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1. INTRODUCTION

1.0 Preamble

This document represents Queen’s University Quality Assurance Processes (QUQAP) and complies with the Framework\(^1\) for quality assurance of all undergraduate and graduate Programs offered by Ontario’s publicly-assisted universities. The Framework is a province-wide initiative undertaken by all universities to ensure consistency and cohesion among all Programs offered in Ontario.

Queen’s University’s QUQAP integrates the quality assurance practices previously established at Queen’s with Framework requirements, with the goal of establishing processes that are effective, transparent, and publicly accountable. This document provides a mechanism for academic Programs to clearly articulate the quality of their Programs, and includes such features as degree level expectations (DLEs) and learning outcomes. The QUQAP also signifies Queen’s University’s firm commitment to cultivating a culture of excellence in education and articulates the quality of a Queen’s degree.

1.1 Authorities

The University Senate is the ultimate authority responsible for quality assurance of all Queen’s academic Programs. The Provost and Vice-Principal (Academic), with the assistance of the Vice-Provost (Teaching and Learning) and Deputy Provost, has oversight over undergraduate and graduate quality assurance processes. N.B Hereinafter, for the purposes of this policy, “Provost (or delegate)”\(^2\) will refer to the Provost, Vice-Provost (Teaching and Learning) or Deputy Provost, unless otherwise stated.

This responsibility is shared with the Vice-Provost and Dean of the School of Graduate Studies (SGS) and the Faculty Deans. Any amendments to the QUQAP are subject to approval by Senate and the Council of Ontario Universities (COU) Quality Council, which is supported by the QC Secretariat.

1.2 Contact Person

The Provost is the contact person for the COU Quality Council (QC).

1.3 Overview of the Quality Assurance Framework

All Programs offered by Queen’s University for which a degree is conferred or a Senate approved Certificate or Diploma awarded are subject to evaluation under the QUQAP. This includes Programs offered by federated or affiliated institutions, as well as those offered in collaboration or in partnership with other universities or other institutions of higher learning. The Quality Assurance Framework has four components:

\(^1\) The Quality Assurance Framework was developed by the Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents (OCAV) and adopted by the Council of Ontario Universities (COU) in April 2010.
• **Protocols for New Program Approvals** apply to both new undergraduate and graduate Programs which are ultimately reviewed by the QC Appraisal Committee. This Committee has the authority to approve or decline new Program proposals.

• **Protocols for Expedited Approvals** apply in situations where major substantive changes are made to existing and previously approved Programs, and where it has been determined that the Program requirements and learning expectations and outcomes are not changed in ways that denote a new Program.
  
  o Expedited approvals are approved by Senate, and in some cases, also require the approval of the Quality Council’s Appraisal Committee. See section 1.6 (Levels of Approval) for further detail.

• **Protocols for the Cyclical Review of Existing Programs** apply to existing Senate-approved undergraduate and graduate Programs, and focuses on ensuring that all academic activities contribute to and are consistent with the mission of the University. When possible and desirable, undergraduate and graduate Program reviews can be conducted concurrently, and if appropriate, can be scheduled to coincide with external accreditations.

• **Protocol for the Audit Process** applies to an Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (QC) audit, done once every eight years, of Queen’s own quality assurance processes, to evaluate their conformity with the *QUQAP* as ratified by the QC. The QC has the authority to approve or not approve the Auditors’ report.

1.4 **Acronyms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COU</td>
<td>Council of Ontario Universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPRs</td>
<td>Cyclical Program Reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIPPA</td>
<td>Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act</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>ITS</td>
<td>Information Technology Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAESD</td>
<td>Ministry of Advanced Education and Skills Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCAV</td>
<td>Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents</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>SGS</td>
<td>School of Graduate Studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.5 Definitions

Below are a number of definitions intended to be helpful in the reading of this document. In addition, the levels of approval required for new Programs and changes to existing Programs are summarized in Chart 1. Additional details and information are also available in the QUQAP Guide.

**Program:** A program is the complete set and sequence of courses, combinations of courses and/or other units of study, research and practice prescribed by Queen's University for the fulfillment of the requirements of a degree, diploma, or certificate.

**Undergraduate Diploma:** Admission to a Queen's UG Diploma will be in accordance with the admission policies of an individual Faculty/School. An UG Diploma is a program of study that involves a significant body of academic work coherently organized around clear learning objectives and outcomes typically having academic content equivalent to a minimum of one year of full-time undergraduate study at Queen's (30.0 units of degree-credit courses or equivalent). An UG Diploma may be a stand-alone credential or, under prescribed circumstances, it may be part of a laddered set of programs leading to an UG Degree (see below). UG Diplomas may be focused primarily upon academic or professional development objectives, but typically all should meet this minimum criterion of academic content.

**Graduate Diploma:** Admission to a Queen's GRAD Diploma requires an honours UG degree as a prerequisite. A GRAD Diploma may be a stand-alone credential and, under prescribed circumstances, it may be part of a laddered set of Programs leading to a Master's degree (see below). A GRAD Diploma typically has the academic content equivalent to a minimum of four courses (12.0 units of graduate degree-credit courses or equivalent), and may take one of three forms as previously defined by OCGS and now adopted by the Quality Assurance Framework:

- **Type 1 Diploma:** Offered when a candidate admitted to a Master's Program leaves the program after completing a specified proportion of the requirements. Students are not admitted directly to these programs.

- **Type 2 Diploma:** Offered in conjunction with a Master's (or Doctoral) Degree, the admission to which requires that the candidate be already admitted to the Master's (or Doctoral) Program. A Type 2 Diploma may be proposed by one or more Academic Units and represents an additional, often interdisciplinary, academic credential.

- **Type 3 Diploma:** A stand-alone, direct-entry Program, generally developed by an Academic Unit already offering a related Master's (and sometimes Doctoral) degree, and designed to meet the needs of a particular clientele or market.

**Undergraduate Certificate:** An UG Certificate is a program of study coherently organized around clear learning objectives and outcomes, and typically having academic content equivalent to a minimum of half a year of full-time undergraduate study at Queen's (15.0 units of degree-credit courses or equivalent). An UG Certificate may be a stand-alone credential and, under prescribed conditions, it may be part of a set of laddered UG Diploma and/or Degree Programs. Certificates may
be focused primarily upon academic or professional development objectives, but typically should meet this minimum criterion of academic content.

**Graduate Certificate:** Admission to a Queen's GRAD Certificate requires an UG degree as a prerequisite. GRAD Certificates are often designed to provide advanced skills and technical/specialized knowledge in a specific field or area that may only peripherally relate to the graduate Programs in the parent academic unit(s). Alternatively, a GRAD Certificate may be a program of study coherently organized around clear learning objectives and outcomes. A GRAD Certificate may be a stand-alone credential or, under prescribed conditions, it may be part of a set of laddered GRAD Diploma and/or Degree Programs (see below). A GRAD Certificate Program has an UG degree as a prerequisite and would typically have an academic content equivalent to a minimum of three courses (9.0 units of graduate degree-credit courses or equivalent).

**New Program:** Any degree, degree program, or program of specialization, currently approved by Senate, which has not been previously approved for Queen’s by the Quality Council, its predecessors, or any intra-institutional approval processes that previously applied. A change of name, only, does not constitute a new program; nor does the inclusion of a new program of specialization where another with the same designation already exists (e.g., a new honours program where a major with the same designation already exists). To clarify, a “new program” is brand new: that is to say, the program has substantially different program requirements and substantially different learning outcomes from those of any existing approved programs offered by Queen’s. Examples of what constitutes a “new program” are provided in the [QUQAP Guide](#) (located on the Provost’s office website) as well as the [Quality Assurance Framework Guide](#). The approval process for new Programs requires external review.

**Undergraduate & Graduate Combined/Concurrent Program:** Queen’s only, two credentials, student enrolled in two programs concurrently.

**Undergraduate Combined/Concurrent Program:** Involves two distinct programs of study, both at Queen’s. Students are enrolled in two programs concurrently, and earn two credentials. Combined programs must demonstrate advantages to students through some time efficiency, benefits to scholarship, professional development or other considerations.

**Graduate Combined Program:** Involves two existing Queen’s degree programs of different types. It may comprise two graduate programs or an undergraduate and a graduate program; in most cases the combination involves one professionally oriented program. Combined programs must demonstrate advantages to students through some time efficiency, benefits to scholarship, professional development or other considerations.

**Joint Program:** A program of study offered by two or more universities or by a university and a college or Institute of Technology and Advanced Learning, in which successful completion of the requirements is confirmed by a single degree document.

