POLICY ON THE ASSESSMENT OF EXISTING PROGRAMS ESTABLISHED UNDER THE NEW BRUNSWICK *DEGREE GRANTING ACT*

INTRODUCTION

Under the New Brunswick *Degree Granting Act*, designated institutions are required to submit their programs for reassessment in the fifth year following designation. The New Brunswick Minister responsible for Post-Secondary Education (hereinafter referred to as "the Minister") has designated the Maritime Provinces Higher Education Commission (hereinafter referred to as "the MPHEC") as one of the quality assurance bodies to carry-out these follow-up assessments.

The general purpose of reviewing existing programs designated under the New Brunswick *Degree Granting Act* is to monitor the quality of approved degree programs on a continuing basis. The success of the existing program will be determined based on the assessment of its compliance with the MPHEC's assessment criteria (outlined on pages 2-4 of the policy).

Furthermore, the MPHEC will be responsible for taking on the following measures:

- To determine whether an institution has met or has made satisfactory progress towards meeting any commitments it made to the Minister regarding programs, staff, libraries, facilities or any other matter.

- To determine whether an institution has:
  - Satisfied conditions specified by the Minister;
  - Considered fully the comments, suggestions and recommendations of reports by panels of external reviewers, insofar as they have been supported by the Minister, and have responded satisfactorily to them; and
  - Developed suitable mechanisms to undertake self-evaluation.

- To provide the Minister with the necessary information to conclude the appropriateness of:
  - The continuation of an approved degree program, including any Minister requirements or;
  - The withdrawal of approval of a degree program.

Please note that all submissions of self-studies on existing programs are made to the Minister and not the MPHEC. It is the Minister who forwards the self-study to the MPHEC for a quality assessment. The MPHEC's role is limited to conducting the quality assessment and providing advice to the Minister who in turn makes the final decision on all existing programs. Therefore, anyone wishing to submit a self-study under the Act should contact the Post-Secondary Affairs Branch of the Department of Post-Secondary Education, Training and Labour (hereinafter referred to as "the Department"). Prior to submitting a self-study, applicants are strongly encouraged to meet with officials from the MPHEC to go over the assessment information requirements and procedures and to clarify expectations. These preliminary meetings are important as the MPHEC does not normally engage in discourse with the applicant once the quality assessment process has been officially launched.

SUBMISSION OF SELF-STUDIES ON EXISTING PROGRAMS

Self-studies submitted by an institution (hereinafter referred to as "the applicant") under the New Brunswick *Degree Granting Act* must be prepared according to the *Information Requirements for the Preparation of Self-Studies on Existing Programs Established under the New Brunswick Degree Granting Act* (Appendix 1).

Applicants are required to submit 10 paper copies and one electronic copy to the Department for use by the MPHEC. Upon receipt of a self-study, the MPHEC will post the name of the program, a brief description, and the name of the applicant on its website.

The MPHEC reserves the right to request from the applicant additional information which it deems necessary to conclude its assessment of the existing program. Self-studies must meet all of the

information requirements in the *Information Requirements for the Preparation of Self-Studies on Existing Programs Established under the New Brunswick Degree Granting Act* (Appendix 1). If the applicant is unable to provide all of the information requirements, it must justify/document the omission.

The MPHEC appreciates that the information required by its information requirements may, if divulged, cause financial loss or gain to the applicant or any other person. In such circumstances, the applicant should attach the information as an appendix and identify it as proprietary information. In most instances, proprietary information is generally used by staff but it may be distributed to the Joint Association of Atlantic Universities (AAU) and the MPHEC Academic Advisory Committee and to the MPHEC; it will also be circulated to the panel of consultants hired by the MPHEC to assess the existing program. In these instances, consultants will be required to sign a confidentiality agreement and must abide by the Laws of the Province of New Brunswick with respect to confidentiality. In every case, the information will always be identified as confidential when it is distributed.

Please note that the MPHEC reserves the right to modify its policies, procedures, criteria, and information requirements from time to time and will post current versions on its website. It is the applicant's responsibility to use current policies, procedures, criteria, and information requirements.

PANEL OF EXTERNAL CONSULTANTS

To assist in the assessment of existing programs under the NBDGA, the AAU-MPHEC Academic Advisory Committee selects a panel of external consultants to provide independent opinion about the academic merits of the existing program(s). The primary purpose of the formal external review is to monitor the quality and assess how the applicant has fared in light of the MPHEC's assessment criteria for existing programs.

The site visit of the panel will comprise an auditing component. An audit includes examining, on a test basis, evidence supporting the self-studies on existing degree programs. The panel of experts will request additional information from the university, as appropriate, based on their assessment of the applicant's self-study. These information requests will vary from program to program, and the university will be expected to provide any necessary documentation during the panel's site visit. Potential requests could include, but are not limited to, providing evidence to support claims made within the self-study, supplying clarification to responses to the information requirements, etc.

The panel's report, along with the applicant's response, and the AAU-MPHEC Academic Advisory Committee's advice, will help the MPHEC decide on its recommendation and advice to the Minister.

MARITIME DEGREE LEVEL QUALIFICATIONS FRAMEWORK

The MPHEC provides detailed criteria for degree level standards (See Appendix 3 - Maritime Degree Level Qualifications Framework). It is the applicant's responsibility to ensure that the degree level standard and nomenclature is consistent with the type of programs it offers and reflects generally acceptable Canadian standards.

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

The following represents the list of assessment criteria; in responding to each of the information requirements, the applicant must ensure that the self-study clearly identifies how the existing program meets these criteria (see Appendix 4):

1. Evidence of the continuing appropriateness of the program's structure, method of delivery and curriculum for the program's educational goals and the degree level expectations.

2. Evidence of the achievement by students and graduates of the learning outcomes in light of the program's stated goals, the degree level expectations, and, where relevant, the standards of any relevant regulatory, accrediting or professional body.

3. Evidence of the continuing appropriateness and effectiveness of the methods used for the evaluation of student progress and achievement in light of the degree level expectations.

