: Process for Cyclical Review of Existing Programs

4.1 - Process for Cyclical Review of Existing Programs (Hearst)

The cyclical reviews for programs in Hearst will essentially follow the process outlined in 4.0. However, given the nature of our relationship (affiliate), a few steps will be added, and a few more adjusted to account for their structural reality.

The sequence for the cyclical review of existing Hearst programs is:

1. The Provost informs the Vice-President Academic at Hearst when a review is scheduled.
2. The program prepares a self-study.
3. The Senate at Hearst approves the self-study.
4. The Vice-President Academic at Hearst submits to the Provost's office the approved self-study, along with his or her comments on it.
5. The Provost, in consultation with the Vice-President Academic at Hearst, appoints a review committee.
6. The onsite visit is organized by the Hearst Vice-President Academic's office. This onsite visit shall include a call to the Provost and the Registrar at Laurentian.
7. The review committee submits a report to the Vice-President academic at Hearst.
8. The Hearst Senate responds to the report.
9. The Vice-President Academic at Hearst responds to the evaluation report and to the Hearst Senate's response to it.
10. The report and the responses of the Hearst Senate and of the Vice-President Academic at Hearst are sent to the Provost in order to be reviewed by ACAPLAN.
11. ACAPLAN's set of commendations and recommendations are reported to Laurentian's Senate, for information, as well as sent to the Vice-President Academic at Hearst.
12. An Executive Summary of the review, prepared by the Provost, is reported to the Board of Governors, for information.
13. ACAPLAN's report is posted on the University website, and submitted to Quality Council by Laurentian. The report should also be posted on Hearst's website
14. No later than 18 months after the Senate submission, the program writes a report to ACAPLAN, with a copy to the Vice-President Academic at Hearst, on the actions it has taken in response to the review.

As a result of the external reviewers report, if ACAPLAN feels that the program is in a precarious state, it can take one of the following steps to ensure high quality is maintained:

- a) Temporarily suspend admissions to the program until such a time as the concerns are adequately addressed
- b) Recommend to Senate the admissions to the program be terminated

4.2 - Programs with an Accreditation

The Framework indicates that the Laurentian 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 substitution or addition, and the grounds on which it was made, will be eligible for audit by the Quality Council. The IQAP review can be moved to match the accreditation timeline, but in no case must time between reviews exceed 8 years. Programs are free to ask for a synchronizing of both processes, or keep them as separate processes.

In cases where the program wishes to combine the accreditation review and the IQAP process, and where the professional program accreditation standards mesh fairly well with the standards set out in the Laurentian University's IQAP, components of the accreditation may be applied to the University's program review process.

Prior to the start of an accreditation review, where the program wants to combine the IQAP and the accreditation review, the program will complete a template that shows the IQAP section covered by each section of the accreditation review. The Dean will fill out the same template. Based on those two templates, the Provost will review and determine if, and how, the two assessment processes should be integrated, ensuring compliance with the provisions of the IQAP. The Provost will then meet with the Dean of the faculty to review and discuss the guidelines for the accreditation, the degree of alignment or overlap between the accreditation process and the undergraduate program review process, and to determine what additional materials or processes may be necessary. Such discussions should have occurred at the time when work begins by a Unit to prepare for the accreditation process.

The outcome of 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 ACAPLAN, with a report being drafted and presented to Senate for information; 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 ACAPLAN along with the final report of the accrediting body, to aid in drafting a report for Senate's information. It may be necessary to add an IQAP external reviewer to the accreditation team to fully evaluate the IQAP review criteria. In that case, the normal processes for recruiting and informing IQAP reviewers will be followed; or,
- 3) The accreditation review will not sufficiently meet the requirements of the cyclical program review and the IQAP process will proceed as scheduled.

4.3 - Cyclical Review of the Northern Ontario Medical School (NOSM) Programs

The Northern Ontario School of Medicine (NOSM) serves as the Faculty of Medicine of Lakehead University, Thunder Bay and Faculty of Medicine of Laurentian University, Sudbury. The review of the Northern Ontario School of Medicine (NOSM) programs will be included in Laurentian University's Cyclical Review Schedule, recognizing that all the requirements of the IQAP for other cyclical reviews apply to that for NOSM. Table 2 outlines the process.

The Dean of NOSM will be responsible for leading the development of a single self-study that addresses the criteria in the QAF Section 4.3 in consultation with faculty, staff and students at each of the partner institutions, and for managing aspects of the review process normally managed by the both the head of an academic unit and the Dean of a Faculty. The self-study brief will clearly explain how input was received from faculty, staff and students at each partner institution. All members of the review team will have the opportunity to consult with faculty, staff, and students at each partner institution. The Site Visit need occur on only one campus.

Feedback on the Reviewers' Report will be solicited from participants at each partner institution. The final response to the review will be coordinated by the Dean and will ensure that each of the following are addressed:

1. The plans and recommendations proposed in the self-study report;
2. The recommendations advanced by the Reviewers;
3. The program's response to the Reviewers' Report;

And will describe:

4. Any changes in organization, policy or governance that would be necessary to meet the recommendations;
5. The resources, financial and otherwise, that would be provided in supporting the implementation of selected recommendations; and
6. A proposed timeline for the implementation of any of those recommendations

The response to the Reviewers' Report will be submitted to the Vice-President (Academic) and Provost at both of the partner institutions for review and approval. The development of a single Final Assessment Report, Implementation Plan and Executive Summary will be coordinated by the Vice-President (Academic) and Provost at both of the partner institutions, and submitted to the NOSM Academic Council and the NOSM Joint Senate Committee for review and approval. The Executive Summary and Implementation Plan will be forwarded to the Laurentian University Senate as an item of information. The Executive Summary and Implementation Plan will be submitted by the Laurentian University Vice-President, Academic & Provost to the Quality Council.

The Dean of the Faculty shall be responsible for monitoring the implementation plan. The details of progress made will be presented in the Deans' Annual Report and filed with both of the Vice-Presidents (Academic). The Executive Summary and the monitoring reports will be posted on the Lakehead and Laurentian University web sites.

Should a NOSM program qualify for external professional accreditation, it is possible to align the cyclical program review with Professional Accreditation under certain circumstances. See Section 4.2 for details.

The external review process and external reviewer's report will follow what is outlined in section 2.2.1 and 2.2.2.

Table 2: Cyclical Review of Existing Programs: NOSM Review and Appraisal Process

1. Cyclical Program Review Process – NOSM	Primary Responsibility For Step In Process
- Initiation of review by University Contact/Authority	Office of VP Academic & Provost at Lakehead University/Laurentian University
- NOSM completes Self-Study	NOSM Dean
- External Evaluation - Site Visit arranged and conducted	Office of VP Academic & Provost at Lakehead University/Laurentian University
- Reviewers' Report received and forwarded to NOSM Dean	Office of VP Academic & Provost at Lakehead University/Laurentian University
- NOSM Dean prepares Internal Response to Reviewers' Report	NOSM Dean
- Development of a Single Final Assessment Report, Implementation Plan, and Executive Summary coordinated by the Vice-President (Academic) & Provost at each of the partner institutions	Office of VP Academic & Provost at Lakehead University/Laurentian University
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Review and approval of Final Assessment Report and Implementation Plan by NOSM Academic Council - Chair of Academic Council forwards recommendation to NOSM Joint Senate Committee - Review and approval of Final Assessment Report and Implementation Plan by NOSM Joint Senate Committee 	<p>Chair of NOSM Academic Council</p> <p>Chair of NOSM Joint Senate Committee</p>
- Joint Senate Committee forwards Executive Summary to the Lakehead University Senate for Information	Chair of Joint Senate Committee
- The Executive Summary and Implementation Plan will be forwarded to the Quality Council and placed on the University web-site	Associate VP Academic
- Report to the Board of Governors once a year on the programs which were reviewed during the previous academic year.	VP Academic and Provost
2. FOLLOW-UP PROCESS	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Implementation and Ongoing Monitoring <p>(Monitoring reports will be posted on the University web site)</p>	<p>NOSM Dean</p> <p>Associate VP Academic</p>

- Schedule next review within 8 years of previous cyclical review	Associate VP Academic

5.0 - Approval and Review of Programs Offered by Two or More Institutions¹

Reviews of Joint Programs and other inter-institutional programs are governed by the IQAPs of the participating university/universities 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, and separately approved IQAP is used, or whether the separate institutions prefer to build their joint processes into their separate IQAPs, the following are the Quality Council's suggestions for inclusion in the IQAP related to both new program approval and cyclical program reviews:

1. The self-study brief clearly explains how input was received from faculty, staff and students at each partner institution. There will be a single self-study.
2. Selection of the reviewers involves participation by each partner institution.
3. Where applicable, selection of the “internal” reviewer requires joint input.
 - a. It could include one internal from both partners (this is impractical if there are multiple partners); and
 - b. It could give preference to an internal reviewer who is from another Joint program, preferably with the same partner institution
4. The site visit involves all partner institutions and preferably at all sites (with exceptions noted in footnote). Reviewers consult faculty, staff, and students at each partner institution, preferably in person.
5. Feedback on the reviewers’ report is solicited from participating units at each partner institution, including the Deans.

¹ For all inter-institutional programs in which all partners are institutions within Ontario, the Quality Council’s standard New Program Approval and Cyclical Program Review Processes will apply to all elements of programs regardless of which partner offers them, including Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology and Institutes of Technology and Advanced Learning. For joint programs in which some partners are institutions outside 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.
(Source: *Quality Assurance Framework*)

6. Preparation of a Final Assessment Report and Implementation Plan requires input from each partner.
7. There is one single Final Assessment Report and Implementation Plan which go through the appropriate governance processes at each partner institution.
8. The Final Assessment Report and Implementation Plan are posted on the university website of each partner.
9. Partner institutions agree on an appropriate monitoring process for the Implementation Plan.
10. The Final Assessment Plan and Implementation Plan should be submitted to the Quality Council by all partners.

