**Acadia University Senate Curriculum Committee (Administrative) 2023-2024**

**Form 5: New Program Proposal**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Department or School: | Click or tap here to enter text. |
| Presented to Faculty Council? | Choose an item. |
| Date presented (or will be) to Faculty Council | Click or tap to enter a date. |

The form below is based on Appendix I: Guidelines for the Preparation of Proposals for New Programmes, from the Policy on Quality Assurance – Programme Assessment by MPHEC (Maritime Provinces Higher Education Commission). The original document can be retrieved from http://www.mphec.ca/resources/Guidelines\_New\_Programmes\_en.pdf. Review the full policy (http://www.mphec.ca/resources/QA\_Policy\_Eng\_05.pdf) before completing this form.

*Proposers of new programs should be aware that the MPHEC form contains additional questions to those listed here. These have been omitted at this stage because submissions to the Senate Curriculum Committee and to Senate are steps in the process, and these sections would likely be completed* ***after*** *Senate has reviewed the proposal. The omitted questions are included on the final page of this form.*

**GUIDELINES FOR THE PREPARATION OF PROPOSALS FOR NEW PROGRAMMES**

**MPHEC acknowledges that not all the information requested will be available for each and every proposal. The absence of information must, however, be noted and explained. The key is to address the assessment criteria listed below and further defined on pages 9 and 10 of the Policy. The definition of a new programme may be found on pages 6 and 7 of the Policy.**

**1. PROGRAMME IDENTIFICATION**

1.1 Submitting institution(s)

1.2 Faculty

1.3 School

1.4 Department

1.5 Programme name and level

1.6 Credential(s) granted

1.7 Proposed starting date

**2. PROGRAMME DESCRIPTION**

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

2.1 Description of programme objectives.

2.2 Description of the overall programme structure.

2.3 Admission requirements, standards, etc.

2.4 Listing of the courses required (course name and number, whether existent or planned, its status in the programme, i.e., compulsory vs. optional; brief description of the course (for example, calendar entry). Programme duration should be stated, as well as justified.

2.5 Other special requirements such as thesis, practicum, apprenticeship, etc.

2.6 Method of programme delivery (e.g. traditional classroom, distance education, co-operative

 education or a combination).

2.7 In the case of a graduate programme, an indication of whether a programme is a research-based programme or professional programme, thesis-based or course-based.

**3. STUDENT OUTCOMES AND THEIR RELEVANCE**

This section of the proposal must provide the information necessary to meet the following assessment criterion: “clearly defined anticipated student outcomes at the programme level and a demonstration of their relevance, including (1) learning outcomes, (2) graduate outcomes, and (3) other outcomes, as deemed appropriate/relevant in the context of a particular programme.”

3.1 Identification of learning outcomes and their relevance to the proposed programme, such as critical thinking skills, breadth and depth of knowledge, attitudes, beliefs, analytical/problem-solving skills, occupation/licencing/accreditation requirements, communication skills, writing skills, etc.

3.2 Identification of graduates’ outcomes and their relevance to the proposed programme, such as further education or graduate study, employability, licensing, accreditation, etc.

3.3 Identification of other outcomes and their relevance to the proposed programme, such as team building, leadership, social citizenship, etc.

**4. RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS**

This section of the proposal must provide the information necessary to meet the following assessment criterion: “evidence of the adequacy of resources (human, physical and financial) and references to the various sources of funding.”

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

4.1. Human and Physical Resource Implications

4.1.1 Description of the extent to which current resources in terms of academic and support staff, library, space, equipment, etc. would be used.

4.1.2 Additional resources needed in the same areas.

4.1.3 Impact of the use of these resources on other programmes, including the elimination or the reduction of the scope of programmes to accommodate the new programme.

4.1.4 Estimate of resource needs and allocation beyond the first five years.

4.2 Financial Implications

*This section will be required in the final submission to MPHEC, but it may be premature to complete it fully for submission to the Senate Curriculum Committee. With the three questions below in mind, a comment on the financial implications should be provided.*

4.2.1 Full and incremental costs of the programme for the first five years (or the time frame in which the programme is expected to be fully operational), broken down by major cost areas, academic salaries, other salaries, equipment, library acquisitions, space, etc.

4.2.2 Expected sources of revenue to cover the costs.

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

**5. RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PROGRAMMES AND INSTITUTIONS**

This section of the proposal must provide the information necessary to meet the following assessment criteria: “evidence of an environmental scan to identify similar or equivalent or comparable programmes in the region and elsewhere as appropriate” and “evidence of consultation with institutions offering similar or equivalent or comparable programmes.”

5.1 Relationship and impact on existing programmes in the same institution.

5.2 Comparison of the proposed programme with other comparable programmes offered elsewhere in the Maritimes and in Canada and rationale for the introduction of an additional programme, if a similar one is already offered in the region.

5.3 Possibilities of collaboration with other institutions in the region (university or non-university), or elsewhere in Canada, in the delivery of the programme and steps taken to that effect.

5.4 *See Appendix.*

**6. PROGRAMME NEED**

This section of the proposal must provide the information necessary to meet the following assessment criteria: “evidence of need” and “evidence of student demand.”

6.1 The social (local, regional, national) need(s) met by graduates from such programmes as documented by, among other things, analysis of the evolution of the discipline, labour market analysis, demand for graduates, etc. This evidence should rely on external sources (leading scholars, government agencies, employers, professional organizations, etc.).

6.2 Consultation with employers and/or professional organizations as to the current and anticipated job market; employability data.

6.3 Priority within each institution’s programme structure and development.

6.4 Student demand.

6.5 Clientele (expected enrolment, enrolment limits or expected maximum enrolment, and clientele sources).

**7. PROGRAMME DEVELOPMENT PROCESS**

This section of the proposal must provide the information necessary to meet the following assessment criterion: “evidence of the involvement of peers and experts, normally external to the institution in the development of the proposed programme.”

7.1 Description of the institutional programme development process leading to the submission of the proposal. Each internal and external expert should be identified and their written assessment or comments on the proposed programme appended to the proposal.

7.2 *See Appendix.*

7.3 Description of any accreditation requirements.

**8. ADDITIONAL ASSESSMENT CRITERIA AND INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS IN THE CASE OF A PROPOSAL FOR A NEW GRADUATE PROGRAMME**

*See Appendix.*

***Appendix: Other questions from MPHEC “Guidelines for the Preparation of Proposals for New Programmes”***

**Section 4**

4.2 Financial Implications

4.2.1 Full and incremental costs of the programme for the first five years (or the time frame in which the programme is expected to be fully operational), broken down by major cost areas, academic salaries, other salaries, equipment, library acquisitions, space, etc.

4.2.2 Expected sources of revenue to cover the costs.

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

**Section 5**

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

**Section 7**

7.2 Description of response to external reviews. An external review is required for all new program proposals – this would normally be completed after the proposal has been submitted to Senate for approval.

**Section 8**

**8. ADDITIONAL ASSESSMENT CRITERIA AND INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS IN THE CASE OF A PROPOSAL FOR A NEW GRADUATE PROGRAMME**

This section is removed from the form as it deals only with graduate programs. At Acadia such programs are dealt with via the Senate Graduate Studies Committee.