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1. INTRODUCTION

The policies and procedures for assessing existing and approving new undergraduate and graduate programs are a key mechanism in the University of Ottawa’s ability to provide the best quality and the highest standards in these programs.

At the University of Ottawa, undergraduate and graduate programs are reviewed separately, not concurrently.

1.1. Authorities

At the University of Ottawa, the Senate is the final authority responsible for quality assurance of all university for-credit programs. The Vice-President Academic and Provost of the University has general oversight over the two “arms” of the quality assurance process – the undergraduate and the graduate.

At the undergraduate level, the Vice-President Academic and Provost is assisted in this process by the Associate Vice-President Academic, who is responsible for undergraduate programs and who chairs both the Senate Committee on the Evaluation of Undergraduate Programs/Comité du Sénat sur l’évaluation des programmes de premier cycle (for cyclical reviews) and the Council on Undergraduate Studies/Conseil des études du premier cycle (for new programs and program modifications).

At the graduate level, the Vice-President Academic and Provost is assisted in this process by the Dean of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies, who is responsible for graduate programs and who chairs the Graduate Program Committee (for new programs and program modifications). The Vice-Dean of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies chairs the Graduate Program Evaluation Committee (for cyclical reviews).

1.2. Contact person

The Vice-President Academic and Provost is the contact person for the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (Quality Council).

1.3. Definitions

A program is a coherent whole composed of a set of articulated and integrated courses and/or other learning activities prescribed as the requirements for obtaining a particular degree.

A new program is defined as any degree, degree program, or program of specialization (including cost-recovery programs and offsite programs), which has not been approved by the Ontario Council on Quality Assurance, its predecessors, or any intra-institutional approval processes that previously applied. It has substantially different program requirements and
substantially different learning outcomes from those of any existing approved programs offered by the institution. A change of name only does not constitute a new program.

**Major modifications** to existing programs typically include one or more of the following program changes: requirements for the program that differ significantly from those existing at the time of the previous cyclical program review (e.g. a change in number and type of mandatory courses; a change in the language of program delivery), significant changes to the learning outcomes, or significant changes to the faculty engaged in delivering the program (e.g. a large proportion of professors retires; new hires alter the areas of research and teaching interests) and/or to the essential physical resources as may occur, for example, when there have been changes to the existing mode(s) of delivery.

1.4. **Evaluation of programs**

All programs offered at the University of Ottawa for which a degree is conferred or a diploma awarded are subject to evaluation. This includes programs offered by federated or affiliated institutions, as well as those offered in collaboration or in partnership with community colleges, other universities or other institutions of higher learning. For complete listings of such programs please refer to the List of joint and other collaborative undergraduate programs provided in Appendix 1 – Undergraduate Programs and to the List of joint and other collaborative graduate programs provided in Appendix 2 – Graduate Programs.

The list of evaluation criteria and the information required by the University of Ottawa for both new and existing undergraduate and graduate programs are available in the various protocols provided in this document.

1.5. **Audit process**

Before implementing its IQAP, the University of Ottawa must first submit it to the Quality Council for ratification. The same process will apply whenever the university implements any substantive changes to its quality assurance processes. The Quality Council will conduct its subsequent audit of University of Ottawa’s compliance with its ratified IQAP once every eight years.

The current document contains all the relevant protocols for the evaluation and approval of undergraduate and graduate programs. All related templates have been included in a separate manual (procedures).

The University of Ottawa IQAP is to be used in conjunction with the *Quality Council Framework and Guidelines.*
2. PROTOCOLS FOR THE EVALUATION AND APPROVAL OF NEW PROGRAMS

2.1. Protocol for the Evaluation and Approval of New Undergraduate Programs

2.1.1. Evaluation and approval process for new undergraduate programs

The creation of a new program may be initiated by an academic unit, a faculty, the central administration, an internal committee, an external organization or at the request of the community.

Each proposal for a new program must undergo an appraisal and approval process that involves five main stages, some of which are broken down into sub-stages. At any of these stages, the proposal can be returned to the academic unit concerned, which must incorporate recommended modifications before moving on to the next approval stage.

2.1.1.1. Academic unit

The evaluation and approval process is normally started by the academic unit or units offering the program. The process may vary slightly for interdisciplinary and collaborative programs. However, before any discussions with academic authorities take place, the Vice-Dean Academic and the Dean of the faculty concerned must be advised of the proposed program of study.

The unit prepares a detailed proposal for the new program and submits it to all its academic authorities for approval (program committee and department assembly or their equivalent).

2.1.1.2. Faculty

The detailed proposal is submitted for approval to all faculty authorities (undergraduate program committee or its equivalent) and, finally, to the faculty council or councils.

2.1.1.3. External review

The external reviewers are selected by a subcommittee of the Council of Undergraduate Studies from two lists of candidates, one compiled by the Chair of the academic unit, and one compiled by the Dean of the faculty concerned. These individuals must have expertise in the discipline and must be at arm’s length from the program under evaluation (no family ties, partnership links, supervisory relations or other types of relationships). They must be associate or full professors and should have a good knowledge of university programs. 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 six years;
has an administrative or family link with a member of the academic program being evaluated;

is a former research supervisor, graduate student, or postdoctoral trainee of one of the members of the academic unit being evaluated;

is involved in a dispute with a member of the academic program being evaluated.

As it sees fit, the subcommittee can also consult representatives from industry or related organizations and professions.

The external reviewers will receive a covering letter listing the evaluation’s objectives, their role and responsibilities and instructions for writing the report as well as a copy of the detailed proposal.

In most cases, the external review of a new undergraduate program will be conducted on-site, but may be conducted by desk audit, video-conference or an equivalent method if the external reviewer is satisfied that the off-site option is acceptable and if each reviewer submits a separate report. However, if the program proposed is considered innovative and an equivalent program does not exist anywhere in Canada, if the program is a pilot project or if the academic unit considers it necessary, the external review will include a site visit. In this case, the reviewers should submit a joint report. Within a month after the consultation, the external reviewers submit the report(s) examining the proposed program’s relevance, importance and viability. More specifically, the reviewers will consider the evaluation criteria described in section 2.1.4 below.

2.1.1.4. Internal Response

The Associate Vice-President Academic sends a copy of the reports to the Dean of the faculty and the Chair of the academic unit concerned, with a request for feedback. If necessary, the academic unit will then make any changes necessary to the proposal.

2.1.1.5. Senate

The Vice-Dean Academic of the faculty concerned submits the detailed proposal for approval to the Council on Undergraduate Studies. Next, the Associate Vice-President Academic presents this proposal to the Executive Committee of the Senate and then to the University Senate.

2.1.1.6. Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance

The detailed proposal as approved by the Senate is then submitted for approval to the Quality Council. The submission template will include information on whether or not the proposed program will be cost-recovery. The same standards and protocols apply regardless of the source of funding.
2.1.2. Evaluation and approval process for new (and changes to existing) undergraduate programs that do not need to be submitted to the Quality Council

New programs (diplomas) and new program components (minors, options) that do not need to be submitted to the Quality Council must nevertheless be evaluated and approved by the University’s academic authorities. The process will be the same as indicated above in section 2.1, but without an external review (section 2.1.1.3) and without submission to the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance.

2.1.3. Information to be included in the proposal

The program proposal brief must include:

a) a rationale specifying the program’s goals, learning outcomes, degree level expectations, the student profile the program is expected to attract, and the expected enrolment consistent with the University’s mission and academic plans;

b) a detailed description of the program’s structure and content (total number of credits; compulsory, optional and elective courses; year-by-year course sequence), admission requirements and opportunities, including access to graduate studies;

c) a statement on ways in which the curriculum addresses the current state of the discipline or area of study;

d) a description of the program delivery methods, evaluation of teaching and learning assessment;

e) the administrative structure of the program;

f) the language of the program;

g) the length of the program;

h) a comparison with similar programs offered elsewhere, ensuring that any innovative aspects or distinctive features of the program are highlighted, including the strengths of the academic unit, teaching staff, partnerships, etc.;

i) an evaluation of the space, professorial, material and financial resources required to offer the program as well as expected class sizes;

j) evidence of interest in and a real demand for the program;

k) any possibilities for cooperation or partnerships with other institutions;

l) a completed New Program form.
If launching the program requires new resources, the Dean and the Administrative Committee must decide on the resources needed to keep the program running for a reasonable period of time. The financial impact of the new program on existing programs, and potential internal and external sources of funding must also be explored.

2.1.4. Evaluation criteria

The various academic authorities involved in the approval process examine the proposals according to several criteria. They take into account academic criteria specific to the University of Ottawa, the Quality Council’s requirements, and the Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents (OCAV) Guidelines on University Degree Level Expectations (Note: The University of Ottawa has adopted OCAV’s Guidelines on Degree Level Expectations and therefore the institution’s guidelines on Degree Level Expectations are the same as OCAV’s).

They must ensure that:

2.1.4.1. Objectives

   a) the new program is consistent with the University’s mission and academic plans, particularly with respect to the Francophonie, the development of bilingualism, and the needs of Franco-Ontarians, and matches both the goals and the teaching and research strengths of the academic unit (or units) concerned;

   b) the new program is consistent with the proposed educational goals and learning outcomes as well as with the undergraduate OCAV’s Degree Level Expectations;

   c) the new program satisfies a societal need and students’ actual interests;

2.1.4.2. Admission requirements

   a) the admission requirements as well as students’ prior learning (results) and level of preparation allow for the learning outcomes to be achieved;

   b) Other possible admission requirements such as the Cumulative Grade Point Average (CGPA), language requirements and recognition of prior learning experience are sufficiently and clearly explained.

2.1.4.3. Program structure

   a) the program’s structure and requirements allow for learning outcomes to be achieved and undergraduate Degree Level Expectations to be met and to be consistent with OCAV’s Degree Level Expectations;
2.1.4.4. **Program content**

a) the program’s name and the degree awarded correspond to both the program content and the terminology used in the discipline;

b) ways in which the curriculum addresses the current state of the discipline or area of study;

c) any innovative aspects or distinctive features of the program are highlighted, in particular those that will contribute to the quality of the student University experience.

2.1.4.5. **Mode of delivery**

a) delivery methods ensure learning outcomes are achieved and meet undergraduate Degree Level Expectations;

b) expected class sizes are specified.

2.1.4.6. **Language of delivery**

a) there is evidence that, where appropriate, the University’s mission concerning Ontario’s Francophone Community and bilingualism is reflected in the program delivery.

2.1.4.7. **Assessment of teaching and learning**

a) the methods used to evaluate student progress ensure learning outcomes are achieved and undergraduate Degree Level Expectations are met and are consistent with OCAV’s guidelines on Degree Level Expectations.

b) the plans for documenting and demonstrating students’ level of performance are included and are consistent with the institution’s statement of its Degree Level Expectations

2.1.4.8. **Resources**

a) the experience and quality of the teaching staff is clearly recognized, and there is a sufficient number of regular faculty members;

b) the role of part-time and adjunct professors is defined;

c) the financial and physical resources available or invested for the program are sufficient;

d) the resources necessary to support students’ scholarly activities, such as experiential learning opportunities (if required), library services, information technology support and laboratory access, are sufficient and of good quality.
2.1.4.9. **Quality and other indicators**

a) quality indicators for teaching staff (training and skills, distinctions, ability to make a significant contribution to the proposed program) are set out;

b) all elements of the academic unit, program structure, composition of teaching staff and possible partnerships that will ensure an intellectually stimulating university experience are identified.

2.1.5. **Role of the Council on Undergraduate Studies**

In addition to receiving the detailed proposal for evaluation and approval, the Council on Undergraduate Studies elects the members of its subcommittee responsible for nominating the external reviewers.

**Nomination Committee - Council on Undergraduate Studies**

**Creation**

The Nomination Committee is a subcommittee of the Council on Undergraduate Studies.

**Status**

The Nomination Committee is an advisory committee of the Council on Undergraduate Studies.

**Mandate**

Under the authority of the Council on Undergraduate Studies, the Nomination Committee names the two professors from other universities to review each proposed undergraduate studies program.

**Functions**

The committee:

- receives the list of external reviewers from the Chair of the academic unit and the Dean of the faculty offering the program;
- names the two external reviewers and their substitutes (the reviewers will normally be associate or full professors, or the equivalent, with expertise in the discipline, and will be at arm’s length from the program under review);
- recommends any improvements to the process for identifying and nominating external reviewers.

**Membership**

The Nomination Committee is chaired by the Associate Vice-President Academic and includes three members of the Council on Undergraduate Studies who are elected by the Council.
Appointments are for one year, and elections take place in June at the last meeting of the academic year.

Meetings
The Nomination Committee meets at the call of its Chair as often as required to carry out its mandate.

Secretarial services
Secretarial services are provided by the Office of the Vice-President Academic and Provost.

APPROVAL PROCESS FOR A NEW UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM PROPOSAL

Academic Unit
  ↓
Faculty
  ↓
External Review
  ↓
Internal Response
  ↓
Council on Undergraduate Studies
  ↓
Executive Committee of the Senate
  ↓
Senate
  ↓
Quality Council
  ↓
Ongoing Program Monitoring by the Institution (Vice-President Academic and Provost)
  ↓
Cyclical Review within 8 Years of First Enrolment
2.1.6. Announcement of new programs

Upon approval by the Senate, the documentation is submitted by the Vice-President Academic and Provost to the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance.