COUNCIL OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROGRAMS
NEW PROGRAM TEMPLATE
2020-2021

For more details on the LU Institutional Quality Assurance Process please refer to:

https://stor.laurentian.ca/www_laurentian_ca/sites/default/files/misc_files/About_LU/Documents/IQAPFinal.pdf

*** It is recommended that you consult the Curriculum Development and Review Specialist on the learning outcomes. (excellence@laurentian.ca)**

Please ensure that all is checked off before submitting your form, if incomplete, it will be returned:

- Submission to and approval by Graduate Council - if applicable
- Send an electronic copy of the completed Word template(s) to CELP@laurentian.ca.
- Send a hard copy with the appropriate signatures to the Office of the Vice-President, Academic & Provost.
- Supporting documents for evaluation – if applicable (such as New/Revised Course Templates, etc.)

New programs must follow several steps for approval. As listed in Laurentian University's Institutional Quality Assurance Processes (IQAP), they are:

1. Proposal initiated by a department/school/planning group
2. Submission to the Dean
3. External review
4. Response by initiators and by the Dean to the external review
5. Submission to and approval by the relevant Faculty Council
6. If the new program is at the graduate level, submission to and approval by the Graduate Council
7. Submission to and approval by the Council of English Language Programs (CELP) or Conseil des programmes en français (CPF) as appropriate
8. Submission to and approval by the Academic Planning Committee (ACAPLAN) (ACAPLAN must consult with the Planning and Resource Committee and may consult with the Space Committee)
9. Submission to and approval by Senate
10. Submission to and approval by the Quality Council
11. For non-core programs, submission to the Provincial Government, for funding
12. Program reported to the Board of Governors, for information

- 13. Program instituted within 36 months of Quality Council approval
- 14. Ongoing program monitored by the Dean
- 15. Cyclical review within 8 years of first enrolment.

Please refer to the IQAP for an explanation on each step required.

Document prepared by:

Name of Faculty Member

Date Print Signature

CAE-Director, Faculty Engagement

**only if offered online or through distance education*

Date Signature

Library

Date Signature - University Librarian

CAE

Date Signature - AVP Learning and Teaching

Department/School

Date Signature - Chair/Director

Faculty Council

Date Signature -Dean

Graduate Council

1. **Program Name:**
2. **Why create a new program? Please specify the purpose in terms of the curriculum, the student, the university community, and possible outcomes with the employer or the community.**
3. **Course Map**
 - a. **Program Name:** (Please specify **SPECIALIZATION** (60 credits in Arts and 66 credits in Science) - **SINGLE CONCENTRATION** (36 credits), etc.)
 - b. **Admission Requirements:**
 - c. **Course Descriptions**
(Description must be in 12 point font, between 4 & 6 lines and in the present tense):
 - d. **Prerequisite:**
 - e. **Other entry requirements:**
 - f. **Please provide course map of:**
 - 1st year:**
 - 2nd year:**
 - 3rd year:**

4th year:

g. Please explain in detail if there are placements, special projects, internships, community-based learning or any other requirements necessary for this program.

Learning Outcomes²

Learning outcomes are statements corresponding to the University Undergraduate Degree Level Expectations (Appendix G of the IQAP document), or the OCGS Degree Level Expectations (Appendix H of the IQAP document). They indicate the results or consequences of learning. Learning outcomes should be measurable and be reflected in the "Methods of Evaluation". <http://laurentian.ca/academic-accountability>. (Example: After successful completion of this course students should ...).

State the Learning Outcomes for this program.

Explain how the courses included in the program meet the Program Learning Outcomes.

Please answer the following:

1. Will the program have its own admission requirements?

- Yes
- No

If you answered **yes**, please explain how these are appropriate for the learning outcomes:

2 [The Learning Outcomes Guide](#)

Please review for guidance: APPENDIX A-Useful verbs for developing learning outcomes

2. Is the program's structure appropriate to meet the learning outcomes?

Explain:

3. How does their curriculum address the current state of the discipline, or areas of study

4. Is this program being offered:

- On Campus**
- Online**
- Both**

Is the mode of delivery appropriate to the learning outcomes?

Explain:

5. How will student achievement of the learning outcomes and degree-level expectations be assessed?

6. What faculty members will be participating in this program?

Are they sufficient and appropriate to achieve the objectives? If already hired, list names, highest degree and provide CV's.

7. Is the undergraduate program "core" arts and science program or a "non-core" program as per the Ministry of Colleges and Universities regulations? All graduate programs are non-core.

8. Have outside experts--for example, from the community, from industry, from the concerned professions and/or practical training programs--been consulted in the preparation of this proposal?

9. Is the program name and degree/diploma/certificate designation appropriate to the program content and consistent with current usage in the discipline?

- Yes
- No

If you answered ***no***, please specify:

10. List the number of faculty overloads or new positions required.

- Some
- None

If you answered ***some***, please specify:

11. What new library resources will be needed to offer this program?

(Include a summary statement prepared in collaboration with the University Librarian on holdings pertinent to the program and proposed future expenditures needed to support the program.)

12. Can the unit(s) support it within current library allocations?

- Yes
- No

If you answered ***no***, please specify:

13. Will this program require the purchase of new equipment?

- Yes
- No

If you answered **yes**, can the cost be accommodated within existing budgets?

- Yes
- No

If you answered **no**, please specify:

14. Will any classroom space need to be redesigned to teach this program?

- Yes
- No

If you answered **yes**, please specify:

15. Will the program have or require any external grants or donations?

- Yes
- No

If you answered **yes**, please specify:

16. Is the program cost-recovery?

- Yes
- No

17. How is the program consistent with Laurentian University's strategic plan? <https://laurentian.ca/strategic-plan>

Does this program fit into the broader array of program offerings, particularly areas of teaching and research strength, collateral areas of study etc.?

In making these determinations, consider:

- a) Notable resources available to the program demonstrating institutional appropriateness e.g. Chairs, institutes, research centres; unique library collections or resources; facilities such as computer, laboratory, other acquisitions etc.*
- b) External financial support demonstrating strength such as facility/equipment donations, other external donations, grants, etc.*

18. What are the projected enrolment levels for the first five years of operation?

19. What is the intended "steady-state" annual enrolment level?

20. What evidence is there of student demand?

21. Is there convincing evidence that graduates of this program are needed in specifically identified fields (academic, public and /or private sector)?

For professional program, supply evidence of congruence with current regulatory requirements of the profession.

In making these determinations consider:

- a) dimensions of societal need for graduates (socio-cultural, economic, scientific, technological)*
- b) geographic scope of societal needs (local, regional, provincial, national)*
- c) trends in societal need for graduates*
- d) duration of societal need (e.g. short, medium or long-term)*

22. What are the innovative or distinguishing aspects of this program? If this duplicates what is done elsewhere, why is such duplication justified?

23. Is there Indigenous-content?

Yes



No

****Note:** Since Laurentian University has a tricultural mission, faculty members are encouraged to consider ways to incorporate Indigenous content into their courses and programs as appropriate. The Associate Vice-President, Academic and Indigenous Programs is available for consultation and assistance in this regard. Indigenousprograms@laurentian.ca*

APPENDIX A

Useful Verbs for Developing Learning Outcomes

This list of useful verbs for creating learning outcomes is arranged according to Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, which identifies different cognitive domains associated with levels of learning. Bloom's taxonomy was developed in 1956, and was revised in 2001 by Bloom's colleagues, Lorin Anderson and David Krathwohl. The revised taxonomy is presented here.

REMEMBERING: recall of information

arrange; cite; collect; define; describe; duplicate; enumerate; find; identify; locate; memorize; record; recognize; match; relate; select; name; label; list; order; quote; recall; repeat; reproduce; select; show; state

UNDERSTANDING: demonstration of comprehension

associate; classify; compare; contrast; convert; describe; estimate; explain; extend; generalize; give examples; identify; interpret; justify; locate; outline; paraphrase; predict; recognize; report; restate; review; select; summarize; trace; translate

APPLYING: applying knowledge in a new context

apply; calculate; chart; choose; classify; complete; compute; construct; contribute; develop; discover; dramatize; employ; experiment; extend; illustrate; implement; instruct; interpret; modify; operate; participate; practice; predict; show; solve; teach; text; use

ANALYZING: supporting assertions through the use of evidence and arguments identifying causes and patterns

advertise; analyze; break down; categorize; classify; collect; compare; connect; contrast; correlate; criticize; diagram; differentiate; distinguish; divide; establish; explain; identify; illustrate; infer; investigate; order; outline; prioritize; question; select; separate; verify

EVALUATING: coming to a judgement on the value of information or the validity of arguments

appraise; argue; assess; choose; conclude; convince; criticize; critique; debate; decide; defend; determine; discriminate; evaluate; grade; integrate; interpret; judge; justify; predict; prioritize; rate; recommend; reframe; score; select; support; value

CREATING: combining or grouping knowledge to come to new conclusions

adapt; anticipate; arrange; assemble; collect; combine; compile; construct; decide; design; develop; facilitate; formulate; generate; generalize; imagine; incorporate; individualize; integrate; invent; modify; negotiate; organize; plan; propose; rearrange; reconstruct; reorganize; revise; select; structure; substitute; validate

(www.teaching.utoronto.ca/teaching-support/course-design/developing-learning-outcomes)

For further assistance with writing your syllabus or crafting your learning outcomes, please contact the Laurentian University Centre for Academic Excellence (Excellence@laurentian.ca)

Appendix B – Evaluation Criteria

1.1 EVALUATION CRITERIA

Prior to submitting a Proposal Brief to the Quality Council for appraisal, institutions will evaluate any new graduate or undergraduate programs against the following criteria:

1.1.1 Objectives

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

1.1.2 Admission requirements

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

1.1.3 Structure

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

1.1.4 Program content

- a) Ways in which the curriculum addresses the current state of the discipline or area of study.
- b) Identification of any unique curriculum or program innovations or creative components.
- c) For research-focused graduate programs, clear indication of the nature and suitability of the major research requirements for degree completion.
- d) 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.