4. Evidence of the capacity of the faculty and staff to deliver the program and the quality of education necessary for the students to achieve the stated learning outcomes, and to meet the demands of the existing and anticipated student enrolments.

5. Evidence of the continuing performance of the faculty, including the quality of teaching and supervision, and their continuing progress and achievement in research, scholarship or creative activity, and professional activity in light of the program under review.

6. Evidence of the appropriateness of the support provided to the learning environment, including but not limited to library and learning resources.

7. Evidence of the effectiveness and appropriateness of the use made of the existing human, physical, technological and financial resources.

8. Evidence of the continuing appropriateness of the academic policies (including admission, promotion and graduation requirements; requests for transfer credit and advanced standing; and appeals) and of the governing and decision-making structures of the academic unit.

9. Clearly defined indicators that provide evidence of quality, including, where appropriate, graduation rates, time-to-completion of degree(s), graduate employment rates, student satisfaction level, and employer satisfaction level.

10. Evidence of the involvement of peers and experts, normally external to the institution in maintaining a quality program. Each external expert should be identified and their written assessment or comments on the existing program should be included.

11. Evidence of need, as documented by, among other things, analysis of the evolution of the discipline: labour market analysis; enrolments; consultation with employers and professional organization(s). This evidence should rely on external sources such as leading scholars, government agencies, employers, professional organizations, etc.

12. Evidence of continuous progress and self-initiated efforts to improve operations and educational offerings and services, including program review policies and procedures that are adequate and promote ongoing program improvements.

13. In the case of graduate programs, evidence of the appropriateness of the academic environment that supports scholarship, such as original research, creativity and the advancement of professional knowledge, as relevant to the existing program. Academic environment is characterized, in the context of program assessment at the graduate level, as follows:
    - A critical mass of research-active faculty and of graduate students;
    - Sufficient breadth of disciplinary expertise among faculty;
    - An appropriate support network of related programs (normally undergraduate and, where relevant, graduate);
    - Capacity to provide a choice of advanced-level graduate courses;
    - Evidence of sufficient library resources (as evidenced by holdings ratio among other measures) and access to scholarly communications for a graduate-level program;
    - An appropriate structure (such as an Office of Graduate Studies) to support the program, especially in the case of a doctoral program; and
    - In the case of research-based (master's and doctoral) degree programs, an appropriate academic environment is further characterized by
        - A strong research focus within the unit proposing the program (as evidenced by peer reviewed grants and publications, as well as seminars, research colloquia etc.);
        - Evidence of faculty's continuous ability to provide long-term supervisory capacity and supervisory committee membership; and

- A demonstration that an appropriate level of student financial support continues to be available.

Please note that: These criteria are a guide and assessors are not limited to, or by, these standards. The MPHEC may provide applicants with a specific list of criteria for their assessments beyond these published standards.

ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES

1. The self-study is forwarded by the New Brunswick Minister responsible for Post-Secondary Education to the MPHEC for an academic quality assessment.

2. The name of the program, a brief description and the name of the submitting institution are posted on the MPHEC's website.

3. Staff prepares an analysis of the self-study.

4. In the event that the self-study is missing information, the applicant will be asked to provide the missing information.

5. The AAU-MPHEC Academic Advisory Committee will normally meet prior to submitting the self-study to external consultants to discuss the self-study, select the consultants, and identify specific areas to be addressed by the panel in its report, in addition to those identified in the Generic Terms of Reference for the External Review of Existing Programs.

6. The Committee establishes a panel comprised of a minimum of three consultants, who possess:
   - An advanced academic credential related to the subject area under review (normally at the terminal level in the field);
   - Any required or desired professional credentials and/or related work experience of substantial depth and range;
   - Relevant academic experience such as administration, teaching, curriculum design and/or quality assessment experience (e.g., as appraisers for accrediting bodies or as reviewers of degree programs); and
   - At least one consultant will have expertise in the delivery mode.

   Other desirable qualities include:
   - Is an active scholar, ideally at the rank of full professor;
   - In the case of graduate programs, has experience in graduate teaching, and, as appropriate, in graduate thesis supervision or in graduate clinical or applied studies supervision; and
   - Is experienced in the administration of programs (e.g., as chair of a department with, graduate program coordinator, chair of the graduate committee, member of an SSHRC/NSERC/CIHR assessment committee, member of a faculty or university graduate or research council or committee).

7. The Committee may, but is not required to, select a consultant from the list of nominees provided by the applicant. The Committee will not consider nominations of individuals who are in conflict of interest (as defined by the MPHEC's Conflict of Interest Policy) or have an inherent bias (whether real or perceived), for example, anyone who has served on any program committee or Board connected to the applicant within the past seven years or who has submitted a letter of support for the program.
8. The panel Chair is appointed by the Committee, and is responsible for overseeing the preparation of the report, liaising with the institution, including presenting, as required, the panel's assessment to the institution and incorporating the institution's response into the panel's report, and finally presenting the report to the Commission. See Appendix 4 for a copy of the Generic Terms of Reference.

9. The panel is provided with the final report from the most recent institutional assessment, including the Minister's final decision based on the assessment. The panel is welcome to comment on whether the applicant continues to meet the standards outlined within the last institutional assessment (e.g., academic freedom and integrity, administrative capacity, etc.).

10. The panel is asked to provide a joint report on which the MPHEC could make a recommendation to the Minister.

11. The panel report is to be based on:
    - A three- to five-day site visit organized by the applicant and the panel.
    - The assessment of the self-study on an existing degree program submitted by the organization, as well as any other pertinent information provided to or requested by the panel.
    - The panel's expertise in the field and knowledge of similar programs elsewhere in Canada or in North America.
    - Any additional documentation provided to the panel to substantiate information provided by the applicant in response to the information requirements.

12. The panel's report is forwarded to the applicant for response.

13. The applicant is to provide a response to the panel's report no later than 30 working days from the day the draft report is delivered to the applicant. If justified, applicants can request, in writing, an extension of ten working days, provided that it informs the MPHEC within the 30 working days allotted to respond to the panel's report.

