



1. Introduction

1.1 Preamble

The Queen's University Quality Assurance Processes (QUQAP) outlines the Protocols for developing new academic programs and for revising and reviewing existing programs. These processes are drawn from and align with the [Quality Assurance Framework \(QAF\)](#) established by the Ontario Quality Council, but they also include requirements established specifically by Queen's University for all undergraduate and graduate programs. The QAF is a province-wide initiative undertaken by all universities to ensure consistency and cohesion among all programs offered in Ontario. The QUQAP is based directly on part II of the QAF but is also committed to the quality assurance principles as outlined in part I of the QAF.

The QUQAP also signifies Queen's University's firm commitment to cultivating a culture of excellence in education and articulates the quality of a Queen's degree. The QUQAP Protocols have the goal of establishing processes that are effective, transparent, publicly accountable, and so on.

Quality Council of a new field in a graduate program, as well as requests for its approval of a proposed major modification to an existing program.

1.2.3 Major Modifications (Program Renewal and Significant Change)

The fundamental purpose for the [Protocol for Major Modifications \(Program Renewal and Significant Change\)](#) is the identification of major modifications to existing programs and their approval through a robust quality assurance process. This process does not require, but may include, Quality Council approval to assure the universities, the public, and the government of the ongoing quality of all the University's academic programs. While universities themselves are best placed to determine the degree of change that is being proposed, the distinction between major modifications and new programs can, at times, be difficult to determine. The Council has the final authority to decide if a major modification constitutes a new program and, therefore, must follow the Protocol for New Program Approvals.

1.2.4 Minor Modifications

[The Protocol for Minor Modifications](#)

1.2.7 Definitions

[The Definitions Section](#) additionally contains definitions of some of the specialized vocabulary used throughout this document. Most of these definitions are derived from the QAF, but some have been modified to fit the Queen's context.

1.3 Scope of the Application of QUQAP

The QUQAP Protocols extend to new and continuing Senate-approved undergraduate and graduate degree/diploma/certificate programs whether offered in full, in part, or jointly by any institutions federated and affiliated with the university. These responsibilities also extend to programs offered in partnership, collaboration or other such arrangement with other postsecondary institutions including colleges, universities, or institutes. For definitions of the inter-institutional arrangements, see [Definitions](#).

1.4 Responsibility for the QUQAP and Institutional Contact

1.4.1 The Provost and Vice-Principal (Academic)

The Provost and Vice-Principal (Academic), with the assistance of the Deputy Provost and the senior leadership Teaching and Learning team within the Office of the Provost has oversight over undergraduate and graduate quality assurance processes. The Provost is the university contact person for the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (QC). N.B Hereinafter, for the purposes of this policy, "Provost (or delegate)" will refer to the leadership position with delegated quality assurance authority in the Teaching and Learning Team within the Office of the Provost and Vice-Principal (Academic), unless otherwise stated.

1.4.2 Vice-Provost and Dean (School of Graduate Studies and Postdoctoral Affairs) and Faculty Deans

This responsibility of quality assurance within the university is shared with the Vice-Provost and Dean of the School of Graduate Studies and Postdoctoral Affairs (SGSPA) and the Faculty Deans as appropriate. The Vice-Provost and Dean (SGSPA) reviews proposals for new graduate programs and major modifications to graduate programs at the pre-approval stage and is involved as proposals develop. The Vice-Provost and Dean (SGSPA) provides guidance to programs during cyclical program review and reviews nominations for review team members for all external reviews, prior to approval by the Provost (or delegate). Faculty Deans advise both new programs and those undertaking cyclical review within their faculties. Their approval is required for new programs and cyclical a

In developing a new joint program and other inter

2.4.2.4 Accessibility

24.2.4.1 Ways in which the new program addresses the regulations under the [Accessibility for Ontarians with Disability Act, 2005](#).

2.4.2.5 Program requirements

24.2.5.1 Appropriateness of the program's structure and the requirements to meet its objectives and program-level learning outcomes;

24.2.5.2 Appropriateness of the program's structure, requirements, and program-level learning outcomes in meeting the institution's undergraduate or graduate DLEs;

24.2.5.3 Appropriateness of the proposed mode(s) of delivery (see [Definitions](#)) to facilitate students' successful completion of the program-level learning outcomes; and

24.2.5.4 Ways in which the curriculum addresses the current state of the discipline or area of study.

2.4.2.6 Program requirements for graduate programs only

24.2.6.1 Clear rationale for program length that ensures that students can complete the program-level learning outcomes and requirements within the proposed time;

24.2.6.2 Evidence that each graduate student in the program is required to take a minimum of two-thirds of the course requirements from among graduate-level courses; and

24.2.6.3 For research-focused graduate programs, clear indication of the nature and suitability of the major research requirements for degree completion.

2.4.2.7 Assessment of

1 o d . e 0 g 0 3 1 (. n 8) 7 r F e f w s r e 3 0 0 2 e 0 0 3

(- i T J 10

2.4.2.8 Admission requirements

24.2.8.1 Appropriateness of the program's admission requirements given the program's objectives and program-level learning outcomes; and

24.2.8.2 Sufficient explanation of alternative requirements, if applicable, for admission into a graduate, second-entry, or undergraduate program, e.g., minimum grade point average, additional languages, or portfolios, and how the program recognizes prior work or learning experience.

2.4.2.9 Resources

- 24.2.10.1 Evidence that faculty have the recent research or professional/clinical expertise needed to sustain the program, promote innovation, and foster an appropriate intellectual climate;
 - 24.2.10.2 Where appropriate to the program, evidence that financial assistance for students will be sufficient to ensure adequate quality and numbers of students; and
 - 24.2.10.3 Evidence of how supervisory loads will be distributed, considering qualifications and appointment status of the faculty.
- 2.4.2.11 Quality and other indicators
- 24.2.11.1 Evidence of the quality of the faculty (e.g., qualifications, funding, honours, awards, research, innovation, and scholarly record; appropriateness of collective Faculty expertise)

Studies and Postdoctoral Affairs (if applicable) and the Provost (or delegate) will approve the full proposal package.