1.1.5 Mode of delivery

Appropriateness of the proposed mode(s) of delivery (see Definitions) to meet the intended program learning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations.

1.1.6 Assessment of teaching and learning

- a) Appropriateness of the proposed methods for the assessment of student achievement of the intended program learning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations.
- b) Completeness of plans for documenting and demonstrating the level of performance of students, consistent with the institution's statement of its Degree Level Expectations (see Guide).

1.1.7 Resources for all programs

- a) 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.
- b) Participation of a sufficient number and quality of faculty who are competent to teach and/or supervise in the program.
- c) 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.

1.1.8 Resources for graduate programs only

- a) Evidence that faculty have the recent research or professional/clinical expertise needed to sustain the program, promote innovation and foster an appropriate intellectual climate.
- b) Where appropriate to the program, evidence that financial assistance for students will be sufficient to ensure adequate quality and numbers of students.
- c) Evidence of how supervisory loads will be distributed, and the qualifications and appointment status of faculty who will provide instruction and supervision.

1.1.9 Resources for undergraduate programs only

Evidence of and planning for adequate numbers and quality of: (a) faculty and staff to achieve the goals of the program; or (b) of plans and the commitment to provide the necessary resources in step with the implementation of the program; (c) planned/anticipated class sizes; (d) provision of supervision of experiential learning opportunities (if required); and (e) the role of adjunct and part-time faculty.

1.1.10 Quality and other indicators

- a) Definition and use of indicators that provide evidence of quality of the faculty (e.g., qualifications, research, innovation and scholarly record; appropriateness of collective faculty expertise to contribute substantively to the proposed program).
- b) Evidence of a program structure and faculty research that will ensure the intellectual quality of the student experience.

(Source: *Quality Assurance Framework*, p. 8-11)

Appendix C – Template for Major Modification to Existing Programs



COUNCIL OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROGRAMS **MAJOR MODIFICATIONS TO EXISTING PROGRAMS TEMPLATE 2020-2021**

See page 9 of the LU IQAP document for a definition of Major Modification.

https://stor.laurentian.ca/www_laurentian_ca/sites/default/files/misc_files/About_LU/Documents/IQAPFinal.pdf

Before Faculty Council:

It is recommended that you consult the Curriculum Development and Review Specialist on the learning outcomes. (excellence@laurentian.ca)

Please ensure that all is checked off before submitting your form, if incomplete, it will be returned:

- Submission to and approval by Graduate Council - if applicable
- Send an electronic copy of the completed Word template(s) to CELP@laurentian.ca.
- Send a hard copy with the appropriate signatures to the Office of the Vice-President, Academic & Provost.
- Supporting documents for evaluation – if applicable (such as New/Revised Course Templates, etc.)

Major modifications must follow several steps for approval. As listed in Laurentian University's Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP), they are:

1. Proposal initiated by a department/school/planning group
2. Submission to the Dean
3. Submission to and approval by the relevant Faculty Council
4. If the new program is at the graduate level, submission to and approval by the Graduate Council
5. Submission to and approval by the Council of English Language Programs (CELP) or Conseil des programmes en français (CPF) as appropriate
6. Submission to and approval by the Academic Planning Committee (ACAPLAN) (ACAPLAN must consult with the Planning and Resource Committee and may consult with the Space Committee)
7. Submission to and approval by Senate

Graduate Council

Signature -Dean
Date

Signature - Dean
Date

1. **Program Name:**
2. **Why is a major modification required? Please specify the purpose in terms of the curriculum, the student, the university community, and possible outcomes with the employer or the community.**
3. **Course Map**
 - a. **Program Name:**
(Please specify **SPECIALIZATION** (60 credits in Arts and 66 credits in Science) - **SINGLE CONCENTRATION** (36 credits), etc.)
 - b. **Admission Requirements:**
 - c. **Course Descriptions:**
(Description must be in 12 point font, between 4 & 6 lines and in the present tense)
 - d. **Prerequisite:**
 - e. **Other entry requirements:**
 - f. **Please provide course map of:**
 - 1st year:**
 - 2nd year:**
 - 3rd year:**
 - 4th year:**
 - g. **Please explain in detail if there are placements, special projects, internships, community- based learning or any other requirements necessary for this program.**

Learning Outcomes³

3

[The Learning Outcomes Guide](#)

Please review for guidance: **APPENDIX A**-Useful verbs for developing learning outcomes

55

Learning outcomes are statements corresponding to the University Undergraduate Degree Level Expectations (Appendix G of the IQAP document), or the OCGS Degree Level Expectations (Appendix H of the IQAP document). They indicate the results or consequences of learning. Learning outcomes should be measurable and be reflected in the "Methods of Evaluation". <http://laurentian.ca/academic-accountability> (Example: After successful completion of this program students should ...).

State the Learning Outcomes for this program.

Explain how the courses included in the program meet the Learning Outcomes.

Please answer the following:

1. Will the program have its own admission requirements?

- Yes
- No

If you answered **yes**, please explain how these are appropriate for the learning outcomes:

2. Is the program's structure appropriate to meet the learning outcomes?

Explain:

3. How does their curriculum address the current state of the discipline, or areas of study

4. Is this program being offered:

- On Campus**
- Online**
- Both**

Is the mode of delivery appropriate to the learning outcomes?

Explain:

5. How will student achievement of the learning outcomes and degree-level expectations be assessed?

6. What faculty members will be participating in this program?

Are they sufficient and appropriate to achieve the objectives? If already hired, list names, highest degree and provide CV's.

7. Is the undergraduate program "core" arts and science program or a "non-core" program as per the Ministry of Colleges and Universities regulations? All graduate programs are non-core.

8. Have outside experts--for example, from the community, from industry, from the concerned professions and/or practical training programs--been consulted in the preparation of this proposal?

9. Is the program name and degree/diploma/certificate designation appropriate to the program content and consistent with current usage in the discipline?

Yes

- No

If you answered ***no***, please specify:

10. List the number of faculty overloads or new positions required.

- Some
- None

If you answered ***some***, please specify:

11. What new library resources will be needed to offer this program?

(Include a summary statement prepared in collaboration with the University Librarian on holdings pertinent to the program and proposed future expenditures needed to support the program.)

12. Can the unit(s) support it within current library allocations?

- Yes
- No

If you answered ***no***, please specify:

13. Will this program require the purchase of new equipment?

- Yes
- No

If you answered ***yes***, can the cost be accommodated within existing budgets?

- Yes

- No

If you answered ***no***, please specify:

14. Will any classroom space need to be redesigned to teach this program?

- Yes
- No

If you answered ***yes***, please specify:

15. Will the program have or require any external grants or donations?

- Yes
- No

If you answered ***yes***, please specify:

16. Is the program cost-recovery?

- Yes
- No

17. How is the program consistent with Laurentian University's strategic plan? <https://laurentian.ca/strategic-plan>

Does this program fit into the broader array of program offerings, particularly areas of teaching and research strength, collateral areas of study etc.?

In making these determinations, consider:

- a) *Notable resources available to the program demonstrating institutional appropriateness e.g. Chairs, institutes, research centres; unique library collections or resources; facilities such as computer, laboratory, other acquisitions etc.*
- b) *External financial support demonstrating strength such as facility/equipment donations, other external donations, grants, etc.*

18. What are the projected enrolment levels for the first five years of operation?

19. What is the intended "steady-state" annual enrolment level?

20. What evidence is there of student demand?

21. Is there convincing evidence that graduates of this program are needed in specifically identified fields (academic, public and /or private sector)?

For professional program, supply evidence of congruence with current regulatory requirements of the profession.

In making these determinations consider:

- a) dimensions of societal need for graduates (socio-cultural, economic, scientific, technological)*
- b) geographic scope of societal needs (local, regional, provincial, national)*
- c) trends in societal need for graduates*
- d) duration of societal need (e.g. short, medium or long-term)*

22. What are the innovative or distinguishing aspects of this program? If this duplicates what is done elsewhere, why is such duplication justified?

23. Is there Indigenous-content?

- Yes
- No

***Note:** *Since Laurentian University has a tricultural mission, faculty members are encouraged to consider ways to incorporate Indigenous content into their courses and programs as appropriate. The Associate Vice-President, Academic and Indigenous Programs is available for consultation and assistance in this regard.*

Indigenousprograms@laurentian.ca

APPENDIX A

Useful Verbs for Developing Learning Outcomes

This list of useful verbs for creating learning outcomes is arranged according to Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, which identifies different cognitive domains associated with levels of learning. Bloom's taxonomy was developed in 1956, and was revised in 2001 by Bloom's colleagues, Lorin Anderson and David Krathwohl. The revised taxonomy is presented here.