14. The report is returned to the panel for final review. The panel is then asked to incorporate the institution's response into the final report and to re-evaluate its recommendations to the MPHEC based on its final assessment of how the institution has fared with respect to each of the assessment criteria.

15. The panel Chair will present the final report to the Academic Advisory Committee, which provides comment as appropriate, and formulates its advice to the Commission.

16. The panel Chair will report directly to the MPHEC, providing its findings as well as the institutional response. Likewise, the Chair of the Academic Advisory Committee will report on the Committee's advice to the Commission.

17. Both the Committee's and the MPHEC's advice are forwarded to the Minister.

18. Following the Minister's announcement of his or her decision, the MPHEC will document its recommendation(s) and advice, and the Minister's decision on its website and in its annual report.

19. In addition, the MPHEC and Academic Advisory Committee's assessments and all discussions of the self-study throughout the process are documented in the minutes of the Committee and Commission, which will remain confidential until the Minister notifies the applicant of the final decision and simultaneously advises the MPHEC that the Minister's decision has been communicated to the applicant.

ASSESSMENT OUTCOMES

The MPHEC's advice will conclude with one of two possible answers:

1. The program, appears to (1) continue to correspond with the standards usually associated with the credential and (2) be effectively delivered by the institution[1]; or

[1] The MPHEC, in exceptional cases, may recommend that approval of a self-study by the Minister be conditional on minor changes to the existing program.

2. The program, as delivered, does not appear to correspond with the standards usually associated with the credential.

The MPHEC may offer other advice as it deems appropriate and necessary to assist the Minister in its decision.

The MPHEC will submit, along with its advice to the Minister, the following documentation:

- The panel's Terms of Reference;
- The panel's original report;
- The applicant's response to the panel's report;
- The panel's final report;
- Any modifications made to the self-study by the applicant as a result of the process; and
- Any other document the MPHEC deems necessary to assist the Minister in his or her decision.

LIMITATIONS

The MPHEC shall remain the sole owner of the advice it provides to the New Brunswick Minister of Post-Secondary Education, Training and Labour until such time that its advice is forwarded to the Minister where the advice will remain confidential until the Minister notifies the applicant of the final decision and simultaneously advises the MPHEC that the Minister's decision has been communicated to the applicant. Following the Minister's announcement of its decision, the MPHEC will document its recommendation and the Minister's decision on its website and in its annual report.

In addition, the MPHEC and Academic Advisory Committee's assessments and all discussions of the self-study throughout the process are documented in the minutes of the Committee and the MPHEC, which will remain confidential until the Minister notifies the applicant of the final decision and simultaneously advises the MPHEC that the Minister's decision has been communicated to the applicant.

The MPHEC's assessment and advice to the Minister cannot be represented as the approval or the accreditation of a program, the accreditation of the institution or the approval of the degree granting status by the applicant.

If, for any reason, the MPHEC is convinced that the applicant is unwilling or unable to supply the required information for the MPHEC to fulfill its obligations and responsibilities, the MPHEC may terminate the assessment process.

All self-studies and supporting documentation are subject to the provisions of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act. In accordance with the provisions of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, an applicant should identify any information in its application for which the applicant claims confidentiality. The MPHEC cannot guarantee confidentiality, as disclosure may be required pursuant to the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.

TIMEFRAME

The assessment process, from the time the MPHEC receives a self-study to the submission of the MPHEC's advice to the Minister, takes an average of four to six months to complete. The timeframe will vary depending on the types of issues which arise during the process, on completeness of the self-study, and on the schedule of the AAU-MPHEC Academic Advisory Committee and Commission meetings (both meet approximately 5 times per year). It is important to note that this timeframe does not include the time for the Minister to advise the applicant of his or her decision.

FEES

The MPHEC will invoice the Department for all expenses associated with the MPHEC's assessment. This cost includes staff time and disbursements (consultants' fees and expenses, and any other expense directly related to the assessment). The Department is responsible for recovering these costs from the applicant.

The charge for an assessment will vary with each application, depending on the number of reviewers, the length and complexity of the review, and associated travel, accommodation, and meeting or communication costs, and whether the applicant's response to the panel's report requires further assessment.

(Approved as a three-to-five year pilot: September 20, 2010)

APPENDIX 1

INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS FOR THE PREPARATION OF SELF-STUDIES ON EXISTING PROGRAMS ESTABLISHED UNDER THE NEW BRUNSWICK *DEGREE GRANTING ACT*

The MPHEC acknowledges that not all the information requested will be available for each and every self-study. The absence of information must, however, be noted and explained. The key is to address the assessment criteria listed on pages 2-4 of the policy.

1. PROGRAM IDENTIFICATION

1.1 Applicant(s) - Name and Address
1.2 Contact name
1.3 Program name and level
1.4 Identify Honours, Majors or areas of specialization available within the program
1.5 Date first enrolments were reported and that the first cohort graduated
1.6 Brief description of program (to be posted on website)

2. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

2.1 A description of program objectives, including an explanation of how the course and curriculum requirements have been integrated to contribute to the objectives of the program. Describe how the institution is ensuring that the stated student objectives are being met, and provide evidence of institutional monitoring in this area. If applicable, note any modifications to these objectives since the last assessment by the MPHEC*, including a description of why these modifications were necessary.

2.2 Provide a side-by-side comparison of the original program structure and the existing program structure. Provide evidence of the continuing appropriateness of the program's structure. In addition, describe any modifications and note why they were necessary.

2.3 Describe the strengths and weaknesses of the program, including areas in which modifications are needed.

2.4 Provide evidence that the program's admission requirements, standards, and promotion and graduation standards are consistent with the level of the degree program. Describe how the institution is ensuring that these standards are being met and provide evidence in support of its response. If applicable, note any modifications to the standards since the last assessment by the MPHEC*, including a description of why these modifications were necessary.