2.5 External Evaluation

2.5.1 Composition of the Review Committee

2.5.1.1 External Reviewers

- 25.1.1.1 The Review Team is required to be comprised of at least two external reviewers for new undergraduate and graduate programs.
- 25.1.1.2 External Review Team members will normally be associate or full professors, active and respected in their field. External Review Team members must also have disciplinary experience and qualifications relevant to the program under review. Their experience must also relate to program management, pedagogy, and learning outcomes.
- 25.1.1.3 All members of the Review Team will be at “arm’s length” from the program being proposed. Potential conflict of interest situations includes, but are not limited to, the existence of family ties, partnership links, supervisory relations, or other types of relationships with individuals connected to the new program(s) under review. Some of these relationships may not exclude a potential reviewer in and of themselves; however, possible conflicts must be identified before the appointment of an individual external reviewer. In case of uncertainty, Academic Units and/or the Faculty Office are encouraged to consult with the Provost (or delegate) and/or the School of Graduate Studies and Postdoctoral Affairs as appropriate.
- 25.1.1.4 Attempts will be made to ensure that at least one of the external reviewers is from inside and one from outside the province of Ontario.

2.5.1.2 Internal Reviewer

- 25.1.2.1 The Review Team is required to include at least one internal reviewer for new undergraduate and graduate programs.
- 25.1.2.2 The internal reviewer does not necessarily need to be a specialist in a discipline of the program(s) under review.
- 25.1.2.3 The internal reviewer should be knowledgeable about Queen's and its administrative and academic structures and experienced in providing constructive program critiques.
- 25.1.2.4 The internal reviewer must also be at arm's length. If possible, the internal reviewer should come from outside the Faculty, School, or discipline in which the program under review is located.
- 25.1.2.5 The internal reviewer will receive the same materials as the external reviewers and will attend briefings with the Provost (or delegate) and all meetings with members of the program under review.

2.5.1.3 Professional Reviewers

- 25.1.3.1 Optional professional reviewers may be requested by the Academic Unit, and inclusion on the Review Team is subject to approval by the relevant Dean(s) and the Provost (or delegate).
- 25.1.3.2 Professional reviewers are appropriately qualified members of industry in good standing with any relevant professional boards.
- 25.1.3.3 Professional reviewers must be at arm's length from the program(s) being reviewed.
- 25.1.3.4 Professional reviewers are considered additional review team members and do not replace internal or external reviewers.

2.5.1.4 Additional Reviewers

- 25.1.4.1 Additional discretionary members may be assigned to the Review Team where requested by the Academic Unit and approved by the relevant Dean(s) and the Provost (or delegate). Any additional reviewers must also be at arm's length from the program(s) being reviewed.
- 25.1.4.2 Additional reviewers do not replace the required internal or external reviewers.

2.5.2 Selection of Review Team

- 2.5.2.1 The Academic Unit may contact the potential reviewers while in the process of developing a list of nominees to ask if they are willing to be considered as a potential reviewer. To avoid conflict of interest, the Academic Unit may not contact the reviewers at other times or for other reasons.
- 2.5.2.2 A rank ordered list of six recommendations for external reviewers, a rank ordered list of three recommendations for internal reviewers, and an optional request for professional or additional reviewers, each with a brief biographical summary and description of relevant expertise, is submitted by the Academic Unit(s) to the Provost (or delegate) using the templates provided by the Provost (or delegate). Any potential conflicts of interest will be identified on the template.
- 2.5.2.3 For undergraduate programs, in departmentalized Faculties, the Faculty Dean(s) ranks nominations from the Academic Unit(s) involved and approves a prioritized list which is then forwarded to the Provost (or delegate) for a final decision.
- 2.5.2.4 Where a graduate program is involved, the faculty-ranked nominations are forwarded to the Vice-Provost and Dean, School of Graduate Studies and Postdoctoral Affairs, who provides comments and submits the nominations and rankings to the Provost (or delegate) for a final decision.
- 2.5.2.5 The decision of the Provost (or delegate) is then communicated to the Academic Unit and Faculty or School Office(s), at which point the Review Team Report template will be provided.
- 2.5.2.6 The Faculty or School Office(s) will then invite reviewers to serve.
- 2.5.2.7 If the required selection of review team members cannot be maintained, the nomination process will be restarted from the beginning.

2.5.3 Preparing the Review Team for the Site Visit

- 2.5.3.1 The Provost (or delegate) will review the New Program Proposal for completeness before sending the documentation to the Review Team.
- 2.5.3.2 The Review Team will also be provided with instructions and an information package by the Faculty or School Office(s) for the program(s) being reviewed.
- 2.5.3.3 The Provost (or delegate) will meet separately with the Review Team in person or online to ensure that the members:
 - 2.5.3.3.1 Understand their role and obligations;
 - 2.5.3.3.2 Identify and commend the program(s)' notably strong and creative attributes;

- 2.5.3.3.3 Describe the program(s)' respective strengths, areas for improvement, and opportunities for enhancement;
- 2.5.3.3.4 Recommend specific steps to be taken to improve the program(s), distinguishing between those the Academic Unit responsible for the program(s) can itself take and those that require external action;
- 2.5.3.3.5 Recognize the University's autonomy to determine priorities for funding, space, and faculty allocation;
- 2.5.3.3.6 Respect the confidentiality required for all aspects of the review process; and
- 2.5.3.3.7 Follow the Review Team Report template provided in developing their report to ensure that the program is assessed against the evaluation criteria specified in section [2.4](#)

- 2.5.5.1 Address the substance of the New Program Proposal;
- 2.5.5.2 Respond to the evaluation criteria set out in section [2.4](#);
- 2.5.5.3 Comment on the adequacy of existing physical, human, and financial resources;
- 2.5.5.4 The internal reviewer may also review a draft of the Review Report and provide comments on its accuracy.
- 2.5.5.5 Acknowledge any clearly innovative aspects of the proposed program together with recommendations on any essential or otherwise desirable modifications to it; and
- 2.5.5.6 Be submitted to the Provost (or delegate) when completed.
 - 2.5.5.6.1 If the report has not been completed or does not provide adequate recommendations, the Provost (or delegate) will return the report to the Review Team for revisions. In the event that the Review Team cannot provide revisions or cannot be reached within a reasonable amount of time, a new review and report will be commissioned utilizing the next-ranked members on the review team nomination form. Faculty Offices are advised to withhold stipends until the report has been received.

