**Information Requirements for Proposals for New Undergraduate Programs**

**Guidelines**

The purpose of these Information Requirements is to outline the information required to allow an external reader to assess that a proposed undergraduate program meets the following assessment criteria:

* Program content, structure and delivery modes reflect a coherent program design that allows for the program objectives and anticipated student outcomes to be achieved, while providing sufficient depth and breadth to meet the standards of quality associated with the credential
* Clearly defined and relevant program objectives and anticipated student and graduate outcomes
* Appropriate fit of name, level and content to ensure “truth in advertising” and to facilitate credential recognition
* Adequate resources (human, physical and financial) to implement and sustain the program
* Program need and viability
* Clearly defined collaborative agreements *[Criterion for programs offered by two or more institutions only, including articulated programs]*

For articulated programs it is important to demonstrate that the proposed program is more than simply a juxtaposition or addition of two programs. The proposed program must show that the program will **integrate** the component parts, providing students with a cohesive program of study and a smooth transition between the two (or more) partner institutions (see the *Policy* for further details).

For further information on the Commission’s program assessment process, including detail on the above-noted criteria, please refer to the full policy document, *Academic Program Assessment Prior to Implementation*. Institutions are also encouraged to contact MPHEC staff should they have questions regarding their program proposal.

Please note that should a program be terminated as a result of the introduction of a new program, and to avoid the need to submit a separate proposal for its termination, the program proposal for the new program should include information on the transition from the existing to the new program, including a phase-out plan for the program being terminated.

**The MPHEC acknowledges that institutions may not be able to meet every information requirement. The absence of information must, however, be noted and explained.**

**Information Requirements**

1. **Program Identification**

1.1 Submitting institution(s)

1.2 Faculty (-ies)

1.3 School(s)

1.4 Department(s)

1.5 Program name

1.6 Program type (e.g., bachelor’s degree, post-baccalaureate certificate)

1.7 Credential(s) granted

1.8 Proposed starting date, considering all required approvals including the MPHEC’s MM/DD/YYYY

1.9 Dates of Senate (or equivalent) and Board approval of the proposed program

(1) Senate MM/DD/YYYY (2) Board MM/DD/YYYY

1.10 Description of the timeframe/phase-out plan, where an existing program will be terminated with the introduction of the new program:

1.10.1 Institutional program code(s) for the existing program(s), as stored in the post-secondary institution’s administrative files, that is reported under PSIS (Post-Secondary Student Information System) (element IP 2000)

1.10.2 Date new registrations will no longer be permitted/accepted into the existing program MM/DD/YYYY

1.10.3 Anticipated date of completion of last student (for the existing program) MM/DD/YYYY

1.10.4 Any other information to assist the MPHEC in understanding how the program will transition from the existing, MPHEC-approved program, to that being proposed

1. **Program Description**

2.1 Description of the program objectives (i.e., “This program aims to…”), including an explanation of how the course and curriculum requirements will be integrated to contribute to the intended objectives of the program.

2.2 Description of the target clientele of the program.

2.3 Evidence of student demand (e.g., survey results, pilot projects, and related course enrolments).

**In the case of articulated programs**, provide evidence of need for broader-based training that would include general university-level competencies.

2.4 Identify each external expert involved in program development, and **append** their written assessment or comments to the proposal[[1]](#footnote-1). Provide a summary of how experts’ comments were addressed.

**In the case of** **articulated programs**, include evidence of consultation with *an advisory industry/sector group* (see section 2.3.1.1 of the *Policy*) comprising a variety of employers and practitioners from the relevant field(s) on the program design and labour market place requirements.

2.5 Using the table provided as an example (see “[Tables to be included in Proposals for New Undergraduate Programs – **Table 2.5 Roll-Out**](http://www.mphec.ca/quality/PubliclyFundedInstitutions.aspx#NewUndergradPrograms)”), outline the year-by-year (or term-by-term) roll-out of the program, accounting for its various components and other learning activities (e.g., work placement(s), thesis, major project) and identifying their links to the program objectives; expected program duration should be stated as well as justified.

**In the case of an articulated or other collaborative program**, identify the institution at which the student is enrolled during each term; when students will be straddling more than one institution at one point in the program, or throughout, outline how students should be considered for enrolment count purposes. If two or more credentials can be earned through program completion, identify the exit point(s) for each credential.

2.6 Description of other promotion/qualification and graduation requirements: e.g., maximum # of introductory (1000-level or equivalent) courses; minimum # of upper-level (3000/4000 or equivalent) courses; completion of a clinical placement or practicum component; minimum average in specific courses/the overall program; must complete *#* credits in *XYZ.*

2.7 Rationale for the choice of program name and credential(s) to be granted, including comment on the process of selecting the name and credential(s).