2.5 Describe courses (Include list with course name and number, its status in the program, i.e., compulsory vs. optional; brief description of the course [for example, calendar entry]). Program duration should be stated, as well as justified. The course descriptions should be comparable to those found in any current university calendars and detailed outlines are to be appended. A discussion of prerequisite courses that may be required is also pertinent. It is important to demonstrate how the thematic structure and the mechanics of the program interrelate to provide a cohesive program of study. In the case of an undergraduate program show how the courses build in complexity and are applicable to practice in the field. Provide samples of student course work, grading, etc.

2.6 In programs with an applied focus, describe how the program ensures the appropriate balance of theory and practice, including the appropriate work experience, field placements, or internship dimensions either required by the profession or material to the quality of education.

2.7 Note other special requirements such as thesis, practicum, apprenticeship, etc.

* If the MPHEC has not conducted an assessment of this program, a timeline for the assessment period will be identified by the Department, the MPHEC and the applicant.

2.8 In the case of a graduate program, indicate whether a program is a research-based program or professional program, thesis-based or course-based.

2.9 Provide evidence that the degree is being recognized and accepted by other post-secondary institutions, employers, professional and licensing bodies.

3. DELIVERY MODE

3.1 In the case of programs with a co-op component, indicate what the objectives are in including this element. Describe the process used to select appropriate co-op placements. Include a list of co-op placements over the past five years and describe how these placements have supported student learning.

3.2 Indicate which delivery mode(s) is being used (traditional classroom, technologically-mediated or other), and in what proportion.

If on-line learning is a delivery method,

3.3 Describe the organization's policies, guidelines and practices pertaining to technology-based, computer-based, and web-based learning modes of delivery to ensure:

- faculty have sufficient technical and pedagogical expertise;
- prospective students are notified of the required level of preparation (technical knowledge, motivation, and independence);
- student protection measures (intellectual property, privacy);
- reliable, sufficient, and scalable course-management systems;
- accessible technical assistance for students and faculty;
- appropriate hardware, software, and other technological resources and media;
- well-maintained and current technology and equipment;
- sufficient infrastructure to support existing services and expansion of online offerings;
- sufficient opportunities to interact with faculty and other students (for graduate programs especially).

Note: Please include as appendices any relevant policies.

3.4 Provide evidence of monitoring how on-line learning methods or other features of on-line courses contribute to and enhance the creation of academic community among students and between students and faculty.

3.5 If program is delivered using traditional classroom, provide description of class room space (size, equipment on site, location, etc)

4. Student Outcomes and their Relevance

4.1 Identify learning outcomes and their relevance to the existing 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. Document how the program meets or exceeds the student outcome standards appropriate to the degree-level standard. Demonstrate not only how students have been meeting student outcomes for the general degree level standards but also for the student outcomes that are specific/relevant to the program's field of study. If applicable, provide evidence that the learning outcomes are in line with the requirements of professional and accrediting bodies in their field of practice. If applicable, note any modifications to these outcomes since the last assessment.

4.2 Describe how the institution maintains the currency of the program quality and ensures appropriate learning outcomes. Include a description of the type and frequency of evaluative techniques that are used. Explain how examinations, assignments, and other evaluation tools measure the achievement and mastery of stated program outcomes. Describe how required

assignments measure the student's ability to master and apply skills or knowledge that are stated as outcomes for the program. Provide samples of the examinations and other evaluation tools.

4.3 Identify graduate outcomes and their relevance to the program, such as further education or graduate study, employability, licensing, accreditation, etc. Include evidence that the program as designed is achieving these outcomes (e.g., confirmation from admitting institutions, employers, graduates, etc.).

4.4 Identify other outcomes and their relevance to the program, such as team building, leadership, social citizenship, etc. Include evidence that students are meeting these outcomes.

5. PHYSICAL RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

Considering the last five years (or the time frame since the last MPHEC assessment) of the program's operation:

5.1 Describe the institution's library and its services. If the institution does not have its own library, explain how it provides access to library resources and services that assist students to meet the objectives of the degree program. Give the name, position, and qualifications of the person(s) who provide or facilitate library services, including media services. Explain how the instructors/faculty and staff of the institution and program systematically and regularly evaluate library services to ensure that they are meeting the needs of its users and contributing to the attainment of institutional and program objectives.

5.2 Describe how current resources are sufficient in scope, quality, currency and type to support students and faculty in the academic program offered by the institution in terms of space, equipment, etc., including a detailed list of physical and human support facilities (e.g., laboratories, instruments, computer backup, technician backup, etc.).

5.3 Describe any additional resources needed in the same areas, including an estimate of resource needs and allocation over the next five years.

6. FACULTY RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

6.1 Provide a list of all academic staff involved, including rank, the highest degree held by each professor and the name of the university that granted it, the specific field in which each professor excels by virtue of his/her previous experience, education or juried research, the name of other post-secondary or research institutions with which each professor is affiliated as a teacher, administrator or researcher, on-site, full-time or part-time status.

The following summary table should be completed for all faculty members.

Name, Rank, and Status	**Highest Degree held and university that granted it and year obtained**	**Specialty**	**Source of Grants received**	**Grants Total amount last 3 years**	**# of refereed publications last 5 years**
e.g. John Doe Associate Part-time	PhD University **X** 1979	Business management	University Provincial National	$18,500	10

Also append the CVs prepared according to the guidelines in Appendix 2.
Note: Written consent to share the CV's of faculty must be provided.

6.2 Include an additional table that provides a mapping of all courses (and sections) offered over the last five years, indicating which faculty taught the courses and the number of students that were enrolled in each.

6.3 Describe the organization's policy with regard to Faculty, including:

- academic/professional credentials required of present and future faculty teaching courses in the program;
- academic/professional credentials required of faculty acting as research/clinical/exhibition supervisors;
- the requirement to have on file evidence supplied direct to the institution from the granting agency of the highest academic credential and any required professional credential claimed by faculty members;
- faculty selection process;
- the regular review of faculty performance, including student evaluation of teaching and supervision;
- the means for ensuring the currency of faculty knowledge in the field;
- faculty teaching and supervision loads;
- faculty availability to students; and
- other professional development of faculty including the promotion of curricular and instructional innovation as well as technological skills, where appropriate.