2.5.6 Internal Responses

It is essential that the proposing Academic Unit and the relevant Dean(s) or their designate(s) make clearly independent responses to the Review Report and recommendations.

2.5.6.3 School of Graduate Studies and Postdoctoral Affairs Response

- 2.5.6.3.1 Where graduate programs are proposed, the Provost will invite the Vice-Provost and Dean of the School of Graduate Studies and Postdoctoral Affairs to make a response to the Reviewer Report independent of that provided by the Academic Unit and Faculty or School.
- 2.5.6.3.2 The response by the Vice-Provost and Dean of the School of Graduate Studies and Postdoctoral Affairs will address substantive matters in the Report and the specific recommendations.
- 2.5.6.3.3 This response should also be submitted to the Provost (or delegate) within two weeks of the invitation to respond.

- 2.5.7 Changes to the New Program Proposal Resulting from the External Review
 - 2.5.7.1 Changes made to the Proposal resulting from the Review Team Report and/or the internal responses should be summarized in an appendix to the original proposal.
 - 2.5.7.2 The changes must be submitted to the Provost (or delegate) for review.
 - 2.5.7.3 After reviewing, the Provost (or delegate) will inform the Academic Unit, Faculty or School and School of Graduate Studies and Postdoctoral Affairs (if applicable). Each body will have the opportunity to amend their initial response.
- 2.5.8 Institutional Approval
 - 2.5.8.1 In consultation with the Provost (or delegate), the Faculty or School Office is responsible for preparing the full New Program Proposal package for submission to SCADP. The package should be submitted to the secretary of SCADP via the Provost (or delegate) in accordance with agenda deadlines. Late submissions may not be considered until future meetings.
 - 2.5.8.2 The New Program Proposal package should contain the final proposal document with associated appendices, Review Team report, and internal responses.
 - 2.5.8.2.1 The package must be submitted in a single, appropriately bookmarked PDF document.
 - 2.5.8.3 SCADP will review the proposal against the evaluation criteria outlined in [section 2.4.2](#)

- 2.5.9.1 The submission will include the New Program Proposal, the Review Team Report, the internal responses, a summary of changes made after the Review Team Report (if applicable), along with the date of approvals by SCADP and Senate.
- 2.5.9.2 The submission template will include information on whether the proposed program will be a cost-recovery program. The same standards and Protocols apply regardless of the source of funding.
- 2.5.9.3 The submission will further include a brief commentary on the two external reviewers selected to review the proposed program regarding their qualifications in the following areas:
 - 2.5.9.3.1 Sufficient expertise in content and program delivery;
 - 2.5.9.3.2 Appropriate connections to industry (where appropriate); and
 - 2.5.9.3.3 Expertise in teaching and learning.
- 2.5.9.4 The review and approval processes, and possible outcomes of the Appraisal Committee and Quality Council review are outlined in the [QAF](#), sections 2.6-2.8.
 - 2.5.9.4.1 Should the Quality Council review be conducted by the Quality Council or the Appraisal Committee?

- 2.5.11.2.1 Within five years of commencement and prior to the program's first cyclical program review, new programs will be jointly assessed by the Dean(s) and Unit Head(s), with the submission of an Interim Monitoring Report to the Provost (or delegate) and to Senate for information.
 - 2.5.11.2.2 The Interim Monitoring Report template must be obtained from the Provost (or delegate).
 - 2.5.11.2.3 The Interim Monitoring Report will evaluate the new program's success in realizing its objectives, requirements, and outcomes, as originally proposed and approved, as well as any changes that have occurred in the interim.
 - 2.5.11.2.4 If the Interim Monitoring Report identifies significant challenges or opportunities, the program may be asked to address these items immediately and/or report on them during the first cyclical program review.
- 2.5.11.3 Website Posting
- 2.5.11.3.1 A brief description of each new program, created by the Academic Unit and approved by the Provost (or delegate), will be posted to the [QUQAUh 1 rg0 Tc 0 Tw 4.08 0 Td-](#)

2.6 Overview of Protocol for Undergraduate and Graduate New Program Approvals

3.4 Initial Institutional Process: The Pre-Approval Stage

The pre-approval stage for Expedited Approvals follows the same process as that set out for new programs in [section 2.3](#).

3.5 Development of Program Proposal: Evaluation Criteria

The Program Proposal will use the applicable evaluation criteria outlined in [section 2.4.2](#). No external review or internal response is required, but the Program Proposal will be submitted to the Quality Council for approval.

3.6 Institutional Approval

The institutional approval processes are the same as those used for new programs with the exclusion of the external evaluation and internal response steps in [section 2.5.8](#).

3.7 Quality Council Approval Process

The Expedited Approval Process is the same as identified for new programs in [section 2.5.9](#), with the exception that the Appraisal Committee will function as the final approval body. Outcomes of the Appraisal Committee review can be found in section 3.2 of the [QAF](#).

3.8 Subsequent Institutional Processes

3.8.1 Implementation Window

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

3.8.2 First Cyclical Program Review

The process for establishing the first cyclical program review is similar to that identified for new programs in [section 2.5.12](#), with the following exceptions:

3.8.2.1 Graduate Diplomas will be reviewed in the same year as related graduate programs if possible.

3.8.2.2 Modifications that have elected to go through the expedited approval process will be reviewed together with the program to which the modification applies.

3.8.3 Audit

3.8.3.1 Programs created or modified through the Protocol for Expedited Approvals are not normally subject to Audit.

3.8.3.2 Information on the Audit of programs created or modified through the Protocol for Expedited Approvals can be found in section 3.4 of the [QAF](#).

