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# Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BPS</td>
<td>Broader Public Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTL</td>
<td>Centre for Teaching and Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COU</td>
<td>Council of Ontario Universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPRs</td>
<td>Cyclical Program Reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLEs</td>
<td>Degree Level Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIPPA</td>
<td>Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDLEs</td>
<td>Graduate Degree Level Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSEC</td>
<td>Graduate Studies Executive Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOs</td>
<td>Learning Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTCU</td>
<td>Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCAV</td>
<td>Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCGS</td>
<td>Ontario Council of Graduate Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QAAC</td>
<td>Quality Assurance Appraisal Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QA</td>
<td>Quality Assurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QAF</td>
<td>Quality Assurance Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QC</td>
<td>Quality Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUQAP</td>
<td>Queen’s University Quality Assurance Processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAD</td>
<td>Senate Committee on Academic Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCPRC</td>
<td>Senate Cyclical Program Review Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGS</td>
<td>School of Graduate Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDLEs</td>
<td>Undergraduate Degree Level Expectations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Preface
The quality assurance (QA) processes adopted in 2011 by all Ontario universities through the initiatives of the Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents (OCAV), have resulted in a sea change in the approval, management and monitoring of new and existing academic programs. The QA processes aim to facilitate an integrated approach to academic and budgetary planning, and focus on enhancing the quality of a university education. They also aim to improve consistency among all university programs offered in Ontario.

At the centre of these new QA processes is the articulation of degree level expectations (DLEs) and learning outcomes (LOs), which outline the creative and intellectual development students will achieve from a particular degree or program. Knowing what skills, knowledge and understanding students have acquired from their academic programs should provide enhanced mobility for our students who wish to move between educational institutions and from one jurisdiction to another. It will also help assure potential employers that they are hiring the right type of graduate.

Queen’s developed its own Quality Assurance Processes (QUQAP), modelled after the Quality Assurance Framework (QAF). They were originally approved by Queen’s Senate in November 2010 and ratified by the Council of Ontario Universities (COU) Quality Council (QC) in April 2011. The processes were updated following an audit by the Quality Council. The revised version was approved by Senate in December 2014 and ratified by the Quality Council in June 2015.

This guide is a companion to the QUQAP policy, offering guidance to academic units and administrators who are working within the QA processes on new program development and review of existing programs. The Quality Assurance Framework is also accompanied by a guide that you may find useful.

Faculty and staff are also urged to refer to this QUQAP Guide frequently and should note that it is a “living document”. Its contents will change periodically, not only in response to updates from the COU QC, but also in response to constructive feedback from the end users – faculty, students and staff at Queen’s. To this end, suggestions for additions or improvements to this QUQAP Guide are welcomed and may be sent to M. Roxanna Gholami, Teaching and Learning Coordinator, Office of the Provost and Vice-Principal (Academic) at: quqap@queensu.ca
Introduction

This QUQAP Guide is intended to assist academic units and administrators as they navigate through the QA processes (QUQAP) for approval of new programs, modifications of existing programs, and cyclical review of existing programs. It provides context and background for:

Features of the Quality Assurance Processes
QUQAP, Queen’s templates, DLEs, curriculum mapping

Approval Processes for New Programs
New undergraduate (UG) and GRAD programs, choosing reviewers, minor versus major modifications of existing programs, new programs - special cases

Cyclical Program Reviews (CPRs)
Roles and responsibilities, orientation session, self-study preparation, review team site visit, CPRs - special cases

Features of the Quality Assurance Processes

When the Quality Assurance processes replaced Internal Academic Review and OCGS review in 2011, there were a number of changes to approvals and reviews of new and existing academic programs. These include:

- A greater emphasis on articulating degree level expectations (DLEs), as well as the learning outcomes (LOs) of a given program. The greater focus on explicitly articulating these fundamental measures of teaching and learning is aimed at providing greater accountability for Ontario’s publicly assisted universities.

- The first step in development of a new academic program is now a pre-approval process. The pre-approval allows relevant deans and the provost to approve, in principle, the proposed new program. If preliminary approval is granted, a decision will be made at this time as to whether the proposal is eligible for an expedited approval process (no external review required) versus a full approval process (external review required). Details of the different processes are provided later in this QUQAP Guide.

- The QA processes call for greater involvement of the faculty deans and the provost in approval and review processes to assist in better integrating the university’s academic and budgetary planning processes.
• Proposed new undergraduate programs are now subject to external review. After the internal approval processes are complete, new UG program proposals will also be reviewed by the COU Quality Assurance Appraisal Committee, which will make recommendations for approval to the QC.

• New graduate programs continue to be subject to external review as they were previously under the Ontario Council of Graduate Studies (OCGS). However, they are now reviewed by the COU Quality Council Appraisal Committee and approved by the QC, instead of an OCGS Committee.

• The cyclical program review (CPR) process has replaced Queen’s internal academic reviews and OCGS reviews. CPRs of undergraduate and graduate programs will be conducted simultaneously. Where applicable and appropriate, CPRs can also be scheduled to coincide with external accreditation reviews of professional programs.

1. Queen’s Templates for Approval and Review Processes

1(i) Templates

Fillable templates related to approval of new programs, major modifications to existing programs, and cyclical program review are available on the Provost’s Office Quality Assurance Website.

N.B. 1: These templates are updated periodically in response to feedback from the end users, and academic units should check the Provost’s Office Quality Assurance website to ensure that they are using the latest versions when preparing proposals for new programs or for CPRs.

N.B 2: When completing templates, academic units are encouraged to delete sections of the template that are not relevant to their proposal/self-study, etc. including specific instructions, in order to reduce the amount of distracting “empty white spaces” and enhance the readability of the documents in both electronic and paper formats.

1(ii) CV Requirements

Both the approval processes for new programs, and cyclical review process, requires submission of the CVs of faculty associated with the program. The specific templates
contain instructions on exactly who needs to submit their CV. Early in the development of QUQAP, a prescriptive CV module was required. As the processes have developed, that module has been dropped and there is now more flexibility in which CVs can be submitted. Please see the guidelines on elements that CVs must cover, available on the QUQAP website.

Academic units are free to decide among themselves which format is most convenient for their discipline, for example Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada, Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, Canadian Institutes of Health Research, as long as all of the essential elements in the CV guidelines are covered. The decision as to what CV format will be used is taken at a program-wide level; i.e. all CVs submitted should ideally be in the same format. This is to assist external reviewers in their review of CVs.

Faculty members should understand that as a consequence of the multistep QA processes, as is common in most academic review processes, their CVs may be viewed by many people.

Note: For new program proposals and CPRs where multiple CVs are required, academic units are asked to “bundle” them together into a single PDF that may be linked to the primary document for easy referral.

1(iii) Budget Module and Template

The budget module and template are important and integral components of the QUQAP new program approval processes. Thus, a budget must be prepared and rationalized as a part of the submissions for all new program proposals (and in some cases, as part of submissions requesting a major modification of an existing program). This will be reviewed together with the proposal. At present, the budget module and template comprises an Excel spreadsheet and a template for the narrative to accompany the spreadsheet. It was designed to assist academic units in ensuring that all elements of the anticipated costs and revenues associated with a new program (or a major program modification, in some instances) are appropriately and realistically considered and accounted for as accurately as possible.

N.B. 1: It is in the best interests of an academic unit to consult early on in the process with appropriate resource individuals in the School of Graduate Studies (SGS) for graduate programs, the Registrar’s Office, the Faculty Office (for example faculty business officer and associate dean or dean), and the Associate Vice-Principal, Planning and Budgeting while preparing the budget module and template for their program
propose.

N.B. 2 It should be noted that unlike the CVs, the budget module and template are considered internal documents and will not be sent to external reviewers during the approval process. They will, however, be available to internal stakeholders including (but not limited to) members of the Senate Committee on Academic Development (SCAD) and Senate.

1(iv) Degree Level Expectations

The COU endorsed the Guidelines for Undergraduate Degree Level Expectations (UDLEs) and Graduate Degree Level Expectations (GDLEs) in December 2005.

The DLEs are critical and foundational elements of new program approvals and cyclical program reviews. They define expectations and explicitly state what is appropriate for a given degree program in terms of both discipline specific as well as generic knowledge and skills. The DLEs are aimed at helping academic units to better evaluate and monitor the effectiveness of all aspects of instruction in their programs and to clarify the outcomes expected of GRADs.

In essence, DLEs for academic programs awarded by Ontario’s publicly assisted universities identify several broad categories of knowledge and skills that students are expected to demonstrate in order to be awarded a degree that include (as a minimum):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate (UDLEs)</th>
<th>Graduate (GDLEs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Depth and breadth of knowledge</td>
<td>Depth and breadth of knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of methodologies</td>
<td>Research and scholarship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application of knowledge</td>
<td>Level of application of knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication skills</td>
<td>Professional capacity/autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of limits of knowledge</td>
<td>Level of communications skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy and professional capacity</td>
<td>Awareness of limits of knowledge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At least once every eight years, a cyclical program review is to be conducted to evaluate the quality of an existing academic program. Included in this review will be an assessment of the extent to which a program is meeting its DLEs. If gaps or shortcomings are identified, academic units will be asked to develop implementation plans to remedy the situation.

Academic units are encouraged to take advantage of resources available for assistance
in formulating and articulating DLEs and LOs for their academic programs. Such resources include the Centre for Teaching and Learning (CTL) and the SGS.

1(v) Curriculum Mapping

Curriculum mapping can be defined as a systematic process that provides a visual overview of learning outcomes, assessment practices, and instructional strategies across a sequence of courses within a program. Curriculum mapping has become integral to understanding the students’ learning experience. It helps students, instructors, administrators and external stakeholders determine where, when, and how learning outcomes are taught and assessed in a specific program. It also provides a framework that helps to ensure programs are optimally organized to build on what students have learned in the early years to prepare them for upper-year study, and ultimately, for postgraduate opportunities. Finally, a mapped curriculum enhances the ability of academic units to make purposeful and appropriate modifications as needed.

For examples of curriculum mapping tools for undergraduate and graduate programs, see the CTL website:

Academic units are encouraged to take advantage of additional online resources available to assist in curriculum mapping and to consult with the CTL for guidance.

2. Program Approval Processes – Full and Expedited

It is important to note that there are restrictions on when an institution may announce its intention to offer a new undergraduate or graduate program in advance of approval by the Quality Council. Once a new program has been approved by Senate, and in advance of its approval by Quality Council, the intention to offer a new program may only be announced subject to approval by the Provost and Vice-President Academic. Any reference to the proposed program must contain the following statement: “Prospective students are advised that offers of admission to a new program may be made only after the university’s own quality assurance processes have been completed and the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance has approved the program.”

The chart below provides a ready reference to the different levels of approval required for different types of proposal.
### Approval Level Required for New Programs and Changes to Existing Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>External Review</th>
<th>QC Appraisal Committee Approval</th>
<th>QC Approval</th>
<th>Queen’s Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Programs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Professional Master of Education (PME); PhD in Environmental Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Modifications</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Revision of fields: Geological Science and Geological Engineering.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Introduction of internship: M.Eng.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Change in course requirements: Graduate Diploma in Accounting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Modifications</td>
<td>Most: No. Limited cases: Yes (c.f. section 1.5)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Modification to a course description or prerequisites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Collaborative Program¹</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Biostatistics; Cancer Research; Applied Sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate DualCredential Program (linking two existing credentials)²</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Joint Program</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>MEng in Nuclear Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Diplomab</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Business; Graduate Diploma in Risk Policy and Regulation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Dual Degree Program</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Master of International Business (dual degree option)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Please consult the Office of the Provost at quqap@queensu.ca or School of Graduate Studies at sgsasst@queensu.ca early in the development stage of a joint, dual or collaborative program for clarification on the level of approval needed. A joint or collaborative program may fit the criteria for a new program, in which case it would be subject to external review and Quality Council approval. However, articulation agreements are not generally within the scope of QUQAP and would not require external review or QC approval.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergrad &amp; Grad Combined/Concurrent Programs</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>JD/MA (Law/Economics)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For-Credit Certificate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Undergraduate Certificate in Business</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Undergraduate Programs

2(i) New Undergraduate Programs

Proposals for all new undergraduate programs, regardless of whether or not the university will be applying for provincial Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities (MTCU) funding, must undergo a full approval process. This process includes external review, internal approval by Queen’s Senate, and appraisal by the Quality Council. (see flowchart page 16). On the basis of its appraisal, the QC will decide whether to approve or reject a proposal.

The Relevant Templates for New Undergraduate Programs are:

- New UG program proposal: Pre-approval form
- New UG program proposal: Full approval submission form
- CV Guidelines
- Budget module and template
- New UG program proposal: External reviewer nomination form
- New UG program: External reviewers report form

Pre-Approval Process
The first step in a new program proposal is seeking approval in principle from the provost to move forward with development of a new (or in some cases, a major modification of a) program(s) of study leading to an undergraduate degree, diploma or certificate. A pre-approval form is available for this purpose. When completed by the academic unit(s), this form must be submitted to the appropriate dean(s) for approval. The dean(s) may, at his/her discretion, submit the completed pre-approval form to the subcommittee (for example Curriculum Committee) of the unit’s Faculty Board (or equivalent) for review, comment and/or preliminary approval.

Completion of the pre-approval form is best done in a consultative fashion between the relevant faculty members and staff in the academic unit(s) and the relevant associate dean(s) in the Faculty Office(s). The intent of the form is to provide a brief summary that establishes the academic merits of the proposed new program (or the proposed modification) and the alignment of its objectives with those of the relevant faculty or faculties and the university. It is also intended as an early vehicle for all potential stakeholders to indicate their awareness and support of the proposal in principle. Thus, the pre-approval form should be completed in such a way that it contains basic academic information about the proposal and its academic and resource requirements, as well as documents indicating support and “buy-in” from relevant stakeholders.
Once the completed pre-approval form has been approved by the dean, it should then be submitted to the Provost’s Office where it will be considered by the provost for approval to go forward as a full program submission. At this time, a decision will be made, in consultation with the academic units and the Faculty Office, as to whether the proposal is eligible for an expedited approval process (no external review required; Senate approval sufficient) or a full approval process (external review required; QC approval required) prior to its submission to SCAD. Note that there are different templates for the two processes.