**Dual Credential Program (also referred to as dual degree program):** A program of study offered by two or more universities or by a university and a college or institute, including Institutes of Technology and Advanced Learning, in which successful completion of the requirements is confirmed by a separate and different degree/diploma document being awarded by each of the participating institutions.
Collaborative Specialization: This is an intra-university graduate field of study that provides an additional multidisciplinary experience for students enrolled in and completing the degree requirements for one of a number of approved masters and/or PhD programs. Students meet the admission requirements of and register in the participating (or “home”) program but complete, in addition to the degree requirements of that program, the additional requirements specified by the Collaborative Specialization. The degree conferred is that of the home program, and the completion of the Collaborative Specialization is indicated by a transcript notation indicating the additional specialization that has been attained (e.g., MA in Political Science with specialization in American Studies).

A Collaborative Specialization must have:

- At least one core one-semester course that is foundational to the specialization and does not form part of the course offerings of any of the partner programs. This course must be completed by all students from partner programs registered in the specialization and provides an opportunity for students to appreciate the different disciplinary perspectives that can be brought to bear on the area of specialization. This course may serve as an elective in the student’s home program.

- Clear and explicit requirements for each Collaborative Specialization. In programs requiring a major research paper, essay, or thesis, the topic must be in the area of the collaborative specialization. In course-only Master’s programs, at least 30% of the courses must be in the area of specialization including the core course described above. Courses in the area of specialization may be considered electives in the home program.

- Only core faculty that are those faculty members in the participating home programs who have an interest and expertise in the area of the collaborative specialization (this may include faculty appointed 100% to an interdisciplinary academic unit—for example, an Institute of American Studies—that provides the anchor for the specialization).

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

Cotutelle: A customized program of doctoral study developed jointly by two institutions for an individual student in which the requirements of each university’s doctoral programs are upheld, but the student working with supervisors at each institution prepares a single thesis which is then examined by a committee whose members are drawn from both institutions. The student is awarded two degree documents though there is a notation on the transcripts indicating that the student completed his or her thesis under cotutelle arrangements.

Field: In graduate programs, field refers to an area of specialization or an area of concentration that is related to the demonstrable and collective strengths of the program’s faculty. A minimum number of faculty (normally not less than 4) must be actively engaged in appropriate scholarly activities in each field designated by the program. It should be noted that institutions are not required to declare fields at either the master’s or doctoral level.

Minor Modifications: Minor modifications are defined as small changes to a Program for clarification purposes or to offer greater detail; these do not change the essence of a Program or its
learning expectations (DLEs). Minor modifications do not, by and large, change the essential nature of the purpose of a Program, nor do they require external review. Most minor modifications do not require Senate approval, with the exception of amendments to departmental names and/or Program names. Minor modifications for undergraduate Programs are approved by their respective Faculty Boards and/or Curriculum Committees as per Faculty regulations. Minor modifications to graduate Programs are approved by the relevant Faculty Board(s) where required as per the relevant regulations of each Faculty (School) Graduate Council (Committee) and the Graduate Studies Executive Council (GSEC).

Minor modifications include, but are not limited to changes to:

- Descriptions of a Program or course;
- Course prerequisites;
- A list of compulsory and optional courses.

**Major Modifications:** A major modification to a Program is a change that normally has a substantial effect in altering an existing Program. Thus, a proposed modification which changes the Program’s conceptual or structural foundations as they were originally approved by Senate is considered a major modification. The approval process for a major modification does not require an external review but does require approval by Senate. It is the responsibility of the Provost (or delegate), in consultation with the Vice-Provost and Dean of the School of Graduate Studies (if appropriate), to determine whether or not a proposed change constitutes a significant change to an existing Program.

Changes are considered major modifications when:

- The requirements for the Program differ significantly from those existing at the time of the previous cyclical review (e.g. admission, graduation requirements);
- There are significant changes to the learning outcomes but they do not meet the threshold for a new Program;
- There is the addition, deletion or renaming of a graduate Field (including a Collaborative Specialization);
- There is a change in degree designation without a substantial change in Program requirements or learning outcomes (e.g. from LLB to JD, or from *Cornell-Queen’s Executive MBA* to *Executive MBA Americas – A Partnership with Cornell*);
- Major changes to courses comprising a significant proportion of the program. As a guide, this proportion would normally be around one-third of the program. However, 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;
- The introduction or deletion of a work experience, co-op option, internship or practicum, or portfolio;
There are significant changes to the faculty engaged in delivering the Program and/or to the essential physical resources, including but not limited to changes to the existing mode(s) of delivery (e.g., different campus, online, inter-institutional collaborations, etc.).

**Expedited Approvals:** The Expedited Approval process is shorter than the full approval process for new programs, because external review is not required. In addition, the Appraisal Committee of Quality Council, rather than the full Quality Council, makes the decision on expedited approvals.

In many cases (including major modifications, new certificate proposals and establishment of dual degrees), Senate is the final approving body. (However, MAESD approval would also be required for undergraduate certificate proposals if OSAP eligibility and/or possible grant revenue are being sought).

In other cases (including proposals for new joint, or diploma programs), the Appraisal Committee of the Quality Council must approve the proposal after Senate has approved it.

The Provost (or delegate), in consultation with the Vice-Provost and Dean of the School of Graduate Studies (SGS) for graduate programs), has authority to decide whether a proposal constitutes a new program, a major modification or minor modification. This decision will be made with reference to the criteria laid out in QUQAP and in the Quality Assurance Framework. The Quality Council will be consulted where necessary.

Proposals which will normally be considered eligible for an Expedited Approval process include (but are not limited to) those for:

- A new combined or dual graduate Program in which partners are Ontario institutions;
- A new Senate-approved for-credit Certificate program;
- A new Diploma Program;
- Mergers of two or more approved Programs;
- Major modification(s) to an existing Program.

**Arm’s Length:** To be considered at “arm’s length” means a reviewer can have no family ties, partnership links, supervisory relations or other types of relationships with individuals in the Program(s) under review. Thus, there is a conflict of interest when a proposed external reviewer:

- Has collaborated or published with a member or members of the academic Program being evaluated within the past seven (7) years;
- Has an administrative or family link with a member of the academic Program being evaluated;
- Within the last seven (7) years, is a former research supervisor, graduate student or postdoctoral trainee of one of the members of the academic Unit being evaluated;
- Is involved in a dispute with a member of the academic Program being evaluated.
## CHART 1

*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: MEng.</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 Specialization&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Biostatistics; Cancer Research;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<sup>2</sup> 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 specialization for clarification on the level of approval needed. A joint or collaborative specialization 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>Program Type</th>
<th>Undergraduate Dual Credential Program (linking two existing credentials)</th>
<th>Graduate Joint Program</th>
<th>Graduate Diploma</th>
<th>Graduate Dual Degree Program</th>
<th>Undergrad &amp; Grad Combined/Concurrent Programs</th>
<th>For-Credit Certificate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applied Sustainability</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEng in Nuclear Engineering</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEng in Nuclear Engineering</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Business; Graduate Diploma in Risk Policy and Regulation.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of International Business (dual degree option)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JD/MA (Law/Economics)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Certificate in Business</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. **NEW PROGRAM APPROVALS**

2.0 **Preamble**

Proposals for all new degree programs, whether or not the University will be applying for provincial funding, require internal approval by the Queen’s Senate and must also be appraised by the QC Appraisal Committee. On the basis of their appraisal, the QC will decide whether to approve or reject the proposal. Exceptions include new Diploma programs, which should normally be processed through an Expedited Approval process (described in Section 3).

2.1 **Institutional Process**

2.1.1 **Institutional Steps**

Institutional steps required to develop and approve a new Program are illustrated in Chart 2 and Chart 3 located at the end of this section.

2.1.2 **Evaluation Criteria**

New Program proposals will be evaluated with respect to the criteria specified in Section 2.2 below.

2.1.3 **Program Proposal Brief**

Academic Units must prepare a pre-approval proposal form (accessed via the quality assurance section of the Provost’s Office website). In the case of new undergraduate Programs, the pre-approval form must be reviewed and approved by the relevant Dean(s). The Dean(s) may, at his/her discretion, submit a preliminary proposal to the appropriate sub-committee (e.g. curriculum committee) of that Unit’s Faculty Board, for review, comment and/or preliminary approval. The preliminary proposal for the new undergraduate Program will then be considered for approval in principle by the Provost (or delegate).

For proposed new graduate Programs, Academic Units must prepare a pre-approval proposal form (see link above), which must be reviewed and approved by the Dean(s)/Director(s) of that Unit(s), the Vice-Provost and Dean of the SGS, and the Graduate Studies Executive Council (GSEC). The preliminary proposal for the new graduate Program will then be considered for approval in principle by the Provost (or delegate).