3.9 Overview of Protocol for Undergraduate and Graduate Expedited Program Approvals

4. Protocol for Major Modifications (Program Renewal and Significant Change)

4.1 Objectives

4.2 Scope

4.2.1

4.2.1.7.4 The establishment of an existing program substantially online where it had previously been offered in face-to-face mode, or vice versa. The program must identify the following criteria when making this change:

- 4.2.1.7.4.1 Maintenance of and/or changes to the program objectives and program-level learning outcomes;
- 4.2.1.7.4.2 Adequacy of the technological platform and tools;
- 4.2.1.7.4.3 Sufficiency of support services and training for teaching staff;
- 4.2.1.7.4.4 Sufficiency and type of support for students in the new learning environment; and
- 4.2.1.7.4.5 Access. For example, students in rural areas may not be able to access online programs.

4.2.1.8 Program Closure

4.2.1.8.1 For the development of a proposal to close a program, see [link](#)

Fove

i1PmC os B)10/T(B)4R)84 j(l)10 (6)22(4)8d(f)6if(t)-4i(c)4a (t)-4i (o)8n(t)-4 (s)2 (s)2h(t)
Provlost alorde9-1 (g)2a (t)-4 (e)-1)tloet2 (sm(lin)-4 (2 (i (f)6 r t)6 (h)-4 (e)-1al)10m(lo

4.1

4.3.1.4.2 Application of the relevant criteria, as outlined in [section 2.4.2](#), to the proposed changes. The University will determine which criteria are deemed relevant for each Proposal and, to meet its own needs and in recognition of the diversity in institutional strategies, the University4 ()tegi imh

The Quality Council reviews these reports to ensure compliance with the Quality Assurance Framework, as well as to compile data for its own Annual Report, which is widely distributed to the internal and external community, including the provincial government.

If any Major Modifications have been deemed by Quality Council not to be in compliance, the Provost (or delegate) will communicate any remedial actions required to the Academic Unit and Faculty Office or School.

4.6 Audit

4.6.1 Major Modifications are not normally subject to Audit.

4.6.2 For information regarding the audit of Major Modifications, see [QAF](#) section 4.4.

5. Protocol for Minor Modifications

5.1 Scope

Minor Modifications to existing programs do not change the fundamental aspects of a Program such as the learning outcomes, program requirements or structure, or admission standards. Minor Modifications include changes to an existing Emphasis, Option, or Minor Program; new or changes to laddering, stacking or similar options (see [Guidance](#)); or comparable elements that do not require Quality Council appraisal and approval.

Detailed process information can be found on the [QUOAP website](#).

5.2 Development of Minor Modification Proposal

5.2.1 Submission

5.2.1.1 Minor Modifications requiring a change to the name of a program or Department, and/or a change to the degree designation (that do not impact learning outcomes) will be submitted using the Minor Modification Form, which can be obtained after consultation with the Provost (or delegate).

5.2.1.2 All other changes not rising to the threshold of a Major Modification remain under the jurisdiction of each Faculty's curriculum committee, Faculty Board, or equivalent.

5.3 Institutional Approval

5.3.1 Approval

Reviews is designed to ensure that the educational experiences students have are engaging and rigorous, but also that the programs through which those experiences are provided are routinely monitored and, if necessary, revised. Continuous improvement of those facets of education that most directly impact the academic experiences of Ontario students is fundamental to quality assurance and, thus, continuous improvement factors significantly in the Protocol for Cyclical Program Reviews.

Detailed process information can be found on the [QUQAP website](#).

6.3 Scope .3.13

- 6.4.2 The first cyclical program review of any new program will be scheduled to take place no more than seven years after the date of the program's initial enrolment.
- 6.4.3 The Schedule of Reviews will identify:
 - 6.4.3.1 the University's full complement of undergraduate programs, graduate degree and diploma programs, and will consider all independent offerings of each program;
 - 6.4.3.2 the years in which active programs will complete their cyclical program review and continuous improvement reports;
 - 6.4.3.3 temporarily suspended programs not requiring review (section [6.3.5](#)).

6.5.1

6.6 Evaluation Criteria for Self-Study

The Self-Study must address the following evaluation criteria:

6.6.1 Program objectives

6.6.1.1 Describe how the program's objectives are consistent with the University's mission and academic plans.

6.6.2 Academic integrity

6.6.2.1 Describe how the program has educated and informed students and staff on the principles of academic integrity (including integrity in research), as outlined in the Senate Academic Integrity Policy.

6.6.2.2 Describe how the program has related the principles of academic integrity to the field of study.

6.6.3 Equity, diversity, inclusivity, and Indigenization

6.6.3.1 The University [Diversity and Equity Assessment and Planning](#) (DEAP) Tool should be used to complete this section.

6.6.3.2 Describe how the program objectives, outcomes and curriculum address equity, diversity, and inclusion.

6.6.3.3 Describe how the program addresses university goals for Indigenization and Reconciliation outlined in [Yakwanastahentéha Aankenjigemi Extending the Rafters](#): Truth and Reconciliation Commission Task Force Final Report, specifically sections 21-25.

6.6.3.4 Comment on anti-racism and anti-oppression initiatives within the program.

6.6.4 Accessibility

6.6.4.1 Describe how the program has addressed the regulations under the [Accessibility for Ontarians with Disability Act](#) (2005).

6.6.5 Program requirements (for all programs)

6.6.5.1 Comment on the appropriateness of the program's structure and the requirements to meet its objectives and the program-level learning outcomes.

6.6.5.2 Comment on the appropriateness of the program's structure, requirements, and program-level learning outcomes in meeting the University's undergraduate or graduate DLEs.

6.6.5.3 Comment on the appropriateness and effectiveness of the mode(s) of delivery (see [Definitions](#)) to facilitate students' successful completion of the program-level learning outcomes.