REMEMBERING: recall of information

arrange; cite; collect; define; describe; duplicate; enumerate; find; identify; locate; memorize; record; recognize; match; relate; select; name; label; list; order; quote; recall; repeat; reproduce; select; show; state

UNDERSTANDING: demonstration of comprehension

associate; classify; compare; contrast; convert; describe; estimate; explain; extend; generalize; give examples; identify; interpret; justify; locate; outline; paraphrase; predict; recognize; report; restate; review; select; summarize; trace; translate

APPLYING: applying knowledge in a new context

apply; calculate; chart; choose; classify; complete; compute; construct; contribute; develop; discover; dramatize; employ; experiment; extend; illustrate; implement; instruct; interpret; modify; operate; participate; practice; predict; show; solve; teach; text; use

ANALYZING: supporting assertions through the use of evidence and arguments identifying causes and patterns

advertise; analyze; break down; categorize; classify; collect; compare; connect; contrast; correlate; criticize; diagram; differentiate; distinguish; divide; establish; explain; identify; illustrate; infer; investigate; order; outline; prioritize; question; select; separate; verify

EVALUATING: coming to a judgement on the value of information or the validity of arguments

appraise; argue; assess; choose; conclude; convince; criticize; critique; debate; decide; defend; determine; discriminate; evaluate; grade; integrate; interpret; judge; justify; predict; prioritize; rate; recommend; reframe; score; select; support; value

CREATING: combining or grouping knowledge to come to new conclusions

adapt; anticipate; arrange; assemble; collect; combine; compile; construct; decide; design; develop; facilitate; formulate; generate; generalize; imagine; incorporate; individualize; integrate; invent; modify; negotiate; organize; plan; propose; rearrange; reconstruct; reorganize; revise; select; structure; substitute; validate

(www.teaching.utoronto.ca/teaching-support/course-design/developing-learning-outcomes)

For further assistance with writing your syllabus or crafting your learning outcomes, please contact the Laurentian University Centre for Academic Excellence (Excellence@laurentian.ca)

Appendix D - Core and Non-Core Programs

Attachment 1: Program Approval Categories

Undergraduate “Core Arts and Science Programs,” Group A - “Non-Core” Undergraduate Programs, and Group B - All Graduate Programs

Group A - “Non-Core” Programs

Accounting, Accountancy	Family Studies, Family Science	Native Studies
Actuarial Science	Film, Cinema	Nursing
Agricultural Business	Finance	Nursing Education
Agriculture	Fine Art, Studio Art, Painting	Occupational Therapy
Architecture	Forest Technology	Optometry
Area Studies	Forestry	Personnel and Administrative Studies
Art Education, Conservation, Art Therapy	Gerontology	Pharmacology
Clothing, Textiles, Design and Fashion	Health Studies	Pharmacy
Commerce	Home Economics, Food Studies	Physical Therapy, Physiotherapy
Communications	Horticulture	Physical Education
Community, Urban and Regional Planning	Industrial, Labour Relations	Planning
Criminology	Journalism	Public Administration
Dance	Kinesiology	Public Service Studies
Dental Surgery	Labour Studies	Radiation Therapy
Dentistry	Landscape Architecture	Recreation
Dietetics	Language and Literature Studies	Resource Management
Drama	Law	Social Work
Education	Law Enforcement	Speech Pathology and Audiology
- Primary-Junior	Legal Studies	Survey Science
- Junior-Intermediate	Library Science	Systems Design
- Intermediate-Senior	Linguistics	Theatre Arts
- Technological Studies	Management, Business Management	Translation, Interpretation
- French as a First Language (FFL)	Marketing	Urban Studies, Urbanism
Engineering	Medical Illustration	Veterinary Medicine
	Medicine	War Studies

Group B - Graduate Programs
All graduate programs

Attachment 2: Information the University Should Consider in Certifying Criteria Have Been Met

Criteria	Institutional Check List
1. Program Nomenclature (“Truth-in-Advertising”)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The University Senate or equivalent academic body should ensure that the program name and degree designation are appropriate to program content and consistent with current usage in the discipline.
2. Academic Quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Undergraduate: the University should ensure that the Senate or equivalent academic body has approved the undergraduate program. ➤ Graduate: the University should ensure that the Dean of Graduate Studies (or equivalent) has received a letter indicating the date the program passed OCGS appraisal without requiring improvements.
3. Financial Viability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The Board of Governors or equivalent body should ensure the university has in hand the requisite resources to introduce the program within existing funding levels and is prepared to maintain the program for a reasonable period of time (The approval of a program is not grounds for a request for additional funding from the Ministry to initiate or sustain the program). ➤ Where there is an increase in the minimum length of time required to complete an existing approved degree program, the institution should be able to justify the additional costs incurred to the institution, government and the student. ➤ In making these determinations, institutions should consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ the impact of the program on funding and how the institution intends to finance and staff the proposed program ○ the additional costs (capital expenditures, additional faculty, etc), and the sources of additional funds (external grants, donations, government grants) ○ how other programs will be affected (joint offerings, closure, rationalization, decreased in size, etc.), including how and whether or not any cost savings will be involved

Criteria	Institutional Check List
4. Institutional Appropriateness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The university should ensure the program is related to institutional mission, academic plans, and/or departmental plans. ➤ The university should ensure the program fits into the broader array of program offerings, particularly areas of teaching and research strength, collateral areas of study, etc. ➤ In making these determinations, institutions should consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ notable resources available to the program demonstrating institutional appropriateness e.g. Chairs, institutes, centres; unique library collections or resources; facilities such as computer, laboratory, other acquisitions, etc. ○ external financial support demonstrating strength such as facility/equipment donations, other external donations, grants, etc.

Criteria	Institutional Check List
5. Student Demand	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The University should ensure there is convincing evidence of student demand for the program. ➤ In making these determinations, institutions should consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ projected enrolment levels for the first five years of operation (If the program is in operation, use actual and projected data) ○ intended steady-state annual enrolment and steady-state total enrolment projections and the year(s) in which they will be achieved ○ evidence of student demand through application statistics, for example: number of enquiries, applications received, number of qualified applicants, use of macro-indicator data (graduate only) ○ origin of student demand (% domestic and visa students; graduate only - the undergraduate or master's programs from which students would be drawn) ○ duration of the projected demand (e.g. short, medium or long-term demand from specified sources) ○ evidence of review and comment by appropriate student organization(s)

Criteria	Institutional Check List
6. Societal Need	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The University should ensure there is convincing evidence that graduates of the program are needed in specifically identified fields (academic, public and/or private sector). ➤ For professional program areas, the university should ensure congruence with current regulatory requirements of the profession. ➤ In making these determinations, institutions should consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ dimensions of the societal need for graduates (e.g. socio-cultural, economic, scientific, technological) ○ geographic scope of the societal need for graduates (e.g. local, regional, provincial, national) ○ trends in societal need for graduates ○ duration of the societal need (e.g. short, medium, or long-term) ○ examples of evidence for the above would be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ letters from a variety of potential employers of graduates who have seen the curriculum and commented upon the need for graduates within their organization and, more broadly, in their field of endeavour ▪ professional society and/or association comments about the need for graduates based on a review of the curriculum ▪ employment surveys, survey of the number of positions advertised in, for example, the CAUT Bulletin, AUCC University Affairs, etc. ▪ statistics related to the number of Ontario students leaving the province to study in the same field elsewhere in Canada or abroad
7. Duplication	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The University should cite similar programs offered by other institutions in the Ontario university system. ➤ The University should provide evidence of justifiable duplication based on societal need and/or student demand in cases where there are programs in the system that are the same or similar (Comments from other institutions regarding proposed new undergraduate programs will be sought by the Ministry. Comments regarding Health Science programs will also be sought from the Ministry of Health). ➤ The University should indicate innovative and distinguishing aspects of the program. ➤ The University should indicate why the institution is offering the program on a “stand-alone” basis rather than merging its resources with another institution in a joint program.

Attachment 3: 2009-2010 Program Approvals Certification Form

Program Name and Degree Designation
(Please attach the Program's Calendar Entry)

Institution

The university certifies that the following six criteria have been evaluated and met for the above proposed new program:

- The program has undergone a nomenclature confirmation review by the University Senate for Group A undergraduate programs and by the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies for Group B graduate programs.
- Senate has certified program quality for Group A undergraduate programs and the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies has done so for Group B graduate programs. (For graduate programs, a copy of OCGS approval is required)
- The governing body of the institution has certified that the program can be financed by institutional resources unless the Minister has given prior approval of additional funding to cover any portion of program costs that cannot be absorbed by the institution.
- The program is consistent with the aims, objectives and existing strengths of the institution.
- There is convincing evidence of student demand.
- There is convincing evidence of societal need.

The university submits the attached information as evidence that any duplicative similarities to existing programs in Ontario or Canada are justifiable for reasons of public funding.

(Signature of President)

(Date)

Attachment 4: 2009-10 Program Developments Report

Institution: _____
 Institutional Contact: _____
 Telephone Number: _____

A. Rationalized / Restructured Programs

Program Name	Degree Designation	Date Effective	Additional Information (e.g. existing program based on)

B. Merged Programs / Departments

Program/Department Name	Degree Designation	Date Effective	Additional Information (e.g. existing program/department based on)

C. Closed Programs

Program Name	Degree Designation	Date Effective	Additional Information

Please fax the Annual Development Report, also referred to as the Faxback Report, to Nadira Ramkissoon, Universities Unit, Postsecondary Accountability Branch, Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities to 416-325-0108 by **May 3, 2010**. You may also email the report to nadira.ramkissoon@ontario.ca.

Relevant calendar copy information should also be provided (Attach additional pages if necessary).