Note: *Relevant policies should be appended.*

6.4 Estimate of human resource needs and allocation over the next five years.

6.5 Note any additional information to demonstrate that a critical mass of faculty exists and that the current faculty complement provides sufficient breadth of disciplinary expertise.

6.6 Describe any anticipated changes to the above faculty (for example, retirements), if applicable.

6.7 Demonstrate that a critical mass of research-active faculty exists, that the current faculty complement provides sufficient breadth of disciplinary expertise, and, in the case of a research-based program, that a strong research focus exists within the unit proposing the program (as evidenced by grants, publications and seminars, etc.).

6.8 In the case of research-based degree programs, demonstrate that the faculty has established long-term supervisory capacity and supervisory committee membership.

Other

6.9 Describe the administrative structure of the program, including academic leadership and administrative support, at the program level.

7. FINANCIAL RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

7.1 A detailed budget including:

- Full and incremental costs of the program for the next five years, broken down by major cost areas: academic salaries, other salaries, equipment, library acquisitions, space, etc.
- Expected sources of revenue to cover the costs for the next five years broken down by major funding sources: tuition, external donations, etc.
- Expectations in terms of additional capital or operating funding, including best-case and worst-case scenarios.

7.2 Describe resource changes that have been encountered over the past five years and future anticipated changes. Explain what circumstances prompted these changes and how future anticipated changes will affect the delivery of the program.

7.3 Describe the impact of the use of financial resources on other existing programs, over the past five years, including the elimination or reduction of the scope of other programs to accommodate this program.

7.4 Include a copy of the institution's most recent business plan and audited financial statements (as an appendix).

8. RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PROGRAMS

8.1 Identify the priority assigned to this program within the applicant's structure and core business.

8.2 Describe the relationship to and impact on other existing programs in the same organization over the past five years.

8.3 Describe how the existing program compares with other comparable programs offered elsewhere in the Maritimes and in Canada and provide a rationale for any significant differences.

9. LINKAGES TO THE LABOUR MARKET

If the program relates to a certified occupation or a particular industry, complete this section.

9.1 Evidence that the existing program is appropriately training students for the labour market; this could include, but is not limited to, letters from past/current employers, graduates, etc.

9.2 Indicate graduates' results in professional certification or licensing examinations.

9.3 The program should normally have the benefit of an advisory industry group. It should comprise a variety of employers and practitioners from the relevant field(s). This group would provide advice on program design and marketplace requirements. Describe the full composition of the group, stating the names of all members and indicating whether they represent employers or practitioners.

10. PROGRAM NEED

10.1 Provide detailed enrolments over the past five years, including course by course and total enrolments. Describe how these enrolments have affected the faculty's ability to offer a quality program.

10.2 Indicate the number of credentials granted in the program for each year.

10.3 Describe how many students apply to the program per year. Of those, describe what proportion is fully qualified, what proportion is admitted, and what percentage of students that start the program complete it.

10.4 Describe the average time to complete the existing program.

10.5 Describe the attrition rates of the existing program over the past five years.

10.6 Provide the student demographics (e.g., average age, gender, country/province of residence, part-time/full-time, etc.).

11. EVALUATION POLICY

11.1 Describe the organization's evaluation procedure and cycle including graduate follow-up surveys, student course evaluations, program/curriculum reviews, etc. This description ought to include the frequency and timeline of the review and identify the coordinating unit responsible for the overall management of the assessment process and for defining the assessment criteria, and determine the procedures and areas of responsibilities to ensure a proper follow-up to a review. Note any methods used to ensure student confidentiality throughout such evaluations.

11.2 In the case of any internal/external reviews, experts consulted/hired should be listed. Provide results of any reviews undertaken since the program was implemented. How has this monitoring lead to changes in the existing program?

11.3 Describe any plans for further developments or changes over the next five years.

11.4 Where applicable, describe any accreditation requirements that apply to the existing program, including a description of how the program has fared over the past five years with respect to these requirements.

11.5 Describe who is responsible for ensuring the continuing relevance of the program and administering any necessary modifications.

11.6 Any other information the submitting institution believes would assist the Commission in completing its assessment of the existing program.

Note: Please include as appendices any relevant policies.

12. ADDITIONAL ASSESSMENT CRITERIA AND INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS IN THE CASE OF A GRADUATE PROGRAM

12.1 Self-studies for graduate programs are assessed through all previously listed assessment criteria as well as the following criteria:

- Existence of an academic environment that supports scholarship such as original research, creativity and the advancement of professional knowledge, as relevant to the program. Academic environment is characterized, in the context of program assessment at the graduate level, as follows:
  - a critical mass of research-active faculty and of graduate students;
  - sufficient breadth of disciplinary expertise among faculty;
  - an appropriate support network of related programs (normally undergraduate and, where relevant, graduate);
  - capacity to provide a choice of advanced-level graduate courses;
  - evidence of sufficient library resources (as evidenced by holdings ratio among other measures) and access to scholarly communications for a graduate-level program;
  - an appropriate structure (such as an Office of Graduate Studies) to support the program, especially in the case of a doctoral program; and
  - in the case of research-based (master's and doctoral) degree programs, an appropriate academic environment is further characterized by
    - a strong research focus within the unit proposing the program (as evidenced by peer reviewed grants and publications, as well as seminars, research colloquia, etc.);
    - evidence of faculty's ability to provide long-term supervisory capacity and supervisory committee membership; and
    - a demonstration that an appropriate level of student financial support is available.
- Employability and student demand for such a program favour the continuation of the program.

12.2 Describe the graduate student services and structure(s) (such as an Office of Graduate Studies) that are in place to support the program.

12.3 In the case of research-based degree programs, describe how the program provides sufficient opportunities and support for research and other scholarly activity as well as interaction with other scholars.

12.4 Provide a more detailed list of available physical and human support facilities, e.g., library resources (holdings ratios among other measures)/access to scholarly communications; laboratories, instruments, computer backup, technician backup, graduate student services, etc. than would be given for undergraduate programs.