6.6.5.4 Describe the ways in which the curriculum addresses the current state of the discipline or area of study.

6.6.6 Program requirements (for graduate programs only)

6.6.6.1 Provide a clear rationale for program length that ensures that students can complete the program-level learning outcomes and requirements within r.6r (provide a clear

- 6.6.9.1 the participation of a sufficient number of qualified core faculty who are competent to teach and/or supervise in and achieve the goals of the program and foster the appropriate academic environment;
- 6.6.9.2 the role and approximate percentage of adjunct and part-time faculty/limited-term appointments used in the delivery of the program and the associated plans to ensure the sustainability of the program and quality of the student experience, if applicable (see [Guidance](#))

6.6.11 Quality and other indicators

- 6.6.11.1 Provide evidence of the quality of the faculty (e.g., qualifications, funding, honours, awards, research, innovation, and scholarly record; appropriateness of collective faculty expertise to contribute substantively to the program and commitment to student mentoring).
- 6.6.11.2 Provide any other evidence that the program and faculty ensure the intellectual quality of the student experience.
- 6.6.11.3 Provide student data: grade-level for admission, scholarly output, success rates in provincial and national scholarships, competitions, awards, commitment to professional and transferable skills, and times-to-completion and retention rates.

6.7 External Evaluation

6.7.1 Composition of the Review Team

6.7.1.1 External Reviewers

- 6.7.1.1.1 The Review Team is required to include at least two external reviewers for undergraduate and graduate programs.
- 6.7.1.1.2 External Review Team members will normally be associate or full professors, active and respected in their field.
- 6.7.1.1.3 Reviewers should also have academic administrative experience in such roles as Undergraduate or Graduate Program Coordinators, Department Chair/Head, Associate Dean, Graduate Dean, or related positions. Reviewers are also expected to have experience with curriculum design and developing learning outcomes. This combination of experience helps to ensure that a reviewer will provide the most informed and constructive feedback on program reviews. External Review Committee members must have disciplinary experience and qualifications relevant to the program(s) under review. Their experience must also relate to program management, pedagogy, and learning outcomes.
- 6.7.1.1.4 All members of the Review Team will be at "arm's length" from the program being reviewed. Potential conflict of interest situations includes, but are not limited to, the existence of family ties, partnership links, supervisory or other types of relationships with individuals connected to the program(s) under review. Some of these relationships may not exclude a potential reviewer in and of themselves; however, possible conflicts must be identified before the appointment of an individual external reviewer. In case of uncertainty, Academic Units and/or the Faculty Office are encouraged to consult with the Provost (or delegate) and/or the School of Graduate Studies and Postdoctoral Affairs as appropriate.

6.7.1.1.5

6.7.2 Selection of Review Team

- 6.7.2.1 Academic Units should work with the relevant Faculty or School Office(s) to prepare the nomination template.
- 6.7.2.2 The Academic Unit may contact the potential reviewers while in the process of developing a list of nominees to ask if they are willing to be considered as a potential reviewer. To avoid conflict of interest, the Academic Unit may not contact the reviewers at other times or for other reasons.
- 6.7.2.3 A rank-ordered list of six recommendations for external reviewers, a rank-ordered list of three recommendations internal reviewers, and a request for any optional additional reviewers, each with a brief biographical summary and description of relevant expertise, is sent by the Dean(s) or delegate(s) using the templates provided by the Provost (or delegate).
- 6.7.2.4 Any potential conflicts of interest will be identified on the template.
- 6.7.2.5 For reviews of undergraduate-only programs, in departmentalized Faculties, the Faculty Dean(s) solicits recommendations from the Academic Unit(s) involved and approves a prioritized list that is then forwarded to the Provost (or delegate) for a final decision.
- 6.7.2.6 Where a graduate program review is involved, the Faculty Dean(s) solicits recommendations from the Academic Unit(s) involved and approves a prioritized list that is sent to the Provost (or delegate).
- 6.7.2.7 The list is then forwarded to the Vice-Provost and Dean of the School of Graduate Studies and Postdoctoral Affairs, who makes comments on the prioritized list and forwards it to the Provost (or delegate) for a final decision.
- 6.7.2.8 The decision of the Provost (or delegate) is then communicated to the Academic Unit and Faculty or School Office(s).
- 6.7.2.9 The Faculty or School Office

6.7.3 Preparing the Review Team for the Site Visit

- 6.7.3.1 The Provost (or delegate) will review the Self-Study for completeness before sending the documentation to the Review Team.
- 6.7.3.2 The Review Team will also be provided with instructions and an information package by the Faculty or School Office(s) for the program(s) being reviewed.
- 6.7.3.3 The Provost (or delegate) will meet separately with the Review Team in person or online to ensure that the members:
 - 6.7.3.3.1 understand their roles and obligations;
 - 6.7.3.3.2 identify and commend the program(s)' notably strong and creative attributes;
 - 6.7.3.3.3 describe the program(s)' respective strengths, areas for improvement, and opportunities for enhancement;
 - 6.7.3.3.4 recommend specific steps to be taken to improve the Program(s), distinguishing between those the Academic Unit responsible for the Program(s) can im

- 6.7.4.2 A site visit, typically for two full days, can be conducted on-campus and in-person, virtually, or by desk review.
 - 6.7.4.2.1 Reviews of doctoral and master's programs must incorporate an on-site visit, with the exception of certain master's programs (e.g., professional master's programs, fully online programs, etc.), reviews for which may be conducted by a desk review or virtual site visit.
- 6.7.4.3 All site visits for undergraduate programs are conducted in-person and on-campus unless an alternative method is requested by the Academic Unit and/or Faculty or School in advance of the review. Alternative methods for site-visits (e.g., virtual or desk review) are not permitted for doctoral or master's programs (with the exception of certain master's programs as stated above.)
 - 6.7.4.3.1 A clear justification for the request of an alternative review method must be provided to the Provost (or delegate), who will have final approval authority over the request.
 - 6.7.4.3.2 The Review Team must be satisfied that the review method taking place is acceptable and appropriate.
- 6.7.4.4 The Review Team should visit the campus together or engage together on the same remote calls.
- 6.7.4.5 The Faculty Office(s) and the School of Graduate Studies and Postdoctoral Affairs, if appropriate, will consult with members of the program(s) and with assistance from the Provost's Office, arrange for meetings between the reviewers and appropriate individuals as outlined in the Sample Meeting Itinerary:
 - 6.7.4.5.1 Provost (or delegate);
 - 6.7.4.5.2 Vice-Provost and Dean of the School of Graduate Studies and Postdoctoral Affairs or delegate (if applicable);
 - 6.7.4.5.3 Dean or delegate of the faculty(ies) (if applicable);
 - 6.7.4.5.4 Unit Head(s);
 - 6.7.4.5.5 Unit(s) faculty members;
 - 6.7.4.5.6 faculty member representatives from cognate units (if applicable);
 - 6.7.4.5.7 Undergraduate students, graduate students, and postdoctoral fellows (as appropriate) of the unit(s);
 - 6.7.4.5.8 Staff members of the unit(s);
 - 6.7.4.5.9 Support Service representatives such as the Librarian (or delegate) associated with the unit(s) and Information Technology Services (ITS) (if applicable); and
 - 6.7.4.5.10 Relevant members of the external community (if applicable).