**New Undergraduate Program**

The template (submission form) for new undergraduate program proposals is comprised of four parts, the most important of which are the Executive Summary, Section B, which addresses the evaluation criteria used to assess the proposal, and Section D, government reporting information.

The Executive Summary is a key section of the proposal since it is likely to be read often and referred to repeatedly through the multiple steps of the approval process. Consequently, it is important that it not only contains sufficient background to provide a convincing rationale for the proposal but it also needs to provide a clear and concise overview of the main points of the proposal in sufficient detail to engage a diverse audience. A length of one-page for the Executive Summary is recommended and it should not exceed two pages.

Section B of the new undergraduate program proposal form is comprised of 12 subsections, 11 of which address the various criteria on which the proposal will be evaluated. The final subsection provides a place where supporting documentation (for example letters from deans, collaborators, and other stakeholders, etc.) for the other subsections can be assembled. The evaluation criteria include summaries of the program’s objectives, its proposed regulations, structure, and admission requirements as well as the anticipated enrolment and resources required to mount the new program. Aspects of the program’s quality are also to be described here including assessment of teaching and learning.

Academic units should consult frequently with the relevant Faculty Office(s) during the development of their proposal.
**QUQAP**
New Undergraduate Program Approval Process

1. **Emergence of concept**
   - Proposal development
   - Faculty Board approval
   - External review and subsequent report
   - Internal responses
   - SCAD
   - Senate
   - Quality Council
   - MTCU

2. **Presubmission**
   - Template completed by unit, signed by unit head, dean and president.
   - Review by Faculty Board Subcommittees (discretionary).
   - Dean’s office recommends potential reviewers, which are then approved by the president.

3. **In the event that significant changes are recommended by the external review(s), the president may request that the academic/academic review the proposal prior to submitting it to SCAD.**
Table 1.  
Approval Process for New Undergraduate Programs 
Then and Now

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEN (former process)</th>
<th>NOW (QUQAP process)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-approval of new program <em>in principle</em> by provost</td>
<td>Program proposal developed by academic unit (now includes budget details)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program submission developed by academic unit</td>
<td>External review/internal responses; approval by department/faculty committee(s)/dean as per faculty regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval by Faculty Board(s)</td>
<td>Approval by the QC Appraisal Committee and then the QC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAD – approval by Senate</td>
<td>SCAD – approval by Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTCU for funding purposes</td>
<td>MTCU for funding purposes (if eligible)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2(ii) Undergraduate Program – Expedited Approval

The process for Expedited Approvals may culminate in Senate approval, or may also require approval by the Appraisal Committee of the Quality Council, depending on the type of proposal. Senate will make the decision on final approval when:

- There is a proposal for major modifications to an existing degree Program or Program of specialization (major modifications to programs are defined below in Section 3.3); or
- There is a proposal for a new Senate-approved Certificate, combined or concurrent Program (undergraduate or graduate), or graduate dual degree Program.

The Appraisal Committee of Quality Council will make the decision on final approval when:

- There is a proposal for a new for-credit Diploma; or
- There is a proposal for a new joint or (graduate) collaborative Program.

An expedited approval process does not normally require external review.
Faculty members or academic units who wish to develop proposals for new undergraduate combined, collaborative or concurrent programs, should first consult with the dean(s) of their faculty/school and the Provost’s Office before proceeding.

2(iii) Minor & Major Modification to an Existing Undergraduate Program – Expedited Approval

Minor Modifications
Approval of minor changes, such as changes to the description of an UG program or course and course prerequisites, remain the jurisdiction of each faculty’s Curriculum Committee and/or Faculty Board (or equivalent). Additional examples of undergraduate program modifications considered to be minor are listed in section 4 below.

The exceptions to this rule are changes to degree designation, departmental names and/or program names. These are considered minor modifications, yet they require the consideration and approval of SCAD and Senate.

Major Modifications
In addition to new concurrent, collaborative and combined undergraduate programs, proposals for major modifications to an existing undergraduate program are also normally eligible to be appraised through an expedited approval process (see chart page 19). Thus, major program modifications require approval by SCAD and Senate but do not require either external review or QC appraisal. Examples of UG program changes considered to be major modifications are listed below in section 4 below.

Academic units should consult with the relevant dean/associate dean of their respective faculty/school and the Provost’s Office, for guidance.

The Relevant Templates for Expedited Approval of a Major Modification to an Existing Undergraduate Program are:

- Proposal for a new or modified UG program: Pre-approval form (may be required; check with Provost’s Office quap@queensu.ca)
- Proposal for major modification of an UG program: Full approval submission form (modified as appropriate in consultation with the appropriate Faculty Office)
- Budget module and template (as applicable)
- CV Guidelines
Graduate Programs

2(iv) New Graduate Programs

Proposals for all new graduate programs, regardless of whether or not the university will be applying for provincial (MTCU) funding, must undergo a full approval process which requires external review followed by internal approval by Queen’s Senate. New graduate degree proposals must also be reviewed by the QC Appraisal Committee (see chart page 22). Based on that appraisal, the QC will decide whether to approve or reject the proposal. Graduate diplomas are not subject to QC approval but must be approved by the QC Appraisal Committee. Graduate certificates will be approved by Senate and do not need to go to the Quality Council or QC Appraisal Committee.

The Relevant Templates for New Graduate Programs are:

- New GRAD program proposal: Pre-approval form
- New GRAD program proposal: Full approval submission form
- CV Guidelines
- Budget module and template
- New GRAD program proposal: External reviewer nomination form
- New GRAD program: external reviewer's report form

To assist academic unit(s), a template has been developed which is to be used when seeking approval in principle from the SGS and provost to move forward with development of a new program(s) of study leading to a graduate degree (or certificate or diploma). The completed form should be completed in consultation with the SGS and then submitted for discussion and approval by the Graduate Studies Executive Council (GSEC) prior to proceeding with a full new graduate program submission. A copy of the pre-approval form must also be submitted to the Office of the Provost and Vice-Principal (Academic) for consideration and approval. Once approved, a full proposal may be developed.

Note: There are different templates for the pre-approval and full approval processes. Academic units must work with the Office of the Vice-Provost and Dean, SGS during the development of their proposal. Refer also to the QUQAP website for more information.

New Graduate Program Proposal

The submission form for new graduate program proposals is comprised of four parts, the most important of which are the Executive Summary, Section B, which addresses the evaluation criteria used to assess the proposal, and section D, government reporting
The Executive Summary is a very important section of the proposal since it is likely to be read often and referred to repeatedly through the multiple steps of the approval process. Consequently, it is important that it not only contains sufficient background to provide a convincing rationale for the proposal but it also needs to provide a clear and concise overview of the main points of the proposal in sufficient detail to engage a diverse audience. A length of one-page is recommended and it should not exceed two pages.

Section B of the new graduate program proposal form is comprised of 12 subsections, 11 of which address the various criteria on which the proposal will be evaluated. The final subsection provides a place where supporting documentation (for example letters from deans, collaborators, other stakeholders, etc.) for the other subsections can be assembled. The evaluation criteria include the program’s objectives, its proposed regulations, structure, and admission requirements as well as the anticipated enrolment and resources required to mount the new graduate program. Aspects of the program’s quality are also to be described here including faculty attributes and research funding.

Academic units must consult with the SGS and the relevant dean’s office(s) during development of their proposal. Refer also to the QUQAP website for more information.
# Table 2. Approval Process for New GRAD Programs

## Then and Now

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEN (former)</th>
<th>NOW (QUQAP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-approval of new program in principle by GSEC</td>
<td>Pre-approval of new program in principle by GSEC and provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program submission developed by unit</td>
<td>Program proposal submission developed by unit (now includes budget details)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval by Faculty Graduate Council(s)/Committee(s)/Faculty Board(s) in accordance with their respective regulations</td>
<td>Approval by Faculty Graduate Council(s)/Committee(s)/Faculty Board(s) in accordance with their respective regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval by GSEC</td>
<td>Approval by GSEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAD – approval by Senate</td>
<td>SCAD – approval by Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External review – OCGS approval</td>
<td>Appraisal and approval by QC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitted to MTCU for funding purposes (if eligible)</td>
<td>Submitted to MTCU for funding purposes (if eligible)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 2(v) New Graduate Programs – Eligible for Expedited Approval

The process for Expedited Approvals may culminate in Senate approval, or may also require approval by the Appraisal Committee of the Quality Council, depending on the type of proposal. Senate will make the decision on final approval when:

- There is a proposal for major modifications to an existing degree Program or Program of specialization (major modifications to programs are defined below in Section 3.3); or
• There is a proposal for a new Senate-approved Certificate, combined or concurrent Program (undergraduate or graduate), or graduate dual degree Program.

The Appraisal Committee of Quality Council will make the decision on final approval when:
• There is a proposal for a new for-credit Diploma; or
• There is a proposal for a new joint or (graduate) collaborative Program.

An expedited approval process does not normally require external review.

Academic units must request confirmation of eligibility for an expedited approval process from the provost and the Vice-Provost and dean of the SGS, which is typically done through the pre-approval process. At this stage the proposal will be examined to determine if it needs to go through the full or expedited approval process. Faculty members or academic units who wish to develop proposals for new graduate combined, collaborative or dual degree programs should first consult with the Vice-Provost and dean of the SGS and the provost before proceeding.

The Relevant Templates for Expedited Approval of a New Graduate Collaborative Program eligible for Expedited Approval are:
• New GRAD program proposal: Pre-approval form
• New GRAD collaborative program proposal: Expedited approval submission form
• Budget module and template
• CV Guidelines

2(vi) Minor & Major Modification to an Existing Graduate Program – Expedited Approval

Minor Modifications
Approval of minor modifications to a graduate program such as modifications to a course remains within the jurisdiction of the GSEC. Additional examples of graduate program changes considered to be minor are listed in section 4.

The exceptions to this rule are changes to degree designation, departmental names and/or program names. These are considered minor modifications, yet they require the consideration and approval of SCAD and Senate.

Major Modifications
In addition to new collaborative and combined graduate programs, proposals for major modifications to an existing graduate program are also normally eligible to be appraised through an expedited approval process (see chart page 26). Thus, major program
Modifications require approval by SCAD and Senate but do not require either external review or QC appraisal. Examples of graduate program changes considered to be major modifications are listed in section 4.

Depending on the type of major modification proposed, it may not be necessary to complete a pre-approval form prior to submission of the proposal. Academic units should consult with the Provost’s Office, SGS, and the relevant faculty dean/associate dean for guidance.

The Relevant Templates for Expedited Approval of Major Modifications to Existing Graduate Programs are:

New GRAD program proposal: *Pre-approval form* (if applicable)
Proposal for major modification of an existing GRAD program: *Expedited approval submission form*
Budget module and template (if applicable)
CV Guidelines
Quoquent, a graduate expedited approval process

Emergence of concept.

Development takes place within the academic unit, in discussion with the dean(s).

Pre-approval

Proposal development

Faculty Board

GSEC

SCAD

Senate

GSEC

Quality Council and MTCU for information

Preapproval is NOT required for all major modifications. Please consult with the provost or vice-provost and dean (SGS).
3. Choosing Reviewers for New and Existing Programs

All proposals for new undergraduate programs are subject to review by at least one external reviewer. External reviews are normally to be conducted on-site, but may be conducted by desk audit, video conference or an equivalent method if the external reviewer(s) and the provost are satisfied that the off-site option is acceptable. If academic units wish to pursue this option, it must be discussed during the pre-approval process. A draft schedule for a new undergraduate program site visit is at appendix D (iv).

To assist the selection of external reviewers of new undergraduate programs, academic units should submit information on six nominees using the nomination forms provided. The purpose of these forms is to provide the essential information needed to ensure proposed reviewers are academically qualified and sufficiently at arm’s length. The completed forms are also needed for purposes of QC audit as evidence that Queen’s has been compliant with its own QUQAP. Completed nomination forms should be submitted first to the faculty dean(s) who will then consult with the provost for final approval. To expedite this process, it is important that these forms are completed in sufficient detail that informed decisions can be made by the senior academic administration without introducing delays caused by needing additional information.

For new graduate programs, at least two external reviewers as well as an on-site visit are required. An off-site review option is not available unless approved in advance by the QC. To assist in the selection of external reviewers, academic units are asked to submit information on six nominees by completing the template provided. These nominations should be submitted in the first instance to the Vice-Provost and dean, SGS who will consult with the provost’s office for final approval. Again, to avoid delays, it is important that these forms are completed in sufficient detail that informed decisions can be made in an efficient manner by the senior academic administration, and the requirements for the QC audit process are met.

For cyclical program reviews, the composition of the review team varies to some degree according to the type of program(s) under review (for details, see section 7 (ii), Composition and Selection of Review Teams).

The Relevant Templates for Nominating Reviewers are:
- New UG program proposal: External reviewer nomination form
- New GRAD program proposal: External reviewer nomination form
- CPR: Review team nomination form

The relevant faculty dean is responsible or inviting reviewers to participate in the review
of proposed new undergraduate programs.

The SGS is responsible for inviting external reviewers to participate in the review of proposed new GRAD programs. Please contact Sarah Pugh, Assistant to the Dean, SGS at: sgsasst@queensu.ca if you have any questions or concerns.

Arm’s Length Requirement

External reviewers for both new and existing programs must be at arm’s length (see below for more detail) and have strong track records as academic scholars. Ideally, they should have had academic administrative experience in such roles as UG or graduate program coordinators, department chair, associate dean, graduate dean or related positions. Reviewers are also expected to have experience with curriculum design and developing LOs. This combination of experience helps to ensure that a reviewer will provide the most informed and constructive feedback on program proposals and reviews.

The following is an excerpt from the COU QA Guide:

“Best practice in quality assurance ensures that reviewers are at arm’s length from the program under review. This means that reviewers/consultants are not close friends, current or recent collaborators, former supervisor, advisor or colleague.

Arm’s length does not mean that the reviewer must never have met or even heard of a single member of the program. It does mean that reviewers should not be chosen who are likely, or perceived to be likely, to be predisposed, positively or negatively, about the program. It may be helpful to review the examples below of what does and does not constitute a close connection that would violate the arm’s length requirement.”