**In the case of an articulated or other collaborative program**, if two or more credentials will be awarded, specify which institution(s) will award the credential(s) and identify any regulations (e.g., to be awarded a degree, 50% of program content must be completed at X university) that were taken into account.

2.8 Admission requirements and standards specific to the program, including, where applicable, a description of the various admission routes.

**In the case of an articulated or other collaborative program**, provide details on the admission requirements of each program/each participating institution.

2.9 Confirmation of the delivery mode(s) to be used (e.g., traditional classroom, technology-mediated, other distance education methods [please specify], experiential learning, and labs).

2.10 Comparison of the proposed program with other comparable programs offered elsewhere in the Maritimes, Canada or the United States.

**3. Student/Learning Outcomes**

*Thinking about everything provided under Section 2, please provide the following:*

3.1 Define the learning outcomes at both the degree and the discipline/specialization/field levels.

3.2 Using the table provided as an example (see “[Tables to be included in Proposals for New Undergraduate Programs – **Table** **3.2 Student Outcomes**](http://www.mphec.ca/quality/PubliclyFundedInstitutions.aspx#NewUndergradPrograms)”), identify the mechanisms through which student/learning outcomes will be achieved/measured.

3.3 Description of any accreditation requirements.

3.4 Define the anticipated graduate outcomes. Available evidence (e.g., letter of support from potential admitting institutions and/or employers) that the program, as designed, will achieve these outcomes is to be appended.

**4. Human Resources**

4.1 Complete and append the summary table (see “[Tables to be included in Proposals for New Undergraduate Programs – **Table** **4.1 Faculty Resources**](http://www.mphec.ca/quality/PubliclyFundedInstitutions.aspx#NewUndergradPrograms)”) for all faculty to support the program.

*(The institution(s) is encouraged to submit the CV of each faculty member as this will help explain the resources available to support the program; refer to Appendix 5 for Guidelines for Information to be Included in Faculty Curriculum Vitae.)*

4.2 Description of the composition of the faculty to support the program, for example:

4.2.1 Academic/professional credentials required of faculty teaching courses in the program

4.2.2 Academic/professional credentials required of faculty acting as research/clinical/exhibition supervisors in the program

4.2.3 Expected vs. current teaching, mentoring, supervision, etc. responsibilities of faculty in the program

4.2.4 Proportions of full-time to part-time faculty for the program

4.3 Description of additional human resources that will be drawn upon to support the program (e.g., adjunct faculty, guest lecturers, administrative support.)

4.4 Human resource deployment plan for the first five years that takes into account the proposed program as well as current offerings.

4.5 Estimate of additional human resource needs beyond the first five years.

**5. Resource Implications**

5.1 Description of the extent to which *current resources* in terms of academic and support staff, library, space, equipment, etc. would be used. [**Append** any relevant reports (e.g., library resources).]

5.2 Description of *additional resources* needed in the same areas outlined under bullet 5.1 above.

5.3 Using the table provided as an example (see “[Tables to be included in Proposals for New Undergraduate Programs – **Table 5.3 Budget**](http://www.mphec.ca/quality/PubliclyFundedInstitutions.aspx#NewUndergradPrograms)”), identify the anticipated costs/revenues (incremental and total) in **each** of the first years of implementation where the final year demonstrates a steady state for the program (i.e., when the program is fully operational, usually by year five of program operation for undergraduate programs).

5.4 If resources are required but not in place/available at the time of submission, a detailed, credible plan outlining how the funding will be acquired, along with letters of support from potential contributors, is to be submitted. This documentation may be labelled as proprietary which would limit circulation.

5.5 Identification of possibilities of collaboration with other institutions in the region (university or non-university), or elsewhere in Canada, in the delivery of the program and the steps taken to that effect.

5.6 Description of the impact that the use of financial resources for the proposed program will have on other existing programs, including the elimination or reduction of the scope of programs to accommodate the new program. (For example, an accounting of funding for course release for existing faculty members to teach, supervise or provide coordination/management support for this new program; reduction in classroom or laboratory space availability.)

**6. Additional Information (General)**

6.1 Scheduled date of program review, once implemented. MM/DD/YYYY

6.2 Any other information the submitting institution(s) believes would assist the Commission in completing its assessment of the proposed new program.

**7. Additional Information for Technology-Mediated and Other Distance-Delivery Programs**

7.1 Description of how the delivery mode(s) will contribute to and enhance learning and create a community both among students and between students and faculty.

7.2 Description of support available to faculty (required and optional pedagogical training, technical support for course design and then instruction, etc.) and to students (required and optional orientation to technology use, communications on expectations for interaction and performance, etc.).

7.3 Description of faculty availability to students, faculty-to-student feedback, and opportunities for interaction with other students, within this program.