If the pre-approval proposal is approved in principle, the Academic Unit(s) will be required to complete a full Program Proposal Brief and proceed with the appropriate internal approval process (see charts 2 & 3).

2.1.4 **External Reviewers**

All Program Proposal Briefs for new Programs will be subject to external review. Academic Units should work with the Faculty Office(s) to prepare the necessary nomination forms for approval by the Dean(s) or delegate. The final decision on external reviewers will be made by the Provost (or delegate), and where a graduate Program is involved, with the Vice-Provost and Dean of the SGS (or delegate), based on the expertise and suitability of the nominees. At least two reviewers for a new graduate Program will be required and at least one for a new undergraduate Program. External review
of new graduate Program proposals must include an on-site visit. Review of new undergraduate Program proposals will normally 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 (or delegate) are satisfied that the off-site option is acceptable.

Reviewers will normally be associate or full professors, preferably with some academic program management experience, and must be at arm’s length from the program under review.

Review teams will be provided with instructions regarding their roles in advance of the site visit. The instructions are developed by the Office of the Provost and Vice Principal (Academic). Faculty Deans’ offices have the option of supplementing these instructions. Instructions will be sent to reviewers by Academic Deans’ offices for new undergraduate programs, and by the Vice-Provost and Dean, SGS, for new graduate programs.

2.1.5 External Reviewers’ Report

The reviewers will normally provide a joint report that appraises the standards and quality of the proposed Program and addresses the criteria set out in Section 2.2, except on occasions when two languages are used or when contrary circumstances apply. They will also be invited to acknowledge any clearly innovative aspects of the proposed Program. Reports are to be submitted to the Office of the Provost and Vice-Principal (Academic) within two (2) weeks of the visit.

The Office of the Provost will invite the Head(s) of the Academic Unit(s) proposing the new Program, and the appropriate Dean(s) (or Associate Dean acting as their delegate), to respond to the External Reviewers’ Report before it is reviewed by the Senate Committee on Academic Development (SCAD). The Vice-Provost and Dean, SGS, will also be invited to respond on graduate programs.

The response from the Academic Unit should be a maximum of two (2) pages long, and address any factual errors in the review team report, as well as responding to the substantive issues raised. The response should be submitted to the Teaching and Learning Coordinator in the Office of the Provost (quqap@queensu.ca), within two (2) weeks of the Unit being asked to respond. The response from the Dean(s) (or delegate) will also be a maximum of two (2) pages long, and comment on both issues raised in the Review Team report and the Unit’s own response. This response should also be submitted to the Teaching and Learning Coordinator within two (2) weeks of the invitation to respond.

2.1.6 Institutional Approval

SCAD will review the proposal against the criteria outlined in Section 2.2 below and, if it meets the University’s quality assurance standards, will recommend the Program to Senate for approval.

2.1.7 Quality Council Secretariat

Following Senate approval, the Program Brief and additional documentation will be submitted to the QC from the Office of the Provost and Vice-Principal (Academic). The submission to the QC will include responses to the External Reviewers’ Report from the Head(s) of the Academic Unit(s) and the relevant Dean(s) or delegate. The submission should include information on whether or not the
The proposed Program is intended to be a cost-recovery or net revenue generating program. Please note that the same standards and protocols apply regardless of the source of funding.

2.1.8 Announcement of New Programs

Subject to approval by the Provost (or delegate), the University may announce its intention to offer the new undergraduate or graduate Program in advance of approval by the QC. When such announcements are made in advance of QC approval, they must contain the following statement: “Prospective students are advised that offers of admission to a new Program may be made only after the University’s own quality assurance processes have been completed and the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance has approved the Program.”

2.2 Evaluation Criteria

Prior to submitting a Program Proposal Brief to the QC for appraisal, the University Senate, after receiving a recommendation from SCAD, will evaluate any new graduate and undergraduate Programs against the following criteria:

2.2.1 Objectives

a) Consistency of the Program with Queen’s mission, values and academic plans;

b) Clarity and appropriateness of the Program’s requirements and associated learning outcomes mapped to the Program to address Queen’s undergraduate or graduate degree level expectations (examples of which are outlined in the UUDLEs and GDLEs in Appendix 1);

c) Appropriateness of degree nomenclature.

2.2.2 Admission Requirements

a) Appropriateness of the Program’s admission requirements for the learning expectations and outcomes established for the Program;

b) Sufficient explanation of alternative requirements, if any, over and above the advertised minimum standards of the Faculty/School(s) or SGS.

2.2.3 Structure

a) Appropriateness of the Program’s structure and regulations to meet specified Program learning outcomes and degree level expectations;

b) For graduate Programs, a clear rationale for program length that illustrates that the Program requirements can be reasonably completed within the proposed time period (not to exceed twenty-four (24) months for Master programs, forty-eight (48) months for PhD programs).

2.2.4 Program Content

a) How the curriculum addresses the current state of the discipline or field of study;
b) Identification of any unique curriculum or program innovations or creative components;

c) How the Program educates the students on the importance and role of academic integrity.

2.2.5 Mode of Delivery

Appropriateness of the proposed mode(s) of delivery to meet the intended program learning outcomes and the degree level expectations, including its ability to meet accessibility requirements.

2.2.6 Assessment of Teaching and Learning

a) Appropriateness of the proposed methods for the assessment of student achievement in the intended program learning outcomes and degree level expectations;

b) Completeness of plans for documenting and demonstrating the level of performance of students, consistent with the OCAV’s statement of its degree level expectations (Appendix 1).

2.2.7 Resources for All Programs

a) Adequacy of the Academic Unit’s planned use of existing human, physical and financial resources, and any institutional commitment to supplement those resources, to support the Unit’s Program(s);

b) Participation of a sufficient number and quality of faculty, staff and other instructors who are competent to teach and/or supervise in the Program (e.g. if a new Field is identified for a new graduate Program ensuring that there is a minimum number of faculty with the necessary expertise to teach/supervise in that Field);

c) Evidence that faculty have the current research or professional/clinical expertise needed to sustain the Program, promote innovation and foster an appropriate intellectual climate;

d) Where appropriate to the Program, evidence that financial support for students will be appropriate for the program type;

e) Evidence of student demand for the Program;

f) Explanation of how the Program will fulfill a societal need;

g) Evidence that students have access to suitable teaching space and workspace;

h) For professional Programs, evidence that it is congruent with the regulatory requirements of the profession;

i) Evidence of adequate resources to sustain the quality of research and scholarship produced by undergraduate students, graduate students and postdoctoral fellows including, but not limited to: library support, information technology support, and laboratory facilities and access;

j) Planned/anticipated class sizes.
2.2.8 Additional Information for Undergraduate Programs

Evidence of the planning for adequate numbers and quality of:

a) Plans and the commitment to provide the necessary resources in step with the implementation of the Program;

b) Provision of supervision of experiential learning opportunities (if required); and

c) The role(s) of adjunct and part-time faculty, staff and other instructors.

2.2.9 Additional Information for Graduate Programs

a) Evidence of supervisory capacity (in each Field if Fields are identified) and the academic and/or professional qualifications and appointment status of faculty who will provide instruction and supervision;

b) For research-focused graduate Programs, clear indication of the nature and appropriateness of the major research requirements for degree completion;

c) Evidence that no more than one third of courses taken to fulfill program requirements are at the undergraduate level or are combined courses in which undergraduates predominate.

2.2.10 Equity, Diversity and Accessibility

Where the following has not already been addressed under other headings, how the Program has addressed equity considerations, including (but not limited to) issues of particular concern for the groups identified in the University’s various Equity programs.

2.2.11 Quality and Other Indicators

a) Definition and use of indicators that provide evidence of quality of the faculty (e.g. qualifications, teaching effectiveness, research impact, innovation and scholarly record; appropriateness of collective faculty expertise to contribute substantively to the proposed Program);

b) Evidence of a Program structure and faculty research that will ensure the intellectual quality of the student experience.

2.3 Appraisal Process

2.3.1 Quality Council Secretariat Check

Program Proposal Briefs and associated reports, as well as internal responses to them, will be checked by the QC Secretariat for completeness. The Secretariat will return Program proposal briefs that are incomplete or defective of substance for revision or amendment and resubmission. Otherwise the Program Proposal Brief and accompanying documents will be forwarded directly to the QC Appraisal Committee.
2.3.2 Quality Council Appraisal Committee Review and Recommendations

After careful review of a complete file, the QC Appraisal Committee will make one of the following recommendations:

a) Approval to commence;

b) Approval to commence, with report;³

c) Deferral for up to one (1) year during which time the University may address identified issues and report back; or

d) Approval denied.