12.5 Describe student financial support available, especially in the case of a doctoral program, including a description of available sources (including amounts) for financial student support.

12.6 Provide evidence of the existence of an appropriate support network of related programs (undergraduate and as relevant, graduate) at the submitting institution. Describe how these programs have contributed to the success of the existing program.

12.7 Any other information the submitting institution believes would assist the MPHEC in completing its assessment of the existing program.

13. NOMINEES FOR EXTERNAL CONSULTANTS

As part of the submission of the self-study, the applicant is asked to nominate three to six individuals from whom the MPHEC may, but is not required to, select as an external consultant. In making its nominations, the applicant is asked to keep in mind the following criteria. Nominees should possess:

- an advanced academic credential related to the subject area under review (normally at the terminal level in the field);
- any required or desired professional credentials and/or related work experience of substantial depth and range;
- relevant academic experience such as administration, teaching, curriculum design and/or quality assessment experience (e.g., as appraisers for accrediting bodies or as reviewers of degree programs);and
- at least one consultant will have expertise in the delivery mode

Other desirable qualities include:

- is an active scholar, ideally at the rank of full professor;
- in the case of graduate programs, has experience in graduate teaching, and, as appropriate, in graduate thesis supervision or in graduate clinical or applied studies supervision; and
- is experienced in the administration of programs (e.g., as chair of a department, graduate program coordinator, chair of the graduate committee, member of an SSHRC/NSERC/CIHR scholarship committee, member of a faculty or university graduate or research council or committee).

The Committee will not consider nominations of individuals who are in conflict of interest or have an inherent bias (whether real or perceived), for example, anyone who has served on any program committee or Board connected to the applicant within the past seven years or who have submitted a letter of support for the program.

13.1 Nominate three to six individuals from whom the MPHEC may select as an external consultant**,** including:

- Name
- Title
- Affiliation
- Telephone Number
- Email Address

CHECKLIST FOR SELF-STUDIES ON EXISTING PROGRAMS

Please ensure that you have (appended) **each** of the following when submitting a completed self-study on an existing degree program for review.

- ☐ **All** of the information requirements have been addressed
- ☐ **Reports** from internal and/or external reviewers, if applicable.
- ☐ Faculty **curriculum vitaes**
- ☐ Copy of most recent **Business Plan** and **audited financial statements**
- ☐ Any relevant **policies**

APPENDIX 2

GUIDELINES FOR THE PREPARATION OF FACULTY CURRICULUM VITAE

Note: Written consent to share the CVs of faculty must be provided.

1. Name: with rank, status (tenured, contract, etc.).

2. Degrees: designation, institution, department, year.

3. Employment history: dates, rank/position, department, institution/firm, including current full-time position and link to the program under review.

4. Academic honours: such as F.R.S., F.R.S.C., Governor General's Award, honorary degrees, or equivalent.

5. Scholarly and professional academic activities: past 7 years only (e.g., executive and editorial positions but ***not*** memberships; **invited** presentations at national or international conferences. Please do not list manuscript and grant application reviews).

6. Graduate supervision: career numbers - master's/doctoral; completed/in progress. Please distinguish between supervision, co-supervision and supervisory committee membership and distinguish between supervision in the program under review and in other programs, if appropriate. Provide a list of the theses or projects supervised (not participation on supervisory committees) during the last seven years with name of student, title of thesis or project (specify), date of first registration and date of completion.

7. Graduate courses: past 7 years, by year.

8. **External** research funding: past 7 years only, by year, indicating source (granting councils, industry, government, foundations, other external); amount; purpose (operating, travel, publication, equipment, etc.); if group grant, indicate the number of grantees and whether principal or co-applicant.

9. **Internal** research funding. This includes university funds, SSHRC minor grants awarded through the university, etc.

10. Publications:
    - Life-time summary (count) according to the following categories:
      - scholarly books
        - authored
        - edited
      - chapters in books
      - papers in refereed journals
      - papers in refereed conference proceedings
      - major invited contributions and/or technical reports
      - abstracts and/or papers read
      - others (e.g., workshops presented, other types of publications)

    - Details for the past 7 years (same categories as above), in chronological order. Please give full citation, including page numbers for books, chapters and journal articles and names of authors in the order in which they appear on the publication.

Note: For some faculty members (e.g., in the performing arts) it may be more appropriate to list exhibitions/performances, by year (for the past seven years), indicating the nature of the exhibition/performance (e.g., juried; local/national/ international; public/competition; and so forth).

MARITIME DEGREE LEVEL QUALIFICATIONS FRAMEWORK

1. UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMMES

1.1 Description of Degree Categories

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

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

MARITIME DEGREE LEVEL QUALIFICATIONS FRAMEWORK

1. UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMMES

1.2 Degree Level Standards

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

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

2. GRADUATE PROGRAMMES

2.1 Description of Degree Categories

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

MASTER'S DEGREE

1. Overall Programme Design and Outcome Emphasis

Professional

A professional master's degree programme builds on knowledge and competencies acquired during undergraduate study, and requires more specialized knowledge and intellectual autonomy than a bachelor's degree programme. Much of the study undertaken at the master's level will have been at, or informed by, the forefront of an academic or professional discipline.

Students will have shown originality in the application of knowledge, and they will understand how the boundaries of knowledge are advanced through research. They will be able to deal with complex issues both systematically and creatively, and they will show originality in tackling and solving problems. Students will understand how professional practice is informed by research, and will have developed the skills necessary to keep apprized of the research literature, to evaluate the reliability of research findings and their relevance for professional practice, and to use research findings as a basis for professional practice.

Profession-oriented master's programmes normally draw on students holding bachelor's degrees or first professional degrees from varied academic backgrounds and provide them with a selection of courses and exercises intended to prepare them for a particular profession or field of practice or, if they are already involved in the profession or field, to extend their knowledge base and skills as professionals/practitioners.