- 6.7.8.4 any changes in organization, policy or governance that would be necessary to meet the recommendations;
- 6.7.8.5 the resources, financial and otherwise, that would be necessary to implement the recommendations; and
- 6.7.8.6 a proposed timeline for the implementation of the recommendations.

6.8 Final Assessment Report and Implementation Plan

The Final Assessment Report provides the institutional synthesis of the external evaluation of the program and strategies for continuous improvement.

The SCPRC identifies key components for inclusion in the Final Assessment Report, and then the Final Assessment Report and Implementation Plan are drafted by the Provost's Office for review and approval by the SCPRC. The SCPRC reports on Final Assessment Reports and Implementation Plans annually, for information.

6.8.1 The Final Assessment Report:

- 6.8.1.1 identifies significant strengths of the program;
- 6.8.1.2 identifies opportunities for further program improvement and enhancement with a view towards continuous improvement;
- 6.8.1.3 lists all recommendations of the external reviewers and the associated, separate, internal responses and assessments from the unit and from the Dean(s);
- 6.8.1.4 explains why any external reviewers' recommendations not selected for further action in the Implementation Plan have not been prioritized;
- 6.8.1.5 includes any additional recommendations that the Academic Unit, the Dean(s) and/or the University may have identified as requiring action as a result of the program's review;
- 6.8.1.6 may include a confidential section (for example, where personnel issues need to be addressed); and
- 6.8.1.7 identifies who will be responsible for approving the recommendations set out in the Final Assessment Report.

6.8.2 The Final Assessment Report must include an Executive Summary, excluding any confidential information, which is to be published on the University's website alongside the associated Implementation Plan.

6.8.3 The Final Assessment Report will also include an Implementation Plan that:

- 6.8.3.1 Is the primary responsibility of the Unit Head and Faculty of the relevant program(s).
- 6.8.3.2 sets out and prioritizes those recommendations that are selected for implementation;
- 6.8.3.3 identifies the group or individual responsible for providing resources needed to address recommendations from the external reviewers or action items identified by the University;

exist, it may decide to initiate a Focused Audit (see section 6.3 of the [OAF](#) and associated Definition).

6.9.3 Subsequent Institutional Processes

6.9.3.1 Monitoring

The program will submit a follow-up report to the SCPRC on the implementation of recommendations 18 months and 4 years after the Final Assessment Report and Implementation Plan approval date. The report will focus on updates to the implementation plan and work completed on the recommendations as outlined in the review team report. While the Faculty Dean is responsible for the continuous improvement of programs, the Provost (or delegate) will initiate the monitoring reports. Reports will be reviewed and approved by the Unit Head, Faculty Dean, Vice-Provost and Dean (SGSPA) (if required)

6.10.2 Considerations for Alignment

How the Academic Unit, relevant Faculty or School Deans, and the Provost (or delegate) approaches the question of whether to combine, coordinate or completely segregate the reviews depends on a number of factors, including:

- levels and complexity of program offered (undergraduate, graduate, professional);
- review cycle;
- qualifications required for reviewers;
- evaluation criteria; and
- issues currently faced by the program and/or the University.

One common characteristic of both accreditation and cyclical program review is the development of a Self-Study by the program undergoing review. However, combining a Cyclical Program Review and an accreditation review can be challenging given the different purposes and evaluation criteria that apply. Ultimately, while some stages of the review process may be substituted or augmented by an accreditation review, the evaluation criteria detailed in section [6.6](#) must be addressed in the Self-Study and by the external reviewers and a Final Assessment Report, Executive Summary, Implementation Plan, and subsequent monitoring reports, as detailed in sections [6.8](#) and [6.9](#), must be produced and approved for all programs.

6.10.3 Impacts of Alignment

If the program has been approved for an accreditation aligned cyclical program review, there are several impacts on the review protocol that the Academic Unit and relevant Faculty or School Deans should be aware of.

6.10.3.1 All cyclical program reviews will be conducted on the accreditation schedule, provided the accreditation takes place within at least every seven years.

6.10.3.2 Ultimately, while some stages of the review process may be substituted or augmented by an accreditation review, the evaluation criteria detailed in section [6.6](#) must be addressed in the Self-Study and by the external reviewers and a Final Assessment Report, Executive Summary, Implementation Plan, and subsequent monitoring reports, as detailed in sections [6.8](#) and [6.9](#), must be produced and approved for all programs.

6.11.2 Cyclical Program Reviews that were undertaken within the period since the conduct of the previous Audit are eligible for selection for the University's next Cyclical Audit.

6.11.3 Additional information on the Audit of Cyclical Program Reviews is found in [QAF](#) 5.6

7. Audit Protocol

Appendix 1: Definitions

Academic Services

Those services integral to a student's ability to achieve the program-level learning outcomes. Such services would typically include, but are not limited to, academic advising and counselling appropriate to the program; information technology, library and laboratory resources directed towards the program; and internship, co-operative education, and practicum placement services, where these experiential components are a required part of a program. Excluded from academic services are items such as intramural and extramural activities, residence services, food services, health and wellness services, psychological services, and financial aid services and career services, except where any of these services are specifically identified to be an integral part of the academic program.