Attachment 5: Program Approval Summary

2009-2010 PROGRAM APPROVAL SUMMARY			
<p>Please submit one form per program and attach the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Program Approval Certification Form 2) Program Calendar Information (including a list of courses offered each year with credits attached to each course) 3) OCGS approval required 			
Institution:			
Name of program:			
Length of Program:		# of Semesters/Year:	
Expected Start Date for Program:			
Suggested FORPOS Code & Program Weight:			
Suggested CIP code:			
<p>Proposed Tuition Fee & Explanation Include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examples of comparator programs used to set the tuition level (internal and/or external) • How tuition fees are charged (flat or program fee, or by course credit) • Annualized tuition fee <p>Note: Tuition fee should exclude all centrally collected ancillary fees and student referenda fees.</p>			
Does this program include a thesis option?			
<p>In addition to the checklist provided by the ministry, please describe the following criteria below:</p>			
Brief Program Description:			
Certification by the executive head that there is convincing evidence of social need:			
Convincing evidence that any duplicative similarities to the existing programs in Ontario/Canada are justifiable reasons of public funding (please list/briefly describe similar programs):			
If this is a collaborative program with another college/university, please identify partners and describe the arrangements by which institutions report enrolments as eligible to be counted for funding purposes.			
Institutional Contact Person:			

Appendix E - Guidelines for the Program Self-Study, Existing Programs

The self-study is to be broad-based, reflective and forward-looking, and is to include critical analysis. It is to be rigorous, objective and searching.

Unless the Provost directs otherwise, the self-study is to review all degree programs that are the responsibility of the unit, including graduate and undergraduate programs, programs delivered with other institutions or on other sites, and programs delivered through non-typical modes.

In some cases, the self-study may form the basis for both the normal program review and an accreditation review. In such cases, it must meet the requirements of both processes.

The immediate purpose of the self-study is to constitute the basis for the review. The self-study should have value well beyond this, however. When conducted seriously and analytically, it provides the basis for a probing self-examination by the program members, for the purpose of rethinking the curriculum and the full student experience in the program.

The program head initiates and makes sure that the self-study is carried out. He/she establishes a self-study committee to undertake the process, the committee to consist of at least five people, including the program head, at least two other full-time faculty members and two students. If graduate programs are involved, the graduate coordinators of these programs will be part of the self-study committee. At the discretion of the department/program, the self-study committee may be larger. The self-study committee prepares a draft of the self-study and presents it to the full department/program. The self-study must be approved by the department/program before it is sent to the next step. The Dean reviews and approves the self-study, to assure that it is complete and analytical, and that it meets the appropriate guidelines. The Dean may return the self-study to the department/program for amendment. When the Dean is satisfied with the self-study, he/she informs the Provost.

The self-study document will not exceed 35 pages, although appendices can be as lengthy and specific as desired. Since it will be made available to the Review Committee (Note: Appendix K), its content should, in a general sense, assist the Review Committee in examining the following aspects, and therefore should reflect the Review Guidelines.

The self-study for existing programs should address the following points:

- Consistency of the program with the general objectives of the University's mission and academic plans;
- Appropriateness and effectiveness of the admission requirements, e.g., preparation and achievement, for the learning outcomes of the institution and the program;
- Appropriateness of the program's structure and curriculum to meet its learning outcomes;

- Appropriateness and effectiveness of the mode of delivery (including, where applicable, distance or on-line delivery) to meet the program’s learning outcomes;
- The level of achievement of students, consistent with the learning outcomes of the educational goals for the program and the degree, and institutional standards;
- Appropriateness and effectiveness of the utilization of the existing human/physical/financial/library resources;
- Definition of indicators that provide evidence of quality student clientele (e.g. applications, registrations and identified workforce needs), quality of faculty, student quality, quality of graduates, program outcomes (graduation rate, length of studies, etc.) and demonstrated achievement of its learning outcomes.
- The integrity of the data will be ensured by using only data provided by the Institutional Planning Office.
- Program-related data and measures of performance, including applicable provincial, national and professional standards (where applicable)

The unit shall submit the self-study through the Dean who, if he/she approves, will forward to the office of the Provost, in three separate parts:

- 1) THE PROGRAM (for every location and method of delivery)
 - 2) CURRICULA VITAE OF THE FACULTY
 - 3) LIST OF PROPOSED CONSULTANTS
1. THE PROGRAM brief is to contain the following information organized (as far as possible) in the following manner.
 - a. **Introduction**
 - i. Brief listing of program(s).
 - ii. Objectives of the program(s) and mission statement.
 - iii. The learning outcomes of the programs based on degree level expectations
 - iv. Review concerns (if any) expressed in previous appraisal, and actions taken.
 - v. Participation of faculty, staff and students in the self-study.

vi. Insure input of others deemed to be relevant and useful, such as graduates of the program, representatives of industries, the professions, practical training programs, and employers may be included.

vii. Special matters and innovative features (if any).

b. The Faculty

i. List of both full-time and part-time faculty; identify core faculty. In the case of a graduate program in which a field or several have been identified, a listing of faculty members by fields is required.

ii. Research Funding – by faculty members for past five years by source (granting councils, industry, government, foundations, other).

iii. Current teaching loads (graduate and undergraduate), showing the number of courses taught by each faculty member.

iv. Career number, and current, supervision of bachelor's theses and graduate students, by faculty member (summary table).

v. Appropriateness and effectiveness of the utilization of existing human resources.

c. Library Resources

i. A summary statement on holdings pertinent to the program, collection policy, and expenditures for last five years (where available).

DO NOT SUBMIT DETAILED DOCUMENTATION ON LIBRARY HOLDINGS, but have available if required by consultants.

ii. Explanation of the use made of existing library and archives services and resources including but not limited to: the liaison librarian or archivist; library and archives instruction; collection development; discipline-specific learning resources; and reference support.

d. Physical Resources

i. Laboratory and computer facilities for teaching and for research - major equipment available for use, commitments/plans (if any) for next five years.

ii. Space - list current faculty, laboratory, graduate student and general research office space, commitments/plans (if any) for next five years.

- iii. Appropriateness and effectiveness of the utilization of existing physical resources.
- e. **Students**
- i. Enrolment and graduations for past five years by program.
 - ii. Educational and/or employment status of students graduating over the past five years.
 - iii. Projected enrolments (FT; PT) for next five years, by program, with a rationale for the numbers provided.
- f. **Program Regulations and Courses**
- i. Regulations for the program(s) including: appropriateness and effectiveness of the admission standards and explanation of admission policies for each program; course requirements, examinations, evaluation procedures; thesis evaluation procedures, language requirements (if any), and other requirements; residence regulations. Also, a statement on the appropriateness of generic admission requirements is required.
 - ii. Total courses listed, including: courses actually offered with enrolments (past three years); combined graduate/undergraduate courses (if any) offered (past three years). A statement concerning the structural relationship between the undergraduate program(s) and the graduate program(s) is required.
 - iii. Collateral and supporting departments: list only those involvements that are substantial, indicating the nature of the co-involvement (i.e. joint research, graduate teaching, etc.).
 - iv. Course outlines and other documents relevant to the content of the courses.
 - v. Appropriateness of the program's structure and curriculum to meet its learning outcomes of the degree which shall be designed, structured and delivered so that graduates may demonstrate achievement, in ways appropriate to the values and ambitions of the institution, of its undergraduate degree level expectations.
 - vi. Rationales for curriculum organization - requirements, relevance and justification of courses. How courses are related and how they build on previous learning. An indication or demonstration of undergraduate

student outcomes in relation to learning outcomes of the program (value added education).

- vii. Curriculum map showing the impact of each course towards the attainment of the degree level expectations.
- viii. Appropriateness and effectiveness of the method of delivering including distance and on-line to meet the program's learning outcomes.
- ix. A statement that explains how the program meets its learning outcomes, and how the learning outcomes fit into the mission of the University.
- x. Statistical summaries only of student course evaluations.

g. Planning

- i. Strengths and weaknesses: Conclusion
- ii. How do you plan to reach your goals?

h. Conclusions

- i. Areas requiring improvement
- ii. Areas that hold promise for enhancement

2. THE CURRICULA VITAE OF THE FACULTY - to be presented in the same format for all faculty listed and also to be presented separately from the section on the program. Each C.V. is to be organized according to the Laurentian University format.

The key information which must be readily accessible in every CV is:

- Peer-reviewed publication (lifetime, and in the past seven years)
- Research funding (in the past seven years)
- Graduate teaching and supervision (lifetime, and in the past seven years)

For some faculty members (for example in the performing arts), other types of scholarly work (including performances) will normally be included.

3. THE LIST OF PROPOSED CONSULTANTS - to be presented in the same format for each nomination and also to be presented separately from the other two sections. The list is to contain the following information organized in the following manner:

- a. name
- b. rank/position
- c. institution/firm - current address, please also include telephone number

- d. degrees - designation, university, discipline, date
 - e. professional experience/expertise relevant to the consultantship
 - f. statement that the proposed consultant does not have a close personal or professional relationship with any member(s) of the unit
4. With respect to the LIST OF PROPOSED CONSULTANTS, the Departments/Schools must:
- a. propose at least 4 nominations
 - b. designate the nominees by program
 - c. not contact the nominees with respect to the nominations.

Appendix F - Guidelines for the review of ongoing programs

The Committee reviews the self-study submitted by the unit, requests any additional information that is needed, and spends at least two days visiting the unit. During the on-campus visit, the Committee first meets in camera to discuss procedures, concerns and additional information that might be required. The Committee then meets with faculty, staff, undergraduate students within the unit, the Dean, the Provost, the Associate Vice-President, Learning and Teaching, and the Dean of Graduate Studies (if appropriate) and any other member of the university community who can provide relevant information (e.g. University Librarian, Director of Computing Services, etc.). Prior to concluding the visit, the External Reviewer meets with the Provost and Dean and, if appropriate, the Dean of Graduate Studies, for a debriefing session to provide preliminary oral feedback on the outcome of the visit and an evaluation of the process.