Examples: MSW (Social Work), MHA (Health Administration), MPA (Public Administration), MHRM (Human Resource Management), M. Eng. (Engineering)

Research

A master's degree programme builds on knowledge and competencies acquired during related undergraduate study, and requires more specialized knowledge and intellectual autonomy than a bachelor's degree programme. Much of the study undertaken at the master's level will have been at, or informed by, the forefront of an academic or professional discipline.

Students will have shown originality in the application of knowledge, and they will understand how the boundaries of knowledge are advanced through research. They will be able to deal with complex issues both systematically and creatively, and they will show originality in tackling and solving problems.

Research-oriented master's programmes are typically offered to graduates of related undergraduate or professional programmes in the field or to students who have taken bridging studies to equip them for graduate study in the field; the focus is on developing the research, analytical, methodological, interpretive and expository skills necessary for doctoral studies or for leadership in society. Typically, programmes are thesis-based and require the student to develop and demonstrate advanced research skills under supervision. Some programmes are course-based and require students to demonstrate the necessary research, analytical, interpretative, methodological and expository skills in course exercises.

Examples: M.A. programmes in the humanities and social sciences; M.Sc. programmes, MASc. (Engineering)

2. Preparation for Employment and Further Study

Graduates will have the qualities needed for employment in circumstances requiring sound judgment, personal responsibility and initiative, in complex and unpredictable professional environments. In the case of research-based programmes, graduates will have received the skills necessary to proceed with further graduate level study (i.e.: doctoral studies).

3. Length of Programme

A master's programme is typically three to five semesters in duration.

DOCTORAL DEGREE

1. Overall Programme Design and Outcome Emphasis

Professional

A doctoral programme builds on the knowledge and competencies in a field or discipline acquired during prior study, usually at the graduate level. Study at the doctoral level is at the forefront of an academic or professional discipline.

Holders of the doctoral degree must have demonstrated a high degree of intellectual autonomy, an ability to conceptualize, design and implement projects for the generation of significant new knowledge and/or understanding, and their ability to create and interpret knowledge that extends the forefront of a discipline, usually through original research or creative activity.

Practice-oriented doctoral programmes are of a more applied nature, relate to a professional or creative activity and, where there is an internship or exhibition requirement, may also require a dissertation. Doctoral programmes with an orientation to practice typically involve more course work than doctoral programmes with a more theoretical or disciplinary focus. Such programmes lead to the award of a degree designation reflecting the field or discipline.

Examples: Ed.D. (Education), Mus. Doc. (Music), Psy.D. (Psychology)

Research

A doctoral programme builds on the knowledge and competencies in a field or discipline acquired during prior study, usually at the graduate level. Study at the doctoral level is at the forefront of an academic or professional discipline.

Holders of the doctoral degree must have demonstrated a high degree of intellectual autonomy, an ability to conceptualize, design and implement projects for the generation of significant new knowledge and/or understanding, and their ability to create and interpret knowledge that extends the forefront of a discipline, usually through original research or creative activity.

Research-oriented doctoral programmes focus on the development of the conceptual and methodological knowledge and skills required to do original research and to make an original contribution to knowledge in the form of a dissertation. In some fields an internship or exhibition component may be required, but without diluting the significance of the dissertation as the primary demonstration of mastery. Such programmes lead to the award of the Ph.D.

Examples: Ph.D. (Psychology), Ph.D. (Education), Ph.D. (Music)

2. Preparation for Employment and Further Study

Holders of doctorates will have the qualities needed for employment requiring the ability to make informed judgements on complex issues in specialist fields, and innovation in tackling and solving problems.

3. Length of Programme

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

2. GRADUATE PROGRAMMES

2.2 Degree Level Standards

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

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

APPENDIX 4

GENERIC TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE EXTERNAL REVIEW OF EXISTING PROGRAMS SUBMITTED UNDER THE NEW BRUNSWICK *DEGREE GRANTING ACT*

1. The panel of experts is asked to provide a joint report on which the MPHEC could make a recommendation to the New Brunswick Minister responsible for Post-Secondary Education.

2. The report is to be based on:
   - A three- to five-day site visit organized by the applicant and the panel.
   - The assessment of the self-study on an existing degree program submitted by the organization, as well as any other pertinent information provided to or requested by the panel.
   - The panel's expertise in the field and knowledge of similar programs elsewhere in Canada or in North America.
   - Any additional documentation provided to the panel to substantiate information provided by the applicant in response to the information requirements.

3. The report will range from five to fifteen typewritten pages.

4. Standard elements of the assessment will include:
   - Assessment of program content, structure, and requirements in relation to normally accepted and expected standards of similar programs and graduates, in Canada and elsewhere, as well as in relation to program title and credential awarded. The assessment will include a comment on the appropriateness of the level of study to respond to identified needs, as well as the effectiveness of the delivery mode(s).
   - As appropriate, a comparison with other comparable programs. How does the program compare with other similar programs offered elsewhere in the Maritimes and in Canada? An assessment of the need for the program? What are the value-added characteristics of the program?
   - Assessment of the adequacy of human resources available for the areas of specialization identified and for program operation, (i.e. number and quality of faculty). Specifically, the report should provide answers to:
     - Is there an appropriate distribution of expertise and strengths for the program?
     - Does the faculty complement provide sufficient depth and breadth of research expertise and linkages with both the national (or international, as appropriate) research community and practitioners to provide an appropriate intellectual environment for students, given the program area?
     - In your view, is the current faculty complement successfully operating the existing program?
     - If new faculty are to be hired, are the position requirements and the selection process adequate.
     - Assessment of faculty evaluation and selection processes.
   - Assessment of the adequacy of physical resources available for program operation, taking enrolments into account (i.e., library holdings, budget allocation, etc). Specifically, are the academic and support staff, library, space, equipment, etc. adequate for the program? In addition, comment on the adequacy of the available physical and human support facilities, e.g., laboratories, instruments, computer backup, technician backup, etc. If new/additional facilities are required, comment on the description of the facilities, cost, process and timeline to acquire them.
   - Assessment of the appropriateness of the organizational environment in providing this program. Specifically, the report should comment on whether or not adequate procedures have been put in place/followed for regular review and assessment of the quality of the program? and quality of teaching?
   - Comment on the stability of the program and the resources allocated to it.