Once the Council has received all the documentation, the academic unit may advertise the proposed program with the following caveat: **Conditional upon approval by the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance.** The academic unit must not solicit applications without the explicit authorization of the Vice-President Academic and Provost.

2.1.7. Implementation window

After a new program is approved to commence, the program will begin within thirty-six months of that date of approval; otherwise the approval will lapse.

2.1.8. Institutional follow-up

Ongoing monitoring of the program (including oversight of the timely implementation of recommendations) is ultimately the responsibility of the Vice-President Academic and Provost, who normally delegates this responsibility to the Dean and Vice-Dean, Academic (or equivalent) of the faculty or faculties concerned, who will monitor the implementation of the recommendations.

The academic unit must submit a brief report at the end of the second and fourth academic year after the program has been approved to commence. These reports will be sent to the Vice-President Academic and Provost with a copy to the Dean of the faculty concerned.

The report must provide the following information:

a) number of applicants;
b) number of offers extended;
c) number of offers accepted (student retention);
d) courses offered;
e) quality of the student experience as determined by focus groups or a survey;
f) any changes in human resources (departures, additions);
g) any other information deemed useful and pertinent by the academic unit.

This report will be shared with the Undergraduate Program Evaluation Committee. After this consultation, the academic unit may be required to make modifications to the program. The Vice-President Academic and Provost is ultimately responsible for overseeing these changes; however, this task is usually delegated to the Dean of the home faculty.

The first cyclical review for any new program must be conducted no more than eight years after the date of the program’s initial enrolment and in accordance with the program review schedule established by the University of Ottawa.
2.2. Protocol for the Evaluation and Approval of New Graduate Programs

2.2.1. Evaluation and approval process for new graduate programs

The initiative for the creation of a new program may come from the academic unit, an institute, faculty members, the central administration, the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies, students, or an external agency (e.g. external reviewers of a program; employers). In most cases, it will be linked to one or more academic units and the latter will drive the creation of the program.

*A “new program” is brand-new: that is, the program has substantially different program requirements and substantially different learning outcomes from those of any existing approved graduate programs offered by the University.*

Each proposal for a new program must undergo a rigorous appraisal and approval process that involves a number of stages. These general stages are outlined below. At any stage, the proposal can be returned to the academic unit concerned, which must incorporate recommended modifications before moving on to the next approval stage.

2.2.1.1. Academic unit(s)

The creation, evaluation and approval process is normally started by the academic unit or units offering the program. After receiving approval from the departmental assembly, program committee or equivalent, the academic unit completes a draft of the proposed program in the form of the Letter of Intent Template for the Creation of a New Program.

2.2.1.2. Home faculty

The Letter of Intent is submitted for approval to all appropriate faculty authorities (Vice-Dean, Graduate Studies or equivalent, Dean of the faculty or faculties involved, Executive Committee of the Faculty Council or Councils).

2.2.1.3. Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies

The proposal (all documentation) is brought to the Council of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies FGPS) by the Dean of the FGPS. Once approved to go forward, it goes to the Graduate Program Committee which oversees the preparation of the three-volume brief (Volume One: Programs; Volume Two: Faculty CVs; Volume Three: Consultants’ CVs). Other committees are informed and their approval is sought as appropriate (e.g. Academic Planning Committee of Senate; the Commissions of Sciences and of Humanities; Administrative Committee for financial approval).
2.2.1.4. **External review and Internal response**

Two external reviewers (chosen by the Dean of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies from a list prepared by the academic unit: Volume Three of the Proposal Brief) are invited to study the proposed program and make an on-site visit. An additional reviewer who is from a different academic unit within the University (and not in conflict of interest) or from outside the University (where appropriate), accompanies the external reviewers during their visit. Other external opinions may be solicited as appropriate (e.g. members of the business community, employers, alumni). The reviewers will normally be associate or full professors, or the equivalent, with program management experience, and will be at arm’s length from the program under review.

There is a conflict of interest when:

- there is an administrative or family link between the proposed external reviewer and a member of the academic program under review; or
- a proposed external examiner is a former research supervisor, graduate student, or postdoctoral trainee of one of the members of the academic unit under review;
- a proposed external reviewer has collaborated or published with a member or members of the academic program under review within the past six years;
- a proposed external reviewer is involved in a dispute with a member of the academic program under review.

The external reviewers will receive a covering letter from the FGPS explaining the evaluation’s objectives, the role and responsibilities of the reviewers and instructions for writing their joint report. The reviewers will appraise the standards and quality of the proposed program as set out in the **Evaluation Criteria** (see below). The reviewers will also be invited to acknowledge any clearly innovative aspects of the proposed program together with recommendations on any essential or otherwise desirable modifications to it.

Normally, the external reviewers prepare a joint report. The internal reviewer will also submit a short written report. These are submitted to the Dean of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies, who sends a copy to the academic unit or units proposing the program, and to the Dean and Vice-Dean, Graduate Studies (or equivalent) of the faculty or faculties concerned within three weeks of having visited the academic unit. The academic unit(s) respond(s) in writing to the Dean of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies within three weeks to any concerns and recommendations, and indicate means by which these will be addressed.

2.2.1.5. **Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies**

The proposal and all the documentation (the Proposal Brief, the external reviewers’ Report, the internal responses to both) are reviewed by the Graduate Program Committee. It decides whether the proposal meets quality assurance standards and is thus acceptable or needs further modification.
2.2.1.6. **Senate**

A final version of the project is prepared by the academic unit and is submitted by the Dean of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies to the Executive Committee of Senate, then to the Senate. A web version is posted and comments from the public are solicited. At the same time, the Dean of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies informs the Council of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies of the decision of the Graduate Program Committee. The calendar text is presented to the Council of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies.

2.2.1.7. **Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance**

The proposal as approved by the Senate is then submitted for approval to the Quality Council by the Vice-President, Academic and Provost. The submission template will include information on whether or not the proposed program will be cost-recovery. The same standards and protocols apply regardless of the source of funding.

2.2.2. **Information to be included in the proposal for a new program**

**Stage one: Letter of Intent – New Graduate Programs** for preliminary approval purposes:

- rationale for the creation of the new program (including program’s aim, learning outcomes, degree level expectations, essential requirements, type of student it is expected to attract);
- program name and degree designation and their accuracy in reflecting the program; content and terminology used in the discipline;
- consistency with University’s mission and academic plans;
- match with goals and research strengths of the academic unit(s);
- general admission requirements;
- general program structure and content;
- rationale for program length;
- comparison with similar programs in Ontario or elsewhere;
- brief evaluation of resources;
- cost recovery;
- site and method of delivery;
- faculty teaching expertise;
- student interest;
- administrative structure.

**Stage two: Template for the Creation of New Graduate Programs and for the Cyclical Review of Existing Graduate Programs:**

2.2.3. **Evaluation Criteria**

The policies and procedures for assessing and approving new graduate programs are a key mechanism in the University of Ottawa’s ability to provide the best quality and the highest standards in these programs. (Note: The University of Ottawa has adopted OCAV’s Guidelines on Degree Level Expectations and therefore the institution’s guidelines on Degree Level Expectations are the same as OCAV’s.)

Prior to submitting a Proposal Brief for appraisal, new graduate programs will be internally evaluated against the following criteria:

**2.2.3.1. Objectives**

a) Consistency of the program with the University’s mission and academic plans, particularly with respect to the *Francophonie*, the development of bilingualism, and the needs of Franco-Ontarians, and matches both the goals and the teaching and research strengths of the academic unit (or units) concerned;

b) Clarity and appropriateness of the program’s requirements and associated learning outcomes in addressing the Ontario Council of Associate Vice-Presidents and University of Ottawa’s Degree Level Expectations;

c) Appropriateness of degree nomenclature;

d) High quality;

e) Fit with other programs.

**2.2.3.2. Admission requirements**

a) Appropriateness of the program’s admission requirements for the learning activities and outcomes established for completion of the program;

b) Sufficient explanation of all admission requirements (e.g. minimum grade point average, language proficiency, previous degrees).

**2.2.3.3. Program structure**

a) Appropriateness of the program's structure and regulations to meet specified program learning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations. (*Note:* The University of Ottawa has accepted the OCAV Degree Level Expectations);

b) A clear rationale for program length that ensures that the program requirements can be reasonably completed within the proposed time period.
2.2.3.4. **Program content**

a) Ways in which the curriculum addresses the current state of the discipline or area of study;

b) Identification of any unique curriculum or program innovations or creative components;

c) For research-focused graduate programs, clear indication of the nature and suitability of the major research requirements for degree completion;

d) Evidence that each graduate student in the program is required (and will be able) to take a minimum of two-thirds of the course requirements from among graduate level courses;

e) A clear list of essential requirements;

f) Learning outcomes of the program.

2.2.3.5. **Mode of delivery**

a) Appropriateness of the proposed mode(s) of delivery to meet the intended program’s learning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations.

2.2.3.6. **Language of delivery**

a) Evidence that, where appropriate, the University’s mission concerning Ontario’s Francophone Community and bilingualism is reflected in the course delivery; supervision offered in both of the official languages (where possible and appropriate); language in which the thesis is written; comprehensive examinations; and other activities offered in both languages.

2.2.3.7. **Assessment of teaching and learning**

a) Appropriateness of the proposed methods for the assessment of student achievement of 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 OCAV’s statement of its Degree Level Expectations.

2.2.3.8. **Resources**

a) Adequacy of the academic unit’s planned utilization of existing human, physical and financial resources, and any institutional commitment to supplement those resources, to support the program;

b) Participation of a sufficient number and quality of faculty who are competent to teach and/or supervise in the program;
c) Evidence that there are adequate resources to sustain the quality of scholarship produced by graduate students’ scholarship and research activities, including library support, information technology support, laboratory access, and student office space;

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

e) Where appropriate, evidence that financial assistance for students will be sufficient to ensure adequate quality and numbers of students; and to ensure that students are able to complete their programs within the specified time;

f) Evidence of the way supervisory loads will be distributed, and the qualifications and appointment status of faculty who will provide instruction and supervision.

2.2.3.9. **Quality and other indicators**

a) Evidence of quality of the faculty (e.g. qualifications, research, innovation; scholarly record; teaching excellence; appropriateness of collective faculty expertise to contribute substantively to the proposed program). These details will be found in Volume Two (faculty CVs) and in the tables in the Template for the Cyclical Review of Graduate Programs (e.g. benchmark data, Graduate and Professional Student Survey results);

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

c) Evidence that the program has addressed the Tri-Council’s guidelines statement concerning graduate students’ professional skills;

d) Mentoring policies in place for junior professors;

e) Mentoring policies and orientation days for new graduate students;

f) Evidence of clear communication between students, faculty, and program administration (e.g. a handbook for students with program details, processes, important deadlines, etc.; a web site; listserv);

g) Appropriate administrative structures (and including frequency of meetings) that ensures oversight of students’ progress;

h) Evidence of student input into graduate program amelioration and development (e.g. exit surveys, student representation on committees, etc.);

i) Postdoctoral fellows: number, length of appointment, and their contribution to the graduate program.
2.2.4. Announcement of new programs

Once the Council has received all the documentation (the three volumes of the Brief, the external reviewers’ report, the response of the academic unit, an accompanying letter from the Vice-President Academic and Provost, and the final calendar text), the academic unit may advertise the proposed program with the following caveat: Conditional on approval by the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance. The academic unit must not solicit applications without the explicit authorization of the Vice-President, Academic and Provost.

2.2.5. Implementation window

After a new program is approved to commence, the program must begin within 36 months of that date of approval; otherwise the approval will lapse.

2.2.6. Institutional follow-up

The academic unit must submit a brief report at the end of the second and the end of the fourth academic years after the program has been approved to commence. These reports will be sent to the Vice-President Academic and Provost with a copy to the Dean and Vice-Dean of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies and to the Dean and Vice-Dean, Graduate Studies of the faculty (faculties) concerned. The Dean of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies is responsible for bringing the report to the council of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies.

The report must provide the following information:

a) number of applicants;

b) number of offers extended;

c) number of offers accepted; student retention;

d) financial support awarded to students;

e) courses offered;

f) quality of the student experience as determined by focus groups or a survey;

g) any changes in human resources (departures, additions); if new hires were made, then CVs must be provided;

h) any other information deemed useful and pertinent by the academic unit.

This report will be shared with the Graduate Program Committee. After this consultation, the academic unit may be required to make modifications to the program. The Vice President
Academic and Provost is ultimately responsible for overseeing these changes; however, this task is usually delegated to the home faculty Dean or to the Dean of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies.

The **first cyclical review** for any new program must be conducted no more than eight years after the date of the program’s initial enrolment and will follow the schedule established by the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies.