Examples of what may not violate the arm’s length requirement:

- Appeared on a panel at a conference with a member of the program
- Served on a granting council selection panel with a member of the program
- Author of an article in a journal edited by a member of the program, or of a chapter in a book edited by a member of the program
- External examiner of a dissertation by a doctoral student in the program
- Presented a paper at a conference held at the university where the program is located
- Invited a member of the program to present a paper at a conference organized by the reviewer, or to write a chapter in a book edited by the reviewer
- Received a bachelor’s degree from the university (especially if in another
Co-author or research collaborator with a member of the program more than seven years ago
- Presented a guest lecture at the university
- Reviewed for publication a manuscript written by a member of the program

Examples of what may violate the arm’s length requirement:
- A previous member of the program or department under review (including being a visiting professor)
- Received a graduate degree from the program under review
- A regular co-author and research collaborator with a member of the program, within the past seven years, and especially if that collaboration is ongoing
- Close family/friend relationship with a member of the program
- A regular or repeated external examiner of dissertations by doctoral students in the program
- The doctoral supervisor of one or more members of the program
4. Minor or Major Modification? Major Modification versus a New Program? (UG & Graduate)

It can sometimes be difficult to determine whether the change you are thinking about is a major or minor modification. Or if proposed changes to an existing program are so extensive that they constitute a new program. The following examples may help academic units and administrators make these distinctions. If any uncertainty remains, units are urged to contact the Provost’s Office (and the Office of the Vice-Provost and Dean, SGS for graduate programs) for clarification. In turn they will, if necessary, contact the QC for confirmation. It is best to be certain at the beginning of the process rather than later.

FAQ: Is our proposal a minor modification, a major modification or a new program?

The following are offered as examples of a “minor modification” to an existing program:

- Addition or deletion of a course
- Modification of a course
- Modification to a course title
- Modification to a course description
- Modification to prerequisites
- Modification to existing course delivery (for example addition of online delivery)

Major modifications to an existing program typically fall within one of four categories, examples of which are listed below:

- Changes in program requirements such that they differ significantly from those existing at the time of the previous cyclical review:
  - Merger of two or more programs (no substantive changes to DLEs and LOs)
  - Significant change in the laboratory time of an UG program/plan
  - Changes in admission or graduation requirements
  - Introduction or deletion of an undergraduate thesis or capstone project
  - Introduction or deletion of an undergraduate work experience, internship or practicum (or portfolio or co-op, etc.)
  - At the master’s level, the introduction or deletion of a research project, research essay or thesis
  - Deletion, creation or renaming of a field in a graduate program
  - Any change to the requirements for graduate program candidacy examinations, field studies or residence requirements
Major changes to courses comprising a significant proportion of the required workload of the program/plan (normally one-third or more of the program; the provost (or delegate) has the authority to decide what level of proposed changes constitutes a major modification, and which would be considered a new program)

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

- Significant changes in the faculty engaged in delivering the program and/or to the essential resources (as may occur, for example, when there have been changes to the existing mode(s) of delivery such as different campus, online delivery, inter-institutional collaboration):
  - Offering of an existing program substantially online where it had previously been offered in face-to-face mode (or vice versa)
  - Changes to the faculty delivering the program (for example a large proportion of the faculty retires; new faculty hires significantly alter the area of research and teaching interests, etc.)
  - Change from full-time to part-time program options (or vice versa)
  - Changes to essential resources where these changes significantly alter/impair the delivery of an existing program
  - Establishment of an existing degree program at another institution or location

- Other:
  - Introduction of a new UG minor (general plan or sub-plan)
  - Addition of a new study abroad option
  - Change in a degree designation without also substantially changing the program requirements or learning outcomes, for example LLB to JD, MSc(E) to MASc**
  - Changes to a departmental name**

** (Considered minor modifications but follow the major modification approval process)

The following are offered as examples of new programs:

- Creation of a major program in addition to a pre-existing minor program. For example, Queen’s offers a minor program (general plan) in Jewish Studies. The introduction of a major program (major plan) in Jewish Studies would be considered a new program (undergraduate only).
- Introduction of a new degree program. For example, adding a PhD program in an academic unit where an MA or MSc program already exists.
- Establishment of a program that is comprised of existing courses as well as a
substantial number of new courses (normally one-third or more of the program; the provost (or delegate) has the authority to decide what level of proposed changes constitutes a major modification, and which would be considered a new program; units are encouraged to consult with the SGS).

- Adding a BScH degree to a pre-existing BAH program to draw on growing research strength.
- Creation of a program that incorporates pre-existing courses from several disciplines and requires the creation of new courses.

The following chart maps recently approved programs (prior to the implementation of the new QAF) to the new processes of QUQAP. By way of example, it illustrates what approval levels the programs would have followed, had they been submitted after September 1, 2011.

Table 3. List of Approval Levels for Recently Approved Programs at Queen’s Mapped to QUQAP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Approval process (and level)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MD/PhD and MD/MSc</td>
<td>Combined UG (professional) and GRAD (relies entirely on already approved programs)</td>
<td>Expedited (Senate approval)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medieval Studies (minor; general plan)</td>
<td>UG – major modification (relies entirely on existing courses)</td>
<td>Expedited (Senate approval)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Latin American Studies (minor; general plan)</td>
<td>UG – major modification (introduction of a minor/general plan)</td>
<td>Expedited (Senate approval)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Graduate Program in Biomedical Engineering</td>
<td>GRAD collaborative program (relies entirely on already approved programs)</td>
<td>Expedited (Senate approval)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Field of Study in MSc (Primary Health Care Nursing)</td>
<td>GRAD field – major modification</td>
<td>Expedited (Senate approval)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate Program in Geographic Information Science</td>
<td>New UG certificate</td>
<td>Expedited (Senate approval)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Graduate Program in Cancer Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New GRAD collaborative (relies entirely on already approved programs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expedited (Senate approval)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Development and Human Toxicology Sub-plan (UG – new research sub-plan (stream) in existing BSc (Life Sci))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expedited (Senate approval)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Master’s Program in Biostatistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAD collaborative degree (relies entirely on already approved programs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expedited (Senate approval)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined MA(Economics) and JD (Law)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined GRAD and UG (professional)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expedited (Senate approval)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Science in Healthcare Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New GRAD program (new)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full approval (Senate then QC approval)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA (Gender Studies)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New GRAD program (new)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full approval (Senate then QC approval)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **Approval Processes for Joint Programs**

A joint program is defined as a program of study offered by two or more universities, or by a university and a college or institute (including an Institute of Technology and Advanced Learning), in which successful completion of the requirements is confirmed by a single degree document (see QAF Guide). Although such joint programs are not common at Queen’s, one example is the MEng in Nuclear Engineering which is offered by Queen’s with five other Ontario universities. Academic units that wish to develop proposals for new joint programs should first consult with their Faculty Office(s), the Provost’s Office and/or the SGS before proceeding. Joint programs are normally approved by Senate and the Quality Council Appraisal Committee.

6. **Approval Processes for Diplomas and Certificates**

Certificates and diplomas are academic programs that are frequently designed to suit the needs of a particular clientele or market, and are often offered on a full-cost recovery basis or as net revenue generating programs. In certain circumstances, Senate approved diplomas and certificates may also be eligible for MTCU funding.
Proposals for new for-credit diplomas are to be prepared using the templates provided and require approval by Senate and by the Quality Council Appraisal Committee. for-credit diploma programs are subject to cyclical review every eight years, normally in conjunction with the programs of the academic unit that offers the certificate/diploma.

Proposals for new for-credit certificates are to be prepared using the templates provided and require Senate approval through SCAD. While approval by the QC is not required, Queen’s may request assessment by the QC Appraisal Committee (see below) and will normally do so in order to maximize the opportunity of securing MTCU funding. All new Senate approved for-credit certificate programs are to be described in Queen’s Annual Report to the QC and are also subject to cyclical review every eight years, normally in conjunction with the programs of the academic unit that offers the certificate/diploma.

For-credit and not-for-credit diplomas and certificates may be distinguished as follows:

**Not-for-credit** diplomas and certificates are characterized by a program of study comprised of courses that would not typically be eligible for credit towards a degree. The minimum admission requirements for the not-for-credit certificate or diploma programs may also be different than those for degree students; similarly, methods of academic assessment that are employed may vary substantially from those for a degree.

Not-for-credit diploma and certificate programs are currently not regulated by Senate and are not eligible for funding from the MTCU. Consequently, they also do not fall under the QAF or QUQAP. Administration of these non-credit programs normally falls within the jurisdiction of the individual faculties which are also responsible for the quality of the programs they deliver. However, Senate policy states that the number and character of such programs are monitored by the Provost’s Office and therefore they must be reported. There is no specific template for this report.

**For-credit** Senate approved diplomas and certificates are characterized by a program of study comprised of courses that are normally eligible for credit towards a degree (as approved by Senate) and have minimum admission requirements and similar methods of academic assessment as those for degree students. Completion of these programs is recorded on a student’s transcript and is awarded at convocation.

**6(i) Diplomas - Undergraduate**

Academic units or faculty members wishing to propose a for-credit UG diploma program should first consult with their dean and the Provost’s Office before proceeding.
6(ii) Diplomas - Graduate
Like the OCGS, the QC recognizes three types or categories of for-credit GRAD diplomas. They are defined as:

**Type 1**: A Type 1 GRAD diploma is awarded when a candidate admitted to a master’s program leaves after completing a certain proportion of the requirements. Students are not admitted directly to these programs.

**Type 2**: A Type 2 GRAD diploma is normally offered in conjunction with a master’s (or doctoral) degree, the admission to which requires that the student be already admitted to the master’s (or doctoral) program. The diploma thus typically represents an additional, often interdisciplinary, qualification.

**Type 3**: A Type 3 GRAD diploma is normally a standalone, direct entry program usually developed by an academic unit offering a related master’s (and sometimes doctoral) degree, and designed to meet the needs of a particular clientele or market.

Where a graduate diploma program has been conceived and developed as a distinct and original entity, it would normally be eligible for an expedited approval process and although requiring approval by Senate and the appraisal committee of the QC, does not require external review. A specific template has been developed for this purpose. Once approved by Senate, a graduate diploma program is subject to a normal cyclical review every eight years. Where applicable, this would typically occur in conjunction with the related degree program.

All new Senate approved graduate diplomas are submitted to the Appraisal Committee of the QC for approval. Academic units or faculty members who wish to develop proposals for new for-credit graduate diplomas should first consult the Office of the Vice-Provost and Dean, SGS and the Provost’s Office.

**The Relevant Templates for For-Credit Graduate Diplomas are:**
- New GRAD program proposal: *Pre-approval form*
- New GRAD for credit diploma proposal: *Expedited approval form*
- Budget module and template
- CV Guidelines

6(iii)Certificates - Undergraduate
As mentioned earlier, undergraduate certificate programs are not subject to approval or audit by the QC, although all new for-credit certificates are reported annually to the QC.
Once approved, for-credit undergraduate certificates are subject to a normal cyclical review every eight years. Academic units or faculty members who wish to develop proposals for new for-credit UG certificates should first consult their Faculty Office and the Provost’s Office.

The Relevant Templates for For-Credit Undergraduate Certificates are:

- New UG program proposal: Pre-approval form
- New UG certificate proposal: Full approval submission form (modified as appropriate)
- Budget module and template
- CV Guidelines

6(iv) Certificates – Graduate
As mentioned earlier, graduate certificate programs are not subject to approval or audit by the QC; however, all new for-credit certificates are reported annually to the QC and may be subject to QC appraisal if MCTU funding is sought (see below). Furthermore, once approved by Senate, for-credit graduate certificates are subject to a normal cyclical review every eight years, normally in conjunction with the related degree program.

The Relevant Templates for For-Credit Graduate Certificates are:

- New GRAD program proposal: Pre-approval form
- New GRAD certificate proposal: Expedited approval form
- Budget module and template
- CV Guidelines

6(v) MTCU Funding for Diploma and Certificate Programs
Certificates and diplomas are often designed to suit the needs of a particular clientele or market, and may be offered on a full-cost recovery basis and/or as revenue generating programs. However, since for-credit diploma and certificate programs fall under a regulated framework similar to degree programs, all domestic enrolment may be eligible for funding from the MTCU, provided they meet the following criteria:

- The courses in the diploma/certificate program are eligible for credit toward a degree;
- The minimum admission requirements for the certificate or diploma programs are the same as those for degree students; and
- Similar methods of academic assessment are employed for diploma and certificate students as for degree students.

For further information on MTCU funding for diploma and certificate programs, academic units are urged to consult with the University Registrar and/or the SGS as
appropriate.
7. Cyclical Program Reviews (CPRs)

Cyclical program review is intended to help academic units assess the impact and quality of their current educational programs. Through the review process, programs identify what works well and ways to contribute to the improvement of teaching, learning, and student development.

Graduate and undergraduate programs will normally undergo cyclical program review together. CPRs can also be scheduled to coincide with external accreditations, where possible and desirable (for more details, see section 7(vi)).

A schedule of CPRs for all undergraduate and graduate programs at Queen’s is available as an appendix to Queen’s University Quality Assurance Processes. This schedule was developed after extensive consultations with the faculties and schools, and took into consideration (to the extent possible) the time since the last OCGS appraisal (for graduate programs), the last IAR (for undergraduate programs) and, in the case of some professional programs, the time since a last accreditation review.

It is understood that circumstances can change such that an academic unit may wish to request a change in the scheduling of a CPR for all or one of its programs. If this occurs, the head/director of the academic unit should first consult with their dean (or associate dean), and (as applicable) the Vice-Provost and Dean SGS. If the dean(s) supports the request, a memo from the dean (or associate dean) and (as applicable) the Vice-Provost and Dean SGS outlining the academic and other reasons for supporting the requested change in schedule should be sent to the provost. A request from an academic unit for a change in the CPR schedule should happen well in advance of the CPR process. At the latest, this request should be made in an early response to the memo from the provost asking for confirmation of the CPR schedule for the next academic year.