Adjusted Oversight

A guiding Principle of the Quality Assurance Framework is that the "Quality Council recognizes past performance of institutions and adjusts oversight accordingly." Adjusted oversight refers to the practice of decreasing or increasing the degree of oversight by the Quality Council depending upon the university's compliance across the spectrum of its quality assurance practices. Oversight may also be increased in one area and decreased in another. Examples of adjusted oversight include: a reduction or increase in the number of programs selected for a Cyclical Audit, a Focused Audit, adjusted requirements for documentation, and adjusted reporting requirements. See [Guidance](#) for detailed examples.

Certificate

See, Undergraduate Certificate

Collaborative Specialization

An intra-university graduate field of study that provides an additional multidisciplinary experience for students enrolled in and completing the degree requirements for one of several approved master's and/or PhD programs within the collaborative specialization. Students meet the admission requirements of and register in the participating (or "home") program but complete, in addition to the degree requirements of that program, the additional requirements specified by the Collaborative Specialization. The degree conferred is that of the home program, and the completion of the Collaborative Specialization is indicated by a transcript notation indicating the additional specialization that has been attained (e.g., MA in Political Science with specialization in American Studies).

A Collaborative Specialization must have:

At least one core one-semester course that is foundational to the specialization and does not form part of the course offerings of any of the partner programs. This

course must be completed by all students from partner programs registered in the specialization and provides an opportunity for students to appreciate the different disciplinary perspectives that can be bro

expression of those Expectations (see [Appendix 2](#)) and achievement of the degree's associated learning outcomes.

Degree Level Expectations

Academic standards that identify the knowledge and skill outcome competencies and reflect progressive levels of intellectual and creative development, as established by OCAV. The DLEs detailed in Appendix 2 are the Quality Assurance Framework's link to the Ontario Qualifications Framework (OQF). DLEs may be expressed in subject-specific or in generic terms. Graduates at specified degree levels (e.g., BA, MSc) are expected to demonstrate these competencies. Each university has undertaken to adapt and describe the DLEs that will apply within its own institution. Likewise, Academic Units will describe their university's expectations in terms appropriate to their academic programs. Further information, together with examples for successive degree levels, is provided in [Guidance](#).

Expedited Protocol

Generally, approvals granted in a shorter time span with less required documentation. The Expedited Protocol requires the submission to the Quality Council of a Proposal Brief (see suggested template) of the proposed program change/new program (as detailed above) and the rationale for it. Furthermore, the Council's appraisal and approval processes are reduced. The outcomes of these submissions will be conveyed to the proposing university directly by the Quality Assurance Secretariat and reported to the Quality Council.

Field

In graduate programs, 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 and to a new or existing program. Universities are not required to declare fields at either the master's or doctoral level. Universities may wish, through an Expedited Protocol, to seek the endorsement of the Quality Council.

Focused Audit

tyeh atetyti Ceougeranllr areaculty dhe ma he mavo3 (g)12 (o)-2 (r)10 (o)tt(c)4 (e)-2 (r(l)-4m (s)2 (-)4 4 1

determine the appropriate action to be taken on quality assurance if the collaboration is to be permitted to proceed.

Major Modifications

A “significant change” in the program requirements, intended learning outcomes, and/or human and other resources associated with a degree program or program of specialization, as defined by institutions within their IQAP. (See [Guidance](#))

Micro-credentials

A designation of achievement of a coherent set of skills and knowledge, specified by a statement of purpose, learning outcomes, and strong evidence of need by esured by Mirer rms1 (as)2 ()1

submitted to the Quality Council will report whether the program is a professional program and/or a full cost-recovery program.

Professional Master's Program

Typically, a professional master's degree is a terminal degree that does not lead to entry into a doctoral program. Such programs are designed to help students to prepare for a career in specific fields, such as occupational therapy, physical therapy, finance, or business, among others. A professional master's degree often puts a great deal of focus on real-world application, with many requiring students to complete internships or projects in their field of study before graduation. In contrast, a research master's degree provides experience in research and scholarship and may be either the final degree or a step toward entry into a doctoral program.

Program

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

Program-Level Student Learning Outcomes

Clear and concise statements that describe what successful students should have achieved and the knowledge, skills, and abilities that they should have acquired by the end of the program, however an institution defines 'program' in its IQAP. Program-level student learning outcomes emphasize the application and integration of knowledge – both in the context of the program and more broadly – rather than coverage of material; make explicit the expectations for student success; are measurable and thus form the criteria for assessment/evaluation; and are written in greater detail than the program objectives. Clear and concise program-level learning outcomes also help to create shared expectations between students and instructors. (See [Guidance](#))

Program Objectives

Clear and concise statements that describe the goals of the program, however an institution defines 'program' in its IQAP. Program objectives explain the potential applications of the knowledge and skills acquired in the program; seek to help students connect learning across various contexts; situate the program in the context of the discipline as a whole; and are often broader in scope than the program-level learning outcomes that they help to generate. (See [Guidance](#))

Program of Specialization (e.g., a major, honours program, concentration, or similar designation)

An identified set and sequence of courses and/or other units of study, research, and

practice within an area of disciplinary or interdisciplinary study, completed in full or partial fulfillment of the requirements for the awarding of a degree, and which is recorded on the graduate's academic record.

It should be noted that:

- a) A program constitutes complete fulfillment of the requirements for the awarding of a degree when the program and degree program are one and the same.
- b) A program constitutes "partial" fulfillment of the requirements for the awarding of a degree when the program is a subset of the degree program. Typically, a bachelor's degree requires the completion of a program of specialization, often referred to as a major, an honours program, a concentration or similar designation.

Undergraduate Certificate

The Senate Policy on [Certificate and Diploma Programs](#) defines the Undergraduate Certificate as follows:

Admission to a Queen's Undergraduate Certificate will be in accordance with the admission policies of an individual Faculty/School. An Undergraduate Certificate is a program of study coherently organized around clear learning objectives and outcomes, and typically having academic content equivalent to a minimum of half a year of full-time

Virtual Site Visit

The practice of conducting all required elements of the external reviewers' site visit using videoconferencing software and/or other suitable platforms. A virtual site visit will still include elements such as virtual meetings with students, faculty, and other relevant groups. It may also include remote attendance at performances or events, and virtual facilities tours. A virtual site visit may replace an in-person site visit for certain undergraduate and master's program, with agreement from both the external reviewers and the Provost.