### 2.2.7. Role and Composition of the Graduate Program Committee and the Council of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies

The Graduate Program Committee is responsible for overseeing the creation of new programs and for overseeing major and minor modifications to existing programs. It consists of the following members:

- Dean, Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies (chair)
- Vice-Dean, Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies
- Associate Dean, Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies
- Assistant Dean, Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies
- Vice-Deans, Graduate Studies or equivalent: Medicine, Education, Management, Sciences, Health Sciences, Law, Arts, Engineering, Social Sciences
- Two professors from the Sciences
- Two professors from the Humanities
- A student representative

**The Council of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies**

The Council promotes the quality and relevance of the graduate programs offered by the University of Ottawa through its Graduate Program Committee and its Graduate Program Evaluation Committee. To that end, it supervises the procedures for the cyclical evaluation of graduate programs; prepares for the audit by the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurances; examines the audit reports and, where relevant, submits its recommendations to the Vice-President Academic and Provost. The Council’s specific role in the evaluation and creation of graduate programs is detailed in the various protocols.

The Council is composed of:

- Dean, Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies, chair
- Vice-Rector Academic of Saint Paul University
- one Associate Vice President Research
- Vice-Dean, Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies
- Associate Dean, Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies
OVERVIEW OF PROTOCOL FOR THE EVALUATION AND APPROVAL OF NEW GRADUATE PROGRAMS

Development of New Proposal Brief
  ↓
  External Review
    ↓
    Internal Response
      ↓
      Institutional Approval
        ↓
        University’s Governance Procedures
          ↓
          Appraisal Committee Review and Recommendation
            ↓
            Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance Approval to Commence
              ↓
              Ontario Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities (for funding purposes)
                ↓
                Ongoing Program Monitoring by the Institution (Vice-President Academic and Provost)
                  ↓
                  Cyclical Review within 8 years of First Enrolment
INTERNAL APPROVAL PROCESS FOR THE EVALUATION AND APPROVAL OF NEW GRADUATE PROGRAMS

Development of New Proposal by the relevant Academic Unit (Template for the Creation of a New Graduate Program)

Approval and support from the home faculty or faculties

Proposal documentation to Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies

Council of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies (preliminary approval)

Graduate Program Committee of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies (scheduling)

(University Administrative Committee if financial implications)

APPROVAL TO DEVELOP THE PROPOSAL

Detailed Proposal Brief (3 volumes)

Graduate Program Committee of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies

External Review (2 external reviewers + 1 internal)

Internal Response

Graduate Program Committee

Executive Committee of Senate

Senate

Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance

Ontario Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities (for funding purposes)

Program initiated within 36 months of approval

On-going monitoring by the University (Dean, Vice-President Academic and Provost)

University follow-up within 8 years of first enrolment
(Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies)
3. PROTOCOLS FOR EXPEDITED APPROVALS

3.1. Protocol for the Expedited Approval of Undergraduate Programs

This protocol applies to proposals for major modifications to existing and already approved undergraduate programs and for which the University is requesting approval from the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (Quality Council). It also applies to new programs that are created from existing University of Ottawa programs or that involve adding components or options to current programs, and for which the University is not requesting an external review.

3.1.1. Major modifications

Modification to a program is considered major when:

a) the requirements for the program differ significantly from those existing at the time of the previous cyclical program review (e.g. a change in number and type of mandatory courses; a change in the language of program delivery; the introduction of a new concentration; a new mode of delivery; the addition or deletion of a coop or practicum; addition or deletion of a research paper; a change in the nature of the comprehensive, qualifying or candidacy examinations; the merger of two or more programs; the introduction of a bridging option for college diploma graduates; any change to field studies or residency requirements; major changes made to more than one-third of courses; a change from full to part-time program options or vice versa);

b) significant changes have been made to the learning outcomes (e.g. a major research component such as a research paper or thesis has been removed, added, or otherwise significantly changed);

c) any changes to program content, other than those listed above, that affect the learning outcomes, but do not meet the threshold for a “new program”;

d) significant changes have been made to the professors engaged in delivering the program (e.g. a large proportion of professors retires; new hires alter the areas of research and teaching interests; a field is deleted; an existing degree program is established at another location or institution). (For the introduction of a new field see above.);

e) when significant changes have been made to the essential physical resources (e.g. new laboratories are created; a complete on-line delivery of the program is proposed; the program is moved to an off-campus location) where these changes impair the delivery of the approved program.

The Senate Committee on Undergraduate Program Evaluation will act as an arbitrator to determine whether a change constitutes a major modification.
3.1.2. Evaluation and approval process for new programs that are created from existing University of Ottawa programs and for major modifications

All proposals for new programs that are created from existing University of Ottawa programs or for major modifications to existing programs are subject to an evaluation and approval process.

This process involves four stages, some of which are broken down into sub-stages, which are described below. At any of these stages, the proposal can be returned to the academic unit concerned, which must incorporate recommended modifications before moving on to the next approval stage.

3.1.2.1. Academic unit

The evaluation and approval process usually begins in the academic unit(s) offering the program. The process may vary slightly for interdisciplinary and collaborative programs. However, before any discussions can take place with the academic authorities of the unit(s), the Vice-Dean Academic must be informed of the proposed modifications.

The unit drafts a proposal for a new program or for major modifications and submits it for approval to the academic authorities concerned (program committee and department assembly, or their equivalent).

3.1.2.2. Faculty

The proposal is next submitted to all academic faculty authorities (undergraduate program committee or its equivalent), and, finally, to the faculty council or councils.

3.1.2.3. Senate

The Vice-Dean Academic of the faculty concerned, or an equivalent authority, submits the proposal for approval to the Council on Undergraduate Studies. Next, the Associate Vice-President Academic forwards the proposal to the Executive Committee of the Senate and to the Senate, if necessary. Senate approval is necessary if a modification has an impact on the diploma (for example, if a new major is created).

3.1.2.4. Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance

The proposal is then sent for expedited approval to the Quality Council.

3.1.3. Information required in the proposal

The proposal must include the following information:

a) a justification for the major modifications proposed or for the new program created from existing programs;
b) a detailed description of the major modifications or of what has been added to the existing programs (admission or graduation requirements, program structure, courses, delivery methods, resource allocation, etc.);

c) how the major modifications or new program will affect the University’s mission and academic plans, learning objectives and outcomes, undergraduate Degree Level Expectations, admission requirements or students’ level of preparation, and student enrolment;

d) how the major modifications or new program will affect teaching, learning and evaluation methods;

e) how the major modifications or new program will affect space requirements as well as professorial resources, material resources, financial resources and anticipated class sizes;

f) how the major modifications or new program will affect the existing program’s administrative structure;

g) how the major modifications or new program will ensure a high quality student University experience.

If implementing the new program or the major modifications requires new resources, the Dean and the Administrative Committee are responsible for determining exactly what resources are needed to offer the program for a reasonable period of time. The financial impact of the major modifications or new program, as well as opportunities to secure extra funding from internal and external sources, must also be examined.

3.1.4. Evaluation criteria

The various academic authorities involved in the approval process examine the proposals according to several criteria. They take into account academic criteria specific to the University of Ottawa, the Quality Council’s requirements, and the Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents (OCAV) Guidelines on University Degree Level Expectations. (Note: The University of Ottawa has adopted OCAV’s Guidelines on Degree Level Expectations and therefore the institution’s guidelines on Degree Level Expectations are the same as OCAV’s).

They must ensure that:

3.1.4.1. Objectives

a) the new program is consistent with the University’s mission and academic plans, particularly with respect to the Francophonie, the development of bilingualism, and the needs of Franco-Ontarians, and matches both the goals and the teaching and research strengths of the academic unit (or units) concerned;
b) the new program is consistent with the proposed educational goals and learning outcomes as well as with the undergraduate OCAV’s Degree Level Expectations;

c) the new program satisfies a societal need and students’ actual interests;

3.1.4.2. Admission requirements

a) the admission requirements as well as students’ prior learning (results) and level of preparation allow for the learning outcomes to be achieved;

b) other possible admission requirements such as the CGPA, language requirements and recognition of prior learning experience are sufficiently and clearly explained.

3.1.4.3. Program structure

a) the program’s structure and requirements allow for learning outcomes to be achieved and undergraduate Degree Level Expectations to be met and to be consistent with OCAV’s Degree Level Expectations;

3.1.4.4. Program content

a) the program’s name and the degree awarded correspond to both the program content and the terminology used in the discipline;

b) any innovative aspects or distinctive features of the program are highlighted, in particular those that will contribute to the quality of the student University experience.

3.1.4.5. Program delivery

a) delivery methods ensure learning outcomes are achieved and meet undergraduate Degree Level Expectations;

b) expected class sizes are specified.

3.1.4.6. Language of delivery

a) there is evidence that, where appropriate, the University’s mission concerning Ontario’s Francophone Community and bilingualism is reflected in the program delivery.

3.1.4.7. Evaluation of teaching and learning assessment

a) the methods used to evaluate student progress ensure learning outcomes are achieved and undergraduate Degree Level Expectations are met and are consistent with OCAV’s guidelines on Degree Level Expectations;
b) plans for documenting and demonstrating students’ level of performance are included and are consistent with the institution’s statement of its Degree Level Expectations.

3.1.4.8. **Resources**

   a) the experience and quality of the teaching staff is clearly recognized, and there is a sufficient number of regular faculty members;

   b) the role of part-time and adjunct professors is defined;

   c) the financial and physical resources available or invested for the program are sufficient;

   d) the resources necessary to support students’ scholarly activities, such as experiential learning opportunities (if required), library services, information technology support and laboratory access, are sufficient and of good quality.

3.1.4.9. **Quality and other indicators**

   a) quality indicators for teaching staff (training and skills, distinctions, ability to make a significant contribution to the proposed program) are set out;

   b) all elements of the academic unit, program structure, composition of teaching staff and possible partnerships that will ensure an intellectually stimulating university experience are identified.

**PROCESS FOR THE EXPEDITED APPROVAL OF NEW UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS CREATED FROM EXISTING PROGRAMS AND OF MAJOR MODIFICATIONS**

```
Academic unit
  ↓
Faculty
  ↓
Council on Undergraduate Studies
  ↓
Executive Committee of the Senate
  ↓
Senate (if necessary)
  ↓
Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance
  ↓
Cyclical Review within 8 years
```
3.2. Protocol for the Expedited Approval of Graduate Programs

The Expedited Approval Process requires the submission to the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance of a Proposal Brief. No external reviewers are required.

This protocol applies in the following cases:

1. the declaration of a new Field in an existing graduate program; or
2. the proposal for a new Collaborative Program; or
3. a new for-credit Graduate Diploma.

This protocol also applies to proposals for major modifications to existing and already approved graduate programs and for which the University is requesting approval from the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (Quality Council). It also applies to new programs that are created from existing University of Ottawa programs or that involve adding components or options to current programs, and for which the University is not requesting an external review.

The steps for evaluation and approval of a brief for Expedited Approval are outlined below. (For details on each of these steps, consult the Protocol for Expedited Approval of Graduate Programs.) Note that the Evaluation Criteria detailed below must be addressed when creating new collaborative programs and new for-credit diploma programs.

3.2.1. Evaluation and approval process for new fields and new programs created from existing and approved University of Ottawa programs

3.2.1.1. Proposal for a New Field

Graduate programs are not required to declare fields in either master’s or doctoral programs but they may do so. If there is a decision to add them after the program is established, the academic unit must follow the Protocol for Expedited Approval and must seek the Quality Council’s endorsement.

The Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance defines “fields” in graduate programs as “an area of specialization or concentration (in multi-interdisciplinary programs a clustered area of specialization) that is related to the demonstrable and collective strengths of the program’s faculty.” Normally, this means that at least three or four regular professors are actively engaged in researching and teaching in the proposed field.

For deletions of or changes to a Field, see Major Modifications.

3.2.1.1.1. Academic Unit:

The academic unit completes the Letter of Intent Template for Expedited Approval proposing a new Field.
- Description of the new field;
- Appropriateness of its title;
- Rationale for the proposal;
- Number and names of faculty involved in the proposed new field;
- Courses linked to the proposed new field;
- Impact, if any, on the program’s goals and learning outcomes;
- Impact on any other programs at the University;
- Effect on student profile and enrolment if any;
- Consistency with mission and academic plans of the University and of the academic unit;
- Impact, if any, on the current facilities, resources (human, material, financial).

3.2.1.1.2. **Home faculty**

The completed template is sent to the home faculty or faculties for approval by the appropriate academic authorities (normally the Dean of the home faculty, Executive Committee or Graduate Studies Committee, Faculty Council). The document will describe the new Field and will provide a rationale for its creation. Faculty expertise and the existence of a sufficient number of related courses must be demonstrated.

3.2.1.1.3. **Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies**

The **Graduate Program Committee** decides whether the proposal meets the following criteria:

a. the faculty expertise justifies its creation;

b. there is a sufficient number of faculty members;

c. the new field’s title (in both languages, where needed) is appropriate and clearly justified in the rationale;

d. there is a sufficient number of related graduate courses to justify the addition of a new field.

Once approved, the proposal is shared with the Council of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies.

3.2.1.1.4. **Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance**

If the proposal is approved, it is sent to the Council of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies. Once approved, it is forwarded by the Vice-President Academic and Provost to the **Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance**.
3.2.1.2. **Proposal for a New Collaborative or For-Credit Graduate Diploma**

3.2.1.2.1. **Academic unit(s):**

The academic unit(s) complete(s) the Letter of Intent Template for Expedited Approval proposing a new Collaborative Program or for-credit Graduate Diploma.