The Relevant Templates for CPRs are:
- CPR: Self-study Form
- CPR: Review team Nomination Form
- CV Guidelines
- CPR: Review team Report

To aid in understanding the cyclical review process, some of the differences between it and the former OCGS Periodic Reviews/Queen’s IARs are outlined in Table 4 below.
Table 4. Summary of Differences between Cyclical Program Reviews (CPRs) Versus former OCGS Periodic Reviews/Queen’s IARs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Then (former process)</th>
<th>Now (QUQAP CPR process)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cycle</td>
<td>7 years (IAR and OCGS)</td>
<td>8 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review team</td>
<td>IAR: normally 2 external reviewers + Internal review team</td>
<td>Comprised of 1-2 reviewers external to the University plus 1 additional reviewer who can be internal to the University but external to the academic unit(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OCGS: normally 2 external reviewers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breadth</td>
<td>IAR: UG programs only</td>
<td>Combines review of graduate and UG programs offered in the same academic unit. For professional programs: can schedule review in conjunction with external accreditation review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OCGS: Graduate programs only For professional programs: No opportunity to schedule review in conjunction with external accreditation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Structure and Requirements</td>
<td>IAR/OCGS: addressed quality of academic programs and unit by focusing on strengths and weaknesses.</td>
<td>In addition to addressing program quality through various specified measures, there is also a requirement to map learning outcomes and curriculum onto Degree Level Expectations (DLEs). The creation and deletion of fields are not part of the CPR review and must be handled as a major modification independently of the CPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Content</td>
<td>Requires explanation on how Program has addressed University’s equity goals</td>
<td>Requires explanation on how program educates students about academic integrity and has addressed University’s equity goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Assessment Report</td>
<td>Not required</td>
<td>Provost’s final report and recommendations submitted to the COU Quality Council and to Senate for information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Plan</td>
<td>Incorporated into dean’s annual report to the vice-principal (academic)</td>
<td>Distributed to program head, Senate and Quality Council for information; provost and deans responsible for monitoring implementation plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUQAP
Cyclical Program Review Process
(8 year cycle)

Orientation Session

Self study

Review team site visit

Internal responses

Senate Cyclical Review Committee (SCPRC)

Provost's final assessment report and implementation plan

Implementing and monitoring

Report sent to Senate and Quality Council for information. Executive Summary posted on website.

Provost in conjunction with relevant deans.

Review cycle begins again within 8 years

Breadth consultation with students, informed by faculty, staff, unit head and (when appropriate) vice-provost and dean (SGS).

Organized by unit and dean.
Roles and Responsibilities for the CPRs

The institutional steps required to complete a CPR involve a number of individuals/units both internal and external to the University [see CPR flowchart]. The various roles and responsibilities critical to completing a successful CPR are summarized below:

Department/Academic unit:
- Prepares nominations for review team members using the template provided and submits to faculty dean (or associate dean) for review and pre-approval;
- Completes self-study (including CV Requirements (twenty essential elements) and any appendices) using templates;
- Provided and submits to faculty dean (or associate dean) for review and pre-approval;
- Develops itinerary for the site visit and organizes all meetings/events (normally in conjunction with the faculty office);
- Provides electronic copies of all self-study documents for the provost, School of Graduate Studies, and faculty office, and for each member of the review team;
- Hosts review team while on campus

Faculty/School:
- Provides academic unit with general support for the review process; Reviews and pre-approves nominations for review team members;
- Secures review team members once nominee list is approved by the provost (and vice provost & dean SGS);
- Reviews and pre-approves self-study;
- In consultation with the review team members and the academic unit(s), sets the dates and schedule for the site visit [e.g. see Table 7];
- Arranges travel, transportation and accommodation for review team members; Pays honoraria for the external members of the review team; completes and submits travel/accommodation/hosting expenses for reimbursement to Financial Services (see Appendix A).

School of Graduate Studies (when GRAD Programs are involved):
- Provides support for overall process involving graduate Programs;
- Vice-Provost & Dean SGS reviews and pre-approves nominations for review team members and pre-approves the self-study;
- If graduate program review only work with the department/academic unit to arrange travel, transportation, accommodation and reimbursement for review team members;
- Vice-Provost & Dean (or delegate) serves on Senate Cyclical Program Review Committee (SCPRC)
Office of the Provost and Vice-Principal (Academic):

- Initiates CPR process via correspondence with the faculty deans
- Has responsibility for overall process and official documentation of self-study that is subject to audit and will eventually be archived;
- Provost (or delegate) provides final review/approval for nominations for review
- Reserves the right to provide final approval for the self-study (in consultation with Vice-Provost & dean SGS as appropriate) before it is sent out to review team;
- Provides administrative support for the Senate Cyclical Program Review Committee (SCPRC);
- Liaises between Queen’s University and COU Quality Council

7(ii) Composition and Selection of Review Teams

The Relevant Template for CPR Review Team Selection is:
CPR: Review team Nomination Form. NB Reviewer nominees’ CVs must also be provided.

The review team is responsible for producing an evaluation report using the template provided (located on the QUQAP website), which is then submitted to the Office of the Provost via the faculty office and, as appropriate, the School of Graduate Studies. This report is due two weeks after the site visit and should be completed as much as possible while the review team is assembled together on campus during the site visit.

The composition of the review team is partly dependent on the size and complexity of the program(s) being reviewed. Normally, the evaluation of existing academic programs will be conducted by a team composed of at least:

- For undergraduate programs, one external reviewer and one additional reviewer; the additional member can be either from within the University but outside of the discipline (or interdisciplinary group), or external to the University
- For graduate programs, two external reviewers qualified by discipline and experience, and one additional reviewer: the additional member can be either from within the University but outside of the discipline (or interdisciplinary group), or external to the University
- For a combined review of undergraduate and graduate programs, two external reviewers and one additional reviewer: the additional member can be either from within the University but outside of the discipline (or interdisciplinary group), or external to the University
- For graduate only or combined undergraduate / graduate reviews, one external reviewer should come from outside of Ontario
The faculty dean may invite discretionary members to the review team if the circumstances warrant. Additional members from academia, industry or other professions must be appropriately qualified and experienced people. If the CPR encompasses both UG and graduate programs, attempts will be made to ensure that at least one of the review team members is from outside the province of Ontario.

As detailed earlier (section 3), review team members should be at arm’s length from the program(s) under review.

To be at arm’s length from the program(s) under evaluation means a reviewer must have no family ties, recent partnership links, supervisory relations or other types of relationships with individuals in the program(s) under review. At the very least, there is a conflict of interest (or an unacceptable perceived conflict of interest) when a proposed reviewer:

- Has collaborated or published with a member or members of the academic program(s) being evaluated within the past seven (7) years
- Has an administrative or family link with a member of the academic program being evaluated
- Is a former research supervisor, graduate student or postdoctoral trainee of one of the members of the academic unit(s) being evaluated, within the last seven (7) years
- Is involved in a dispute with a member of the academic program being evaluated

Academic units are responsible for contacting potential reviewers (both external and internal) to request their CVs and confirm that there is no conflict of commitment or conflict of interest. This can be done by sending a blanket e-mail to all potential reviewers (bcc’d of course) inquiring about their willingness (if asked) to serve on a review team and to declare that they satisfy the QUQAP definition of ‘arm’s length’ (to be contained in the e-mail). To avoid unnecessary delays, it is important that the nomination forms are completed in sufficient detail that informed decisions can be made by senior academic administrators in the faculty office(s) and the provost’s office (and SGS, if applicable) without having to ask for more information.

Internal Reviewer

The internal reviewer does not necessarily need to be a specialist in a discipline of the program(s) under review. However, like the external reviewers, the internal reviewer must be at arm’s length. If possible, the internal reviewer should come from outside the faculty or school in which the program under review is located (the Faculty of Arts & Science could be an exception here because of the exceptional breadth of its
academic programs). The internal reviewer should be knowledgeable about Queen’s and its administrative and academic structures, and experienced in providing constructive program critiques. During the site visit and writing of the review team report, the internal reviewer will provide important insights about the University so that any conclusions drawn and/or recommendations made by the external reviewers are done with an understanding of how changes are implemented in a decentralized university like Queen’s. Faculty members from academic units about to undergo a CPR in the near future may find it a very useful experience to participate as an internal reviewer for another unit’s CPR.

Approval of Review Team Nominees
After receiving the completed review team nomination form and CVs, the faculty dean(s) (in consultation with the academic unit(s)) should then prepare a rank ordered list as follows.

For review of graduate programs or combined review of undergraduate and graduate programs:

Eight (8) nominations of individuals external to the University (external reviewers) who have the necessary expertise and a rank ordered list of four (4) nominations of additional individuals who can be either from within the University but outside the discipline (or interdisciplinary group) engaged in the program (internal reviewer – see above), or (if appropriate and necessary) external to the University.

For review of undergraduate programs only:

Four (4) nominations of individuals external to the University (external reviewers) who have the necessary expertise and a rank ordered list of four (4) nominations of additional individuals who can be either from within the University but outside the discipline (or interdisciplinary group) engaged in the program (internal reviewer – see above), or (if appropriate and necessary) external to the University.

These lists, the completed template and CVs are then to be forwarded to the provost’s office where the provost (or delegate) (in consultation with the Vice-Provost and dean SGS as appropriate) will select the final slate of reviewers. This will be communicated back to the faculty office.

The faculty dean(s) will subsequently contact approved nominees to formally request their participation in the review and notify the provost’s office of any changes. Contact
with the reviewers from this point on will be channeled through the Dean’s office.

7(iii) Guidance for the Preparation of the CPR Self-study

Orientation Session
Before academic units begin their self-study in earnest, the Office of the Provost and Vice-Principal (Academic) will hold orientation meetings with all academic units with programs slated for a cyclical program review (CPR) in the upcoming academic year. The intent of these sessions is to inform academic units of the support available to them. Additional members of the University community will be invited to act as informational resources for academic units as they embark upon the CPR process.

Attendees at the orientation session might include the program/department head, program graduate and undergraduate chairs, department administrative assistant (or equivalent), faculty dean (or associate dean) and appropriate faculty assistants, as well as representatives from the Library, the Equity Office, School of Graduate Studies (both staff and academic), Institutional Research and Planning, and the Centre for Teaching and Learning.
Table 5. Recommended Timelines for Cyclical Program Reviews
(Revised July 2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Winter term</td>
<td>Office of the Provost corresponds with Faculty Deans to confirm CPR schedule for next academic year. It will be assumed that the reviews will include undergraduate and graduate programs unless a request is made by the faculty deans to separate the reviews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-June</td>
<td>Provost’s Office (with the School of Graduate Studies) conducts orientation meetings with programs. Development of self-study begins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer - April</td>
<td>Centre for Teaching and Learning (CTL) offers workshops on learning outcomes and curriculum mapping (fall and winter terms).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Units work with CTL to develop program specific learning outcomes and engage in curriculum mapping exercise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additional consultations and workshops with Library, Faculty Office, SGS, Equity Office, Institutional Research and Planning, Academic Integrity Officer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Units draft self-study documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February - April</td>
<td>Reviewer nominees to be submitted to faculty office by mid-February; Provost (or delegate) (and Vice-Provost &amp; Dean SGS) approve nominations for Review Team. Review Team members invited to participate by Faculty Office(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>By end April - Penultimate version of self-study submitted to Faculty Dean(s) (and Vice-Provost &amp; Dean SGS as applicable to Program(s) included in CPR) for review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May - June</td>
<td>Faculty Dean/Associate Deans and Associate Dean/Dean SGS review self-study. Unit incorporates revisions and resubmits. Final version submitted by faculty office to provost’s office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September - March</td>
<td>Self-Study documents sent to review team by faculty office(s). Site visits occur – organized by faculty office(s).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Upon receipt of the review team’s report (normally two weeks after the site visit), the unit and relevant dean(s) are invited to respond. All documents (including the self-study, the review team report and all internal responses) are referred to the Senate CPR Committee (SCPRC).

After the SCPRC has reviewed the submissions it will make recommendations to the provost. The provost will then prepare a final assessment report and implementation plan, which will be provided to the faculty deans, Senate and the COU Quality Council (excluding any confidential information) for information.
A self-study is intended to be a broad-based, reflective, critical and forward-looking analysis of an academic program [see Table 6 below]. It also provides an opportunity for academic units to articulate or update the degree level expectations (DLEs) and discipline-specific learning outcomes of their programs.

The relevant templates for preparation of the CPR self-study are:

CPR: Self-study Form
CV Guidelines

Faculty, staff, and designated student representatives should be involved in the preparation of the self-study. Accordingly, input should be sought at a time when students are available to participate. Responsibility for ensuring that this occurs rests with the unit head(s). Input of others deemed to be relevant and useful [e.g. graduates of the program, representatives of industry, the professions, practical training programs, and employers] may also be solicited, as appropriate.

The self-study comprises three major parts:
1. Summary and Quality Enhancements
2. Evaluation Criteria
3. Supporting Documentation

The evaluation criteria listed in Part B of the self-study template address the objectives of the program, the program’s admission requirements, the curriculum, and assessment of teaching and learning (including mapping of curriculum and DLEs). They also address the appropriateness and availability of resources to the program. There are also sections on equity, diversity and accessibility (Section 6) and academic integrity (Section 7). Completion of the DEAP tool is a prerequisite for completing the section on equity (section 6). The University Equity Office should be consulted and will provide support. Text examples for these two sections are available at Appendix F of this guide.

Quality indicators of the program(s) are addressed in sections on faculty complement and activities, student attributes and satisfaction, and program graduates (Sections 8-10).

Additionally, there is a section for issues specific to graduate programs (Section 11).

Academic units are responsible for collecting and integrating pertinent materials that support the narrative outlined in the self-study template. To provide guidance to academic units, a list of potential documents and data summaries that the unit is responsible for, is provided in the self-study template (Section 15). Section 16 of the
self-study template lists additional information/documentation that may be provided by sources external to the academic unit (for example: the Office of Planning and Budget, the Library, the Office of the University Registrar, and the School of Graduate Studies).

Academic units should prepare their self-study such that it can be readily understood, assimilated and supported by the multiple audiences that will review it, including members of the review team, the Senate Cyclical Program Review Committee and Senate. It is important to read the instructions on the template itself carefully and consider the recommendations on length and format.

In completing their self-study, academic units are encouraged to make any changes to the template that will enhance the readability of the document (e.g., present tables in landscape orientation). The template contains a table of contents that should be updated as the document is completed. Instructions on this are contained in the template. Sections of the template that are not applicable to an academic unit’s self-study (e.g. Table 7.b for a unit that does not have a doctoral program) should be deleted.