- Comment on the program's anticipated student outcomes and whether these have been achieved for students in all streams.
- Opportunities presented by present and anticipated labour market trends to graduates of such programs, given the focus.
- Comment on the support to faculty for research, inquiry and academic freedom.
- Assessment of the organization's policies, guidelines and practices pertaining to technology-based, computer-based, and web-based learning modes of delivery to ensure:
  - faculty have sufficient technical and pedagogical expertise
  - prospective students are notified of the required level of preparation (technical knowledge, motivation, and independence);
  - student protection measures (intellectual property, privacy);
  - reliable, sufficient, and scalable course-management systems;
  - accessible technical assistance for students and faculty;
  - appropriate hardware, software, and other technological resources and media; and
  - well-maintained and current technology and equipment;
  - sufficient infrastructure to support existing services and expansion of online offerings
  - sufficient opportunities to interact with faculty and other students (For graduate programs especially).

- Assess how on-line learning methods or other features of on-line courses contribute to and enhance the creation of academic community among students and between students and faculty.

5. The panel is asked to comment on the following assessment criteria which are used by the MPHEC to assess existing programs established under the New Brunswick Degree Granting Act. The panel is to assess the existing program in light of each of the assessment criteria and note whether the applicant:
   - Fails to meet the criterion
   - Meets or exceeds the criterion
   - Meets the criterion on the condition that the following requirements are addressed:

Assessment Criteria

1) *Evidence of the continuing appropriateness of the program's structure, method of delivery and curriculum for the program's educational goals and the degree level expectations.*
2) *Evidence of the achievement by students and graduates of the learning outcomes in light of the program's stated goals, the degree level expectations, and, where relevant, the standards of any relevant regulatory, accrediting or professional body.*
3) *Evidence of the continuing appropriateness and effectiveness of the methods used for the evaluation of student progress and achievement in light of the degree level expectations.*
4) *Evidence of the capacity of the faculty and staff to deliver the program and the quality of education necessary for the students to achieve the stated learning outcomes, and to meet the demands of the existing and anticipated student enrolments;*
5) *Evidence of the continuing performance of the faculty, including the quality of teaching and supervision, and their continuing progress and achievement in research, scholarship or creative activity, and professional activity in light of the program under review.*
6) *Evidence of the appropriateness of the support provided to the learning environment, including but not limited to library and learning resources.*
7) *Evidence of the effectiveness and appropriateness of the use made of the existing human, physical, technological and financial resources.*
8) *Evidence of the continuing appropriateness of the academic policies (including admission, promotion and graduation requirements; requests for transfer credit and advanced standing; and appeals) and of the governing and decision-making structures of the academic unit.*
9) *Clearly defined indicators that provide evidence of quality, including, where appropriate, graduation rates, time-to-completion of degree(s), graduate employment rates, student satisfaction level, and employer satisfaction level.*

10) *Evidence of the involvement of peers and experts, normally external to the institution in maintaining a quality program. Each external expert should be identified and their written assessment or comments on the program should be included.*
11) *Evidence of linkages to the labour market, including, where appropriate, confirmation from employers of graduates.*
12) *Evidence of need, as documented by, among other things, analysis of the evolution of the discipline: labour market analysis; enrolments; consultation with employers and professional organization(s). This evidence should rely on external sources such as leading scholars, government agencies, employers, professional organizations, etc.*
13) *Program review policies and procedures are adequate and promote ongoing program improvements.*
14) *Evidence of continuous progress and self-initiated efforts to improve operations and educational offerings and services.*
15) *In the case of graduate programs, evidence of the appropriateness of the academic environment that supports scholarship, such as original research, creativity and the advancement of professional knowledge, as relevant to the existing program. Academic environment is characterized, in the context of program assessment at the graduate level, as follows:*
    - *a critical mass of research-active faculty and of graduate students;*
    - *sufficient breadth of disciplinary expertise among faculty;*
    - *an appropriate support network of related programs (normally undergraduate and, where relevant, graduate);*
    - *capacity to provide a choice of advanced-level graduate courses;*
    - *evidence of sufficient library resources (as evidenced by holdings ratio among other measures) and access to scholarly communications for a graduate-level program;*
    - *an appropriate structure (such as an Office of Graduate Studies) to support the program, especially in the case of a doctoral program; and*
    - *in the case of research-based (master's and doctoral) degree programs, an appropriate academic environment is further characterized by*
        - *a strong research focus within the unit proposing the program (as evidenced by peer reviewed grants and publications, as well as seminars, research colloquia etc.);*
        - *evidence of faculty's ability to provide long-term supervisory capacity and supervisory committee membership; and*
        - *a demonstration that an appropriate level of student financial support is available.*

6. The panel will be asked to conduct an on-site audit as part of the assessment. An audit includes examining, on a test basis, evidence supporting the self-studies on existing degree programs. The panel of experts will request additional information from the institution, as appropriate, based on their assessment of the applicant's self-study. These information requests will vary from program to program, and the institution will be expected to provide any necessary documentation during the panel's site visit. Potential requests could include, but are not limited to, providing evidence to support claims made within the self-study, supplying clarification to responses to the information requirements, etc. Internal Guidelines for the auditing component of the assessment will be provided to panel members.

7. Any other additional comments judged important or useful by the panel.

8. The report should include a recommendation on one of the following options (the recommendation(s) should be substantiated in the report), with additional comments as deemed useful by the reviewer:
    - "the program appears to (1) continue to correspond to the standards usually associated with the credential and (2) be effectively delivered by the institution"; or
    - "The program, as delivered, does not appear to correspond to the standards usually associated with the credential".

9. In addition, the report can include specific recommendations regarding periodic program review, and other recommendations as the panel would judge important and useful.
10. Once the institution has had the opportunity to respond to the panel's report, the panel will be asked to review the institution's response and to provide a final report and recommendation(s), as well as any additional advice, as necessary.