7.4 Description of the mechanisms in place to ensure the following for the proposed program:

 7.4.1 Reliable, sufficient, and scalable course-management systems

 7.4.2 Appropriate hardware, software, and other technological resources and media

 7.4.3 Well-maintained and current technology and equipment

 7.4.4 Sufficient infrastructure to support existing services and expansion of online offerings

**8. Additional Information Requirements for Collaborative Programs (including Articulated Programs)**

8.1 Description of the main components that each institution brings to the program (e.g., disciplinary expertise, practical experience).

8.2 Describe **and append** the signed inter-institutional agreement(s) that are in place to assure the quality of the proposed program and that outline the division of responsibilities for all relevant aspects of the program, including its management and/or delivery, and the means through which the standards of the program will be maintained, with clear channels of authority and accountability. In addition to any other information that may be provided, the agreements ought to address the following:

* The units responsible, at each participating institution, for the academic leadership of the program, detailing the various levels and types of responsibilities. This can include, but is not limited to, responsibility for overall management of the program, and its component parts; quality assurance monitoring and program review; defining procedures and assessment criteria to ensure proper follow-up; and communications within and outside the institutions.
* The units responsible, at each participating institution, for administrative functions for the program, detailing the various levels and types of responsibilities. This can include, but is not limited to: registration; enrolment reporting; student advising/services; and decisions relating to an individual’s progress through the program (e.g., assessment and appeals).
* Cost and revenue-sharing, both in terms of the short-term (implementation of the program) and the long term (maintenance and upgrades). This includes an agreement to the effect that each institution will be funded directly for the part of the program they deliver; when students are registered with and pay fees to the particular institution where they are taking the courses. When students are moving from one institution to the other, in any given term or year, other arrangements should be made and outlined.
* Procedures/standards for student admissions and progression through, and graduation from, the program(s) and the harmonization of these components across the two (or more) institutions.
* Information and reporting requirements for the transcripts and credential(s) to be granted at both (all) institutions.
* Procedures for resolving any differences that might arise between the parties to this collaborative agreement.
* Procedures for the protection of students should the arrangement be terminated.

8.3 Describe the evaluation procedure and cycle that would follow the implementation of the program. The evaluation procedure should address how the institution will take into account the components offered by **each** institution. An integrated and cooperative mechanism should be in place to evaluate **the entire program** (i.e., the program as a whole, including transition between institutions) while addressing each partner’s policies and procedures, frequency of reviews, standards and scope of program review.

**For articulated programs in particular**, the policy must include a graduate follow-up process to measure the success of the program in meeting its objectives (to provide graduates with a more timely access to significant jobs or earnings and to ensure that they have acquired both occupation-specific and general post-secondary education competencies).

8.4 For **articulated** programs, describe the **inter-institutional coordinating mechanism** (see section 2.3.1.1 of the *Policy*)and append its Terms of Reference as well as list of members.

**Appendices**

Please ensure that **each of the following are appended/included**, as applicable, when submitting a completed program proposal:

[ ]  A list of appendices to the program proposal

[ ]  Detailed course descriptions for each compulsory and required elective course including: calendar entry, course objectives, main themes, prerequisites, student evaluation (assessments), and preliminary bibliography (and availability).

[ ]  Letters of support from potential admitting institutions

[ ]  Letters of support from potential employers, and relevant professional organizations (and for articulated programs, from an advisory industry group)

[ ]  Faculty CVs

[ ]  Detailed budget, including completed table of enrolments

[ ]  Letters from external sources of funding commitment/intent to fund

[ ]  Written correspondence (as evidence of consultation) from post-secondary institutions within and outside the region that offer similar, equivalent, or comparable programs

[ ]  Written correspondence/reports from external experts consulted during program development

[ ]  Evidence of student demand (e.g., survey results; analysis of a pilot project)

[ ]  Signed inter-institutional agreements (for articulated and other collaborative programs)

[ ]  Terms of Reference, and list of members, for the inter-institutional coordinating mechanism (for articulated programs)

[ ]  Letter of AACHHR support (for health-related programs)

**Checklist**

[ ]  All of the information requirements have been addressed

[ ]  All relevant appendices are attached

[ ]  Description of the timeframe/phase-out plan where an existing program will be terminated with the introduction of the new program

[ ]  Program roll-out table is complete and detailed course descriptions are appended

[ ]  Student/learning outcomes table is complete

[ ]  Faculty table is complete

[ ]  Human resources deployment plan is provided

[ ]  Explanation of how comments from experts/assessors/consultants etc. were addressed is included

[ ]  Any additional information to help the MPHEC assess the quality of the proposed program

[ ]  Signature (or appended letter) confirming the collaborative submission, and principal applicant, where applicable

1. The timeframe for the MPHEC’s assessment process will probably be reduced if an external program assessment (see Appendix 4) has been undertaken for significantly new undergraduate programs. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)