Faculty CVs should be assembled together in a separate PDF document, not incorporated in the body of the self-study document itself. Each CV must contain essential elements as per the CV guidelines (found at the QUQAP website) that cover academic credentials, teaching and supervision, research/scholarly and professional work and service and administration. It is important that the format adopted by the unit be consistent in order to facilitate the review process. We encourage units to work with the team developing the Faculty 180 CV tool.

For CPRs, CVs should contain information for the past 8 years at a minimum because this is the normal interval between program reviews. Lifetime CVs are acceptable. Faculty members are reminded that as a consequence of the multistep quality assurance processes, as is common in most academic review processes, their CVs may be viewed by many people.
Table 6. Guidance for Creating an Effective Self-study for Program Reviews *
(“excerpt from COU Quality Assurance Guide”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Best Practice</th>
<th>Poor Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal/Purpose</td>
<td>The self-study is aimed at quality improvement. Self-appraisal asks for analysis of strengths and weaknesses, and asks how improvements can be made.</td>
<td>The self-study is aimed at defending or justifying the status quo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>The self-study focuses on the UG/GRAD Programs (as required by the IQAP and Quality Assurance Framework).</td>
<td>The self-study focuses on the academic unit (department), rather than on the UG/GRAD programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character/Nature of Report</td>
<td>The self-study is reflective, analytical, self-critical, and evaluative.</td>
<td>The self-study is descriptive rather than reflective, analytical, self-critical, and evaluative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment of Curriculum</td>
<td>The curriculum is critically examined, with an eye to DLEs, learning objectives, learning outcomes and to change and improvement.</td>
<td>The curriculum is described.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree Level</td>
<td>The self-study expresses DLEs and learning objectives that operationally drive admission requirements, curriculum content, modes of delivery, bases of evaluation of student performance and commitment of resources.</td>
<td>The self-study does not address or only superficially addresses DLEs, learning objectives, or learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment of Data</td>
<td>Data are analyzed – e.g. used - as the basis for performance evaluation. Data analysis contributes to the assessment of strengths and weaknesses of the program(s).</td>
<td>Raw data are attached as appendices, or used only in a descriptive manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Missing or if a Student Survey is Included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authorship</strong></td>
<td>The self-study results from a participatory self-critical process and</td>
<td>The self-study is written by the head of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>documents involvement in its preparation of all faculty in the Program(s),</td>
<td>of the academic unit, without evidence of buy-in (or sometimes even knowledge) of faculty and students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and of students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Involvement</strong></td>
<td>The self-study shows active involvement of students in setting the agenda,</td>
<td>There is no evidence of active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the self-analysis, and the preparation of the Report.</td>
<td>involvement of students in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>preparation of the self-study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Role</strong></td>
<td>Students contribute to the preparation of the Self-study, as well as meet</td>
<td>Students meet with the review team, but</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with the review team.</td>
<td>have no input to the self-appraisal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Survey</strong></td>
<td>A student survey provides another valuable source of input to the self-study.</td>
<td>Missing or if a student survey is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>included, it is conducted after the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>self-study is prepared, and so has no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>input to that document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship to External</strong></td>
<td>The self-study does address, and inform, all of the issues the review team</td>
<td>The self-study does not address, or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer Mandate</td>
<td>are asked to review.</td>
<td>inform, all the issues the review team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>are asked to review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>QUQAP/Quality Assurance</strong></td>
<td>The self-study addresses explicitly each of the “elements” specified in the</td>
<td>The self-study does not explicitly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framework Elements</td>
<td>QUQAP and QAF.</td>
<td>address each of the “elements” specified in the QUQAP and QAF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Criteria</strong></td>
<td>The institution specifies the criteria of program quality used in its</td>
<td>The institution does not specify the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>program review process.</td>
<td>criteria of Program quality used in its</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>program review process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7(iv) QUQAP Guidelines for Review Team Site Visits

Site visits for CPRs normally take place over a two-day period but may be shorter or longer if appropriate to the size and complexity of the program(s) being reviewed. Prior to their visit, the review team will have reviewed the academic unit’s self-study document and any other submitted materials, and will use the site visit as an opportunity to better understand the program so that their report can be balanced, constructive and supportive of the academic unit’s goals to improve on the academic quality of its programs.

The academic unit is responsible for developing and implementing the site visit agenda in consultation with the faculty office(s), the provost’s office and the SGS. The site visit agenda should be finalized at least two weeks before the site visit and the provost’s office notified.

The site visit is comprised of several key components including meetings of the review team with faculty, students, key staff and other stakeholders (see Table 7). It also includes time for the review team to discuss and begin to write (if not complete) their report. Many academic review teams welcome the opportunity for closed organizational meetings at meals before the site visit such as a working dinner the evening before and/or a working breakfast the day of the visit. A working dinner for review team members may also be appreciated at the end of day 1 of the site visit. Academic units should offer and arrange for such meetings should they be requested by the review team.

The following QUQAP Guidelines for Site Visits are offered:

- Designate a contact person in the department/academic unit to be responsible for the visit to ensure that conference rooms have been booked and lunches arranged as appropriate, and to ensure (if needed) that the review team members are escorted from one meeting to the next, allowing sufficient travel time between meetings
- Allow for adequate time during the day to permit the review team an opportunity to synthesize and integrate information, and begin report writing;
- Arrange for a meeting between the review team and students in circumstances that promote frank and open discussion
- The review team should not be invited to social events
- Arrange for the review team to meet the following individuals/groups:
  - Head(s) of academic unit(s) at start and end of visit
  - Academic administrators as appropriate
  - Regular faculty members as well as adjuncts, cross-appointees and emeriti
  - Undergraduate and graduate student and post-doctoral representatives
- Other groups affiliated/associated with the unit under review (e.g., TAs, postdoctoral fellows) as appropriate
- Departmental/unit (administrative, research and technical) staff
- Library staff member
- Vice-Provost and Dean, SGS (or delegate)
- Provost and Vice-Principal (Academic) or delegate
### Table 7. Sample Schedule for Review Team Site Visit

*(UG and GRAD reviewed concurrently)*

#### Day before

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Meeting with</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6:00-8:00 pm</td>
<td>Review team – working dinner [Organizational Meeting]</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Day 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Meeting with</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:30–8:30 am</td>
<td>Review team - working breakfast <em>as needed</em></td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30–9:00 am</td>
<td>Department/Unit</td>
<td>Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00–9:30 am</td>
<td>Faculty dean/Associate dean(s)</td>
<td>Dean’s Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30–9:45 am</td>
<td>Travel to Office of the Provost and VPA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:45–10:15 am</td>
<td>Provost and Vice-Principal (Academic)</td>
<td>Richardson Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30–11:00 am</td>
<td>Vice-Provost and Dean, School of Graduate Studies</td>
<td>Gordon Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00–11:30 am</td>
<td>Departmental tour</td>
<td>Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30–12:30 pm</td>
<td>Regular faculty</td>
<td>Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30–1:30 pm</td>
<td>LUNCH with Undergraduate Students</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30–2:00 pm</td>
<td>Representative from appropriate University Library</td>
<td>Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00–2:30 pm</td>
<td>Associate dean(s) (Faculty and SGS)</td>
<td>Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30–3:30 pm</td>
<td>Unscheduled time to discuss/plan Report</td>
<td>Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30–4:00 pm</td>
<td>Adjunct faculty members, Cross-appointees and Emeriti</td>
<td>Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00–5:00 pm</td>
<td>Undergraduate Coordinator</td>
<td>Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00–6:00 pm</td>
<td>BREAK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00–8:00 pm</td>
<td>Review team - working dinner [closed]</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Day 2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Meeting with</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:30–9:30 am</td>
<td>Support Staff</td>
<td>Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30–10:30 am</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30–11:00 am</td>
<td>BREAK</td>
<td>Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00–noon</td>
<td>Cognate Heads</td>
<td>Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noon-1:00 pm</td>
<td>LUNCH with Graduate Students</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00-2:00 pm</td>
<td>Staff/students/faculty not available during other scheduled times:</td>
<td>Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00-3:30 pm</td>
<td>Unscheduled time to plan/prepare Report</td>
<td>Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30–4:00 pm</td>
<td>Department/Unit Head(s)/Faculty Assoc. Dean/SGS Assoc. Dean [Exit Meeting]</td>
<td>Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00–4:30 pm</td>
<td>Review team – debriefing session</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7(v) CPRs for Joint Programs Offered by Two or More Institutions

Reviews of joint programs that involve more than one institution are required to identify a lead institution to prepare the self-study document. Input will be sought by the lead institution from all participating institutions on the selection of reviewers. The site visit will involve all partner institutions and will preferably include a visit to all sites offering the joint program. Once the review team’s report has been received, feedback will be solicited from all participating units at each partner institution, including the deans. All partner institutions will participate in the preparation of the final assessment report and implementation plan, and be responsible for monitoring the implementation of the recommendations.

7(vi) CPRs for Academic Programs Subject to External Accreditation

As mentioned previously, CPRs may be scheduled in conjunction with an external accreditation review if desired by the academic unit(s) and approved by the faculty (and graduate) dean(s) and the provost. The Quality Assurance Framework (QAF) notes that:

“…. the substitution or addition of documentation or processes associated with the accreditation of a program, for components of the institutional program review process, when it is fully consistent with the requirements established in the Quality Assurance Framework. A record of substitution or addition, and the grounds, on which it was made, will be eligible for audit by the Quality Council” (QAF, p. 22)

Combining a CPR and an accreditation review can be challenging, and the feasibility of doing so may well be discipline specific. Accreditation is often described as a process by which a program is evaluated to determine if it meets certain pre-determined minimal criteria or standards. A quality assurance process, on the other hand, is described as an on-going and continuous evaluation of a program for the purpose of quality improvement. Quality assurance processes include assessing, monitoring, guaranteeing, maintaining and improving.

There are several factors that need to be considered when deciding whether to combine, coordinate or completely segregate a CPR with an external accreditation review including:

- Levels of complexity of program(s) offered (undergraduate, graduate, professional)
- Review cycle
- Qualifications required for reviewer’s evaluation criteria
- Issues currently facing program(s) and the University

As a first step, the degree of alignment or overlap of the processes should be determined by comparing the accreditation review template with the templates for the CPR self-study and the CPR review team report. Depending on the outcome of the comparison, it may be determined that:

- the accreditation review meets all of the criteria for the CPR;
- the accreditation review meets most of the criteria for the CPR and that some supplementary information will need to be provided; or,
- the accreditation review will not sufficiently meet the requirements of the CPR and a regular CPR process must be followed.

Academic units should consult with the Provost’s Office and the School of Graduate Studies as appropriate to make this determination. Staff at the Quality Council will be consulted by the Provost’s Office as needed.
8. Suspension and Closure of Programs

There are a number of possible reasons for closing an existing academic program. These may include: low enrolment, a changing disciplinary landscape, poor quality of the academic program, reprioritization and/or changes in resource allocation. The recommendation to close an Academic Program may be articulated in a cyclical program review (CPR) review team report or may be identified by members of the university community, for example the dean, associate dean and/or the unit itself. Closure of a program is a significant step and as such, appropriate and thorough consultation and relevant supporting data are essential in order to enable informed, and transparent, decision making.

Senate has approved a policy for suspension and closure of programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels. The policy is restricted to situations where Article 39 (Closure of an Academic Program or Unit for Academic Reasons) of the of the 2011-15 collective agreement between Queen’s University and Queen’s University Faculty Association, or any successor provision or provisions in subsequent collective agreements, does not apply.

Requests for closure of an academic program will not be considered unless admissions to the program have already been temporarily suspended following the Senate Recommended Procedures Concerning the Temporary Suspension of Admissions to Academic Programs (Approved by Senate May 28, 2013). An exception will be made for Academic Programs to which admissions were de facto suspended prior to May 28, 2013.

There is a template to be filled out when requesting approval for closure of a program, which can be found on the QUQAP website.
Appendix A  Expense Guidelines for External Reviewers

Personal information on external reviewers is required by Financial Services in order to process the payment of travel claims and honoraria, and should be obtained as early in the review process as possible. The department/unit proposing the new program or undergoing the CPR must obtain the following from each external reviewer:

- Home address
- Home telephone number
- Social insurance number (or social security number, if applicable)

*Note: A PERSONAL INFORMATION FORM is found at the end of this Appendix. When completed, it should be returned to the relevant dean’s office for processing.*

Under legislation set out by the Canada Revenue agency (CRA), please note that if a reviewer is a non-resident of Canada, the university is required to withhold 15% tax on their honorarium.

**TRAVEL EXPENSES**

Queen’s University will reimburse reasonable and necessary travel expenses incurred by external reviewers while conducting university business. This policy is in accordance with applicable federal and provincial legislation including but not limited to the CRA and the Broader Public Sector (BPS) Accountability Act 2010, and all related directives. Queen’s University is considered a Designated BPS organization and is required to comply with directives issued under the authority of the BPS Accountability Act. For further information please see Queen’s University Financial Services travel expenses policy.

**Travel Expense Form**

The department/unit itself or the Faculty Office of the department/unit undergoing the new program review or CPR is responsible for completing the travel expense form(s) for the external reviewer(s). Most external reviewers who are from the USA will wish to have their travel claims paid in US funds because of significant bank charges incurred at US banks when cashing cheques in foreign currency. The reviewer should be advised that although the cheque will be issued and payable in US funds, the amount will normally be equivalent to the Canadian dollar amount claimed on the travel expense form.
The completed travel expense form, with the required supporting documentation and original receipts, should be forwarded to the relevant dean’s office for processing. The reimbursement cheque will be sent to the external reviewer’s home address.

**Transportation**
In accordance with the university Travel Policy, *individuals are responsible for making the most economical travel arrangements under the circumstances*. Transportation costs will be reimbursed by the dean’s office. It is suggested that travel expenses be kept to a maximum of CDN$1,500. If an external reviewer is using an e-ticket, boarding passes and an itinerary from the relevant ticket issuer must be provided as an attachment to the Travel Expense Form. If the external reviewer is using paper tickets, ticket coupons and the invoice from the travel agency must be provided as an attachment to the Travel Expense Form.

**Accommodation and Subsistence**
Queen’s University will reimburse reasonable accommodation and reasonable meal expenses incurred by an external reviewer. Hotel bills are reimbursed on the basis of room charges for single occupancy only. If an external reviewer is accompanied, he/she is expected to pay the difference between single and double occupancy rates. Extended long distance telephone calls, gift charges, in-house movie charges, or alcohol are not eligible expenses.