The review team produces one report. The report is authored by the external consultant(s), but it is the responsibility of all members of the committee. The internal members of the committee are consulted during the writing, and indicate whether they approve of the report. The report is submitted to the Provost (and, in the case of a federated or affiliated university, the President of the federated university) no later than six weeks after the on-site visit.

The report addresses aspects of the department / faculty / institution that influence the quality of the program. The spirit of the review should be constructive and analytical. The report should state what the unit has done since its last review.

The members of the review committee are to respect the confidentiality that is required for all aspects of the review process.

The report should include, but is not limited to, the following:

- an outline of the visit (who interviewed, facilities seen, other relevant activities);
- Consistency of the program with the general objectives of the institution's mission and academic plans, and with the standards, educational goals, learning outcomes of the degree, which shall be designed, structured and delivered so that graduates may demonstrate achievement, in ways appropriate to the values and ambitions of the institution, and of its degree level expectations.
- 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
- Appropriateness and effectiveness of the admission requirements, e.g., preparation and achievement, with respect to the learning outcomes of the institution and the program;
- Appropriateness of the program's structure and curriculum to meet its learning outcomes, especially in the student's final year;

- Appropriateness and effectiveness of the mode of delivery (including, where applicable, distance or on-line delivery) to meet the program's learning outcomes;
- The level of achievement of students, consistent with the educational goals, learning outcomes for the program, the degree, and institutional standards,
- Identify and commend the program's notably strong and creative attributes;
- Describe the program's respective strengths, areas for improvement, and opportunities for enhancement;
- Appropriateness and effectiveness of the utilization of the existing human/physical/financial/library resources;
- Definition of indicators that provide evidence of quality student clientele (e.g. applications, registrations and identified workforce needs), quality of faculty, student quality, quality of graduates, program outcomes (graduation rate, length of studies, etc.) and demonstrated achievement of its learning outcomes.
- Recommendation of specific steps to be taken to improve the program, distinguishing between those the program can itself take and those that require external action.
- Note: additional criteria for graduate programs
 - A) Evidence that students' time-to-completion is both monitored and managed in relation to the program's defined length and program requirements.
 - B) Quality and availability of graduate supervision.
 - C) Definition and application of indicators that provide evidence of faculty, student and program quality, for example:
 - 1) Faculty: funding, honours and awards, and commitment to student mentoring;
 - 2) Students: grade-level for admission, scholarly output, success rates in provincial and national scholarships, competitions, awards and commitment to professional and transferable skills;
 - 3) Program: evidence of a program structure and faculty research that will ensure the intellectual quality of the student experience;
 - 4) 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.

The Provost forwards the report to the program and to the Dean. The unit will then have one month's time from receipt of the report to formulate a response to the report. The unit's response is forwarded to the Dean, who in turn writes a response to both the report and the unit's response. The Dean submits all three documents to ACAPLAN. The Dean's response should address the following:

- 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;
- Identify the relevant dean(s) or academic administrator(s) responsible for the program, who will provide their responses to each of the following:
 1. The plans and recommendations proposed in the self-study report;
 2. The recommendations advanced by the Review Committee;
 3. The program's response to the Review Committee's report(s);and will describe:
 4. Any changes in organization, policy or governance that would be necessary to meet the recommendations;
 5. The resources, financial and otherwise, that would be provided in supporting the implementation of selected recommendations; and
 6. A proposed timeline for the implementation of any of those recommendations.
- List of commendations

Appendix G - Definitions

Arm's length: See definition in section 1.2

Certificate: Laurentian may grant certificates in acknowledgement of students' participation in either for-credit or not-for-credit activities at the undergraduate or graduate level. Not-for-credit programs are not subject to approval or audit by these procedures. Certificate program involving for-credit coursework and related activities use the Expedited Approval Process (see below) for initial approval. Subsequently, the ongoing program will be submitted to its appropriate position in the cycle of program reviews.

Collaborative Specialization: This is an intra-university graduate field of study that provides an additional multidisciplinary experience for students enrolled in and completing the degree requirements for one of a number of approved masters and/or PhD programs. Students meet the admission requirements of and register in the participating (or "home") program but complete, in addition to the degree requirements of that program, the additional requirements specified by the Collaborative Specialization. The degree conferred is that of the home program, and the completion of the Collaborative Specialization is indicated by a transcript notation indicating the additional specialization that has been attained (e.g., MA in Political Science with specialization in American Studies).

A Collaborative Specialization must have:

- At least one core one-semester course that is foundational to the specialization and does not form part of the course offerings of any of the partner programs. This course must be completed by all students from partner programs registered in the specialization and provides an opportunity for students to appreciate the different disciplinary perspectives that can be brought to bear on the area of specialization. This course may serve as an elective in the student's home program.
- Clear and explicit requirements for each Collaborative Specialization. In programs requiring a major research paper, essay, or thesis, the topic must be in the area of the collaborative specialization. In course-only Master's programs, at least 30% of the courses must be in the area of specialization including the core course described above. Courses in the area of specialization may be considered electives in the home program.
- Only core faculty that are those faculty members in the participating home programs who have an interest and expertise in the area of the collaborative specialization (this may include faculty appointed 100% to an interdisciplinary academic unit – for example, an Institute of American Studies – that provides the anchor for the specialization).

- In place appropriate administrative and academic oversight/governance to ensure requirements associated with the specialization are being met.

Degree: An academic credential awarded on successful completion of a prescribed set and sequence of requirements at a specified standard of performance consistent with the OCAV's Degree Level Expectations and the University's own expression of those Expectations.

Degree Level Expectations: The Degree Level Expectations established by OCAV serve as Ontario universities' academic standards and identify the knowledge and skill outcome competencies that reflect progressive levels of intellectual and creative development. They may be expressed in subject-specific or in generic terms. Graduates at specified degree levels (e.g., BA, MSc) are expected to demonstrate these competencies. Laurentian University has undertaken to adapt and describe the degree level expectations that apply to its programs.

Degree Program: The complete set and sequence of courses, combinations of courses and/or other units of study, research and practice prescribed by the University for the fulfillment of the requirements of a particular degree.

Diploma Programs: Laurentian may grant diplomas in acknowledgement of students' participation in either for-credit or not-for-credit activities at the undergraduate and graduate level. Not-for-credit diploma programs are not subject to these procedures. Introduction of an Undergraduate Diploma program involving for-credit coursework and related activities uses the Expedited Approval Process (see definition below) in submitting them for the Quality Council's approval. Subsequently, the ongoing program is submitted to its appropriate position in the institution's cycle of program reviews.

The Quality Council recognizes only three types or categories of Graduate Diploma and has specific appraisal conditions (and an associated submission [template](#)) applying to each. In each case, when proposing a new graduate diploma, a university may request an Expedited Approval Process (see definition below).

Type 1: Awarded when a candidate admitted to a master's program leaves the program after completing a certain proportion of the requirements. Students are not admitted directly to these programs. When new, these programs require submission to the Quality Council for an Expedited Approval Process (no external reviewers required) prior to their adoption. Once approved, they will be incorporated into the institution's schedule for cyclical reviews as part of the parent program.

Type 2: Offered in conjunction with a master's or doctoral degree, the admission to which requires that the candidate be already admitted to the master's or doctoral program. This represents an additional, usually interdisciplinary, qualification. When new, these programs require submission to the Quality Council for an Expedited Approval Process (no external reviewers required) prior to their adoption. Once approved, they are incorporated into the institution's schedule for cyclical reviews as part of the parent program.

Type 3: A stand-alone, direct-entry program, generally developed by a unit already offering a related master's (and sometimes doctoral) degree, and designed to meet the needs of a particular clientele or market. Where the program has been conceived and developed as a distinct and original entity, the institution will use the Expedited Approval Process (see below).

All such programs, once approved, will be subject to the normal institutional cycle of program reviews, typically in conjunction with the related degree program.

Emphasis, Option, Minor Program (or similar): An identified set and sequence of courses, and/or other units of study, research and practice within an area of disciplinary or interdisciplinary study, which is completed on an optional basis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the awarding of a degree, and may be recorded on the graduate's academic record. While requiring recognition in the IQAP, proposals for their introduction or modification do not require reference to the Quality Council.

Expedited Approval Process: The Quality Council will normally require only an Expedited Approval Process where:

- there are Major Modifications to Existing Programs, as already defined through the IQAP, proposed for a degree program or program of specialization; or
-
- there are proposals for new for-credit graduate or undergraduate certificates or diplomas.

The Expedited Approval Process requires the submission to the Quality Council of a Proposal Brief of the proposed program change/new program (as detailed above) and the rationale for it. The process is expedited by not requiring the use of external reviewers. The outcomes of these expedited approval processes will be conveyed to the proposing institution directly by the Executive Director and reported to the Quality Council.

Field: In graduate programs, field refers to an area of specialization or concentration (in multi/interdisciplinary programs a clustered area of specialization) that is related to the demonstrable

and collective strengths of the program's faculty. Institutions are not required to declare fields at either the master's or doctoral level. Institutions may wish, through an expedited approval process, to seek the endorsement of the Quality Council.

Graduate Level Course: A course offered by a graduate program and taught by institutionally-approved graduate faculty, where the learning outcomes are aligned with the Graduate Degree Level Expectations and the majority of students are registered as graduate students.