The QC Appraisal Committee reserves the right to seek further information from Queen’s University, in which case it will provide reasons for its request. This may include further input from an external expert, either through a desk audit or a site visit.

Normally, the QC Appraisal Committee will make its recommendation within forty-five (45) days of receipt of the submission of the Program Proposal Brief, provided that the submission is complete and in good order, and that no further information or external expert advice is required. If additional information is required by the QC Appraisal Committee, a recommendation to the QC will be made within a further thirty (30) days of its receipt.

2.3.3 Consult/Appeal to Quality Council Appraisal Committee

When the recommendation is one of b), c) or d) in Section 2.3.2 above, the University within sixty (60) days, can make an appeal to, or request a meeting with, the QC Appraisal Committee for reconsideration. Normally, grounds for seeking reconsideration include:

- New information is available;
- There are errors of fact in the QC Appraisal Committee’s commentary;
- There were procedural errors.

Following such communication, the QC Appraisal Committee will revisit the Program brief and may revise its assessment. The QC Appraisal Committee will then make its final recommendation to the QC.

2.3.4 Appeal to Quality Council

The QC will make one of the following decisions once it has received and considered the QC Appraisal Committee’s final assessment and recommendation; any additional comments from

³ This typically refers to some provision or facility not currently in place but planned for later implementation, often two or three years in the future. The with report condition implies no lack of quality in the program at this point, does not hold up the implementation of the new program and is not subject to public reference, whether on the web or elsewhere.
Queen’s on the assessment; and, after having heard any requested appeal from Queen’s on matters of fact or procedure:

a) Approved to commence;
b) Approved to commence, \textit{with report};
c) Deferred for up to one (1) year, affording Queen’s an opportunity to amend and resubmit its proposal brief; or
d) Approval denied.

If the QC decides to defer for up to one (1) year, the QC Appraisal Committee will suspend its assessment process until Queen’s University has resubmitted its Program Brief. If the QC Appraisal Committee has not received a response within the one-year period, the proposal is considered to be withdrawn.

2.3.5 Quality Council Report

The QC will communicate its decisions via the Office of the Provost and Vice-Principal (Academic) and report it for information to OCAV and MAESD. The QC and Queen’s University will post “approved to commence” decisions on their respective websites along with a brief description of the new Program. Only at this point may applications be accepted to the new Program. The Office of the Provost will be responsible for notifying the appropriate Units including the Office of the University Registrar, the Library and the relevant Faculty/School offices.

2.3.6 Waiting Period before Resubmission

Normally, resubmissions will not be accepted before one (1) year has elapsed from the date the QC declines a new Program proposal brief.

2.3.7 Subsequent “with report” Appraisal

If the QC Appraisal Committee recommends approval to commence a new Program \textit{with report}, it will review subsequent reports, conduct consultation if required and make one of the following recommendations to the QC:

a) The Program be approved to continue without condition;
b) The Program may continue accepting admissions but the QC requires additional follow-up and report within a specified period, prior to the conduct of the initial cyclical review;
c) The Program is required to suspend admissions for a minimum of two (2) years. The QC will specify the conditions to be met in the interim before admissions to the Program may resume;
d) Queen’s may appeal to the QC on the grounds that:
   
   o New information is available; or
There are errors of fact in the QC Appraisal Committee’s commentary; or

There were procedural errors.

2.3.8 Quality Council Hears *with report* Appeals

Having received and considered the QC Appraisal Committee’s recommendation, and Queen’s appeal, if any, the QC may decide:

a) To approve the Program without condition; or

b) To approve the Program continuing admissions with a further report; or

c) To require the Program to suspend admissions for a minimum of two (2) years. This decision by the QC is final. The QC will convey its decision to Queen’s and report its findings to OCAV and MAESD for information.

2.3.9 Implementation Window and First Cyclical Review

New Programs must commence within thirty-six (36) months of the approval date by the QC; otherwise the approval will lapse. The first cyclical review for any new Program will normally be conducted no more than eight (8) years after the date of the program’s initial enrolment and normally in accordance with the University’s Cyclical Program Review (CPR) schedule (Appendix 2).

2.3.10 Monitoring of New Programs

Within five (5) years of commencement new Programs will be jointly assessed by the Dean(s) and Unit Head(s), with summaries being submitted to the Provost and Vice-Principal (Academic) and to Senate for information.

2.3.11 Annual Report to the Quality Council

All changes to existing Programs approved by Senate will be included in an Annual Report to the QC which will be submitted by the Office of the Provost and Vice-Principal (Academic).
CHART 2

Approval Process for a New UG Program Proposal

Preparation of pre-approval proposal form by Academic Unit(s)
[as per template instructions]

Approval of new Program/Plan in principle by Dean(s) and Director(s) of Academic Unit(s) and Provost (or delegate)

Development of full Proposal by Academic Unit(s)

Approval by Faculty Committees and Board(s) (as appropriate)

External review/internal responses

Submission of Proposal and responses to University Secretariat by Faculty Boards

Recommendation by Senate Committee on Academic Development (SCAD)

Approval by Senate

Submission by Provost Office to Quality Council
[for approval]

Ministry of Advanced Education and Skills Development (MAESD)
[for funding purposes]

Monitoring of the Program/Plan by the University

Cyclical review within 8 years of first enrolment
CHART 3

Approval Process for a New GRAD Program Proposal

Preparation of pre-approval proposal form by Academic Unit(s)
[as per template instructions]

Approval of new Program in principle by Dean(s) and Director(s) of Academic Unit(s), Vice-Provost and Dean of SGS, Graduate Studies Executive Council (GSEC) and Provost (or delegate)

Development of full Proposal by Academic Unit(s)

Approval by Faculty Graduate Council/Committee(s) and Faculty Board(s) (as appropriate)*

Approval by GSEC and Vice-Provost and Dean, SGS

External review/internal responses

Submission of Proposal and responses to University Secretariat

Recommendation by Senate Committee on Academic Development (SCAD)

Approval by Senate

Submission by Provost Office to Quality Council [for approval]

Ministry of Advanced Education and Skills Development (MAESD) [for funding purposes]

Monitoring of the Program by the University

Cyclical program review within 8 years of first enrolment

*as per regulations of relevant Faculty graduate Council/Committee
3. **EXPEDITED APPROVALS**

3.0 **Preamble**

Please see section 1.5 for the definition of expedited approvals. 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 Program.

An expedited approval process does not normally require external review.

Institutional steps outlining an expedited approval process for existing undergraduate and graduate Programs, or new certificate, diploma, combined, or dual degree Programs in which partners are Ontario institutions, are illustrated in Charts 4 and 5. Academic units must prepare a pre-approval proposal form which, after approval by the Faculty Dean(s), will be considered by the Provost (or delegate) for undergraduate Programs and by the Provost (or delegate), in consultation with GSEC and the Dean and Vice-Provost SGS, for graduate Programs. If the pre-approval proposal is approved in principle, the Academic Unit(s) will develop a Program Proposal Submission.

The QUQAP process for expedited approvals does not apply when changes to a Program are considered minor [described in Section 3.4 below, Charts 6 and 7]. For example, amendments to “Emphasis, Options, and/or Minors” remain the jurisdiction of each Faculty’s curriculum committee/Faculty Board and/or the Graduate Studies Executive Council (GSEC).

3.1 **Program Proposal Brief for Expedited Approvals**

The Program Proposal Brief for an expedited approval will describe the new Program/Specialization (e.g. Collaborative) or the significant changes (e.g. major modifications) being proposed (including, as appropriate, reference to learning outcomes, faculty and resources), provide a brief account of the rationale for the changes, and address the following evaluation criteria (where applicable and as detailed in the appropriate templates):

- Objectives;
- Admission requirements;
• Structure;
• Program content;
• Mode of delivery;
• Assessment of teaching and learning;
• Resources for all Programs;
• Resources for graduate Programs only;
• Resources for undergraduate Programs only; and
• Quality and other indicators.

Further explanation of the above criteria may be found in Section 2.2 “New Program Approvals – Evaluation Criteria”, the templates and/or the QUQAP Guide.

3.2 Expedited Approval Process

The University Secretariat will refer Program Proposal Briefs subject to an expedited approval process to the Senate Committee on Academic Development (SCAD) for a recommendation to Senate. In some circumstances the Proposal Brief may at the discretion of the Provost (or delegate) be submitted to the QC Appraisal Committee for approval. If the Provost (or delegate) decides to submit the proposal to the QC, the QC Appraisal Committee will decide:

a) That the University can proceed with the proposed changes/new Programs; or
b) That further consultation with the University is needed.

Within forty-five (45) days of receipt of a final and complete submission, the Executive Director of the QC will report the outcomes of the expedited approval process to the Provost and to the QC.