The QUQAP, ratified by the COU QC, state that: “external reviewers should not be invited to participate in academic or social events other than as required by their duty as reviewers”. Consequently, only reasonable costs of entertaining an external reviewer for meals during his/her stay will be covered by Queen’s University.
HONORARIUM PAYMENTS
Honoraria for external reviewers will be in accordance with the following scheme agreed upon by OCAV (all amounts in Canadian funds):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate new program proposal review</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desk audit</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desk audit/site visit</td>
<td>$1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate new program proposal review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site visit</td>
<td>$1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodic review of programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG and GRAD program review combined</td>
<td>$1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program review combined with accreditation review</td>
<td>$1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG program only combined with accreditation</td>
<td>$1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAD program only</td>
<td>$1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review involving site visit to more than one campus</td>
<td>$1500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Honoraria will be paid in Canadian funds to a Canadian external reviewer. It may be paid in US funds to an external reviewer from the US or other foreign country but the amount paid will normally be the equivalent to the amount above in Canadian funds.

Under legislation set out by the CRA, please note that if a reviewer is a non-resident of Canada, the university is required to withhold 15% tax on their honorarium.

After the site visit, and when the report of the review team has been received in the Provost’s Office, the faculty office will forward the honorarium cheque to the external reviewer’s home address. For non-Canadian external reviewers from institutions outside Canada, it is presently understood that under the provisions of the Citizenship and Immigration Foreign Worker Manual, external examiner(s) (reviewers) will be exempt from the need to obtain a work permit for the purposes of participating in the Review. Section 5.15 states:

*Work without a work permit [R186(n)]—Examiners and evaluators*

“Eminent individuals who direct the studies and review the work done by university students that are under their tutelage will, on occasion, enter Canada to review their student’s thesis and papers. R186(n) also includes foreign professors and researchers seeking entry to evaluate academic university programs or research proposals [including evaluation of proposals from organizations such as the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC)].”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Academic program(s) undergoing review:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Name of reviewer:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Home (mailing) address:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Home telephone number:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Work address:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Work telephone number:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Social insurance number:</strong> (or Social security number)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please return this form completed to:
**Insert contact information for review coordinator in dean's office**

*Please be advised that the above information will be kept strictly confidential.*
Appendix B  Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance—Quality Council (QC): What It Does

Last updated February 2012

Taken from the COU Quality Assurance website

The Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (the Quality Council) is an arm’s length body designed to ensure rigorous quality assurance of university undergraduate and graduate programs.

The Quality Council is responsible for the approval of new undergraduate and graduate programs (see Program Approvals), as well as auditing each university’s quality assurance processes on an eight-year cycle (see Audit Reports).

The roles and responsibilities of the Quality Council, while respecting the autonomy and diversity of the individual institutions, are the following:

- To Guide Ontario’s publicly assisted universities in the ongoing quality assurance of their academic programs
- To review and approve proposals for new graduate and undergraduate programs
- To ensure through regular audits that Ontario’s publicly assisted universities comply with quality assurance guidelines, policies and regulations for graduate and undergraduate programs
- To communicate final decisions to the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities to review and revise, from time-to-time for future application, the quality assurance protocols of the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance, in light of its own experiences and developments in the field of quality assurance
- To liaise with other quality assurance agencies, both provincially and elsewhere
- To undergo regular independent review and audit at intervals of no longer than eight years

The members of the Quality Council typically meet on a monthly basis in order to conduct the business of the Council. The Quality Council operates in a fair, accountable and transparent manner with clear and openly accessible guidelines and decision-making processes, and through reasoned results and evidenced-based decisions. The latest agenda and executive summaries of the minutes from the Quality Council’s meetings are available on the website.
Appendix C  Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance – Appraisal and Audit Committees

*Last updated February 2012*

*Taken from the COU Quality Assurance website*

The purpose of the Quality Council’s Appraisal Committee is to review proposals for new undergraduate and graduate programs from Ontario’s publicly assisted universities, and make recommendations regarding their approval to the Quality Council.

The Audit Committee’s purpose is to review audit reports from the Quality Council Audit Panel on each publicly assisted university, and make recommendations regarding their approval to the Quality Council. The audit report will describe whether or not the institution, since the last review, has acted in compliance with the provisions of its Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP) for Cyclical Program Reviews as ratified by the Quality Council.

**Nominations:**
Nominations to the Appraisal and Audit Committees are made by the Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents, with appointments made by the Quality Council. Including the Chair, there are eight voting members on the Appraisal Committee and a panel of voting members on the Audit Committee. The Executive Director, Quality Assurance, is a non-voting ex-officio member. Members are appointed on a three-year term and can be re-appointed for a second term.

**Committee Membership:**
Members of the Appraisal and Audit Committees are senior academics with current experience in the development, delivery and quality assessment of both graduate and undergraduate programs (experience on Senate and its major committees or equivalent would be an asset). Members represent a range of academic disciplines (including at least one member from an accredited professional/health science program). At least one member is bilingual. Members of these Committees cannot also sit on the Quality Council
Instructions to External Reviewers for New Undergraduate Programs

Thank you for agreeing to serve as an external reviewer for the proposed [add name of new program] at Queen’s University. External reviewers are selected for their expertise in the discipline and their experience in curriculum development and/or administration. External Reviewers must be at arm’s length from the unit under evaluation and individuals associated with the proposed program. A conflict of interest exists when a reviewer has collaborated or published with a member or members of the program being evaluated, has an administrative or family link with a member of the unit under evaluation, or has a connection to the program or members within it that gives rise to a conflict of interest.

External reviewers for new undergraduate programs are expected to:

1. Become familiar with the documentation provided.
2. In advance of the site-visit, consider the program evaluation criteria listed below and identify any issues or questions that will need to be pursued during the site-visit.
3. Visit Queen’s to meet with relevant stakeholders associated with the program under evaluation.
4. Submit, within two weeks of the site-visit, a report that addresses the program evaluation criteria listed below and include a summary statement, any recommendations and matters of concern.
5. Respond to any questions or requests for clarity from the Provost’s Office related to the report submitted.

Program Evaluation Criteria

- Alignment of the proposed program with the Queen’s Academic Plan, faculty and unit’s goals(s);
- Appropriateness of the learning outcomes for the proposed program and assessment thereof relative to the Undergraduate Degree Level Expectations (UDLEs);
• Appropriateness of the proposed degree nomenclature;
• Alignment of the admission requirements with the learning outcomes;
• Alignment of the curriculum (curricula) with the current state of the discipline or area of study;
• Appropriateness of the mode of delivery to meet proposed outcomes;
• Special matters, innovation and/or creative features of the proposed program;
• Adequacy of the proposed program’s access and use of library services, academic services, existing human (faculty and staff), existing physical and existing financial resources;
• Alignment with university’s equity and accessibility goals;
• Evidence that the proposed program will inform faculty, students and staff on the role and importance of academic integrity;
• Quality of the faculty and staff associated with the proposed program delivery;
• Evidence of student demand for the program.

The report should be signed and submitted to the Office of the Provost and Vice-Principal (Academic), within two weeks of the site visit, via email: quqap@queensu.ca
Instructions to External Reviewers for New Undergraduate Programs (Desk Audit)

Thank you for agreeing to serve as an external reviewer for the proposed [add name of new program] at Queen’s University. External reviewers are selected for their expertise in the discipline and their experience in curriculum development and/or administration. External Reviewers must be at arm’s length from the unit under evaluation and individuals associated with the proposed program. A conflict of interest exists when a reviewer has collaborated or published with a member or members of the program being evaluated, has an administrative or family link with a member of the unit under evaluation, or has a connection to the program or members within it that gives rise to a conflict of interest.

External reviewers for new undergraduate programs that are participating in a desk audit are expected to:

- Become familiar with the documentation provided.
- Consider the program evaluation criteria listed below and identify any issues or questions that will need to be pursued via teleconference or video conference.
- Submit, within two weeks of the desk-visit, a report that addresses the program evaluation criteria listed below and include a summary statement, any recommendations and matters of concern.
- Respond to any questions or requests for clarity from the Provost’s Office related to the report submitted.

Program Evaluation Criteria

- Alignment of the proposed program with the Queen’s Academic Plan, faculty and unit’s goals(s);
- Appropriateness of the learning outcomes for the proposed program and assessment thereof relative to the Undergraduate Degree Level Expectations (UDLEs);
- Appropriateness of the proposed degree nomenclature;
- Alignment of the admission requirements with the learning outcomes;
- Alignment of the curriculum (curricula) with the current state of the discipline or area of study;
• Appropriateness of the mode of delivery to meet proposed outcomes;
• Special matters, innovation and/or creative features of the proposed program;
• Adequacy of the proposed program’s access and use of library services, academic services, existing human (faculty and staff), existing physical and existing financial resources;
• Alignment with university’s equity and accessibility goals;
• Evidence that the proposed program will inform faculty, students and staff on the role and importance of academic integrity;
• Quality of the faculty and staff associated with the proposed program delivery;
• Evidence of student demand for the program.

The report should be signed and submitted to the Office of the Provost and Vice-Principal (Academic) via email: quqap@queensu.ca
Invite Letter to External Reviewer - New Undergraduate Program (Site Visit)

Date
Add Name
Address

Dear Dr. [Add Name]:

I am writing to ask if you would be willing to act as the academic external reviewer for the proposed new [Add Name of Program] undergraduate program to be offered by the Department of [Add Name] at Queen’s University at Kingston. You have been asked to participate because of your knowledge and standing in your discipline. Please note that in accordance with the Quality Assurance Framework all external reviewers must be at arm’s length from the program under review.

The detailed proposal is near completion and is subject to external review before submission for approval by Queen’s Senate and Quality Council. If you agree to act as the external reviewer, you will be provided with a copy of the submission form and appendices in advance of the site visit. These documents are considered privileged and are not for distribution.

As the external reviewer, you will be responsible for submission within two weeks of the site visit a report that addresses a number of evaluation criteria outlined in the QUQAP. A template will be provided for this purpose. Queen’s University offers external reviewers an honorarium of $1,000 and will cover all reasonable travel expenses.

In order to meet our goal of offering this new program as of September [Add Year], we are eager for the one-day [length may have to be adjusted] site visit to take place [Add Window of Time]. We hope that the proposed timing of the site visit is convenient for you and that you are willing to accept this invitation to serve.

I look forward to hearing from you. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

Dean

cc. Teaching and Learning Coordinator, Office of the Provost
ii. Thank you for agreeing to serve letter (site visit)

Date

Add Name
Address

Dear Dr. [Add Name]:

I am writing to thank you for agreeing to serve as the external reviewer for the proposed new [Add Name of Program] undergraduate program offered by the Department of [Add Name] at Queen’s University at Kingston.

The unit has prepared a detailed proposal that addresses the criteria for new undergraduate programs and a copy will be forwarded to you in [Add Month & Year]. While this proposal will be the primary source of documentation, please feel free to request any other information that you believe would be helpful. Requests for additional information should be made through [Add Name] in the Dean’s Office, Faculty of [Add Name].

The structure for the external review will be guided by the Senate document, *Queen’s University Quality Assurance Processes (QUQAP)*, and by the external review report template which includes instructions on how the proposed new program is to be evaluated. In preparation for the review, please refer to the attached *Instructions to External Reviewers for New Undergraduate Programs*.

It is anticipated that your one-day [length may have to be adjusted] site visit will take place [Add approximate time, e.g. second week of October]. The site visit will provide an opportunity for you to visit the physical facilities and interview faculty, students, staff, and others who could most appropriately provide informed comment.

Your written assessment should be submitted to the Office of the Provost ([quqap@queensu.ca](mailto:quqap@queensu.ca)), within two weeks following the site visit. Please ensure to set aside sufficient time to complete the report following the site visit. The Office of the Provost will circulate the report to me as well as the unit head to allow for correction of any factual errors and will follow up with you as required. Your report and all internal responses will then be forwarded to the Senate Committee on Academic Development for recommendation to Senate.
We are very grateful that you have agreed to undertake this task and in recognition of your efforts, I am confirming that you will receive an honorarium in the amount of $1,000 (Cdn) which will be paid to you in full at the time your assessment report is received.

[Add Name] in the Office of the Dean of the Faculty of [Add Name] will act as a liaison for the external review. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact [Add Name] at [Add phone number] or by email at [Add email].

Again, we greatly appreciate your willingness to assist the university in this way and look forward to working with you on the external review.

Yours sincerely,

[Add Name] Dean

cc: [Insert name(s) of staff person(s) coordinating Site Visit]
Teaching and Learning Coordinator, Office of the Provost

Attachment: Instructions to External Reviewers for New Undergraduate Programs
iii. Final letter of instruction (site visit)

Date

Add Name
Address

Dear Dr. [Add Name]:

Thank you again for agreeing to participate as the external reviewer for the proposed new [Add Name of Program] undergraduate program offered by the Department of [Add Name] at Queen’s University at Kingston.

This will confirm the arrangements for your visit on [Add exact dates]. A detailed schedule is attached.

We also attach a copy of the new program proposal prepared by the unit and approved by faculty board on [Add Date]. If, after you have read it, there are any matters about which you would like further information, either before or during your visit, you should feel free to contact [Add Name] in the Dean’s Office.

A template is attached for the report that you are asked to submit to the university within two weeks of the visit. The report should address fully those points referred to in the Instructions to External Reviewers for New Undergraduate Programs (attached). We understand that there are strength and weaknesses in all new academic program proposals and we encourage you to be frank as we wish to benefit fully from your appraisal. The written assessment report should be submitted to the Office of the Provost and Vice-Principal (Academic) via email: quqap@queensu.ca

Once you have made your travel arrangements please forward your itinerary to [Add Name]. Your travel expenses will be reimbursed by my office in accordance with the regulations set out in Queen’s University Financial Services Travel Policy. Please collect and submit all supporting documentation and original receipts relating to your travel expenses.