3.2.1.2.2. **Home faculty (faculties)**

The completed template is submitted to all appropriate academic authorities (e.g. Dean, Vice-Dean, Graduate Studies, Executive Committee or Graduate Studies Committee, Faculty Council) for approval. The document will describe the new Collaborative Program or for-credit Graduate Diploma and will provide a rationale for its creation. The program must meet the **Evaluation Criteria** set out below.

3.2.1.2.3. **Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies**

The proposal is studied by and shared with the appropriate academic authorities (e.g. Graduate Program Committee, Commissions, the Council of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies, the Administrative Committee of Senate if financial implications). If the proposal is approved, the unit proceeds to prepare a full program proposal Brief. The **Proposal Brief** will describe the new program using the relevant sections of the Template for the Cyclical Review of Graduate Programs (e.g. learning outcomes, Degree Level Expectations, program content, structure, faculty physical and other resources, funding, etc.). Note that Volume 3 (Reviewers) is not required. The Brief will also provide a brief account of the rationale for the changes, and will address the Evaluation Criteria where they apply.

3.2.1.2.4. **Senate**

The final version of the proposed program is submitted by the Dean of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies to the Executive Committee of Senate, then to the Senate. A web version is posted and comments from the public are solicited.

3.2.1.2.5. **Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance**

Upon approval by the Senate, the documentation is submitted by the Vice-President Academic and Provost to the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance.
3.2.2. Information to be included in the proposal for new collaborative or for-credit graduate diploma programs

a) a brief description of the new diploma/new collaborative program;

b) a rationale for this proposal;

c) for the proposal of a new Graduate Diploma: definition of the area of focus and the academic requirements of the program;

d) for Types 2 and 3 Graduate Diplomas: appraisal status and degree level(s) of the related programs;

e) list of the core faculty of the collaborative program, together with their home affiliation;

f) added value of the proposed program to the educational experience of students (i.e. beyond that which would be obtained in the home program);

g) intellectual focus of the program and the degree level(s) at which it is offered (i.e. Master’s, PhD);

h) common learning experience for the students (e.g. core courses);

i) academic requirements of the program (including required and elective courses, thesis, etc.);

j) impact on the existing program’s goals. Impact on other programs at the University of Ottawa;

k) changes affecting the student profile and enrolment;

l) consistency with the mission and academic plans of the University and the academic unit;

m) impact on the facilities, faculty resources, and material and financial resources required to offer the program;

n) description of the administrative structure;

o) comparison with similar programs offered at other institutions in Ontario and Canada.

3.2.3. Evaluation Criteria

3.2.3.1. Objectives

a) consistency of the program with the University’s mission and academic plans;
b) clarity and appropriateness of the program’s requirements and associated learning outcomes in addressing the Ontario Council of Associate Vice-Presidents and University of Ottawa’s Degree Level Expectations;

c) appropriateness of degree nomenclature;

d) high quality;

e) fit with other programs.

3.2.3.2. **Admission requirements**

a) appropriateness of the program’s admission requirements for the learning activities and outcomes established for completion of the program;

b) sufficient explanation of all admission requirements (e.g. minimum grade point average, language proficiency, previous degrees).

3.2.3.3. **Structure**

a) appropriateness of the program's structure and regulations to meet specified program learning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations. *Note:* The University of Ottawa has accepted the OCAV Degree Level Expectations;

b) a clear rationale for program length that ensures that the program requirements can be reasonably completed within the proposed time period.

3.2.3.4. **Program content**

a) ways in which the curriculum addresses the current state of the discipline or area of study;

b) identification of any unique curriculum or program innovations or creative components;

c) for research-focused graduate programs, clear indication of the nature and suitability of the major research requirements for degree completion;

d) evidence that each graduate student in the program is required (and will be able) to take a minimum of two-thirds of the course requirements from among graduate level courses;

e) a clear list of essential requirements;

f) learning outcomes of the program.
3.2.3.5. **Mode of delivery**

   a) appropriateness of the proposed mode(s) of delivery to meet the intended program’s learning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations.

3.2.3.6. **Language of delivery**

   a) evidence that, where appropriate, the University’s mission concerning Ontario’s Francophone Community and bilingualism is reflected in the course delivery;

   b) supervision offered in both of the official languages (where possible and appropriate);

   c) language in which the thesis is written;

   d) comprehensive examinations;

   e) and other activities offered in both languages.

3.2.3.7. **Assessment of teaching and learning**

   a) appropriateness of the proposed methods for the assessment of student achievement of 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 OCAV’s statement of its Degree Level Expectations.

3.2.3.8. **Resources**

   a) adequacy of the academic unit’s planned utilization of existing human, physical and financial resources, and any institutional commitment to supplement those resources, to support the program;

   b) participation of a sufficient number and quality of faculty who are competent to teach and/or supervise in the program;

   c) evidence that there are adequate resources to sustain the quality of scholarship produced by graduate students’ scholarship and research activities, including library support, information technology support, laboratory access, and student office space;

   d) evidence that faculty have the recent research or professional/clinical expertise needed to sustain the program, promote innovation, and foster an appropriate intellectual climate;

   e) where appropriate, evidence that financial assistance for students will be sufficient to ensure adequate quality and numbers of students; and to ensure that students are able to complete their programs within the specified time;
f) evidence of the way supervisory loads will be distributed, and the qualifications and appointment status of faculty who will provide instruction and supervision.

3.2.3.9. **Quality and other indicators**

a) evidence of quality of the faculty (e.g. qualifications, research, innovation; scholarly record; teaching excellence; appropriateness of collective faculty expertise to contribute substantively to the proposed program). These details will be found in Volume Two (faculty CVs) and in the tables in the Template for the Cyclical Review of Graduate Programs (e.g. benchmark data, Graduate and Professional Student Survey results);

b) evidence of a program structure and faculty research that will ensure the intellectual quality of the student experience;

c) evidence that the program has addressed the Tri-Council’s guidelines statement concerning graduate students’ professional skills;

d) mentoring policies in place for junior professors;

e) mentoring policies and orientation days for new graduate students;

f) evidence of clear communication between students, faculty, and program administration (e.g. a handbook for students with program details, processes, important deadlines, etc.; a web site; listserv);

g) appropriate administrative structures (and including frequency of meetings) that ensures oversight of students’ progress;

h) evidence of student input into graduate program amelioration and development (e.g. exit surveys, student representation on committees, etc.);

i) postdoctoral fellows: number, length of appointment, and their contribution to the graduate program.

3.2.4. **Announcement of new programs**

Once the Council has received all the documentation, the academic unit may advertise the proposed program with the following caveat: **Conditional upon approval by the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance.** The academic unit must not solicit applications for admission to new Collaborative or for-credit Graduate Diploma programs without the explicit authorization of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies.
3.2.5. **Implementation window**

After a new program is approved to commence, the program must begin within 36 months of that date of approval; otherwise, the approval will lapse.

3.2.6. **Institutional follow-up of new collaborative programs or new for-Credit Graduate Diplomas**

New collaborative programs and new for-credit graduate diplomas will be monitored in the same fashion as a new program (i.e. with a report two and four years after initiation).

The **first cyclical review** for any new program must be conducted no more than eight years after the date of the program’s initial enrolment and follows the schedule established by the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies.

---

**OVERVIEW OF PROTOCOL FOR EXPEDITED APPROVALS FROM THE ONTARIO UNIVERSITIES ON QUALITY ASSURANCE**

Development of a new Program by the Academic Unit

↓

Institutional Approval

↓

University’s Governance Procedures Appraisal Committee Review and Recommendation

↓

Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance

↓

Cyclical Review within 8 years
OVERVIEW OF PROTOCOL FOR APPROVAL PROCESS FOR A NEW FIELD

Academic Unit proposes a new field

↓

Approval of the faculty or faculties involved

↓

Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies (Council, Program Committee)

↓

Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance
COLLABORATIVE PROGRAMS AND FOR-CREDIT GRADUATE DIPLOMAS OR CERTIFICATES

Development of the proposal for a new collaborative program or new graduate diploma

↓

Approval of the faculty or faculties involved

↓

Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies (Council, Program Committee)

↓

Administrative Committee (*if financial implications*)

↓

Executive Committee of Senate

↓

Senate

↓

Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance

↓

Ontario Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities (*for funding purposes*)

↓

Ongoing Program Monitoring by the University (Dean of home faculty/faculties, Vice-President Academic and Provost)

↓

Cyclical Review within 8 years of First Enrolment
4. PROTOCOLS FOR THE EVALUATION AND APPROVAL OF MAJOR MODIFICATIONS TO EXISTING PROGRAMS

4.1. Protocol for the Evaluation and Approval of Major Modifications to Existing Undergraduate Programs

4.1.1. Major modifications

Modification to a program is considered major when:

a) the requirements for the program differ significantly from those existing at the time of the previous cyclical program review (e.g. a change in number and type of mandatory courses; a change in the language of program delivery; the introduction of a new concentration; a new mode of delivery; the addition or deletion of a coop or practicum; addition or deletion of a research paper; a change in the nature of the comprehensive, qualifying or candidacy examinations; the merger of two or more programs; the introduction of a bridging option for college diploma graduates; any change to field studies or residency requirements; major changes made to more than one-third of courses; a change from full to part-time program options or vice versa);

b) significant changes have been made to the learning outcomes (e.g. a major research component such as a research paper or thesis has been removed, added, or otherwise significantly changed;

c) any changes to program content, other than those listed above, that affect the learning outcomes, but do not meet the threshold for a “new program”;

d) significant changes have been made to the professors engaged in delivering the program (e.g. a large proportion of professors retires; new hires alter the areas of research and teaching interests; a field is deleted; an existing degree program is established at another location or institution). (For the introduction of a new field see above.);

e) when significant changes have been made to the essential physical resources (e.g. new laboratories are created; a complete on-line delivery of the program is proposed; the program is moved to an off-campus location) where these changes impair the delivery of the approved program.

The Senate Committee on Undergraduate Program Evaluation will act as an arbitrator to determine whether a change constitutes a major modification.
4.1.2. Evaluation and approval process for major modifications

All proposals for major modifications to an existing program must undergo an evaluation and approval process. The stages involved in the process vary depending on whether the proposal is submitted to the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (Quality Council). If the proposal is submitted to the Quality Council (expedited approval), it will undergo a five-stage evaluation and approval process similar to the process for evaluating and approving new programs. If the proposal is not submitted to the Quality Council, it will undergo a three-stage evaluation and approval process, as described below (some stages are broken down into sub-stages). At any of these stages, the proposal can be returned to the academic unit concerned, which must incorporate recommended modifications before moving on to the next approval stage.

4.1.2.1. Academic unit

The evaluation and approval process for major modifications is normally initiated by the academic unit(s) offering the program. The process may vary slightly for interdisciplinary or collaborative programs. However, before any discussions with the unit’s academic authorities take place, the Vice-Dean Academic must be advised of the modifications being proposed.

The unit prepares a proposal for the major modifications and submits it to all its academic authorities for approval (program committee and department assembly, or their equivalent).

4.1.2.2. Faculty

The proposal is submitted for approval to all faculty academic authorities (including the undergraduate program committee, or its equivalent) and, finally, to the faculty council or councils.

4.1.2.3. Senate

The Vice-Dean Academic, or equivalent, of the faculty concerned submits the proposal to the Council on Undergraduate Studies for approval. The Associate Vice-President Academic then presents the proposal to the Executive Committee of the Senate and to the Senate, if necessary. Senate approval is necessary if a modification has an impact on the diploma (for example, if a new major is created).

4.1.2.4. Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance

A copy of the major modifications approved by Senate is sent to the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance as part of the University’s annual report on major modification(s) approved during the academic year.
4.1.3. Information to be included in the proposal

The proposal must include:

a) a justification for the major modifications being proposed;

b) a detailed description of the modifications (changes to admission or graduation requirements, program structure, courses, delivery methods, allocated resources, etc.);

c) the effect of these modifications on the University’s mission and academic plans, on the learning goals and expected learning outcomes, on undergraduate Degree Level Expectations, on admission requirements, on student preparedness, on enrolment and on the student university experience;

d) the effect of these modifications on teaching, learning or evaluation methods;

e) the effect of these modifications on physical space requirements as well as on professorial resources, material and financial resources required and expected class sizes;

f) and the effect of these modifications on the program’s administrative structure.

If new resources are required in order to implement the major modifications, the Dean and the Administrative Committee must decide on the resources needed to offer the program for a reasonable period of time. The financial impact of the major modifications and potential internal or external sources of funding must also be explored.

4.1.4. Evaluation criteria

The various academic authorities involved in the approval process examine the proposals according to several criteria. They take into account academic criteria specific to the University of Ottawa, the Quality Council’s requirements and the Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents (OCAV) guidelines on University Degree Level Expectations. They must ensure that:

4.1.4.1. Objectives

a) the major modifications allow the University to carry out or better carry out its mission and academic plans, reach its goals, and build upon the teaching and research strengths of the academic unit(s) concerned;

b) the major modifications are consistent with or reinforce the educational goals, learning outcomes, and undergraduate Degree Level Expectations;

c) major modifications allow the program to satisfy societal needs and students’ actual interests.
4.1.4.2. Admission requirements

a) the admission requirements, as well as students’ prior learning (results) and level of preparation, allow for the learning outcomes to be achieved;

b) other possible admission requirements such as the CGPA, language requirements, and recognition of prior learning experience are sufficiently and clearly explained.