3.3 Major Modifications to Existing Programs

Major Modifications to existing Programs may include one or more of the following Program changes:

a) The requirements for the Program differ significantly from those existing at the time of the previous cyclical review (e.g. admission and graduation requirements);
b) There are significant changes to the learning outcomes but they do not meet the threshold for a new Program;
c) The creation, deletion, or renaming of a field in a graduate program including a Collaborative Specialization;
d) Major changes to courses comprising a significant proportion of the program. As a guide, this proportion would normally be around one-third of the program. However, 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;

e) The introduction or deletion of a work experience, co-op option, internship or practicum, or portfolio;

f) There are significant changes to the faculty engaged in delivering the Program and/or to the essential physical resources, including but not limited to changes to the existing mode(s) of delivery (e.g. different campus, online, inter-institutional collaborations, etc.).

3.3.1 All major modifications to existing Programs and new certificate, combined, dual Programs, and new/renamed or changed Collaborative Specializations that were approved by the Senate, will be included in an Annual Report to the QC submitted by the Provost and Vice-Principal (Academic) (or delegate). New graduate diploma proposals are submitted to the Quality Council Appraisal Committee for approval as part of the expedited approval process.
CHART 4

Expedited Approval Process for a Major Modification to an Existing UG Program, or a New UG Certificate, Joint Degree, or Dual Credential Program

(Not requiring an External Review. A dual or joint program which involves new content would follow the new program process. Please consult the Provost’s office for advice on this.)

Preparation of pre-approval proposal form by Academic Unit(s)
[Pre-approval is required for new joint or dual credential program proposals only; not other major modifications. See template instructions]

Approval of proposed changes in principle by Dean(s)/Director(s) and Provost (or delegate)

Development of full Proposal by Academic Unit(s)

Approval by Faculty Committees and Board(s) and other internal sign offs (as appropriate)

Submission to University Secretariat

Recommendation by Senate Committee on Academic Development (SCAD)

Approval by Senate

Quality Council

[New programs following expedited process: for approval by Appraisal Committee
 Other major modifications: for information via Annual Report]
CHART 5

Expedited Approval Process for a Major Modification to an Existing GRAD Program or a Proposed New GRAD Combined, Certificate, Diploma or Dual Degree Program (in which partners are Ontario Institutions)

(Not requiring an External Review)

Preparation of pre-approval proposal form by Academic Unit(s)
[Pre-approval is required for new diploma program proposals only; not other types of major modifications. See template instructions]

Approval of new Program (from list above) in principle by Dean(s)/Director(s) of Units, GSEC, Vice-Provost and Dean of SGS, and Provost (or delegate)

Development of expedited approval submission form by Academic Unit(s)

Approval by Faculty Graduate Council(s)/Committee(s) and Faculty Board(s) (as appropriate)*

If pre-approval not required then approval by Department Head(s) and Faculty Dean(s) is required before the Faculty Graduate Council(s)/Committee(s)

Approval by Graduate Studies Executive Council (GSEC) and Vice-Provost & Dean, SGS

Submission to University Secretariat

Recommendation by Senate Committee on Academic Development (SCAD)

Approval by Senate

Quality Council

[New programs following expedited process: for approval by Appraisal Committee
Other major modifications: for information via Annual Report]

*as per regulations of relevant Faculty graduate Council/Committee
CHART 6

Approval Process for a Major Modification to an Existing or a Proposed New GRAD Collaborative Specialization

(Not requiring an External Review)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development of New Collaborative Graduate Specialization Proposal by Academic Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval of new Specialization in principle by Dean(s)/Director(s) of Units, Vice-Provost and Dean of SGS, and Provost (or delegate) and others as appropriate*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval by Faculty Graduate Council(s)/Committee(s) and Faculty Board(s) (as appropriate)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval by Graduate Studies Executive Council (GSEC) and Vice-Provost &amp; Dean, SGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission to University Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation by Senate Committee on Academic Development (SCAD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval by Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[For information via Annual Report]

* Vice-Provost and University Librarian, University Registrar, Associate Vice-Principal (Planning and Budget) if there are resource implications.

**as per regulations of relevant Faculty graduate Council/Committee
3.4  Minor Modifications to Existing Programs

Minor Modifications to existing programs do not change the essence or nature of a Program or the expected learning outcomes and, in most cases, do not require Senate approval. As noted in Section 3.0, minor modifications for undergraduate Programs are approved by their respective Faculty Boards and/or Curriculum Committees. Minor modifications to graduate Programs are approved by the GSEC. As is current practice, amendments to departmental names and/or Program names will continue to be reviewed by SCAD and approved by Senate.

Institutional steps required for minor modifications to existing undergraduate and graduate Programs are illustrated in Charts 6 and 7 below.
CHART 7

*Internal Approval Process for Minor Modifications to an Existing UG Program*

*(Senate approval not required, except for amendments to departmental and/or Program name)*

Academic Unit(s) in consultation with Dean/Associate Dean prepares appropriate documentation

*[no template required]*

Curriculum Committee(s)/Faculty Board(s)

*[for approval as per Faculty-specific regulations]*

CHART 8

*Internal Approval Process for Minor Modifications to an Existing GRAD Program*

*(Senate approval not required, except for amendments to departmental and/or Program name)*

Academic Unit(s) in consultation with Dean/Associate Dean (SGS) prepares appropriate documentation

*[no template required]*

Faculty Graduate Council(s)/Committee(s)/Faculty Board(s) as appropriate*

*[for approval as per Faculty-specific regulations]*

Graduate Studies Executive Council (GSEC)

*[for approval]*

*as per regulations of relevant Faculty graduate Council/Committee*
4. **PROGRAM CLOSURE**

4.0 **Preamble**

As outlined in the *Senate Policy and Procedures for the Closure of Academic Programs (Undergraduate or Graduate)* (approved 27 May 2014), there are a number of possible reasons for closing a Program including low enrolment, a changing disciplinary landscape, poor quality of academic program, reprioritization and/or changes in resource allocations. The recommendation to close an academic Program may be articulated in an external review report or may be identified by members of the University community.

4.1 **Proposal**

As outlined in the *Senate Policy and Procedures for the Closure of Academic Programs (Undergraduate or Graduate)*, the proposal for a Program closure will include the following criteria:

a) Rationale for the closure;

b) Impacts on, and plans for accommodation of, any students currently enrolled in the Program;

c) Impacts on program(s) students may transfer into in order to complete their degree

d) Impacts on time-to-completion;

e) Impacts on staff and faculty members involved in the delivery of the Program;

f) Impacts on the nature and quality of the Unit's programs of study;

g) Impacts on other cognate units and inter-institutional agreements/contracts (if applicable);

h) Impacts on shared services and/or resources (e.g. library resources, physical facilities, IT resources);

i) Impact on the equity goals of the Academic Unit/Faculty/University;

j) Impacts on the overall academic mission of Queen's University;

k) For combined or joint programs with other institutions, in cases where the partner institution withdraws, demonstration that Queen's University has made reasonable efforts to find a new partner which can provide the resources or expertise required to support the program.

4.2 **Institutional process and approvals**

As outlined in the *Senate Policy and Procedures for the Closure of Academic Programs (Undergraduate or Graduate)*, proposals for the closure of an existing Program will be subject to the following sequence of internal University approvals processes. The relevant Dean(s) is/are responsible for initiating and executing the following process steps:
i) Preliminary consultation with students, faculty, staff, other academic units and external stakeholders, and the Provost;

ii) Draft proposal for Program closure initiated by Unit and/or Faculty/School;

iii) Draft proposal sent to Provost's Office for preliminary discussion. For Graduate Programs, the proposal will be sent concurrently to the School of Graduate Studies;

iv) Draft proposal presented by relevant Dean(s) for information and discussion at the relevant Faculty Board(s) (and in the case of Graduate Programs, at GSEC);

v) Draft proposal is presented by relevant Dean(s) for information to Senate;

vi) Proposal is developed further by Unit in conjunction with the relevant Faculty/School;
   a) During this phase broad consultation will take place with students, faculty, staff, other academic units and external stakeholders.
   b) The proposed date for discontinuing or phasing out an Academic Program will take into consideration the time required for anticipated completion by students currently enrolled or for facilitation of their placement in acceptable alternative programs.

vii) Final proposal is signed off by Provost;

viii) Students currently enrolled in the Program are notified of the proposed Program closure and timing for phasing out of the Program;

ix) Final proposal approved by relevant Faculty Boards and GSEC;

x) Final proposal approved by Senate Committee on Academic Development (SCAD);

xi) Final proposal is submitted to Senate by SCAD for approval.