	<p>d) make use of scholarly reviews and primary sources; and</p> <p>e) explore problems from local and global perspectives.</p>	<p>The ability to use a range of established techniques to:</p> <p>a) initiate and undertake critical evaluation of arguments, assumptions, abstract concepts and information;</p> <p>b) propose solutions;</p> <p>c) frame appropriate questions for the purpose of solving a problem;</p> <p>d) solve a problem or create a new work;</p> <p>e) make critical use of scholarly reviews and primary sources; and</p> <p>f) explore problems from local and global perspectives.</p>
<p>Communication Skills</p>	<p>The ability to communicate information, arguments, and analyses:</p> <p>a) accurately and reliably;</p> <p>b) orally and in writing; and</p> <p>c) to a broad range of audiences in ways that are accessible and inclusive.</p>	<p>The ability to communicate information, arguments, and analyses:</p> <p>a) accurately and reliably;</p> <p>b) orally and in writing; and</p> <p>c) to a broad range of audiences in ways that are accessible and inclusive.</p>
<p>Awareness of Limits of Knowledge</p>	<p>An understanding of the limits to their own knowledge and how this might influence their analyses and interpretations.</p>	<p>a) An understanding of the limits to their own knowledge and ability, and an appreciation of the uncertainty, ambiguity and limits to knowledge and</p>

	<p>b) working effectively with others;</p> <p>c) the ability to identify and address their own learning needs in changing circumstances and to select an appropriate program of further study;</p> <p>d) behaviour consistent with academic integrity and social responsibility; and</p> <p>e) behaviour consistent with exercising intercultural sensitivity.</p>	<p>b) working effectively with others;</p> <p>c) decision-making in complex contexts;</p> <p>d) ability to manage their own learning in changing circumstances, both within and outside the discipline and to select an appropriate program of further study;</p> <p>e) behaviour consistent with academic integrity and social responsibility; and</p> <p>f) behaviour consistent with exercising intercultural sensitivity.</p>
--	--	---

With Revisions specific to Queen's University

	Master's degree This degree is awarded to students who have demonstrated the following:	Doctoral degree This degree extends the skills associated with the master's degree and is awarded to students who have demonstrated the following:
Depth and Breadth of Knowledge	<p>a) A systematic understanding of knowledge, including, where appropriate, relevant knowledge outside the field and/or discipline, and a critical awareness of current problems and/or new insights, much of which are at, or informed by, the forefront of their academic discipline, field of study, or area of professional practice;</p> <p>b) A recognition of diverse worldviews, ways of knowing, abilities and experiences, including Indigenous perspectives; and</p> <p>c) A recognition of how one's field of study has developed over time.</p>	<p>a) A thorough understanding of a substantial body of knowledge that is at the forefront of their academic discipline or area of professional practice including, where appropriate, relevant knowledge outside the field and/or discipline;</p> <p>b) A critical engagement with diverse worldviews, ways of knowing, abilities, and experiences, including Indigenous perspectives; and</p> <p>c) A recognition of how one's field of study has developed over time.</p>
Research and Scholarship	<p>A conceptual understanding and methodological competence that:</p> <p>a) enables a working comprehension of how established techniques of research and inquiry are used to create and interpret knowledge in the discipline;</p> <p>b) enables a critical evaluation of current research and advanced research and scholarship in the discipline or area of professional competence, including recognizing potential inequities, biases or implicit assumptions;</p> <p>c) enables a treatment of complex issues and judgements based on established principles and techniques; and</p> <p>d) enables a recognition of diverse research methods, technologies, and ways of knowing to explore complex problems.</p>	<p>a) The ability to conceptualize, design, and implement research for the generation of new knowledge, applications, or understanding at the forefront of the discipline, and to adjust the research design or methodology in the light of unforeseen problems;</p> <p>b) The ability to make informed judgments on complex issues in specialist fields, sometimes requiring</p>

		e) The ability to ethically engage diverse communities and participants to advance research and scholarship and to benefit communities.
Level of Application of Knowledge	<p>a) Competence in the research process by applying an existing body of knowledge in the critical analysis of a new question or of a specific problem or issue in a new setting;</p> <p>b) originality in the application of knowledge; and</p> <p>c) application of context-appropriate approaches in the production, dissemination, and validation of knowledge.</p>	<p>The capacity to:</p> <p>a) undertake pure and/or applied research at an advanced level; and</p> <p>b) contribute to the development of academic or professional skills, techniques, tools, practices, ideas, theories, approaches, and/or materials; and</p> <p>c) apply context-appropriate approaches in the production, dissemination, and validation of knowledge.</p>
Professional Capacity/Autonomy	<p>a) The qualities and transferable skills necessary for employment requiring:</p> <p>i. the exercise of initiative and of personal responsibility and accountability; and</p> <p>ii. decision-making in complex situations;</p> <p>b) The intellectual independence required for continuing professional development;</p> <p>c) The ethical behaviour consistent with academic integrity and the use of appropriate guidelines and procedures for responsible conduct of research; and</p> <p>d) The ability to appreciate the broader implications of applying knowledge to particular contexts.</p>	<p>a) The qualities and transferable skills necessary for employment requiring the exercise of personal responsibility and largely autonomous initiative in complex situations;</p> <p>b) The intellectual independence to be academically and professionally engaged and current;</p> <p>c) The ethical behaviour consistent with academic integrity and the use of appropriate guidelines and procedures for responsible conduct of research;</p> <p>d) The ability to evaluate the broader implications of applying knowledge to particular contexts; and</p> <p>e) The ability to recognize inequitable power structures in the field.</p>

Level of Communication Skills

The(c)-4.9 (9)2.3 (it)-62 (-2.9 (e)-3.1 (x)8.4 1

	<p>c) to diverse audiences in ways that are accessible and inclusive; and</p> <p>d) in ways that demonstrate active listening skills.</p>	<p>d) in ways that demonstrate active listening skills.</p>
<p>Awareness of limits of knowledge</p>		