I look forward to meeting you on [Add Date]. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

[Add Name] Dean
c. Teaching and Learning Coordinator, Office of the Provost
   [insert name(s) of staff person(s) coordinating Site Visit]

Attachments/Links

- New Program Proposal
- Site Visit Schedule
- *Instructions to External Reviewers for New Undergraduate Programs*
- External Review Report Form for New Undergraduate Programs
- [Queen’s Academic Plan](#)
- [Queen’s University Quality Assurance Processes (QUQAP)](#)
- [Senate Educational Equity Policy](#)
- [Guide to Developing Effective Learning Outcomes](#)
- External Reviewer Personal Information Form
- [Travel Policy](#)
iv. Draft Itinerary for New Undergraduate Program Review Team Site Visits

<dates>

Reviewer(s): <list name(s), affiliation and contact info>

*Evening prior to Day 1 (optional)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Meeting with</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6:00 – 8:00 pm</td>
<td>If more than one reviewer: review team – working dinner (organizational meeting)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Day 1* <date>*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Meeting with</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00 – 8:45am</td>
<td>Reviewer(s) – working breakfast and orientation with program director/associate dean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 – 9:30 am</td>
<td>Meet with Vice-Provost (teaching and learning)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:45 – 10:45am</td>
<td>Meet with dean(s)/associate dean(s) and program director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 – 11:45</td>
<td>Tour of facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 – 1:30 pm</td>
<td>Lunch with current students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30 – 3:00 pm</td>
<td>Meet with program faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:15 – 4:00 pm</td>
<td>Meet with support staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 – 5:00 pm</td>
<td>Unscheduled time to discuss/plan report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00 – 8:00 pm</td>
<td>Reviewer(s) – time to work on report/working dinner if more than one reviewer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Day 2* <date>*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Meeting with</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00 – 10:00 am</td>
<td>Meet with adjunct faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15 – 11:15 am</td>
<td>Meet with partners, prospective employers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30 – 1:00 pm</td>
<td>Lunch with prospective students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 – 2:00 pm</td>
<td>Meet with program committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 – 3:30 pm</td>
<td>Unscheduled time to plan/prepare report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30 – 4:15 pm</td>
<td>Exit meeting with program director and associate dean(s).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
v. Invite Letter to External Reviewer - New Undergraduate Program (Desk Audit)

Date

Add Name
Address

Dear Dr. [Add Name]:

I am writing to ask if you would be willing to act as the academic external reviewer for the proposed new [Add Name of Program] undergraduate program offered by the Department of [Add Name] at Queen’s University at Kingston. You have been asked to participate because of your knowledge and standing in your discipline. For this particular proposal, the Provost is satisfied that a desk audit is acceptable and a site visit will not be required.

Please note that in accordance with the Quality Assurance Framework all external reviewers must be at arm’s length from the program under review.

The detailed proposal is near completion and is subject to external review before submission for approval by Senate and Quality Council. If you agree to act as the external reviewer, you will be provided with a copy of the submission form and appendices in advance of the desk audit. These documents are considered privileged and are not for distribution.

As the external reviewer you, will be responsible for submitting, within two weeks of the desk audit, a report that addresses a number of evaluation criteria outlined in the QUQAP. A template will be provided for this purpose. Queen’s University offers external reviewers participating in a desk audit an honorarium of $500.

In order to meet our goal of offering this new program as of September [Add Year], we are eager for the desk audit to be completed by [Add Window of Time]. We hope that the proposed timing is convenient for you and that you are willing to accept this invitation to serve.

I look forward to hearing from you. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or concerns.
Sincerely,

Dean
cc. Teaching and Learning Coordinator, Office of the Provost
vi. Thank you for agreeing to serve letter (desk audit)

Date

Add Name
Address

Dear Dr. [Add Name]:

I am writing to thank you for agreeing to serve as the external reviewer for the proposed new [Add Name of Program] undergraduate program offered by the Department of [Add Name] at Queen’s University at Kingston.

The unit has prepared a detailed proposal that addresses the criteria for new undergraduate programs and a copy will be forwarded to you in [Add Month & Year]. While this proposal will be the primary source of documentation, please feel free to request any other information that you believe would be helpful. Requests for additional information should be made through [Add Name] in the Dean’s Office, Faculty of [Add Name].

The structure for the external review will be guided by the Senate document, Queen’s University Quality Assurance Processes (QUQAP), and by the external review report template which includes instructions on how the proposed new program is to be evaluated. In preparation for the review, please refer to the attached Instructions to External Reviewers for New Undergraduate Programs (Desk Audit).

It is anticipated that the desk audit will take place [Add approximate time, e.g. second week of October].

Your written assessment should be submitted to the Office of the Provost (quqap@queensu.ca) within two weeks of the desk audit. Please ensure to set aside sufficient time to complete the report within this timeframe. The Office of the Provost will circulate the report to me as well as the unit head to allow for correction of any factual errors and will follow up with you as required. Your report and all internal responses will then be forwarded to the Senate Committee on Academic Development for recommendation to Senate.
We are very grateful that you have agreed to undertake this task and in recognition of your efforts, I am confirming that you will receive an honorarium in the amount of $500 (Cdn) which will be paid to you in total at the time your assessment report is received.

[Add Name] in the Office of the Dean of the Faculty of [Add Name] will act as a liaison for the external review. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact [Add Name] at [Add phone number] or by email at [Add email].

Again, we greatly appreciate your willingness to assist the university in this way and look forward to working with you on the external review.

Yours sincerely,

[Add Name] Dean

cc: [Insert name(s) of staff person(s) coordinating Site Visit Teaching and Learning Coordinator, Office of the Provost

Attachment: Instructions to External Reviewers for New Undergraduate Programs (Desk Audit)
vii. Final letter of instruction (desk audit)

Date

Add Name
Address

Dear Dr. [Add Name]:

Thank you again for agreeing to participate as the external reviewer for the proposed new [Add Name of Program] undergraduate program offered by the Department of [Add Name] at Queen’s University at Kingston. This will confirm that the desk audit will take place on [Add exact dates].

Attached is a copy of the new program proposal prepared by the unit and approved by faculty board on [Add Date]. If, after you have read it, there are any matters about which you would like further information you should feel free to contact [Add Name] in the Dean’s Office.

Also attached is a template for the report that you are asked to submit to the university within two weeks of the desk audit. The report should address fully those points referred to in the Instructions to External Reviewers for New Undergraduate Programs (Desk Audit). We understand that there are strengths and weaknesses in all new academic program proposals and we encourage you to be frank as we wish to benefit fully from your appraisal. The written assessment report should be submitted to the Office of the Provost and Vice-Principal (Academic) via email: quqap@queensu.ca

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or concerns,

Sincerely,

[Add Name] Dean

cc. Teaching and Learning Coordinator, Office of the Provost
[Insert name(s) of staff person(s) coordinating Site Visit]
Attachments/Links

• New Program Proposal
• *Instructions to External Reviewers for New Undergraduate Programs (Desk Audit)*
• External Review Report Form for New Undergraduate Programs
• [Queen’s Academic Plan](#)
• [Queen’s University Quality Assurance Processes (QUQAP)](#)
• [Senate Educational Equity Policy](#)
• [Guide to Developing Effective Learning Outcomes](#)
• External Reviewer Personal Information Form
Appendix E: Instructions to Review Teams for Cyclical Program Reviews

Thank you for agreeing to serve on a review team for a cyclical program review at Queen’s University. Normally, a review team is comprised of two external reviewers and one internal reviewer. External reviewers are chosen because of their knowledge and standing in their particular field, and expertise in curriculum development. Internal reviewers are not expected to be specialist in a discipline of the program(s) under review, but are chosen because of their knowledge about Queen’s and its administrative and academic structures, for their perspective on curriculum development, and for their past experience with program reviews. During the site visit and report writing stage, the internal reviewer will provide important insights about Queen’s so that any conclusions drawn, and/or recommendations made by the review team as a whole, are done with an understanding of how changes are implemented in a decentralized university like Queen’s. All members of the review team must be at arm’s length from the program(s) under review.

In contributing to Queen’s University cyclical program review of its existing graduate and undergraduate academic programs the review team is expected to:

6. Become familiar with the documentation and procedures for the cyclical program review process. Links to the QUQAP policy and QUQAP guide will be provided by the relevant dean(s).

7. Review the self-study and appendices, giving consideration to the following:
   - Are the learning outcomes of the program(s) appropriate? Are they clearly mapped out according to the program(s) and degree level expectations? You may wish to consult the Developing Effective Learning Outcomes Guide produced by Queen’s Centre for Teaching and Learning
   - Are the curriculum design and modes of delivery appropriate?
   - Is the quality and distribution of the faculty’s expertise able to adequately support the learning outcomes of the program(s)?
   - Does the program(s) foster an enriching student learning experience?
   - Does the program use existing resources (physical, financial, human) appropriately and effectively?

8. Participate in the site visit; meet with students, staff, faculty and university administrators.

9. Submit, within two (2) weeks of the site visit, a joint report that addresses the following criteria, which appraise the standards and quality of the program(s)
under review. Most site visit’s schedules build-in time during the day for the review team to begin writing the report. Please note that under the Quality Assurance Framework, review teams are expected to address all the evaluation criteria, for each program under review.

The joint report, written by all members of the review team, should comment specifically on the following points. The report template will be provided to the review team by the relevant dean(s):

- the alignment of the program(s) under review with Queen’s Academic Plan, Strategic Framework and Strategic Mandate Agreement.
- the appropriateness of the learning outcomes for the program(s) under review
- the alignment of the admission requirements with the learning outcomes
- the alignment of the curriculum (curricula) with the current state of the discipline or area of study
- the appropriateness of the modes of delivery and whether or not they are effective in facilitating the articulated learning outcomes
- special matters, innovation and/or creative features of the program(s)
- the appropriateness of the methods of assessment
- the adequacy of the program(s)’s access to, and use of, library services, academic services, existing human (faculty and staff), physical and financial resources
- program(s) alignment with university’s equity and accessibility goals
- evidence that the program(s) informs faculty, students and staff on the role and importance of academic integrity
- quality of the faculty
- quality of student performance, achievement and employment status after graduation
- for graduate program(s): quality and availability of graduate supervision and mentorship; availability and adequacy of financial support; quality of the structure of the graduate program(s); intellectual quality of the student learning experience; and, development of professional and transferrable skills
- identified strengths of the program(s)
- recommendations for program(s) improvements and enhancements. Please ensure all recommendations are listed in section 15 of the report. Please consider a maximum of 10-12 recommendations.

In completing the report, reviewers are requested to:

a) avoid using reference to individuals. Rather, you are asked to assess the ability of the faculty as a whole to deliver the program(s) and to comment on the
appropriateness of the expertise and scholarly productivity, and;
b) be mindful that under the *Ontario Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (FIPPA)*, Queen’s University is obliged to disclose, upon request, sections of the Review Team Report that contain observations, facts and conclusions. The only sections that are exempt from the *Act* are those which contain advice and recommendations.

The joint Report should be signed by all members of the review team and submitted to the Office of the Provost and Vice-Principal (Academic) via email: [quqap@queensu.ca](mailto:quqap@queensu.ca)
Dear Dr. [Add Name]:

I am writing to ask if you would be willing to act as one of two academic external reviewers for the cyclical program review of the graduate and undergraduate academic programs offered by the Department of [Add Name] at Queen’s University at Kingston. You have been asked to participate because of your knowledge and standing in your discipline. Please note that in accordance with the Ontario Universities’ Council on Quality Assurance’s Framework all members of the review team must be at arm’s length from the program(s) under review.

In preparation for the cyclical program review, and in accordance with Queen’s University Quality Assurance Processes (QUQAP), the unit is preparing a self-study document that will be a broad-based, reflective, critical and forward-looking analysis of the academic programs it delivers. The self-study will also contain the curriculum vitae of faculty who teach in these programs and other data that provide a ‘snapshot’ of the program(s) under review. If you agree to act as an external reviewer, you will be provided with a copy of the self-study and appendices in advance of the site visit.

It is anticipated that the two-day site visit will take place [Add Window of Time]. The review team will be comprised of yourself (if you agree to serve), one other external reviewer and one internal reviewer from Queen’s. The internal reviewer will be selected for their knowledge about Queen’s and its administrative and academic structures and for their past experience with program reviews. They will not be an expert in the discipline but will normally come from a cognate unit.

It will be the responsibility of the review team to submit, within two weeks of the site visit, a joint report that addresses a number of evaluation criteria outlined in the QUQAP, and provides clear recommendations. A template will be provided for this purpose.

Queen’s University offers external reviewers an honorarium of $1,500 and will cover all reasonable travel expenses. We hope that the timing of the site visit is convenient for you and that you are willing to accept this invitation to serve.

I look forward to hearing from you. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or concerns,
Sincerely,

Dean

cc. Teaching and Learning Coordinator, Office of the Provost
ii. Invite Letter to External Reviewers - Grad Only (CPR)

Date

Add Name
Address

Dear Dr. [Add Name]:

I am writing to ask if you would be willing to act as one of two academic external reviewers for the cyclical program review of the graduate academic program(s) offered by the Department of [Add Name] at Queen’s University at Kingston. You have been asked to participate because of your knowledge and standing in your discipline. Please note that in accordance with the Ontario Universities’ Council on Quality Assurance’s Framework all members of the review team must be at arm’s length from the program(s) under review.

In preparation for the cyclical program review, and in accordance with Queen’s University Quality Assurance Processes (QUQAP), the unit is preparing a self-study document that will be a broad-based, reflective, critical and forward-looking analysis of the academic programs it delivers. The self-study will also contain the curriculum vitae of faculty who teach in the program(s) and other data that provide a ‘snapshot’ of the programs under review. If you agree to act as an external reviewer, you will be provided with a copy of the self-study and appendices in advance of the site visit.

It is anticipated that the two-day site visit will take place [Add Window of Time]. The review team will be comprised of yourself (if you agree to serve), one other external reviewer and one internal reviewer from Queen’s. The internal reviewer will be selected for their knowledge about Queen’s and its administrative and academic structures and for their past experience with program reviews. They will not be an expert in the discipline but will normally come from a cognate unit.

It will be the responsibility of the review team to submit, within two weeks of the site visit, a joint report that addresses a number of evaluation criteria outlined in the QUQAP, and provides clear recommendations. A template will be provided for this purpose.

Queen’s University offers external reviewers an honorarium of $1,000 and will cover all reasonable travel expenses. We hope that the timing of the site visit is convenient for you and that you are willing to accept this invitation to serve.