Solely in the case of combined or joint programs involving an external partner institution, it is understood that if the other institution decides to withdraw from its partnership with Queen's, the Provost may waive the requirement that admission to the program be suspended before the closure process is initiated.

Program closures are reported annually to the COU Quality Council and the MAESD by the Office of the Provost for information.
5 CYCLICAL PROGRAM REVIEWS

5.0 Preamble

Queen’s University Quality Assurance Processes (QUQAP) for the conduct of Cyclical Program Reviews (CPRs) consist of five major components:

- The Self-Study;
- External evaluation (peer review) including site visits;
- Internal responses from the Academic Unit Head(s) and appropriate Dean(s);
- Analysis of program review reports by the Senate CPR Committee; and
- Provost’s recommendations and plans to implement, monitor and follow-up on those recommendations.

The institutional steps required for CPRs are illustrated in Chart 8 at the end of this section. An orientation workshop for internal stakeholders involved in the CPR, or meetings for individual units, will be organized by the Office of the Provost and Vice-Principal (Academic) at an appropriate time.

5.1 Schedule of Reviews

A schedule of CPRs, not exceeding eight (8) years between reviews, of Queen’s University’s full complement of academic programs is attached [Appendix 2]. When possible, and desirable, undergraduate and graduate programs can be reviewed concurrently and if appropriate, can be scheduled to coincide with external accreditations. The schedule for CPRs includes all collaborative, joint, multi-disciplinary, interdisciplinary, multi-sited and inter-institutional programs/specializations and all modes of delivery. Where there is more than one mode or site involved in delivering a specific Program, the distinct versions of each Program that are to be reviewed must be clearly identified.

Reviews of collaborative/joint/interdisciplinary Programs/Specializations leading to a degree follow the same protocols as those for single disciplinary Programs (described below). Review of interdisciplinary collaborative specializations may be undertaken, where appropriate, in combination with the review of the larger degree Program.

Joint graduate Programs that involve more than one institution will identify a lead institution to prepare the Self-Study document, consulting and obtaining relevant input from all participating institutions.

5.2 Protocol for Cyclical Program Reviews

The Provost and Vice-Principal (Academic) or delegate, is responsible for CPRs and reporting their outcomes to the QC.
5.2.1 Self-Study

The Self-Study will be a broad-based, reflective, critical and forward-looking analysis of the Program/Plan that is the outcome of active involvement of and consultation among the faculty, staff and students in the Academic Unit(s); and it will employ data that are standardized across Units to the extent possible and that is deemed authoritative by Senate, thus ensuring its integrity. The self-study template is reached from the QUQAP templates section of the Provost’s office website.

The Self-Study document will address:

- Objectives of the Program/Plan(s);
- Program regulations;
- Consistency of the Program/Plan’s learning outcomes with the University’s mission and degree level expectations (see Appendix 1), and how its graduates achieve those outcomes;
- Graduate Fields in the Program(s) (if applicable);
- Special matters and innovative features;
- Program-related data and measures of performance, including applicable provincial, national and professional standards and benchmarks (where available) and internal and external research funding;
- Financial support for graduate students (where applicable);
- Review criteria and quality indicators identified in Section 5.3 of this policy;
- Concerns raised and recommendations made in most recent reviews;
- Areas identified through the conduct of the Self-Study that require improvement;
- Areas that hold promise for enhancement;
- Academic services that directly contribute to the academic quality of the Program/Plan, including library support;
- Enrolments, graduations and withdrawals;
- Employment;
- Publications;
- Ways in which equity is integrated into all aspects of the academic processes;
- Ways in which academic integrity is integrated into all aspects of the academic processes;
• Explanation of how faculty, staff, students and post-doctoral fellows (where appropriate), participated in the Self-Study and how their views were obtained and considered.

Faculty, staff, and designated student representatives should be involved in the preparation of the Self-Study. Input should be sought at a time when students are available to participate, if necessary before formal development of the study is fully underway. Responsibility for ensuring that this occurs rests with the Unit Head.

If appropriate, 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. After review and approval by the Faculty Dean, the Provost and Vice-Principal (Academic) or delegate-and the Vice-Provost and Dean of the SGS, (as appropriate), will review and approve the Self-Study report to ensure that it meets the criteria listed above.

5.2.2 Evaluation

The external evaluation is to provide an informed, impartial, and critical assessment of the quality of an academic Program from the perspective of an objective arms-length outside observer(s) (for definition of arm’s length see Section 1.5). Normally, the evaluation will be conducted by a Review Team composed of at least:

• For undergraduate Programs, one external reviewer and one additional reviewer;

• For graduate Programs, two external reviewers qualified by discipline and experience and one additional reviewer;

• For a concurrent review of undergraduate and graduate Programs, two external reviewers and one additional reviewer;

• For all reviews, the additional reviewer can be either from within the University but outside the discipline (or interdisciplinary group) engaged in the Program, or external to the University.

Academic Deans 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 undergraduate and graduate Programs, attempts will be made to ensure that at least one of the external reviewers is from outside the province of Ontario. If the program is undergoing a successive CPR, at least one of the external reviewers must not have participated in a previous cyclical review of that Unit or Program.

All members of the Review Team will be at “arm’s length” from the Program under review. Potential conflict of interest situations include, but are not limited to, the existence of family ties, partnership links, supervisory relations or other types of relationships with individuals in the Program(s) under review. None of these relationships need exclude a potential reviewer of itself; however, possible conflicts must be identified before appointment of an individual external reviewer. In case of
uncertainty, Academic Units and/or the Faculty Office are encouraged to consult with the Office of the Provost and/or the SGS as appropriate.

Reviewers will normally be associate or full professors, active and respected in their field, preferably with some program management experience, and must be at “arm’s length” from the Program under review.

The Provost (or delegate), in consultation with the Vice-Provost and Dean of the SGS (as appropriate), is responsible for appointing the Review Team as follows:

- The number of required reviewers is determined;
- A rank ordered list of eight (8) recommendations for external reviewers, and a rank ordered list of four (4) recommendations for additional reviewers, each with a brief biographical summary and description of relevant expertise, is solicited from the Faculty Dean(s) using the templates provided. Any potential conflicts of interest will be identified. For undergraduate only programs, in departmentalized Faculties, the Faculty Dean(s) solicits these recommendations from the Academic Unit(s) involved and approves the list before it is forwarded to the Provost (or delegate) for final decision.
- Where a graduate program is involved, the Faculty Dean(s) solicits recommendations from the Academic Unit(s) involved and approves the list before forwarding it to the Vice-Provost and Dean, SGS, who makes recommendations and forwards the list to the Provost (or delegate) for final decision.
- The Provost (or delegate), in consultation with the Vice-Provost and Dean, SGS, decides on which nominees will be invited to serve as reviewers. At least one of the reviewers will normally be chosen from the Academic Unit’s list. The Faculty Office(s) then invites reviewers to serve.

5.2.3 Role of the Provost

It is the responsibility of the Provost (or delegate) to ensure that the Review Team will:

a) Understand its role and obligations;

b) Identify and commend the Program(s)’ notably strong and creative attributes;

c) Describe the Program(s)’ respective strengths, areas for improvement, and opportunities for enhancement;

d) Recommend specific steps to be taken to improve the Program(s), distinguishing between those the Academic Unit responsible for the Program(s) can itself take and those that require external action;

e) Recognize the University’s autonomy to determine priorities for funding, space, and faculty allocation;

f) Respect the confidentiality required for all aspects of the review process.
These expectations will be conveyed to the Review Team in written instructions and face-to-face meetings with the relevant Faculty Dean(s), the Provost (or delegate) and the Vice-Provost and Dean of the SGS. In addition to the Self-Study, the Provost (or delegate) will determine if any additional information is needed by the Review Team. Additional information may include (but is not limited to) submissions from graduates of the Program, representatives of industry, the professions, employers and professional associations. The Provost (or delegate) will also be responsible for providing the Review Team with explicit instructions that the Program is to be evaluated against the criteria listed in Section 5.3.5 of this document and to complete the template provided.

5.2.4 Site Visit

A site visit, typically for two (2) full days, will be coordinated by the relevant Faculty Office(s) and/or the SGS, as appropriate, so the Review Team can examine the physical facilities and conduct interviews with students, staff, faculty and others who can most appropriately provide informed comments. Wherever possible, the external reviewers should visit the campus together.

The Review Team members are not invited to participate in academic or social events other than as required by their duties as reviewers.