Inter-Institutional Program Categories:

1. **Conjoint Degree Program:** A program of study, offered by a postsecondary institution that is affiliated, federated or collaborating with a university, which is approved by the university's Senate or equivalent body, and for which a single degree document signed by both institutions is awarded.
2. **Cotutelle:** A customized program of doctoral study developed jointly by two institutions for an individual student in which the requirements of each university's doctoral programs are upheld, but the student working with supervisors at each institution prepares a single thesis which is then examined by a committee whose members are drawn from both institutions. The student is awarded two degree documents though there is a notation on the transcripts indicating that the student completed his or her thesis under cotutelle arrangements.
3. **Dual Credential Degree Program:** A program of study offered by two or more universities or by a university 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 document being awarded by each of the participating institutions.
4. **Joint Degree Program:** A program of study offered by two or more universities or by a university and a college or institute, including an Institute of Technology and Advanced Learning, in which successful completion of the requirements is confirmed by a single degree document.

In the case of the Cotutelle, since this arrangement relates to an existing, approved program, no separate appraisal or review processes will apply.

For all inter-institutional programs in which all partners are institutions within Ontario, the Quality Council's standard New Program Approval and Cyclical Program Review Processes will apply to all elements of programs regardless of which partner offers them, including Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology and Institutes of Technology and Advanced Learning. For joint programs in which some partners are institutions outside 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.

Joint Degree Program: A program of study offered by two or more universities or by a university and a college or institute, including an Institute of Technology and Advanced Learning, in which successful completion of the requirements is confirmed by a single degree document.” (QAF, 2010)

Major Modifications to Existing Programs:

a) (Examples of) **Requirements that differ significantly from those existing at the time of the previous cyclical program review**

- The merger of two or more programs
- New bridging options for college diploma graduates
- Significant change in the laboratory time of an undergraduate program
- The introduction or deletion of an undergraduate thesis or capstone project
- The introduction or deletion of a work experience, co-op option, internship or practicum, or portfolio
- At the master’s level, the introduction or deletion of a research project, research essay or thesis, course-only, co-op, internship or practicum option
- The creation, deletion or re-naming of a field in a graduate program
- Any change to the requirements for graduate program candidacy examinations, field studies or residence requirements
- Major changes to courses comprising a significant proportion of the program (may be defined in quantitative terms; typically, institutions have chosen one-third)

b) (Example of) **Significant changes to the learning outcomes**

- Changes to program content, other than those listed in a) above, that affect the learning outcomes, but do not meet the threshold for a ‘new program’

c) (Examples of) **Significant changes to the faculty engaged in delivering the program and/or to the essential resources as may occur, for example, when there have been changes to the existing mode(s) of delivery (e.g. different campus, online delivery, inter-institutional collaboration)**

- 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
- A change in the language of program delivery
- The establishment of an existing degree program at another institution or location
- The offering of an existing program substantially online where it had previously been offered in face-to-face mode, or vice versa
- Change to full- or part-time program options, or vice versa

- Changes to the essential resources, where these changes impair the delivery of the approved program
- d) The addition of a new field to an existing graduate program. This modification is subject to an optional **Expedited Approval**. Note that institutions are not required to declare fields for either master's or doctoral programs
- e) ACAPLAN will act as arbiter to determine whether changes constitute "major modifications".

The following are not Major modifications:

- The approval of an articulation agreement with a college
- Changes in admission requirements that are a result of changes from the high school curriculum

Mode of Delivery: The means or medium used in delivering a program (e.g., lecture format, distance, on-line, problem-based, compressed part-time, different campus, inter-institutional collaboration or other non-standard form of delivery).

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, for the purposes of this Framework, 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 Guide.

The approval process for the introduction of new undergraduate and graduate programs follows the New Program Approval Protocol in Framework Section 2. All Proposal Briefs submitted to the Quality Council will report whether the program is a professional program and/or a full cost recovery program.

Program Head: The program head can vary between a Chair, a Director or a Coordinator.

Program of Specialization: An identified set and sequence of courses, and/or other units of study, research and practice 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 graduate's academic record (e.g., a major, honours program, concentration or similar).

It should be noted that:

- A program constitutes “full” fulfillment of the requirements for the awarding of a degree when the program and degree program are one and the same;
- A program constitutes “partial” fulfillment of the requirements for the awarding of a degree when the program is a subset of the degree program. Typically, a bachelor’s degree requires the completion of a program of specialization, often referred to as a major, an honours program, a concentration or similar.

Appendix H - Ontario Council of Academic Vice Presidents (OCAV) Guidelines for University Undergraduate Degree Level Expectations

Introduction

The globalization of higher education has led to the need to be able to compare and contrast the variety of qualifications granted by academic institutions for credit transfer, graduate study preparation and professional qualification. Similarly, jurisdictions with decentralized systems are looking for ways to measure academic equivalencies. In addition, in order to be able to evaluate and monitor the effectiveness of all aspects of instruction, institutions, accrediting authorities and funding bodies have begun to clarify the outcomes expected of graduates. OCAV, aware of a national initiative to state degree expectations, has prepared this document to reflect expectations of performance by the graduates of the Baccalaureate/Bachelors programs of Ontario's publicly assisted universities.

The degree level expectations presented below elaborate the intellectual and creative development of students and the acquisition of relevant skills that have been widely, yet implicitly, understood. Below, they are explicitly stated.

	Baccalaureate/Bachelor's Degree <i>This degree is awarded to students who have demonstrated:</i>	Baccalaureate/Bachelor's Degree: Honours <i>This degree is awarded to students who have demonstrated:</i>
1. Depth and Breadth of Knowledge	a) a general knowledge and understanding of many key concepts, methodologies, theoretical approaches and assumptions in a discipline b) a broad understanding of some of the major fields in a discipline, including, where appropriate, from an interdisciplinary perspective, and how the fields may intersect with fields in related disciplines c) an ability to gather, review, evaluate and interpret information relevant to one or more of the major fields in a discipline	a) a developed knowledge and critical understanding of the key concepts, methodologies, current advances, theoretical approaches and assumptions in a discipline overall, as well as in a specialized area of a discipline b) a developed understanding of many of the major fields in a discipline, including, where appropriate, from an interdisciplinary perspective, and how the fields may intersect with fields in related disciplines c) a developed ability to: i) gather, review, evaluate and interpret information; and ii) compare the merits of alternate hypotheses or creative options, relevant to one or more of the major fields in a discipline d) a developed, detailed knowledge of and experience in

	<p>d) some detailed knowledge in an area of the discipline</p> <p>e) critical thinking and analytical skills inside and outside the discipline</p> <p>f) the ability to apply learning from one or more areas outside the discipline</p>	<p>research in an area of the discipline</p> <p>e) developed critical thinking and analytical skills inside and outside the discipline</p> <p>f) the ability to apply learning from one or more areas outside the discipline</p>
2. Knowledge of Methodologies	<p>... an understanding of methods of enquiry or creative activity, or both, in their primary area of study that enables the student to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● evaluate the appropriateness of different approaches to solving problems using well established ideas and techniques; and ● devise and sustain arguments or solve problems using these methods. 	<p>... an understanding of methods of enquiry or creative activity, or both, in their primary area of study that enables the student to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● evaluate the appropriateness of different approaches to solving problems using well established ideas and techniques; ● devise and sustain arguments or solve problems using these methods; and <p>describe and comment upon particular aspects of current research or equivalent advanced scholarship.</p>
3. Application of Knowledge	<p>a) the ability to review, present, and interpret quantitative and qualitative information to:</p> <p>i) develop lines of argument;</p> <p>ii) make sound judgments in accordance with the major theories, concepts and methods of the subject(s) of study; and</p> <p>b) the ability to use a basic range of established techniques to:</p> <p>i) analyse information;</p> <p>ii) evaluate the appropriateness of different approaches to solving problems related to their</p>	<p>a) the ability to review, present and critically evaluate qualitative and quantitative information to:</p> <p>i) develop lines of argument;</p> <p>ii) make sound judgments in accordance with the major theories, concepts and methods of the subject(s) of study;</p> <p>iii) apply underlying concepts, principles, and techniques of analysis, both within and outside the discipline;</p> <p>iv) where appropriate use this knowledge in the creative process; and</p> <p>b) the ability to use a range of established techniques to:</p> <p>i) initiate and undertake critical evaluation of arguments, assumptions, abstract concepts and information;</p> <p>ii) propose solutions;</p>

	<p>area(s) of study;</p> <p>iii) propose solutions; and</p> <p>c) the ability to make use of scholarly reviews and primary sources.</p>	<p>iii) frame appropriate questions for the purpose of solving a problem;</p> <p>iv) solve a problem or create a new work; and</p> <p>c) the ability to make critical use of scholarly reviews and primary sources.</p>
4. Communication Skills	... the ability to communicate accurately and reliably, orally and in writing to a range of audiences.	... the ability to communicate information, arguments, and analyses accurately and reliably, orally and in writing to a range of audiences.
5. Awareness of Limits of Knowledge	... an understanding of the limits to their own knowledge and how this might influence their analyses and interpretations.	... 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.
6. Autonomy and Professional Capacity	<p>a) qualities and transferable skills necessary for further study, employment, community involvement and other activities requiring:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the exercise of personal responsibility and decision-making; • working effectively with others; <p>b) the ability to identify and address their own learning needs in changing circumstances and to select an appropriate program of further study; and</p> <p>c) behaviour consistent with academic integrity and social responsibility.</p>	<p>a) qualities and transferable skills necessary for further study, employment, community involvement and other activities requiring:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the exercise of initiative, personal responsibility and accountability in both personal and group contexts; • working effectively with others; • decision-making in complex contexts; • <p>b) the ability to manage their own learning in changing circumstances, both within and outside the discipline and to select an appropriate program of further study; and</p> <p>c) behaviour consistent with academic integrity and social responsibility.</p>

Updated: October 24, 2005

Appendix I - OCGS Degree Level Expectations for Graduates of Each Credential

These degree level expectations are intended and expected to complement the existing appraisal process, and not to replace it, or any part of it. The degree level expectations elaborate the intellectual development of students, and the acquisition of relevant skills that have been widely understood, but heretofore implicitly rather than explicitly stated.