4.1.4.3. Program structure

a) the program structure and requirements allow for learning outcomes to be achieved and undergraduate Degree Level Expectations to be met.

4.1.4.4. Program content

a) the name of the program and the degree awarded correspond to both the program content and the terminology used in the discipline;

b) any innovative aspects or distinctive features of the program are highlighted, in particular those that will contribute to the quality of the student University experience.

4.1.4.5. Mode of delivery

a) delivery methods ensure learning outcomes are achieved and meet undergraduate Degree Level Expectations;

b) expected class sizes are specified.

4.1.4.6. Language of delivery

a) there is evidence that, where appropriate, the University’s mission concerning Ontario’s Francophone Community and bilingualism is reflected in the course delivery.

4.1.4.7. Assessment of teaching and learning

a) the methods used to evaluate student progress ensure learning outcomes are achieved and undergraduate Degree Level Expectations are met and are consistent with OCAV’s guidelines on Degree Level Expectations.

4.1.4.8. Resources

a) the experience and quality of the teaching staff is clearly indicated, and there is a sufficient number of regular faculty members;

b) the role of part-time and associate professors is defined;

c) the financial and physical resources required or invested for the program are sufficient;
d) the resources necessary to support students’ scholarly activities, such as library services, information technology support and laboratory access, are sufficient and of good quality.

4.1.4.9. **Quality and other indicators**

a) quality indicators of teaching staff (training and skills, distinctions, ability to make a significant contribution to the proposed program) are set out;

b) all elements of the academic program, program structure, composition of the teaching staff and possible partnerships that will ensure an intellectually stimulating university experience are identified.

**APPROVAL PROCESS FOR A MAJOR MODIFICATION PROPOSAL FOR UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS**

```
Academic unit
↓
Faculty
↓
Council on Undergraduate Studies
↓
Executive Committee of the Senate
↓
Senate (if necessary)
↓
Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (via annual report)
```
4.2. Protocol for the Evaluation and Approval of Major Modifications to Existing Graduate Programs

4.2.1. Major Modifications

Modification to a program is considered major when:

a) the requirements for the program differ significantly from those existing at the time of the previous cyclical program review (e.g. a change in number and type of mandatory courses; a change in the language of program delivery; the introduction of a new concentration; a new mode of delivery; the addition or deletion of a coop or practicum; addition or deletion of a research paper; a change in the nature of the comprehensive, qualifying or candidacy examinations; the merger of two or more programs; the introduction of a bridging option for college diploma graduates; any change to field studies or residency requirements; major changes made to more than one-third of courses; a change from full to part-time program options or vice versa);

b) significant changes have been made to the learning outcomes (e.g. a major research component such as a research paper or thesis has been removed, added, or otherwise significantly changed);

c) any changes to program content, other than those listed above, that affect the learning outcomes, but do not meet the threshold for a “new program”;

d) significant changes have been made to the professors engaged in delivering the program (e.g. a large proportion of professors retires; new hires alter the areas of research and teaching interests; a field is deleted; an existing degree program is established at another location or institution). (For the introduction of a new field see above.);

e) when significant changes have been made to the essential physical resources (e.g. new laboratories are created; a complete on-line delivery of the program is proposed; the program is moved to an off-campus location) where these changes impair the delivery of the approved program.

The above list is merely illustrative and does not exhaust the possibilities of the definition of a major modification to a program. The Assistant Dean and Secretary General of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies and the Graduate Program Committee should be consulted for further information and in case of doubt.
4.2.2. Evaluation and approval process for major modifications

4.2.2.1. Academic unit

The academic unit submits the proposed modification (which includes a clear and detailed rationale for the changes, as well as implications, if any, for the program) to the home faculty authorities for approval, using the Letter of Intent Template for Major Modifications of Graduate Programs.

Academic units are encouraged to consult the Secretary General and Assistant Dean of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies to determine whether the proposed changes are considered “major” or “minor.”

4.2.2.2. Home faculty

Once approved by the appropriate authorities in the home Faculty (e.g. Dean, Executive Committee or Graduate Studies Committee, Faculty Council), the academic unit prepares a full (calendar) version of the proposed changes. This document is submitted to the Graduate Program Committee of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies, and a copy is sent to the Dean(s) and Vice-Deans of the faculty or faculties concerned.

4.2.2.3. Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies

The Graduate Program Committee considers the proposal in light of the applicable Evaluation Criteria and, if there are financial implications to the creation of the new program, the proposal is submitted for approval to the Administrative Committee.

Once all the necessary approvals have been received, the Graduate Program Committee submits the document to the Council of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies.

4.2.2.4. Senate

The proposed changes are then sent to the Executive Committee of Senate. Once approved by the Executive Committee of Senate, the documentation will automatically be sent for Senate approval if deemed necessary.

4.2.2.5. Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance

A copy of the major modification approved by Senate is sent to the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance as part of the University’s annual report on Major Modification(s) approved during that academic year.
4.2.3. Information to be included in the proposal

The proposal must include:

a) a description of changes made (structure, courses, mode of delivery, deletion of a field, etc.);

b) a rationale for the changes; the impact on the program’s goals, degree level expectations and learning outcomes;

c) the impact on student’s profile and enrolment;

d) the effect of these modifications on the mission and academic plans of the University and the unit;

e) the effect of these modifications on admission requirements and student’s level of preparation;

f) the effect of these modifications on teaching, learning and evaluation methods;

g) the effect of these modifications on the program structure;

h) the impact on facilities, faculty resources, and material and financial resources required to offer the program;

i) the effect these modifications on the program’s administrative structure.

4.2.4. Evaluation Criteria

4.2.4.1. Objectives

a) Consistency of the program with the University’s mission and academic plans;

b) Clarity and appropriateness of the program’s requirements and associated learning outcomes in addressing the Ontario Council of Associate Vice-Presidents and University of Ottawa’s Degree Level Expectations;

c) Appropriateness of degree nomenclature;

d) High quality;

e) Fit with other programs.

4.2.4.2. Admission requirements

a) Appropriateness of the program’s admission requirements for the learning activities and outcomes established for completion of the program;

b) Sufficient explanation of all admission requirements (e.g. minimum grade point average, language proficiency, previous degrees).
4.2.4.3. **Structure**

a) Appropriateness of the program's structure and regulations to meet specified program learning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations. *Note:* The University of Ottawa has accepted the OCAV Degree Level Expectations;

b) A clear rationale for program length that ensures that the program requirements can be reasonably completed within the proposed time period.

4.2.4.4. **Program content**

a) Ways in which the curriculum addresses the current state of the discipline or area of study;

b) Identification of any unique curriculum or program innovations or creative components;

c) For research-focused graduate programs, clear indication of the nature and suitability of the major research requirements for degree completion;

d) Evidence that each graduate student in the program is required (and will be able) to take a minimum of two-thirds of the course requirements from among graduate level courses;

e) A clear list of essential requirements;

f) Learning outcomes of the program.

4.2.4.5. **Mode of delivery**

a) Appropriateness of the proposed mode(s) of delivery to meet the intended program’s learning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations.

4.2.4.6. **Language of delivery**

a) Evidence that, where appropriate, the University’s mission concerning Ontario’s Francophone Community and bilingualism is reflected in the course delivery; supervision offered in both of the official languages (where possible and appropriate); language in which the thesis is written; comprehensive examinations; and other activities offered in both languages.

4.2.4.7. **Assessment of teaching and learning**

a) Appropriateness of the proposed methods for the assessment of student achievement of 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 OCAV’s statement of its Degree Level Expectations.

4.2.4.8. **Resources**

a) Adequacy of the academic unit’s planned utilization of existing human, physical and financial resources, and any institutional commitment to supplement those resources, to support the program;
b) Participation of a sufficient number and quality of faculty who are competent to teach and/or supervise in the program;

c) Evidence that there are adequate resources to sustain the quality of scholarship produced by graduate students’ scholarship and research activities, including library support, information technology support, laboratory access, and student office space;

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

e) Where appropriate, evidence that financial assistance for students will be sufficient to ensure adequate quality and numbers of students; and to ensure that students are able to complete their programs within the specified time;

f) Evidence of the way supervisory loads will be distributed, and the qualifications and appointment status of faculty who will provide instruction and supervision.

4.2.4.9. **Quality and other indicators**

a) Definition and use of indicators that provide evidence of quality of the faculty (e.g. qualifications, research, innovation; scholarly record; teaching excellence; appropriateness of collective faculty expertise to contribute substantively to the proposed program). These details will be found in Volume Two (faculty CVs) and in the tables in the Template for the Cyclical Review of Graduate Programs (e.g. benchmark data, Graduate and Professional Student Survey results);

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

c) Evidence that the program has addressed the Tri-Council’s guidelines statement concerning graduate students’ professional skills;

d) Mentoring policies in place for junior professors;

e) Mentoring policies and orientation days for new graduate students;

f) Evidence of clear communication between students, faculty, and program administration (e.g. a handbook for students with program details, processes, important deadlines, etc.; a web site; listserv); Appropriate administrative structures (and including frequency of meetings) that ensures oversight of students’ progress;

g) Appropriate administrative structures (and including frequency of meetings) that ensures oversight of students’ progress;
h) Evidence of student input into graduate program amelioration and development (e.g. exit surveys, student representation on committees, etc.);

i) Postdoctoral fellows: number, length of appointment, and their contribution to the graduate program.

APPROVAL PROCESS FOR MAJOR MODIFICATIONS TO AN EXISTING PROGRAM

Development of the proposal for major change to program

\[\rightarrow\]

Approval of the faculty or faculties involved

\[\rightarrow\]

Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies (Council and Graduate Program Committee)

\[\rightarrow\]

Executive Committee of Senate

\[\rightarrow\]

*Senate (if deemed necessary by the Executive Committee of Senate)*

\[\rightarrow\]

Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (via annual report)
5. PROTOCOLS FOR THE EVALUATION AND APPROVAL OF MINOR MODIFICATIONS TO EXISTING PROGRAMS

5.1. Protocol for the Evaluation and Approval of Minor Modifications to Existing Undergraduate Programs

5.1.1. 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 the expected learning outcomes.

Minor modifications include, but are not limited to, changes to titles, descriptions, course prerequisites and the list of compulsory and optional courses. They are generally any “cosmetic” modifications that do not, by and large, change the essential nature or the purpose of a program.

5.1.2. Evaluation and approval process for minor modifications

All proposals for minor modifications to an existing program must undergo a three-stage evaluation and approval process (some of the stages are broken down into sub-stages). At any of these stages, the proposal can be returned to the academic unit concerned, which must incorporate recommended modifications before moving on to the next approval stage.

5.1.2.1. Academic unit

The evaluation and approval process for minor modifications is normally initiated by the academic unit or units offering the program. The process may vary slightly for interdisciplinary and collaborative programs.

The unit prepares a short proposal for the minor modifications and submits the proposal to all its academic authorities for approval (program committee and department assembly or their equivalent).

5.1.2.2. Faculty

The proposal is submitted for approval to all faculty academic authorities (undergraduate program committee or its equivalent) and, finally, to the faculty council or councils.

5.1.2.3. Senate

The Vice-Dean Academic, or equivalent, of the faculty concerned submits the proposal to the Council on Undergraduate Studies for approval and then to the Executive Committee of the Senate. This is the last stage of approval.
5.1.2.4. **Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance**

Minor changes to the program are reported to the Quality Council by way of the Vice-President Academic and Provost’s annual report.

5.1.3. **Information to be included in the proposal**

The proposal must include:

a) a short justification for the minor modifications being proposed;

b) a description of the modifications (titles, descriptions, course prerequisites, etc.);

c) the effect that these modifications will have.

5.1.4. **Evaluation criteria**

The various authorities involved in the approval process examine the proposal according to following criteria: the relevance of the modifications, the potential for improving the program and the students’ university experience, as well as the consistency with the University’s mission and academic plans.

**APPROVAL PROCESS FOR A MINOR MODIFICATION PROPOSAL TO AN UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM**

```
Academic unit
    ↓
  Faculty
    ↓
Council on Undergraduate Studies
    ↓
Executive Committee of the Senate
    ↓
Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance
  (via Vice-President Academic and Provost’s Annual Report)
```
5.2. **Protocol for the Evaluation and Approval of Minor Modifications to Existing Graduate Programs**

5.2.1. **Minor modifications**

Minor modifications are defined as any small changes (usually “cosmetic”) that do not alter the essential nature, learning outcomes, degree expectations, or purpose of a program.

Modification to an existing and approved program is considered minor when:

- When a course description or title is changed;
- When courses that are not mandatory are removed from the program (e.g. when they have not been offered in some time.);
- When a prerequisite is changed, added, or deleted;
- When a full-year course is split into two, or when two half-courses are combined into one;
- When a course is renumbered.