The Faculty Office(s) and the SGS, if appropriate, will consult with members of the Program(s) under review and with assistance from the Provost’s Office, arrange for meetings between the reviewers and appropriate individuals such as the following:

- Provost and Vice-Principal (Academic) or delegate;
- Vice-Provost and Dean or delegate of the SGS (as applicable);
- Dean or delegate of the Faculty(s) (as applicable);
- Unit Head(s);
- Unit(s) faculty members;
- Faculty member representatives from cognate units (if applicable);
- Undergraduate students, graduate students and postdoctoral fellows (as appropriate) of the Unit(s);
- Staff members of the Unit(s);
- Librarian (or delegate) associated with the Unit(s) and Information Technology Services (ITS) as applicable;
- Relevant members of the external community (if applicable).
The Review Team members will be free to seek information from other sources, and in particular, to suggest other individuals and groups with whom to meet during the site visit.

5.2.5 Review Team’s Report

The Review Team’s evaluation and Report(s) is submitted to the Office of the Provost, via the Faculty Dean(s), and the SGS, if appropriate, within one (1) month subsequent to the site visit. External and Internal reviewers will normally jointly author a single Review Team Report.

The Review Team’s Report will be circulated to the SGS (if appropriate), the relevant Dean(s) and the Unit Head(s) responsible for the Program under review by the Office of the Provost. The Dean(s) are required to provide their responses to each of the following:

a) The plans and recommendations proposed in the Self-Study document;

b) The recommendations advanced by the Review Team; and

c) The Academic Unit’s response to the Review Team’s report(s).

In their responses to the Review Team’s report, the relevant Dean(s) should indicate which recommendations they endorse, where they disagree and the reasons why. For the recommendations they support, responses should include a description, to the extent possible, of the following:

- Any changes in organization, policy or governance that would be necessary to meet the recommendations;

- The resources, financial and otherwise, that would be necessary to implement the recommendations; and

- A proposed timeline for the implementation of the recommendations.

5.2.6 University Perspective and Report

The internal responses, along with the Review Team’s Report and the Self-Study, will be sent by the Office of the Provost to the Senate CPR Committee, which is elected by the Senate. The Senate CPR Committee will prepare and submit a report to the Provost on each Program under review. The report will:

a) Identify significant strengths of the Program/Plan(s);

b) Identify opportunities for Program/Plan(s) improvement and enhancement; and

c) Make recommendations.

The Provost will consider the Senate CPR Committee’s report and write a Final Assessment Report, and an associated Implementation Plan, setting out and prioritizing recommendations for implementation and, where appropriate, timelines. Responsibility for making final recommendations rests with the Provost. The Final Assessment Report may include a confidential section where human resources issues are addressed.
The Provost will provide the Final Assessment Report (excluding any confidential information) and the associated Implementation Plans, to the Head of the Academic Unit(s) responsible for the Program(s), the Senate, and the QC, for information.

The Provost, in conjunction with the Vice-Provost and Dean of the SGS, as applicable, and the Faculty Deans, will be responsible for monitoring the implementation of the recommendations.

The Provost, in consultation with the Senate CPR Committee and the Faculty Deans (within the guidelines of the FIPPA), will determine to what extent the public will have access to:

- The information made available for the Self-Study;
- The Self-Study document;
- The report of the Review Team; and
- Specified internal responses to the report of the Review Team.

5.2.7 Executive Summary and Implementation Plan

An executive summary and implementation plan will be published on the University’s website.

5.2.8 Monitoring of Implementation of Recommendations

The Provost (or delegate) shall be responsible for the monitoring of implementation of recommendations in the Final Assessment Report and Implementation Plan. Monitoring reports will be requested and will be posted on the University website.

5.2.9 Accreditation Reviews

As mentioned previously, CPRs may be scheduled in conjunction with an accreditation review if desired by the Unit(s) and approved by the Faculty Dean(s), (e.g. School of Nursing and the Canadian Association of Schools of Nursing accreditation review). In order to minimize duplication of effort, the Provost (or delegate), in consultation with the relevant Dean(s), will determine to what extent the requirements of an accreditation review can be used to satisfy the requirements of the QUQAP.

5.2.10 Queen’s University QUQAP Guide

The Office of the Provost, in consultation with the SGS, will be responsible for maintaining a guide containing a detailed description of the CPR process and associated protocols. The guide is accessed from the Quality Assurance website. At a minimum, the Guide:

a) Provides guidance on the conduct of rigorous, comprehensive and probing Self-Studies;

b) Establishes the criteria for the nomination and selection of “arm’s length” external reviewers;

c) Identifies responsibilities for the collection, integration and distribution of institutional data and outcome measures required for Self-Studies;
d) Specifies the format required for the Self-Study and the Review Team Reports; and
e) Sets out the University’s schedule for the CPRs (Appendix 2).

5.3 Evaluation Criteria for Self-Study

A review of existing Programs shall require statements explaining:

5.3.1 Objectives

a) How the Program is consistent with the University’s mission, values and academic plans;
b) How the Program requirements and learning outcomes are clear, appropriate and in alignment with the University’s statement of the UUDLEs and GDLEs (Appendix 1)

5.3.2 Admission Requirements

How admission requirements are appropriately aligned with the identified Program requirements established for completion of the degree.

5.3.3 Curriculum

a) How the curriculum reflects the current state of the discipline or area of study;
b) Evidence of significant innovation or creativity in the content and/or delivery of the Program relative to other such programs;
c) Mode(s) of delivery to meet the Program’s identified learning outcomes are appropriate and effective.

5.3.4 Teaching and Assessment

Evidence that the appropriateness and effectiveness of the methods of teaching and assessment, especially in the student’s final year of the Program, clearly demonstrate achievement of the Program learning outcomes and the University’s (or the Program’s own) statement of UUDLEs and GDLEs.

5.3.5 Equity, Diversity and Accessibility

a) How the Program has addressed the university goals for equity, diversity, and inclusion;
b) How the Program has addressed the regulations under the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disability Act (2005);
5.3.6 Academic Integrity

a) How the Program has educated and informed students and staff on the principles of academic integrity (including integrity in research), as outlined in the Senate-adopted *Academic Integrity Policy Statement*;

b) How the Program has related the principles of academic integrity to the particular field of study.

5.3.7 Resources

a) How the program has appropriately and effectively used existing human, physical, library and financial resources to deliver the program.

b) How the program’s support system has been designed to ensure the success of non-traditional students.

5.3.8 Quality Indicators

In addition to the above evaluation criteria, the reviews should include information regarding the following:

**Faculty:** qualifications, research and scholarly record; funding, honours and awards, class sizes; percentage of classes taught by permanent or non-permanent (contractual) faculty; numbers, assignments and qualifications of part-time or temporary faculty, commitment to student mentoring (graduate Programs);

**Program:** evidence of a Program structure and faculty research that will ensure the intellectual quality of the student experience;

**Students:** applications and registrations; grade-level for admission; success rates in provincial and national scholarship competitions and awards; academic awards; rates and timing of attrition; time-to-completion\(^4\); graduation rates; final-year academic achievement (undergraduate Programs); scholarly output (graduate Programs); commitment to professional and transferrable skills (graduate Programs); student in-course reports on teaching; and

**Graduates:** employment, post-graduate study, “skills match” and alumni reports on Program quality when available and when permitted by FIPPA. COU Quality Assurance Auditors will be instructed that these items may not be available and/or applicable to all Programs – Refer to Section 6.0.

For reviews of Graduate Programs, the following should also be included:

---

\(^4\) Accommodation for equity or other relevant purposes may be noted here as justification for extended times to completion.
Time to Completion: Time-to-completion is both monitored and managed in relation to the Program’s length and Program requirements;

Supervision: quality and availability;

Courses: assurance that no more than one third of courses taken to fulfill Program requirements are at the undergraduate level or are combined courses in which undergraduates predominate.

5.3.9 Quality Enhancement

Initiatives that have been implemented to improve the quality of the Program and the associated learning outcomes and teaching environment.
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Cyclical Program Reviews

Notification by Provost’s Office to Academic Units through their Faculty Offices that their Program(s) are up for review

Orientation Workshop or Meetings led by Office of the Provost (and Vice-Provost & Dean, SGS)
Information packages prepared for Academic Units by Office of Institutional Research & Planning

Initiation of Self-Study by Academic Unit(s).
Submission of nominations for Review Team members to Faculty Office [for approval]

Submission of Review Team nominations to Office of the Provost (and Vice-Provost and Dean, SGS) [for approval]

After approval by Faculty Dean, submission of Self-Study by Academic Unit(s) to Office of the Provost (and Vice-Provost and Dean, SGS) [for approval]

Submission of the Self-Study to Review Team; site visit by Review Team

Submission of Self-Study, Review Team’s Report and internal responses to Senate CPR Committee

Senate CPR Committee prepares report with recommendations to Provost

Preparation by Provost of Final Assessment Report and Implementation Plan, and Executive Summary

Office of the Provost sends Final Assessment Report and Implementation Plan to the Head of Unit(s) responsible for the program, relevant Faculty Dean(s) and (if applicable) Vice-Provost & Dean, SGS.