EXPECTATIONS	MASTER'S DEGREE
1. Depth and Breadth of Knowledge	<p><i>This degree is awarded to students who have demonstrated:</i></p> <p>A systematic understanding of knowledge, including, where appropriate, relevant knowledge outside the field and/or discipline, 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;</p>
2. Research and Scholarship	<p>A conceptual understanding and methodological competence that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Enables a working comprehension of how established techniques of research and inquiry are used to create and interpret knowledge in the discipline; ii) Enables a critical evaluation of current research and advanced research and scholarship in the discipline or area of professional competence; and iii) Enables a treatment of complex issues and judgments based on established principles and techniques; and, <p>On the basis of that competence, has shown at least one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) The development and support of a sustained argument in written form; or ii) Originality in the application of knowledge.

3. Level of Application of Knowledge	Competence in the research process by applying an existing body of knowledge in the critical analysis of a new question or of a specific problem or issue in a new setting.
4. Professional Capacity/Autonomy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The qualities and transferable skills necessary for employment requiring <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) The exercise of initiative and of personal responsibility and accountability; and ii) Decision-making in complex situations; and b. The intellectual independence required for continuing professional development; c. The ethical behavior consistent with academic integrity and the use of appropriate guidelines and procedures for responsible conduct of research; and d. The ability to appreciate the broader implications of applying knowledge to particular contexts.
5. Level of Communications Skills	The ability to communicate ideas, issues and conclusions clearly.
6. Awareness of Limits of Knowledge	Cognizance of the complexity of knowledge and of the potential contributions of other interpretations, methods, and disciplines.

Appendix J – TEMPLATE FOR REVIEWERS' REPORT FOR NEW PROGRAMS

EXPECTATIONS	DOCTORAL DEGREE <i>This degree extends the skills associated with the Master's degree and is awarded to students who have demonstrated:</i>
<p>1. Depth and Breadth of Knowledge</p> <p>Reviewers' Report on the Proposed (INSERT DEGREE) Program in (INSERT PROGRAM NAME) at Laurentian University.</p> <p>(REVIEWER 1) UNIVERSITY ADDRESS</p>	<p>A thorough understanding of a substantial body of knowledge that is at the forefront of their academic discipline or area of professional practice including, where appropriate, relevant knowledge outside the field and/or discipline. (REVIEWER 2) UNIVERSITY ADDRESS</p>
<p>2. Research and Scholarship</p> <p>1. OUTLINE OF THE REVIEW</p> <p>Please indicate whether this review was conducted by desk audit or site visit. For those reviews that included a site visit, please indicate the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who was interviewed? • What facilities were seen? • Any other activities relevant to the appraisal. <p>2. EVALUATION CRITERIA</p> <p>NOTE: Reviewers are asked to provide feedback on each of the following Evaluation Criteria.</p>	<p>a. The ability to conceptualize, design, and implement research for the generation of new knowledge, applications, or understanding at the forefront of the discipline, and to adjust the research design or methodology in the light of unforeseen problems;</p> <p>b. The ability to make informed judgments on complex issues in specialist fields, sometimes requiring new methods; and</p> <p>c. The ability to produce original research, or other advanced scholarship, of a quality to satisfy peer review, and to merit publication.</p>
<p>3. Level of Application of Knowledge</p> <p>2.1 Objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 own undergraduate or graduate Degree Level Expectations. • Appropriateness of degree nomenclature. • Appropriateness of the degree map. 	<p>The capacity to Undertake pure and/or applied research at an advanced level, and to contribute to the development of academic or professional skills, techniques, tools, practices, ideas, theories, approaches, and/or materials.</p>
<p>4. Professional Capacity/Autonomy</p> <p>2.2 Admission requirements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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, secondarily or undergraduate program, such as minimum grade point average, additional languages or portfolios, along with how the program recognizes prior work or learning experience. <p>2.3 Structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<p>a. The qualities and transferable skills necessary for employment requiring the exercise of personal responsibility and judgment in the resolution of complex situations;</p> <p>b. The ability to demonstrate the broad implications of applying knowledge to particular contexts.</p> <p>c. The ability to evaluate the broad implications of applying knowledge to particular contexts.</p>
<p>5. Level of Communication Skills</p> <p>6. Awareness of Limits of Knowledge</p> <p>2.4 Program content</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<p>The ability to communicate complex and/or ambiguous ideas, issues and conclusions clearly and effectively.</p> <p>An appreciation of the limitations of one's own work and discipline, of the complexity of knowledge, and of the potential contributions of other interpretations, methods, and disciplines.</p>
<p>2.5 Mode of delivery</p> <p>Comment on the appropriateness of the proposed mode(s) of delivery to meet the intended program learning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations.</p>	
<p>2.6 Assessment of teaching and learning</p>	

- 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.

2.7 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.
- 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.

2.8 Resources for graduate programs only

- Evidence that faculty have the recent 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.

2.9 Resources for undergraduate programs only

Evidence of and planning for adequate numbers and quality of: (a) faculty and staff to achieve the goals of the program; or (b) of plans and the commitment to provide the necessary resources in step with the implementation of the program; (c) planned/anticipated class sizes; (d) provision of supervision of experiential learning opportunities (if required); and (e) the role of adjunct and part-time faculty.

2.10 Quality and other indicators (to be inclusive of the institution's own additional quality indicators)

- Definition and use of indicators that provide evidence of quality of the faculty (e.g. qualifications, research, 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.

NOTE: Reviewers are urged to avoid using references to individuals. Rather, they are asked to assess the ability of the faculty as a whole to deliver the program and to comment on the appropriateness of each of the areas of the program (fields) that the university has chosen to emphasize, in view of the expertise and scholarly productivity of the faculty.

3. OTHER ISSUES

4. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

NOTE: The responsibility for arriving at a recommendation on the final classification of the program belongs to the Appraisal Committee. Individual reviewers are asked to refrain from making recommendations in this respect.

Signature:

Date:

Signature:

Date:

Appendix K - TEMPLATE FOR REVIEWERS' REPORT ON EXISTING PROGRAMS

External Reviewers' Report on the (INSERT DEGREE) Program in (INSERT PROGRAM NAME) at Laurentian University.

(Reviewer 1)
UNIVERSITY ADDRESS

(Reviewer 2)
UNIVERSITY ADDRESS

1. OUTLINE OF THE VISIT

- Who was interviewed?
- What facilities were seen?
- Any other activities relevant to the appraisal.

2. PROVIDE FEEDBACK ON EACH OF THE FOLLOWING EVALUATION CRITERIA

2.1 Objectives

- Is the program consistent with the institution's mission and academic plans?
- Are the program requirements and learning outcomes clear, appropriate and in alignment with the institution's statement of undergraduate and/or graduate Degree Level Expectations?
- Is the program map complete and appropriate?

2.2 Admission requirements

- Are admission requirements appropriately aligned with the learning outcomes established for completion of the program?

2.3 Curriculum

- Does the curriculum reflect the current state of the discipline or area of study?
- What evidence is there of any significant innovation or creativity in the content and/or delivery of the program relative to other programs?
- Are the modes of delivery appropriate and effective to meet with program's identified learning outcomes?

2.4 Teaching and assessment

- Are the methods used to assess student achievement of the defined learning outcomes and degree level expectations appropriate and effective?
- Are the means of assessment (particularly in the students' final year of the program) appropriate and effective to demonstrate achievement of the program learning outcomes and the institutions (or program's) own degree level expectations?

2.5 Resources

- Assess the appropriateness and effectiveness of the academic unit's use of existing human, physical and financial resources in delivering its program(s). Note reviewers must recognize the institution's autonomy in determining priorities for funding, space and faculty allocation.
- Comment on the appropriateness and effectiveness of academic services (e.g. library, co-op, technology, etc.) to support the program(s) being reviewed.

2.6 Quality Indicators (to be inclusive of the institution's own additional quality indicators)

- Comment on the outcome measures of student performance and achievement for the program(s).
- Faculty: comment on: the qualifications; research and scholarly record; class sizes; % classes taught by permanent or non-permanent (contract) faculty; number, assignments and qualifications of part-time or temporary faculty.

NOTE:

Consultants are urged to avoid using references to individuals. Rather, they are asked to assess the ability of the faculty as a whole to deliver the program and to comment on the appropriateness of each of the areas of the program(s) that the university has chosen to emphasize, in view of the expertise and scholarly productivity of the faculty.

- Students: comment on: applications and registrations; attrition rates, times-to-completion; final year academic achievement; graduation rates; academic awards; student in-course reports on teaching.
- Graduates: comment on: rates of graduation; employment after six months and two years after graduation; post graduate study; skills match' alumni reports on program quality (if available and permitted by FIPPA).

2.7 Additional graduate program criteria

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

2.8 Quality enhancement

- Comment on initiatives taken to enhance the quality of the program and the associated learning and teaching environment

3. OTHER ISSUES

4. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Signature:

Date:

Signature:

Date: