

UNIVERSITY OF NEW BRUNSWICK

GUIDELINES FOR COMPLETING PROPOSALS FOR NEW ARTICULATED PROGRAMS

As approved by Fredericton Senate: December 5, 2005

As approved by Saint John Senate: February 22, 2006

Proposals intended for implementation at the beginning of the Fall term must be completed and submitted to the Secretary of Senate no later than December 31. Approval may take up to twelve months from the date of submission.

Proposers of a new academic program, a modified academic program, a program termination, initiation or renewal of UNB Credit Program involving an External Partner or an articulated program (as defined by *Policy on Quality Assurance*, MPHEC, May 2005) must provide the information required by Senate, the AACHR (if required), and MPHEC in the format described in the appropriate guidelines. Different forms are required to be completed if the proposal involves a new program, a program that is articulated between institutions, UNB Credit Programs involving External Partners, or if an existing program requires modification or termination.

Following approval by the relevant Faculty(ies), the Dean(s) shall submit the proposal to the appropriate Vice-President [VP (UNBSJ) or VPF(A), and in the case of Graduate Programs, the Dean of Graduate Studies] and the AUNBT, together with a covering letter to confirm Faculty approval and any other relevant information for consideration by Senate. If the program proposal is for a new or significantly modified health program, the program must first be approved by the Atlantic Advisory Committee on Health Human Resources, prior to submission to Senate. Program proposals will continue to be submitted in a paper format under the signature of the institutional head, or his or her designate, and as well, all proposals must be submitted by the institutional head and/or his or her designate electronically to proposals@mphec.ca or on diskette (appendices are not, at this time, required in electronic format) and on paper (see page 9 of the policy).

Guidelines provide further instructions to assist program proposers in completing each form type noted above. For further assistance, please contact the Office of the University Secretary.

These guidelines explain the information required for each section of the accompanying Program Proposal. Completed proposals go through an approval process at the appropriate Senate, the Board, and in most cases the MPHEC. Some of the required information is subsequently used during MPHEC quality assurance processes.

Please provide contact information for the person to be contacted in relation to this program proposal.

I. PROGRAM IDENTIFICATION

In this section, proposers must include information regarding the specific identification characteristics of the proposed new articulated program.

Institution(s)/Faculty(ies)/School(s)/Department(s)

Program name and level

Credential(s) granted (provide justification)

Proposed starting date

II. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

1. Explicit statement with respect to the value added by combining components of a program at one level with components of a program at another level.

Proposed structure and content, addressing the following three major components:

- a. Occupational content – ie. Course content directly related to the practice of an occupation in the field;
 - b. Occupationally related content – i.e. Courses usually delivered, especially at the upper level, by a university department (English, Political Science, History, Psychology, Management, etc.), where the content has been tailored to the clientele of the program, for example, English or Political Science for journalists);
 - c. Other academic content – i.e. Courses in other fields that contribute to the education of the student.
1. Listing of the courses required (course name and number, whether existent or planned, its status in the program, i.e. Compulsory vs. optional). Program duration should be stated, as well as justified.

Course NO.	Course Name	Existent or Planned	Compulsory or Optional

2. Practical requirements – articulated programs should attempt to integrate practical, hands-on training. This training can be provided to the student by different means, whether in the context of the learning program or through internships or practicums. The proposal should describe if and how this type of training will be provided.

3. Method of program delivery and location from the beginning to the end of the program.

4. Summary of the admission policy and requirements. The admission policy and requirements must be agreed upon by all the parties involved. The policy should include the customary elements of an admission policy. It can, and probably should, include several admission routes (prior learning assessment, credit transfer arrangements, etc.). The policy should address whether the province of residence would constitute a criterion for admission or exclusion, as is often the case with community college programs. This element is important as the MPHEC expects that several of these articulated programs could be unique in the region.

5. Comparison with similar programs offered in the region, or elsewhere in Canada.

I. STUDENT OUTCOMES AND THEIR RELEVANCE

1. Identification of learning outcomes and their relevance to the proposed program, such as critical thinking skills, breadth and depth of knowledge, attitudes, beliefs, analytical/problem-solving skills, occupation/licensing/accreditation requirements, communication skills, writing skills, etc.
2. Identification of graduate outcomes and their relevance to the proposed program, such as graduate study, employability, licensing, accreditation, etc.
3. Identification of other outcomes and their relevance to the proposed program, such as team building, leadership, social citizenship, etc.

II. RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

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

1. Human and Physical Resource Implications

- i. Extent to which current resources in terms of academic and support staff, library, space, equipment, etc. would be used.
- ii. Additional resources needed in the same areas.
- iii. Impact of the use of these resources on other programs, including the elimination or the reduction of the scope of programs to accommodate the new program.
- iv. Estimate of resource needs and allocation beyond the first five years.

2. Financial Implications

- i. Projection of the incremental costs for the program for its first five years:

Academic Salaries

Other salaries

Equipment

Library Acquisitions

Space (classroom, office, laboratory)

Other

ii. Expected sources of revenue to cover the costs.

iii. Expectations in terms of additional capital or operating funding. Institutions are normally expected to find the financial resources for new programs from increases in the regular budget, through reallocation, or from other sources.

III. RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PROGRAMS AND INSTITUTIONS

1. Relationship and impact on existing programs.
2. Comparison of the proposed program with other comparable programs offered elsewhere in the Maritimes and in Canada and rationale for the introduction of an additional program, if a similar one is already offered in the region.
3. Possibilities of collaboration with other institutions in the regional (university or non-university), or elsewhere in Canada, in the delivery of the program and steps taken to that effect.

4. Evidence of consultation with institutions offering similar or equivalent or comparable programs (at a minimum, details on the consultation process and letters of evidence of communication sent to other institutions requesting input; preferably letters of comments from these institutions should be included).

Institution	Person, Title	Date(s) Contacted	Form of Contact (written preferred & attached)	Response received and attached

IV. RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE PROGRAM

1. Description of how the following duties will be addressed on an ongoing basis:

i. Admission policy, requirements and practices.

ii. Program design.

iii. Standards for progression through, and graduation from, the program.

iv. Information requirements for the transcripts at both institutions.

v. Liaison with the specific academic unit assuming responsibility for the program at each institution.

- vi. In addition, a program proposal should state how each institution will address the issue of student advising, and additional students services, where required.
-
- 2. Identification of the unit(s) responsible for the program at each participating institution, detailing the various levels and types of responsibilities.
 - 3. Description of the inter-institutional coordinating mechanism and its duties, given that when more than one institution is involved, the information flow between the participating institutions, as well as with the students, must be facilitated.

V. PROGRAM NEED

- 1. The social (local, regional, national) need(s) met by graduates from such programs as documented by, among other things, analysis of the evolution of the discipline, labour market analysis, demand for graduates, etc. This evidence should rely on external sources (leading scholars, government agencies, employers, professional organizations, etc.).
- 2. Consultation with employers and/or professional organizations as to the current and anticipated job market, employability data.
- 3. Priority within each institution's program structure and development.

4. Student Demand (Departments are encouraged to consult students, where appropriate, when developing new articulated programs). Please provide concrete evidence that there will be a demand from students when making proposals.
5. Clientele (expected enrollment, enrollment limits or expected maximum enrollment, and clientele sources.
6. The need for a broader-based training that would include general university level competencies.
7. Any accreditation requirements.
8. Additional Inter-Institutional Arrangements – evidence should be provided that inter-institutional arrangements are in place to facilitate the following:
 - i. Student transfer from one institution to the other.
 - ii. Cost and revenue sharing both in the short term and the long term.
 - iii. Clarification about enrollment count for every year or term of the program.

9. Evidence of linkages to the labour market should be provided; this includes but is not limited to, evidence of consultation with respect to both program need and program design. Articulated programs should have a close connection with the practical requirements of the labour market.

In addition to the inter-institutional coordinating mechanism, the program should normally have the benefit of an advisory industry group. It should comprise a variety of employers and practitioners from the relevant field(s). This group would provide advice on program design and marketplace requirements.

10. Evaluation Policy

A proposal for an articulated program should present the evaluation procedure and cycle that would follow the implementation of the program. This procedure should include graduate follow-ups. The policy should include the frequency and time line of the evaluation process; identify the coordinating unit responsible for the overall management of the assessment process and for defining the assessment criteria, and determine the procedures and areas of responsibilities to ensure a proper follow-up to the review.

11. Articulated Programs at the Graduate Level

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

- i. A critical mass of research-active faculty and of graduate students.

- ii. Sufficient breadth of disciplinary expertise among faculty.
- iii. An appropriate support network of related programs (normally undergraduate and, where relevant, graduate).
- iv. Capacity to provide a choice of advanced-level graduate courses.
- v. Evidence of sufficient library resources (as evidenced by holdings ratio among other measures) and access to scholarly communications for a graduate-level program.
- vi. An appropriate structure (such as an Office of Graduate Studies) to support the program, especially in the case of a doctoral program; and in the case of research-based (master's and doctoral) degree programs, an appropriate academic environment is further characterized by a strong research focus within the unit proposing the program, evidence of faculty's ability to provide long-term supervisory capacity and supervisory committee membership and a demonstration that an appropriate level of student financial support is available.
- vii. The final version of the program proposal has been reviewed by an expert external to the institution prior to submission to the Commission.

- viii. The proposed program is non-duplicative of offerings elsewhere in the region or represents necessary duplication or market demand demonstrably justifies further capacity.

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

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

12. Using the following table, list (1) the academic staff to be involved in the program, and (2) the research support accorded to professors in the past with a record of publications, especially in refereed journals.

Name, rank and status	Highest degree held and university that granted it and year obtained	Specialty	Sources of grants received	Grants total amount last 3 years	# of refereed publications last 5 years

13. Include the CVs prepared according to the guidelines described below for all academic staff to be directly involved in the program as an appendix to the proposal.

Guidelines for the preparation of faculty curriculum vitae:

- i. Name: with rank status (tenured, contract, etc.)
 - ii. Degrees: designation, institution, department, year.
 - iii. Employment history: dates, rank/position, department, institution/firm, including current full-time position and link to the program under review.
 - iv. Academic honours: such as F.R.S., F.R.S.C., Governor General's Award, honorary degrees, or equivalent.
 - v. Scholarly and professional academic activities: past 7 years only (e.g. executive and editorial positions but **not** memberships; **invited** presentations at national or international conferences. Please do not list manuscript and grant application reviews).
 - vi. Graduate supervisions: career numbers – master's/doctoral; completed/in progress. Please distinguish between supervision, co-supervision and supervisory committee membership and distinguish between supervisors in the program under review and in other programs, if appropriate. Provide a list of the theses or projects supervised (not participation on supervisory committees) during the last seven years with name of student, title of thesis or project (specify), date of first registration and date of completion.
 - vii. Graduate courses: past 7 years, by year.
 - viii. **External** research funding: past 7 years only, by year, indicating source (granting, councils, industry, government, foundations, other external); amount; purpose (operating, travel, publication, equipment, etc.); if group grant, indicate the number of grantees and whether principal or co-applicant.
 - ix. **Internal** research funding: this includes university funds, SSHRC minor grants awarded through the university, etc.
 - x. Publications: life-time summary (count) according to scholarly books (authored/edited), chapters in books, papers in refereed journals, papers in refereed conference proceedings, major invited contributions and/or technical reports, abstracts and/or papers read, others (i.e., workshops presented, other types of publications). Details for the past 7 years (same categories as above) in chronological order. Please give full citation, including page numbers for books, chapters and journal articles and names of authors in the order in which they appear on the publication.
4. Additional information required to demonstrate that a critical mass of research-active faculty exist, that the current (or planned) faculty complement provides sufficient breadth of disciplinary expertise, and, in the case of a research-based program, that a strong research focus exists within the unit proposing the program (as evidenced by grants, publications, and seminars).

5. In the case of research-based degree programs, a demonstration of faculty's ability to provide long-term supervisory capacity and supervisory committee membership.
6. Description/evidence that an appropriate structure(s) such as an Office of Graduate Studies) are in place to support the program.
7. A more detailed list of available physical and human support facilities, e.g. library resources (holdings ratio among other measures)/access to scholarly communications; laboratories, instruments, computer backup, technician backup, graduate student services, etc. than would be given for undergraduate program.
8. Description of student financial support available, especially in the case of a doctoral program, including a description of available sources (including amounts) for financial student support.

9. Evidence of the existence of an appropriate support network of related programs (undergraduate and as relevant, graduate) at the submitting institution.
10. Information confirming that the proposed program is non-duplicative of offerings elsewhere in the region or represents necessary duplication, or market demand demonstrably justifies further capacity.
11. Information to demonstrate that the nature of the proposed program is such that it can best be offered at the institution in question.
12. Description of the review process of the program proposal by an expert external to the institution selected according to established standards (are recognized scholars in the field of the proposal, have not studied at, collaborated with or worked for the submitting institution within the past seven years, and are not in any potential conflict of interest among other key standards). The expert's Terms of Reference are expected to cover at a minimum the elements highlighted in the Generic Terms of Reference of External Reviewers(Appendix V).

13. Any other information the submitting institution believes would assist the Commission in completing its assessment of the proposed new graduate program.

NEW ARTICULATED PROGRAM PROPOSAL CHECKLIST

Please ensure you have included a copy of each of the following when submitting your completed program proposal to Senate:

- ☐ Department Council/Non-department (i.e., Group of individuals or committee bringing forward the proposal).
- ☐ letter of approval from relevant Dean (or Deans if more than one Faculty involved) (Section I)
- ☐ if program is the first bachelor, master, or doctoral program for the department/ school, curricula vitae for each faculty member involved in the program (Section I)
- ☐ calendar entry for each new course (Section II)
- ☐ if required or elective courses are outside the home Faculty, correspondence from relevant outside unit(s) confirming that additional students can be accommodated and indicating the prerequisite(s) for those course(s), if applicable (Section II)
- ☐ correspondence (as evidence of consultation) between you and the post-secondary institutions who offer similar, equivalent, or comparable programs in the region, and elsewhere as appropriate (Section V)
- ☐ correspondence (as evidence of consultation) between you and employers and/or professional organizations re job market (Section VI)
- ☐ written assessment or comments on the program from peers and experts external to the University who were involved in the development process (Section VII)
- ☐ for graduate- and doctoral-level programs, curricula vitae for each faculty member involved in the program (Section VIII)
- ☐ for graduate- and doctoral-level programs, list of external reviews, summary of the reviewers' conclusion, a description of changes made to the proposal as a result of the external reviews (Section VIII)
- ☐ if a health related program, correspondence received from the AACHR approving the proposed program (Section IX)
- ☐ if applicable, written approval from Vice-President (Finance and Corporate Services) regarding proposed student fees (Section X)
- ☐ libraries assessment (Section XIII)

- ☐ if applicable, feedback received from consultations re university services and space requirements (Section XIII)
- ☐ all correspondence received as a result of approvals and consultations held under Section XIV
- ☐ any items/implications by external partners.