I look forward to hearing from you. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or concerns,
Sincerely,

Dean
cc. Teaching and Learning Coordinator, Office of the Provost

iii. Invite Letter to External Reviewers - Undergrad Only (CPR)
Date

Add Name
Address

Dear Dr. [Add Name]:

I am writing to ask if you would be willing to act as an academic external reviewer for the cyclical program review of the undergraduate academic program(s) offered by the Department of [Add Name] at Queen’s University at Kingston. Please note that in accordance with the Ontario Universities’ Council on Quality Assurance’s Framework, all members of the review team must be at arm’s length from the program(s) under review.

In preparation for the cyclical program review, and in accordance with Queen’s University Quality Assurance Processes (QUQAP), the unit is preparing a self-study document that will be a broad-based, reflective, critical and forward-looking analysis of the academic programs it delivers. The self-study will also contain the curriculum vitae of faculty who teach in these programs and other data that provide a ‘snapshot’ of the programs under review. If you agree to act as the external reviewer, you will be provided with a copy of the self-study and appendices in advance of the site visit.

It is anticipated that the two-day site visit will take place [Add Window of Time]. The review team will be comprised of yourself (if you agree to serve) and one internal reviewer from Queen’s. The internal reviewer will be selected for their knowledge about Queen’s and its administrative and academic structures and for their past experience with program reviews. They will not be an expert in the discipline but will normally come from a cognate unit.

It will be the responsibility of the review team to submit, within two weeks of the site visit, a joint report that addresses a number of evaluation criteria outlined in the QUQAP, and provides clear recommendations. A template will be provided for this purpose.

Queen’s University offers external reviewers an honorarium of $1,000 and will cover all reasonable travel expenses. We hope that the timing of the site visit is convenient for you and that you are willing to accept this invitation to serve.

I look forward to hearing from you. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or concerns,

Sincerely,
iv. Thank you for agreeing to serve letter
Date

Add Name  
Address

Dear Dr. [Add Name]:

I am writing to thank you for agreeing to participate as an external reviewer for the cyclical program review of the academic program(s) offered by the [Add Unit] at Queen’s University. The review team membership is as follows:

Dr. [Add Name], Department of [Add Name], University of [Add Name]  
Dr. [Add Name], Department of [Add Name], [Add Name] University  
Dr. [Add Name], Department of [Add Name], Queen’s University

The unit is currently preparing its self-study document, a copy of which will be forwarded to you in [Add Month & Year]. While this self-study will be the primary source of documentation, please feel free to request any other information that you believe would be helpful. Requests for additional information should be made through [Add Name] in the Dean’s Office, Faculty of [Add Name].

The work of the review participants will be guided by the Senate document, Queen’s University Quality Assurance Processes (QUQAP), Section 5, and by the review team report template, which provides the objectives of the review and the guidelines for the process. These documents include instructions on how the academic programs in the department of [Add Name] are to be evaluated. A single joint report, with input from the external and internal reviewers, is to be submitted.

Please note that under the Quality Assurance Framework, review teams are expected to address all the evaluation criteria, for each program under review. In preparation for the review, please refer to the attached Instructions to Review Teams for Cyclical Program Reviews.

It is anticipated that your two-day [length may have to be adjusted] site visit will take place [Add approximate time, e.g. early in the New Year]. The site visit will provide an opportunity for you to meet with the other reviewers. You will also, at that time, be able to visit the physical facilities and interview faculty, students, staff, and others who could most appropriately provide informed comment.

The written assessment should be submitted to the Office of the Provost (quqap@queensu.ca) preferably two weeks, and no later than four weeks, after the site visit. Please ensure to set aside sufficient time to complete the report following the site visit.
visit. The Office of the Provost will circulate the report to the relevant dean(s) as well as the unit head to allow for correction of any factual errors, and will follow up with you as required. The reviewers’ final assessment and all internal responses will then be forwarded to the Senate Cyclical Program Review Committee.

We are very grateful that you have agreed to undertake this task and in recognition of your efforts, I am confirming that you will receive an honorarium in the amount of $1,500 (Cdn), [Note: $1,000 if undergrad or graduate review only] which will be paid to you in total at the time the final joint assessment report is received.

[Add Name] in the Office of the Dean of the Faculty of [Add Name] will act as a liaison for the review. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact [Add Name] at [Add phone number] or by email at [Add email].

Again, we greatly appreciate your willingness to assist the university in this way and look forward to working with you on the review.

Yours sincerely,

[Add Name] Dean

cc: Staff person(s) coordinating Site Visit
Teaching and Learning Coordinator, Office of the Provost

Attachment: Instructions to Review Teams for Cyclical Program Reviews
v. Final letter of instruction

Date

Add Name
Address

Dear Dr. [Add Name]:

Thank you again for agreeing to participate as an external reviewer for the cyclical program review of the graduate and undergraduate academic programs offered by the Department of [Add Name] at Queen’s University at Kingston.

This confirms the arrangements for your visit on [Add exact dates]. A detailed schedule is attached.

I have also attached a copy of the self-study document prepared by the unit. If, after you have read it, there are any matters about which you would like further information, either before or during your visit, please feel free to contact [Add Name] in the Dean’s Office.

The template is also attached for the report that you are asked to submit to the university within two weeks of the visit. The report should address fully those points referred to in the Instructions to Review Teams for Cyclical Program Reviews (attached). I understand that there are strengths and weaknesses in all academic program(s) and encourage the review team to be frank, as the university wishes to benefit fully from your appraisal. Please ensure that a maximum of 10-12 clear recommendations are included in section 15 of the report. The written review team report should be submitted to the Office of the Provost and Vice-Principal (Academic) via email: quqap@queensu.ca

Once you have made your travel arrangements please forward your itinerary to [Add Name]. Your travel expenses will be reimbursed by my office in accordance with the regulations set out in Queen’s University Financial Services Travel Policy. Please collect and submit all supporting documentation and original receipts relating to your travel expenses.

I look forward to meeting you on [Add Date]. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or concerns,

Sincerely,

[Add Name] Dean
cc. Teaching and Learning Coordinator, Office of the Provost
   Staff person(s) coordinating Site Visit

Attachments/Links
- Self-Study and Appendices
- Site Visit Schedule
- *Instructions to Review Teams for Cyclical Program*
- Review Team Report Form
- [Queen’s Academic Plan](#)
- [Guide to Developing Effective Learning Outcomes](#)
- [Queen’s University Quality Assurance Processes (QUQAP)](#)
- [Senate Educational Equity Policy](#)
- External Reviewer Personal Information Form
- [Travel and Expense Reimbursement Policy](#)
vi. Sample Letter of Confirmation for foreign External Reviewers: Not TRV

Applicable to: Citizens of countries that do not require a Temporary Resident Visa (TRV) to enter Canada


Date

Name
Position
Address

Dear Dr.____:

On behalf of the Faculty of ____ Department of ____ I am writing to confirm that you will be participating as an external reviewer for the Cyclical Program Review of the Name of Department/Unit as part of Queen’s University Quality Assurance Processes. You will be visiting Queen’s University’s campus in Kingston, Ontario for a site visit in connection with this review from date to date.

We understand that under the Citizenship and Immigration Canada Immigration Regulations [Reg. 186 (n)], as an evaluator of an academic program you should be exempt from the need to obtain an Employment Authorization for the purposes of participating in the review.

Please carry this letter of confirmation with you when you arrive and present it to the admitting Immigration Officer at the Canadian port of entry. As proof of your citizenship, you also require a passport that is valid for the entire length of your intended stay in Canada.

As your stay in Canada will be temporary, you will not be covered by the Ontario Health Insurance Plan. In case you do not have out of country coverage under your medical insurance plan in your country of residence, you may purchase medical insurance as a visitor to Canada.

Thank you again for agreeing to assist Queen’s University in this way. I look forward to working with you on this review.

Yours sincerely,
vii. Sample Letter of Confirmation for External Reviewers (TRV)

Applicable to: Citizens of countries that require a Temporary Resident Visa (TRV) to enter Canada


Date

Name
Position
Address

Dear Dr._____

On behalf of the Faculty of ____, Department of ____ I am writing to confirm that you will be participating as an external reviewer for the Cyclical Program Review of the Name of Department/Unit as part of Queen’s University Quality Assurance Processes. You will be visiting Queen’s University’s campus in Kingston, Ontario for a site visit in connection with this review from date to date.

We understand that under the Citizenship and Immigration Canada Immigration Regulations [Reg. 186 (n)], as an evaluator of an academic program you should be exempt from the need to obtain an Employment Authorization for the purposes of participating in the review.

However, citizens of certain countries must obtain a Temporary Resident Visa (TRV) through a Canadian visa post abroad prior to entering Canada. For a complete list of countries whose citizens require a TRV, please refer to the Citizenship and Immigration web site at http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/visit/visas.asp. Instructions on how to apply for a TRV can be found at http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/visit/apply-how.asp. Visa processing times vary depending on the visa office where you apply. For more information please see http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/information/times/index.asp

Please carry this letter of confirmation with you when you arrive and present it to the admitting Immigration Officer at the Canadian port of entry. As proof of your citizenship, you also require a passport that is valid for the entire length of your intended stay in Canada.

As your stay in Canada will be temporary, you will not be covered by the Ontario Health Insurance Plan. In case you do not have out of country coverage under your medical insurance plan in your country of residence, you may purchase medical insurance as a visitor to Canada.

Thank you again for agreeing to assist Queen’s University in this way. I look forward to working with you on this review.

Yours sincerely,
Appendix F   Text examples for CPR Self-Study Sections 6 and 7

The following text is meant to assist Units with completing section 6.1 of the Self-Study
Statistical information regarding the demographic makeup of the student body as well as results of the relevant questions from USAT and from the Exit Poll are contained in the information package provided by the Office of Planning and Budgeting. [Section 16]

Statistical information regarding designated group profiles of the Unit for staff and faculty are contained with the DEAP tool.

The Equity Office will provide statistical information regarding compliance with the QUFA Collective Agreement’s Article 24 equity provision.

The Equity Office will provide statistical information concerning compliance with the mandatory Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) trainings for your Unit.

This information may help inform and then explain the initiatives taken by the Unit to address or redress inequities. For example, a department’s search for a scholar in African studies or the development of certificates within a program, such as the certificate in lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender studies in the Department of Gender Studies.

The following information is meant to assist Academic Units with completing Section 7.1 of the Self-Study

All efforts made by the Department/Academic Units to educate its members about academic integrity can be described here. Various initiatives can be discussed in the context of undergraduate students, graduate students, and postdoctoral fellows and other researchers. Academic integrity initiatives may fall into two general categories: (i) regulatory-related initiatives; and (ii) educational initiatives. Accordingly, the narrative may also be structured along these lines. Academic Units may also wish to describe these types of initiatives as they occur throughout the academic year. If an academic Program undergoes some form of external accreditation in which a Professional Code of Ethics is discussed, Units may also wish to discuss this here, as appropriate and relevant.

Sample Response for 7.1

Department of Geological Sciences and Geological Engineering
The Department views academic integrity as a fundamental and critical underpinning of the scholarly enterprise for all students and staff. For students, academic integrity is discussed in the first lecture of every course - notably, its importance in scholarly work, while at Queen's and beyond. A statement on academic integrity is included in every course outline, as required by the Faculty of Arts and Science. In particular, commonly recurring issues that our faculty members have seen from time-to-time (such as plagiarism and inappropriate collaboration) are discussed in the introductory lectures to a course in an attempt to clarify these issues for students and avoid infractions later in the term. For graduate students and postdoctoral fellows, academic integrity is discussed as part of a formal orientation and welcome session for new researchers at the start of each academic year. Here, academic integrity is discussed in two different contexts: first, as a fundamental part of their own work; and second, as a matter which may arise in the course of their duties as markers or teaching assistants.

The Department has taken a proactive and leadership stance by requiring that all of its incoming undergraduate students take (and pass) the University’s on-line Academic Integrity module within the first term of entering the Program. This module is currently undergoing pilot-phase testing across the University. Compliance is ensured by making the module a mandatory component of a core course for all programs (GEOL221 Geological Field Methods). All incoming graduate students are also required to take and pass this module.

Furthermore, because the geosciences and geological engineering are self-regulated professions in Canada (for example, in order to practice professionally in Ontario, geoscientists and engineers are governed by the Association of Professional Geoscientists of Ontario and Professional Engineers Ontario, respectively), these Associations have adopted Professional Codes of Ethics to which all members must adhere. These are further discussed in individual courses in our Programs (e.g. GEOL 445 - Site Investigation and Case Histories). This is a mandatory criterion used by the Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board (CEAB) in its accreditation evaluation of engineering Programs across Canada. The Geological Engineering Program at Queen's University is currently accredited by the CEAB and has been accredited continuously since 1975.

The following information is meant to assist Academic Units with completing Section 7.2 of the Self-Study
All efforts made by the Academic Unit to educate its instructional staff (e.g. teaching assistants and faculty members) about academic integrity policies and procedures can be described in this Section. Academic integrity initiatives may fall into two general categories: (i) regulatory-related initiatives; and (ii) educational initiatives. Accordingly, the narrative in this Section may also be structured along these lines. Academic Units may also wish to outline these types of initiatives as they occur at various times throughout the academic year. Efforts made to address academic integrity issues related to research can also be discussed in this Section.

Sample Response for 7.2

The Department/Academic Unit circulates to all instructional staff (TA’s, lecturers, and faculty members) continuing updates from the Faculty of Arts and Science on revisions to the academic integrity regulations. In addition, specific policy issues are discussed during departmental faculty meetings to ensure there is a consistent understanding and application of the Faculty regulations. For graduate students who may be serving as TA’s or PDF’s who may be serving as instructors, there is a mandatory orientation session in which they are further informed about the standardized Faculty procedures for handling possible departures from academic integrity, including the appropriate steps to be taken and relevant documentation and template forms which must be used. These steps are also clearly laid out in the academic regulations for the Faculty of Arts and Science. Finally, every year the Department hosts and organizes an open seminar for all of its researchers, addressing the topic of integrity in research and discussing the issues highlighted in the report from the Council of Canadian Academies - Honesty, Accountability and Trust: Fostering Research Integrity in Canada. This seminar usually takes place in September.