5.2.2. **Evaluation and approval process for minor modifications**

5.2.2.1. **Academic unit**

The academic unit submits the proposed modification (which includes a clear and detailed rationale for the changes, as well as implications, if any, for the program) to the home faculty authorities for approval using the Template for Minor Modifications to Existing Graduate Programs.

Academic units are encouraged to consult the Secretary General and Assistant Dean of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies to determine whether the proposed changes are considered “major” or “minor.”

5.2.2.2. **Home faculty**

Once approved by the appropriate authorities in the Faculty (e.g. Dean, Executive Committee or Graduate Studies Committee, Faculty Council), the academic unit prepares a full (calendar) version of the proposed changes. This document is submitted to the Graduate Program Committee of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies, and a copy is sent to the Dean(s) and Vice-Dean(s) of the faculty or faculties concerned.

5.2.2.3. **Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies**

The proposed changes are reviewed by the **Graduate Program Committee** that examines them in light of the appropriate Evaluation Criteria (especially the relevance of the modifications; potential for improvement and clarity). (See Evaluation Criteria below)
Minor modifications to a course description or title and to a prerequisite, once approved by the Graduate Program Committee, come immediately into effect (unless otherwise stated). All other minor modifications go forward for approval to the Executive Committee of Senate; they come immediately into effect (unless otherwise stated) upon approval by that committee.

5.2.2.4. **Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance**

Minor changes to the program are reported to the Quality Council by way of the Vice-President Academic and Provost’s annual report.

5.2.3. **Information to be included in the proposal**

The proposal must include:

a) A description of the modifications proposed (e.g. course description, deletion of a course, etc.);

b) Rationale for these proposed changes;

c) The effect that these modifications might have, if any.

5.2.4. **Evaluation Criteria**

a) Appropriateness of the proposed changes;

b) Relevance of the modifications;

c) Potential for improvement and or clarity;

d) Changes do not have any negative or major impact on the program;

e) Consistency with the University’s mission and academic plans.
INTERNAL APPROVAL PROCESS FOR MINOR MODIFICATIONS TO AN EXISTING PROGRAM

Academic Unit develops the proposal for minor modification(s) to program

↓

Approval of the faculty or faculties involved

↓

Graduate Program Committee, Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies

↓

Executive Committee of Senate (*except for course descriptions and prerequisites*)

↓

Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance

(*via Vice-President Academic and Provost’s Annual Report*)
5.3. Protocol for the Cyclical Review of Undergraduate Programs

5.3.1. Programs subject to the evaluation process

The evaluation process applies to all undergraduate programs that lead to a degree or a diploma from the University of Ottawa, whether they require prior university studies or not. Also subject to evaluation are programs offered by affiliated or federated institutions under collaborative agreements or partnerships with other colleges and universities.

Undergraduate programs are evaluated in turn within eight years, according to a pre-determined schedule. If under exceptional circumstances a deferral is required, the Quality Council will be informed. The schedule takes into account the evaluations required for graduate programs, as well as those conducted by professional accreditation bodies.

Programs requiring professional accreditation may undergo both the cyclical review and the accreditation at the same time. The template for evaluating these programs is designed to meet the requirements of both the professional bodies and those of the cyclical review. The schedule is set as required by the professional accreditation process; however, when accreditation visits are scheduled every four years, cyclical reviews take place every eight years.

Bidisciplinary programs and integrated programs are evaluated at two specific times, that is, once from the discipline-specific perspective, and once from the structural perspective. For the discipline-specific context, they are assessed discipline-by-discipline during the cyclical review of the program applicable to that discipline (major, honours, honours with specialization). From the structural perspective, they undergo evaluation every eight years; the University has designed a specific template for this eight-year evaluation and does not require an external review.

General bachelor’s programs also undergo cyclical reviews, but these are conducted using a specifically designed template and do not involve an external review component.

For joint and other collaborative undergraduate programs, the cyclical review process will include a self-evaluation report that clearly explains how input was received from faculty, staff and students at each partner institution. The selection of the reviewers involves participation by each partner institution and the site visit involves all partner institutions and preferably at all sites (with exceptions noted, as per Quality Assurance Framework, p.6). Reviewers consult faculty, staff, and students at each partner institution, preferably in person. For a complete list of undergraduate collaborative programs, please refer to the List of joint and other collaborative undergraduate programs available in Appendix 1 – Undergraduate Programs.
5.3.2. Components of the cyclical review

The evaluation of undergraduate programs takes into account the Quality Council’s Framework, the Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents (OCAV) guidelines for University Degree Level Expectations and the learning outcomes of both the program and the degree. These periodic evaluations of undergraduate programs allow us to measure the degree to which programs:

- have attained program goals and learning outcomes;
- meet students’ needs and provide students with a university experience that lives up to their high expectations;
- help the University accomplish its academic plan and mission;
- have the quantity and quality of human, financial and material resources they need;
- are viable and relevant.

The following five stages are involved in the cyclical review (some of the stages are broken down into sub-stages):

5.3.2.1. Self-evaluation

The self-evaluation critically analyzes all aspects of a program, specifically, the curriculum, student population and faculty resources, as well as all other human, financial and material resources. It is an in-depth, forward-looking probe based on significant data and on quality indicators. The self-evaluation calls for the involvement of all professors in the academic unit, of a representative number of students, especially those serving on the unit’s assembly or standing committees, and of administrative staff.

The self-evaluation report must include a specific description of educational goals and learning outcomes of the program under review. The goals should refer to the program’s purpose (specific profession and graduate studies, in-depth training in a specific discipline, prerequisite training for a related program, etc.) while the outcomes translate students’ expected learning in terms of knowledge, skills and attitudes. Reference should be made to the Guidelines for University Undergraduate Degree Level Expectations as approved by the Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents (OCAV).
Information to be included in the self-evaluation report

The self-evaluation report must include the following:

a) a rationale specifying the program’s goals, learning outcomes, Undergraduate Degree Level Expectations, student profile and enrolment;

b) a detailed description of the program’s structure and content (total number of credits; compulsory, optional and elective courses; year-by-year course sequence), admission requirements and opportunities, including access to graduate studies;

c) a statement on ways in which the curriculum addresses the current state of the discipline or area of study;

d) a description of the program delivery methods, evaluation of teaching and learning assessment;

e) the administrative structure of the program;

f) the language of the program;

g) the length of the program;

h) program-related data and measures of performance, including applicable provincial, national and professional standards (where applicable);

i) a comparison with similar programs offered elsewhere, ensuring that any innovative aspects or distinctive features of the program are highlighted, including the strengths of the academic unit, teaching staff, partnerships, etc.;

j) an evaluation of the space, professorial, material and financial resources required to offer the program as well as expected class sizes;

k) an evaluation of academic services (library, co-op education, academic advising, etc.);

l) concerns and recommendations raised in previous reviews;

m) comments from others deemed relevant and useful (e.g. graduates of the program, employers, representatives from industry, business, the professions, or practical training programs) may also be solicited and included in the self-study.

The Senate Committee on the Evaluation of Undergraduate Programs (SCEUP) reviews the self-evaluation reports and then meets with those who drafted the reports as well as with the Chair of the academic unit concerned and asks for modifications if required. The revised self-evaluation report is then forwarded to the external reviewers.
In essence, the self-evaluation report is much more than a description of the aspects under evaluation. It must be the product of a thorough examination into the program’s strengths and weaknesses; where applicable, it must suggest how the program can be improved and what its future directions are.

To help units draft their self-evaluation reports, the University has developed a workshop and a detailed template (the detailed **Template for the Self-Evaluation of Undergraduate Programs** is available online at [http://www.uottawa.ca/vr-etudes-academic/en/templates.html](http://www.uottawa.ca/vr-etudes-academic/en/templates.html)). In addition, units can call on the professional expertise of the Teaching and Learning Support Service. Finally, through the Office of Institutional Planning and Research, they can tap into a range of relevant statistics on the student population: number of applications, number of offers, number of acceptances, admission averages, registration figures, size and direction of cohorts; language used; age, sex, region of origin, withdrawal rates, graduation rates, length of studies before graduation, grade distribution, grades in the final year of studies, teaching-evaluation results, number of registrations per class, etc. The Office also provides academic units with the results of surveys conducted among students registered in the program and students who have completed the program since the last evaluation.

Self-evaluation reports have three volumes: the first is the evaluation itself; the second contains the *curricula vitae* of all faculty members; and the third includes the *curricula vitae* of the suggested external reviewers.

It is important that some sections of the report be written in French and others in English. If for some reason a fully unilingual report is submitted, the Committee will ask to have the summary presented in the other official language.

5.3.2.2. **External review**

The external review is conducted by two reviewers selected by members of the SCEUP from a list of external candidates compiled by both the Dean and the Chair of the academic unit concerned. These individuals must have expertise in the discipline and must be at arm’s length from the program under evaluation (no family ties, partnership links, supervisory relations or other types of relationships). They must be associate or full professors and should have a good knowledge of university programs. 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 six years;
- has an administrative or family link with a member of the academic program being evaluated;
- is a former research supervisor, graduate student, or postdoctoral trainee of one of the members of the academic unit being evaluated;
- is involved in a dispute with a member of the academic program being evaluated.
If it sees fit, the SCEUP can also consult representatives from industry, related professions and practical training programs.

The reviewers will appraise the standards and quality of the program as set out in the Evaluation Criteria. They will also be invited to acknowledge any clearly innovative aspects of the program together with recommendations on any essential or otherwise desirable modifications to it.

In addition to commenting on the way in which the program conforms (or not) to the Evaluation Criteria, the reviewers will also be invited:

- to identify and commend the program’s notably strong and creative attributes;
- to describe the program’s respective strengths, areas for improvement, and opportunities for enhancement;
- to recommend specific steps to be taken to improve the program, distinguishing between those that the program can itself take and those that require external action;
- to understand and recognize the institution’s autonomy in determining priorities for funding, space, and faculty allocation.

5.3.2.2.1. **Material provided to the external reviewers**

The material to be sent to the external reviewers before their visit includes:

a) a cover letter, including a requirement on respecting the confidentiality necessary for all aspects of the review process;

b) a guide listing the objectives of the cyclical review, the roles and responsibilities of external reviewers, and instructions for writing their report;

c) a checklist of the evaluation criteria;

d) the protocol for the cyclical review of undergraduate programs;

e) sections I and II of the self-evaluation report.

External reviewers can ask for any other piece of information they deem useful in preparation for their visit.

The material to be provided to external reviewers during their visit includes:

a) all course outlines for the program;

b) a sampling of assignments and examinations;

c) a template for reviewers’ report.

5.3.2.2.2. **External reviewers’ visit**

The visit usually extends over one or two days and must include meetings with the Vice-President Academic and Provost, the Associate Vice-President Academic,
the Dean and the Chair of the academic unit concerned, full-time professors, a representative sample of part-time professors, of the student body, key support staff members, as well as any other individuals who have an important role in ensuring program quality.

Where programs are offered jointly with other institutions, the external reviewers must also visit those institutions to meet with the program manager(s) and with professors. For a list of such programs, see the List of joint and other collaborative undergraduate programs provided in Appendix 1 – Undergraduate Programs.

When the undergraduate and graduate programs are evaluated the same year, visits by external reviewers take place sequentially.

For programs offered by the University of Ottawa at other sites, their review will include a site visit or, alternately, videoconferencing will be made available to the external reviewers so they may communicate with teaching staff, administrative staff and students at these sites.

5.3.2.2.3. **External reviewers’ report**

The report submitted by external reviewers must address each section of the self-evaluation report. (see section 6.1.2.1 above)

Within one month of the visit, the external reviewers submit a joint report to the Vice-President Academic and Provost, who forwards a copy to both the Dean and the Chair of the academic unit concerned. The University may also accept individual reports from the external reviewers if they so request, for instance because of language needs.

5.3.2.3. **Internal Response**

The Dean and Chair are invited to submit their comments on the external evaluators’ report.

5.3.2.4. **Evaluation summary**

The SCEUP drafts a summary report based on all the information it has received, the aim being to determine the quality of each program and the measures required. This report will, but is not limited to:

- Identify any significant strengths of the program;
- Identify opportunities for program improvement and enhancement;
- Set out and prioritize the recommendations that are selected for implementation;
- Set out a timetable and deadline for implementing any of those recommendations;
- May include a confidential section (where personnel issues require to be addressed).
The SCEUP submits its observations and recommendations to the Vice-President Academic and Provost. These can go as far as calling into question the need for the program. The Vice-President Academic and Provost then forwards the summary report to the Dean and to the Chair of the unit concerned, who are then responsible for implementing the recommendations.

The Dean and the Chair of the program(s) under review are responsible for providing responses to the recommendations made by the external evaluators on any change in program structure, policy or governance. As for recommendations pertaining to resources, financial and otherwise, the Dean has the responsibility of addressing these issues.

5.3.2.5. Follow-up procedure for the implementation of recommendations

Roughly one year after the cyclical review, the SCEUP asks the academic unit to submit a progress report on the implementation of the recommendations put forward.

Depending on the nature of the recommendations (some can take several years to implement) or on the progress made in implementing requested measures, the SCEUP can require other follow-up reports until all adjustments have been made to the full satisfaction of its members.