Submission by Provost of Final Assessment Report and Implementation Plan to Senate and Quality Council [for information]
Office of Provost posts Executive Summary and Implementation Plan on University’s website

Monitoring by Provost of implementation of recommendations.
Monitoring reports posted on University’s website

Cyclical Program Review begins again within 8 years
6. QUALITY COUNCIL AUDIT

6.0 Audit Process

Once every eight years, all publicly assisted Ontario universities will participate in an audit to determine whether or not the institution, since the last review, has acted in compliance with the provisions of its QUQAP for Cyclical Program Reviews (CPRs) as ratified by the QC.

No fewer than three Auditors, selected by the Executive Director of the QC, will conduct an institutional audit. Typically four undergraduate and four graduate CPRs will be selected for audit. At least one of the undergraduate programs and one of the graduate programs will be a new Program or a major modification to an existing Program approved within the period since the previous audit. The audit cannot reverse the approval of a Program to commence.

The audit will be comprised of a desk audit and on-site visit over 2-3 days as needed. The Auditors will prepare a report that will make suggestions and recommendations and, where necessary, identify causes for concern. A summary of the Auditors’ findings, together with a record of the recommendations, will be published on the QC’s website and communicated to Queen’s for publication on its website.

Within one (1) year of receiving the final Auditors’ report, the University will report to the QC on steps taken to address the recommendations. In consultation with the Auditors, the QC reserves the right to recommend a course of action if the University’s follow-up is deemed unsatisfactory. The Auditors’ summary of the scope and adequacy of the University’s response will be posted on the QC website and communicated to the University community, OCAV, COU and MAESD for information.
# APPENDIX 1:

## ONTARIO COUNCIL OF ACADEMIC VICE-PRESIDENTS’
UNDERGRADUATE AND GRADUATE DEGREE LEVEL EXPECTATIONS

### Undergraduate Degree Level Expectations

| 1. Depth and breadth of knowledge | **Baccalaureate/bachelor's degree**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This degree is awarded to students who have demonstrated the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) General knowledge and understanding of many key concepts, methodologies, theoretical approaches and assumptions in a discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Broad understanding of some of the major fields in a discipline, including, where appropriate, from an interdisciplinary perspective, and how the fields may intersect with fields in related disciplines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Ability to gather, review, evaluate and interpret information relevant to one or more of the major fields in a discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) Some detailed knowledge in an area of the discipline</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2. Knowledge of methodologies    | **Baccalaureate/bachelor's degree: honours**
|                                  | This degree is awarded to students who |
|                                  | a) Developed knowledge and critical understanding of the key concepts, methodologies, current advances, theoretical approaches and assumptions in a discipline overall, as well as in a specialized area of a discipline |
|                                  | b) Developed understanding of many of the major fields in a discipline, including, where appropriate, from an interdisciplinary perspective, and how the fields may intersect with fields in related disciplines |
|                                  | c) Developed ability to: i) gather, review, evaluate and interpret information; and ii) compare the merits of alternate hypotheses or creative options, relevant to one or more of the major fields in a discipline |
|                                  | d) Developed, detailed knowledge of and experience in research in an area of the discipline |

An understanding of methods of enquiry or creative activity, or both, in their primary area of study that enables
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baccalaureate/bachelor’s degree</th>
<th>Baccalaureate/bachelor’s degree: honours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This degree is awarded to students who have demonstrated the following:</td>
<td>a) evaluate the appropriateness of different approaches to solving problems using well established ideas and techniques; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) evaluate the appropriateness of different approaches to solving problems using well established ideas and techniques; and</td>
<td>b) devise and sustain arguments or solve problems using these methods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) devise and sustain arguments or solve problems using these methods.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Application of knowledge

The ability to review, present, and interpret quantitative and qualitative information to:

- a) develop lines of argument;
- b) make sound judgments in accordance with the major theories, concepts and methods of the subject(s) of study; and
- The ability to use a basic range of established techniques to:
  - a) analyze information;
  - b) propose solutions;
 |

The ability to review, present and critically evaluate qualitative and quantitative information to:

- a) develop lines of argument;
- b) make sound judgments in accordance with the major theories, concepts and methods of the subject(s) of study; and
- c) apply underlying concepts, principles, and techniques of analysis, both within and outside the discipline; and
- d) where appropriate use this knowledge in the creative process; and
- The ability to use a range of established techniques to:
  - a) initiate and undertake critical evaluation of arguments, assumptions, abstract concepts and information; and
  - b) propose solutions;
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Communication skills</th>
<th>The ability to communicate accurately and reliably, orally and in writing to a range of audiences.</th>
<th>The ability to communicate information, arguments, and analyses accurately and reliably, orally and in writing to a range of audiences.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Awareness of limits of knowledge</td>
<td>An understanding of the limits to their own knowledge and how this might influence their analyses and interpretations.</td>
<td>An understanding of the limits to their own knowledge and ability, and an appreciation of the uncertainty, ambiguity and limits to knowledge and how this might influence analyses and interpretations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Autonomy and professional capacity</td>
<td>Qualities and transferable skills necessary for further study, employment, community involvement and other activities requiring:</td>
<td>Qualities and transferable skills necessary for further study, employment, community involvement and other activities requiring:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) the exercise of personal responsibility and decision-making;</td>
<td>a) the exercise of initiative, personal responsibility and accountability in both personal and group contexts;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) working effectively with others;</td>
<td>b) working effectively with others;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) the ability to identify and address their own learning needs in changing circumstances and to select an appropriate program of further study; and</td>
<td>c) decision-making in complex contexts;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) behaviour consistent with academic integrity and social responsibility.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Graduate Degree Level Expectations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Master’s degree</strong></th>
<th><strong>Doctoral degree</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Depth and breadth of knowledge</strong></td>
<td>This degree is awarded to students who have demonstrated the following: A systematic understanding of knowledge, including, where appropriate, relevant knowledge outside the field and/or discipline, and a critical awareness of current problems and/or new insights, much of which is at, or informed by, the forefront of their academic discipline, field of study, or A thorough understanding of a substantial body of knowledge that is at the forefront of their academic discipline or area of professional practice including, where appropriate, relevant knowledge outside the field and/or discipline.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Research and scholarship</strong></td>
<td>A conceptual understanding and methodological competence that a) Enables a working comprehension of how established techniques of research and inquiry are used to create and interpret knowledge in the discipline; b) Enables a critical evaluation of current research and advanced research and scholarship in the discipline or area of professional competence; and c) Enables a treatment of complex issues and judgments based on established principles and techniques; and, a) The ability to conceptualize, design, and implement research for the generation of new knowledge, applications, or understanding at the forefront of the discipline, and to adjust the research design or methodology in the light of unforeseen problems; b) The ability to make informed judgments on complex issues in specialist fields, sometimes requiring new methods; and c) The ability to produce original research, or other advanced scholarship, of a quality to satisfy peer review, and to merit publication.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **3. Level of application of knowledge** | Competence in the research process by applying an existing body of knowledge in the critical analysis of a new question The capacity to... |...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Master’s degree</strong></th>
<th><strong>Doctoral degree</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This degree is awarded to students who have demonstrated the following:</td>
<td>This degree extends the skills associated with the Master’s degree and is awarded to students who have demonstrated the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <strong>Professional</strong></td>
<td>new setting.</td>
<td>b) Contribute to the development of academic or professional skills,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>capacity/autonomy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) The qualities and transferable skills necessary for employment requiring:</td>
<td>a) The qualities and transferable skills necessary for employment requiring the exercise of personal responsibility and largely autonomous initiative in complex situations;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i) The exercise of initiative and of personal responsibility and accountability; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii) Decision-making in complex situations;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) The intellectual independence required for continuing professional development;</td>
<td>b) The intellectual independence to be academically and professionally engaged and current;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) The ethical behavior consistent with academic integrity and the use of appropriate guidelines and procedures for responsible conduct of research; and</td>
<td>c) The ethical behavior consistent with academic integrity and the use of appropriate guidelines and procedures for responsible conduct of research; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. <strong>Level of</strong></td>
<td>The ability to communicate ideas, issues and conclusions clearly.</td>
<td>The ability to communicate complex and/or ambiguous ideas, issues and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. <strong>Awareness of</strong></td>
<td>Cognizance of the complexity of knowledge and of the potential contributions of other interpretations, methods, and disciplines.</td>
<td>An appreciation of the limitations of one’s own work and discipline, of the complexity of knowledge, and of the potential contributions of other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>limits of knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>