5.3.2.6. Distribution of reports

The SCEUP submits an annual report to the Senate and to the Board of Governors. The report includes the list of external evaluators, all summary reports stemming from the cyclical reviews, follow-up recommendations as well as the progress reports received during the current year. The SCEUP sends a copy of the report to the Council on Undergraduate Studies, to the Student Academic Success Service and to the Teaching and Learning Support Service. Finally, the annual report is made available for public access on the University of Ottawa website and a copy is forwarded to the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance. Self-study reports are not made public and will not be posted on the University website.

5.3.3. Evaluation criteria

The evaluation criteria are divided into the following categories:

5.3.3.1. Objectives

a) The degree to which the program contributes to the University’s mission and academic plan, specifically:

- the availability of programs, in both English and French, of national and international calibre;
- the availability of programs and services that fulfill the needs of Ontario’s Francophone population.
a) The degree to which the program meshes academically, at both the teaching and research levels, with the goals and strengths of the academic unit(s) concerned.

b) The degree to which the program’s learning outcomes are consistent with the University’s mission and Degree Level Expectations and to which the program’s graduates achieve those outcomes.

5.3.3.2. Admission requirements

The coherence between the admission requirements/required degree of preparation and the program’s learning outcomes.

- Are admission requirements appropriately aligned with the learning outcomes established for completion of the program?
- Is there sufficient explanation of alternative requirements, if any, such as minimum grade point average, additional languages or portfolios, along with how the program recognizes prior work or learning experience?

5.3.3.3. Curriculum

a) The curriculum reflects the current state of the discipline or area of studies, the degree to which the program’s innovative aspects and distinctive features stand out, and evidence of any significant innovation or creativity in the content and/or delivery of the program relative to other programs.

b) Mode(s) of delivery to meet the program’s identified learning outcomes are appropriate and effective.

c) The degree to which the program’s teaching and learning methods relate to learning outcomes and to University of Ottawa’s Degree Level Expectations.

d) The degree to which the program’s structure and innovative aspects contribute to ensuring the quality of the student university experience.

5.3.3.4. Assessment of teaching and evaluation

a) The relevance and efficiency of the methods used to assess student progress in relation to the program’s learning outcomes and degree learning expectations;

b) The relevance and efficiency of the methods used to assess the achievement of learning outcomes in the final year of the program, by clearly demonstrating achievement of the program learning objectives and the program’s statement of Degree Level Expectation;

c) The student satisfaction with the program (results of the Undergraduate Program Evaluation Survey).
5.3.3.5. **Resources**

The proper and effective use of the human resources (e.g. number and quality of faculty members), financial resources and material resources (e.g. space, library and laboratory resources, access to computers, e-mail, and the internet, etc.) allocated to the program. In making this assessment, reviewers must recognize the institution’s autonomy to determine priorities for funding, space and faculty allocation.

5.3.3.6. **Quality and other indicators**

a) Professors: education and skills, awards, distinctions; class size; percentage of courses taught by regular and contract professors; number of professors, number of courses taught; education and qualifications of part-time professors;

b) Students: number of applications and registrations; admission averages; attrition rates; length of studies; academic performance in final year of studies; graduation rates; awards and distinctions;

c) Graduates: graduation rates; employment rates six months and two years after graduation; admissions to graduate studies; appreciation of program quality.

5.3.3.7. **Quality enhancement**

a) A description of all measures taken to improve the program since the previous evaluation.

5.3.4. **Role of the Dean**

The Dean of the faculty whose program is being evaluated takes part in the evaluation process at several stages. First, he or she is notified of which programs are scheduled for evaluation in the following year. If needed, the Dean can ask the Office of Institutional Research and Planning to compile and supply specific data on the program being evaluated. He or she ensures that someone is appointed to produce the self-evaluation report and that each evaluation process is completed within the set timeline. The Dean also proposes external reviewers to the SCEUP, meets with these reviewers when they visit the campus and provides comments on the external review reports. Finally, he or she receives a copy of the summary report sent by the Vice-President Academic and Provost at the end of the process and must ensure that the progress report and the follow-up reports are submitted by the requested deadlines.
5.3.5. **Role of the Senate Committee on the Evaluation of Undergraduate Programs (SCEUP)**

The SCEUP sets the evaluation schedule, selects the external reviewers and informs the Vice-President Academic and Provost accordingly. It also informs the Vice-President Academic and Provost of the evaluation results and of any other issue related to the overall process.

The Committee reviews the self-evaluation reports and then meets with those who drafted the reports as well as with the Chair of the academic unit concerned. Using the evaluation reports and other comments received, the Committee drafts a summary report that lists the strengths and weaknesses of the program in question, puts forward recommendations and ensures they are implemented.

The SCEUP is chaired by the Associate Vice-President Academic; its membership comprises a maximum of eight professors, who must represent the two major branches of knowledge – the pure and applied sciences, and the humanities and social sciences – as well as programs requiring prior university studies. Members are appointed by the Executive Committee of the Senate, upon recommendation by the Vice-President Academic and Provost. One of the members is a faculty member at Saint-Paul University, in keeping with the agreement between the two institutions.
OVERVIEW OF THE CYCLICAL REVIEW OF EXISTING UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

Initiation of review by Vice-President Academic and Provost

↓

Academic unit prepares Program Self-Study

↓

Senate Committee on the Evaluation of Undergraduate Programs

↓

External Evaluation

↓

Internal Responses

↓

Senate Committee on the Evaluation of Undergraduate Programs

↓

Vice-President Academic and Provost

Executive of Senate (Annual Report)

↓

Implementing and ongoing monitoring

↓

Senate (Annual Report)

↓

Cyclical Review within 8 years (or earlier, if deemed necessary)

↓

Board of Governors (Annual Report)

↓

Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (via Vice-President Academic and Provost’s annual report) Posted on University of Ottawa website
5.4. Protocol for the Cyclical Review of Existing Graduate Programs

Definition of existing and approved program: Any diploma, degree, degree program, or program of specialization, currently approved by Senate or equivalent governing body, which has been previously approved for the University of Ottawa by the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies or its successor, the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance.

5.4.1. Evaluation and approval process for the cyclical review

The self-evaluation critically analyzes all aspects of a program, specifically, the curriculum, student population and faculty resources, as well as all other human, financial and material resources. It is an in-depth, forward-looking probe based on significant data and on quality indicators.

5.4.1.1. Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies

The Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies identifies the specific graduate programs that will be undergoing review (after consulting the Schedule of Cyclical Reviews of Graduate Programs) and identifies, 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. Normally, the review of graduate programs will be carried out separately from that of undergraduate programs; however, where possible, this will be done sequentially so that some data (e.g. c.v.s) may be employed for both reviews. Reviews will be carried out on an eight-year cycle as established in the Schedule.

The Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies contacts the deans of the academic units that will be undergoing a cyclical review. A self-study periodic evaluation committee is created (normally, the director of the program, the graduate director and their graduate committee) that will be responsible for the preparation of the brief. The Committee is provided with the Template for the Cyclical Review of Graduate Programs.

For joint graduate programs, the cyclical review process will include a self-evaluation report that clearly explains how input was received from faculty, staff and students at each partner institution. The selection of the reviewers involves participation by each partner institution and the site visit involves all partner institutions and preferably at all sites (with exceptions noted, as per Quality Assurance Framework, p.6). Reviewers consult faculty, staff, and students at each partner institution, preferably in person. For a complete list of joint graduate programs, please refer to the List of joint and other collaborative graduate programs in Appendix 2 – Graduate Programs.

In the case of programs that undergo professional accreditation, the Graduate Program Evaluation Committee, in consultation with the Dean of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies, will decide upon the manner in which elements from the accreditation process (where possible and appropriate) may be integrated into the cyclical review process, all the while ensuring that the exigencies and policies of the evaluation process are respected.
5.4.1.2. Academic unit and home faculty

The academic unit begins the process of consultation and information and data collection in collaboration with the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies and Institutional Research. The self study process should involve the participation of all the faculty members, as well as administrative personnel and students. Feedback is offered by the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies. The brief should not be merely descriptive; it should be broad-based, analytical, critical, and reflective.

5.4.1.3. Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies

a) Once the self-study report is finalized (Volume 1: Program; Volume 2: faculty CVs; Volume 3: CVs of potential external reviewers), it is submitted to the Graduate Program Evaluation Committee for comment and feedback.

b) Two external reviewers, and one internal, are recommended by the Graduate Program Evaluation Committee to assess the program. The Committee’s choice is approved by the Dean of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies. The academic unit consults the document “Reviewers – Graduate Programs” for details concerning the arm’s length policy, criteria for selecting reviewers, the tasks of the reviewers, etc.

c) The reviewers will appraise the standards and quality of the program as set out in the Evaluation Criteria. The reviewers will also be invited to acknowledge any clearly innovative aspects of the program together with recommendations on any essential or otherwise desirable modifications to it.

d) In addition to commenting on the way in which the program conforms (or not) to the Evaluation Criteria, the reviewers will also be invited:

   i. to acknowledge any particular strong, innovative, or creative aspects of the program;
   ii. to describe the program’s respective strengths;
   iii. to describe areas for improvement and opportunities for enhancement;
   iv. to recommend specific steps for improving the program, distinguishing between those that the program itself can undertake and those that require action on the part of the home Faculty or the University as a whole;
   v. to distinguish between those recommendations that are essential and those that are desirable modifications;
   vi. to understand and recognize the institution’s autonomy in determining priorities for funding, space, and faculty allocation;
   vii. to respect the confidentiality for all aspects of the review process.
e) Comments from others deemed relevant and useful (e.g. graduates of the program, employers, representatives from industry, business, the professions, or practical training programs) may also be solicited and included in the self-study. The brief is sent by the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies to the reviewers with instructions and, if deemed necessary, a list of questions from the Graduate Program Evaluation Committee.

f) The academic unit, together with the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies, organizes a visit for the reviewers. During their visit, the reviewers must meet with students, professors, support staff, faculty representatives and Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies representatives. The reviewers assess the program in light of its stated objectives and the Evaluation Criteria as outlined below.

g) Normally, the two external reviewers prepare a joint report. The internal reviewer will submit a short written report. The reports must be submitted to the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies within three weeks of having visited the academic unit. Copies are sent to the academic unit involved and to the unit’s home faculty (normally, to the Dean and Vice-Dean, Graduate Studies).

h) The academic unit and the relevant Dean and Vice-Dean, Graduate Studies (or their delegates) respond in writing to the Chair of the Graduate Program Evaluation Committee within three weeks to any concerns and recommendations. They will describe any changes in organization, policy or governance that would be necessary to meet the recommendations and will indicate which, if any, necessary resources (financial, physical, human) will be provided to support the implementation of selected recommendations.

i) All the documentation (the self-study report, the external reviewers' report, the internal response) is reviewed by the Graduate Program Evaluation Committee. The academic unit may be asked to appear before the Committee to present the documentation and answer any questions. The Committee may also make additional recommendations and comments.

j) The Graduate Program Evaluation Committee then recommends one of the following ratings:
   i. Good Quality program;
   ii. Good Quality with Report in a specified time (e.g. two years);
   iii. Conditional Approval;
   iv. Not approved to continue; program must be closed when the last students currently registered in the program have graduated.
k) The Graduate Program Evaluation Committee is responsible for preparing the Final Assessment Report, consisting of a synthesis of the external evaluation and internal assessments and responses. The Final Assessment Report will:

i. Identify any significant strengths of the program;

ii. Identify opportunities for program enhancement and improvement;

iii. Set out and prioritize the recommendations that are selected for implementation;

iv. Set out a timetable and deadline for implementing any necessary changes;

v. Identify the authority responsible for providing any resources made necessary by these recommendations;

vi. Include an Executive Summary, exclusive of any confidential information, for posting on the University website. Only the Executive Summary will be available for public scrutiny.

l) The academic unit and the Dean and Vice-Dean, Graduate Studies of the faculty involved and the Vice-President Academic and Provost are provided with a copy of the Final Assessment Report. The faculty Dean is responsible for overseeing the follow-up of the recommendations, and for reporting on them to the Vice-President Academic and Provost.

m) In the event of concerns, the academic unit and the faculty Dean are informed of the specific issues (e.g. core human resources, physical resources, etc.) and are provided with a timetable for implementation and or follow-up. The Dean of the faculty is responsible for overseeing the follow-up and reporting to the Vice-President Academic and Provost who will ensure that the monitoring report is posted on the web.

5.4.1.4. Senate

The Dean of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies presents the Final Assessment Report (including approval rating) to the Senate of the University. A copy is sent to the Board of Governors. The Executive Summary and the implementation plan are immediately posted on the University web site.
5.4.1.5. **Ontario University Council on Quality Assurance**

A copy of the Final Assessment Report including the Executive Summary and the Implementation Plan is sent by the Office of the Vice-President Academic and Provost to the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance.

5.4.2. **Information to be included in the self-evaluation report**

The self-evaluation report must include the following:

a) Concerns and recommendations raised in previous reviews;

b) Areas that hold promise for enhancement.

In essence, the self-evaluation report is much more than a description of the aspects under evaluation. It must be the product of a thorough examination into the program’s strengths and weaknesses; where applicable, it must suggest how the program can be improved and what its future directions are.

Please note that the detailed Template for the self-evaluation of graduate programs is available online at [http://www.uottawa.ca/](http://www.uottawa.ca/).

5.4.3. **Evaluation Criteria**

5.4.3.1. **Objectives**

a) Consistency with the University’s mission and academic plans. Clarity and appropriateness of the program’s requirements and associated learning outcomes in addressing the Ontario Council of Associate Vice-Presidents and University of Ottawa’s Degree Level Expectations;

b) Appropriateness of degree nomenclature;

c) High quality;

d) Fit with other programs.

5.4.3.2. **Admission requirements**

a) Appropriateness of the program’s admission requirements for the learning activities and outcomes established for completion of the program;

b) Sufficient explanation of all admission requirements (e.g. minimum grade point average, language proficiency, previous degrees).

5.4.3.3. **Curriculum**

a) Appropriateness of the program's structure and regulations to meet specified program learning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations. *Note:* The University of Ottawa has accepted the OCAV Degree Level Expectations;

b) A clear rationale for program length that ensures that the program requirements can be reasonably completed within the proposed time period;
c) Ways in which the curriculum addresses the current state of the discipline or area of study;

d) Identification of any unique curriculum or program innovations or creative components;

e) For research-focused graduate programs, clear indication of the nature and suitability of the major research requirements for degree completion;

f) Evidence that each graduate student in the program is required (and will be able) to take a minimum of two-thirds of the course requirements from among graduate level courses;

g) A clear list of essential requirements;

h) Learning outcomes of the program;

i) Appropriateness of the proposed mode(s) of delivery to meet the intended program’s learning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations;

j) Evidence that, where appropriate, the University’s mission concerning Ontario’s Francophone Community and bilingualism is reflected in the course delivery; supervision offered in both of the official languages (where possible and appropriate); language in which the thesis is written; comprehensive examinations; and other activities offered in both languages.

5.4.3.4. Assessment of teaching and learning

a) Appropriateness of the proposed methods for the assessment of student achievement of 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 OCAV’s statement of its Degree Level Expectations.

5.4.3.5. Resources

a) Adequacy of the academic unit’s planned utilization of existing human, physical and financial resources, and any institutional commitment to supplement those resources, to support the program;

b) Participation of a sufficient number and quality of faculty who are competent to teach and/or supervise in the program;

c) Evidence that there are adequate resources to sustain the quality of scholarship produced by graduate students’ scholarship and research activities, including library support, information technology support, laboratory access, and student office space;

d) Evidence that faculty have the recent research or professional/clinical expertise needed to sustain the program, promote innovation, and foster an appropriate intellectual climate;
e) Where appropriate, evidence that financial assistance for students will be sufficient to ensure adequate quality and numbers of students; and to ensure that students are able to complete their programs within the specified time;

f) Evidence of the way supervisory loads will be distributed, and the qualifications and appointment status of faculty who will provide instruction and supervision.

5.4.3.6. **Quality and other indicators**

a) Evidence of quality of the faculty (e.g. qualifications, research, innovation; scholarly record; teaching excellence; appropriateness of collective faculty expertise to contribute substantively to the proposed program). These details will be found in Volume Two (faculty CVs) and in the tables in the Template for the Cyclical Review of Graduate Programs (e.g. benchmark data, Graduate and Professional Student Survey results);

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

c) Evidence that the program has addressed the Tri-Council’s guidelines statement concerning graduate students’ professional skills;

d) Mentoring policies in place for junior professors;

e) Mentoring policies and orientation days for new graduate students;

f) Evidence of clear communication between students, faculty, and program administration (e.g. a handbook for students with program details, processes, important deadlines, etc.; a web site; listserv);

g) Appropriate administrative structures (and including frequency of meetings) that ensures oversight of students’ progress;

h) Evidence of student input into graduate program amelioration and development (e.g. exit surveys, student representation on committees, etc.);

i) Postdoctoral fellows: number, length of appointment, and their contribution to the graduate program;

j) Students: applications and registrations, attrition rates, time-to-completion, final-year academic achievement, graduation rates, academic awards, student in-course reports on teaching;

k) Graduates: rates of graduation, employment six months and two years after graduation, post-graduation study, “skills match” and alumni reports on program quality when available and when permitted by the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (FIPPA). Auditors will be instructed that these items may not be available and applicable to all programs;

l) Program-related data and measures of performance, including applicable provincial, national and professional standards (where available).
5.4.3.7. **Quality enhancement**

a) Initiatives taken to enhance the quality of the program and the associated learning and teaching environment.

5.4.3.8. **Additional graduate program criteria**

a) Evidence that students’ time-to-completion is both monitored and managed in relation to the program’s defined length and program requirements;

b) Quality and availability of graduate supervision;

c) Definition and application of indicators that provide evidence of faculty, student and program quality, for example:

   i. Faculty: funding, honours and awards, and commitment to student monitoring;

   ii. Students: grade-level for admission, scholarly output, success rates in provincial and national scholarships, competitions, awards and commitment to professional and transferable skills;

   iii. Program: Evidence of a program structure and faculty research that will ensure the intellectual quality of the student experience;

   iv. Sufficient graduate level courses that students will be able to meet the requirement that two-thirds of their course requirements be met through courses at this level.

5.4.4. **Follow-up procedure**

If the evaluation was satisfactory, the next cyclical review takes place in eight (8) years time. If concerns were expressed, the academic unit will be required to prepare a short report two years after the cyclical review is completed, noting what specific action was taken to address these concerns. This short report will not replace the normal eight-year review cycle but will be in addition to it. The report will be sent to the Dean of the faculty or faculties concerned, as well as to the Dean and Vice-Dean of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies, and the Vice-President Academic and Provost. The report will be assessed by the Graduate Program Evaluation Committee. If the Graduate Program Evaluation Committee concludes that the concerns have not been satisfactorily addressed, the Committee, in consultation with the Dean
and Vice-Dean of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies, will recommend an appropriate course of action to the Executive Committee of Senate (this may be another report; another complete evaluation of the program; or another course of action, including and up to the closure of a program). Monitoring reports will be posted on the web.

**Composition of the Graduate Program Evaluation Committee**

**The Graduate Program Evaluation Committee**

Mandate: The Graduate Program Evaluation Committee oversees the cyclical reviews of all graduate programs following the principles described in the University’s IQAP.

The Graduate Program Evaluation Committee is composed of:

- Dean of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies – ex officio
- Vice-dean, Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies, chair
- Associate Dean, Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies
- Assistant Dean and Secretary General (non-voting), Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies
- President of the Commission - Humanities
- President of the Commission - Sciences
- three professors from the Humanities with experience in graduate program administration chosen by the Dean in consultation with their respective faculties
- three professors from the Sciences with experience in graduate program administration chosen by the Dean in consultation with their respective faculties
- a representative from Saint Paul University
OVERVIEW OF THE CYCLICAL REVIEW OF EXISTING GRADUATE PROGRAMS

Initiation of review by University Authority

↓

Program Self-Study

↓

External Evaluation

↓

Internal Responses

↓

Institutional Perspective and Final Assessment Report

↓

University Governance Procedures

Summary of outcomes Communicated to Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance and placed on university’s website

Implementation and Ongoing Monitoring

Within 8 years of previous cyclical reviews
INTERNAL CYCLICAL REVIEW PROCESS OF EXISTING GRADUATE PROGRAMS

Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies

↓

Academic Unit prepares the brief

↓

Graduate Program Evaluation Committee, Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies

↓

External Evaluation

↓

Response to External and Internal Evaluation reports

↓

Graduate Program Evaluation Committee prepares Final Assessment Report

↓

Final Assessment Report submitted to Executive of Senate

↓

Final Assessment Report submitted to Senate

↓

Final Assessment Report submitted to Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance

↓

Executive Summary posted on appropriate websites

↓

Ongoing Program Monitoring by the University; monitoring reports posted on the web (Dean, Vice-President Academic and Provost)

↓

Cyclical Review within 8 years (or earlier, if deemed necessary)
APPENDICES
Appendix 1
List of Joint and Other Collaborative Undergraduate Programs

Undergraduate Programs Offered in Collaboration with Algonquin College

- Honours Bachelor in Journalism
- Honours Bachelor in Public Relations
- Bachelor of Science in Nursing (Woodroffe and Pembroke Campuses)

Undergraduate Programs Offered in Collaboration with La Cité collégiale

- Baccalauréat spécialisé en journalisme
- Baccalauréat spécialisé en relations publiques et communication
- Baccalauréat ès sciences en sciences infirmières
Appendix 2

List of joint and other collaborative graduate programs

Listing of joint graduate programs, joint or collaborative programs, reciprocity agreements, and federated institution

Joint Graduate Programs

A. As joint programs are indissoluble entities that cannot be reviewed separately according to the IQAPs of the two partner universities, separate and distinct IQAPs will be developed by the partner universities after each university has had its own IQAP accepted by the Quality Council. The joint IQAP will address the following, as per the directive of the Quality Council.

a. The self-study brief will clearly explain how input was received from faculty, staff and students at each partner institution. There will be a single self-study.

b. Selection of the reviewers will involve participation by each partner institution.

c. Where applicable, selection of the “internal” reviewer may require joint input.
   i. It could include one internal from both partners (this is impractical if there are multiple partners); and
   ii. It could give preference to an internal reviewer who is from another Joint program, preferably with the same partner institution

d. The site visit will involve all partner institutions and preferably at all sites (with exceptions noted, as per Quality Assurance Framework, p.6). Reviewers consult faculty, staff, and students at each partner institution, preferably in person.

All out of scope joint programs are listed, below.

Joint or Collaborative Graduate Programs between the University of Ottawa and Carleton University:

- Advanced Materials and Manufacturing (MASc / MEng / PhD) / Matériaux avancés et fabrication (M.Sc.A. / M.Ing. / Ph.D.)
- Behavioural Neuroscience (PhD) (Collaborative) / Neuroscience du comportement (Ph.D.) (pluridisciplinaire)
- Bioinformatics (MSc/MCS) (Collaborative) / Bioinformatique (M.Sc. / M.I.) (pluridisciplinaire)
- Biology (MSc / PhD) / Biologie (M.Sc./ Ph.D.)
• Biomedical Engineering (MASc) / Génie biomédical (M.Sc.A.)
• Biostatistics (MSc) (Collaborative) / Biostatistique (M.Sc.) (pluridisciplinaire)
• Chemical and Environmental Toxicology (MSc / PhD) (Collaborative) / Toxicologie chimique et environnementale (M.Sc. / Ph.D.) (pluridisciplinaire)
• Chemical and Environmental Toxicology (PhD) (Collaborative)
• Chemistry (MSc / PhD) / Chimie (M.Sc. / Ph.D.)
• Civil Engineering (MEng / MASc / PhD) / Génie civil (M.Ing. / M.Sc.A.)
• Génie civil (Ph.D.)
• Computer Science (MCS / PhD) / Informatique (M.I. / Ph.D.)
• Earth Sciences (MSc / PhD) / Sciences de la terre (M.Sc. / Ph.D.)
• Economics (PhD) - Science économique (Ph.D.)
• Electrical and Computer Engineering (MASc / MEng / PhD) / Electrical and Computer Engineering (PhD)
• Environmental Engineering (MEng / MASc / PhD) / Génie de l'environnement (M.Ing. / M.Sc.A. / Ph.D.)
• Mathematics and Statistics (MSc / PhD) / Mathématiques et statistique (M.Sc. / Ph.D.)
• (M.Sc. / Ph.D.)
• Mechanical Engineering (MEng / MASc / PhD) / Génie mécanique (M.Ing. / M.Sc.A. / Ph.D.)
• Physics ((MSc / PhD) Physique (M.Sc. / Ph.D.)

International Reciprocity Agreements between the University of Ottawa and the following universities:
• Washington College of Law (American University) – Master of Law (LLM)
• Université Paris Ouest Nanterre La défense – Master of Law (LLM)
• Université Paul-Cézanne (Aix-Marseille III) – Master of Law (LLM)
• University of Haifa - Master of Law (LLM)

Saint Paul University - Federated institution and the graduate programs associated with them:
• Canon Law (MCL / MA / PhD) / Droit Canonique (M.D.C. / M.A. / Ph.D.)
• Graduate Certificate in Canon Law / Droit canonique (Certificat d'études supérieures)
- Graduate Certificate in Canonical Practice / Pratique canonique (GCCP)
- Graduate Certificate in Ecclesiastical Administration / Administration ecclésiastique (Certificat d'études supérieures)
- Conflict Studies (MA) / Études des conflits (M.A.)
- Counselling and Spirituality (MA / PhD) / Counselling et spiritualité (M.A. / Ph.D.)
- Couple Counselling and Spirituality (Graduate Certificate) / Counselling de couple et spiritualité (Certificat d'études supérieures)
- Ministry (DMin) / Théologie pratique (D.Th.T.)
- Mission Studies and Interreligious Dialogue (MA) / Sciences de la mission et dialogue interreligieux (M.A.)
- Public Ethics (MA) – Éthique publique (M.A.)
- Public Ethics (Graduate Certificate) / Éthique publique (Certificat d'études supérieures)
- Religious Education (MRE)
- Theology (MA / MTh / PhD) / Théologie (M.A.(Th.) / M.Th.P. / Ph.D.)