**Western’s Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP)**  
For Graduate Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Graduate Programs (Full Review &amp; Approval)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For the Introduction of New Graduate Programs (Requires External Consultants)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contents of the Brief:**

- **Objectives of the program**
  - Fit with University’s mission and academic plan
  - Appropriateness of requirements and learning outcomes in relation to “Graduate Degree Level Expectations”
  - Appropriateness of the degree nomenclature

- **Admission requirements**
  - Additional requirements (e.g., additional languages, portfolios, auditions)

- **Structure and regulations**
  - Course requirements
  - Progression requirements
  - Timeline for milestones
  - Rationale for program length

- **Program content**
  - Description of fields (if proposed)
  - Courses
  - Milestone requirements
  - Explain how the proposed curriculum addresses the current state of the discipline or area of study
  - Unique or innovative aspects
  - Nature and appropriateness of research requirements
  - Evidence that 2/3 of course content is clearly at the graduate level

- **Mode of delivery**
  - Appropriate for Degree Level Expectations

- **Assessment of teaching & learning**
  - Assessing achievement of Degree Level Expectations and learning outcomes

- **Proposed Tuition**
  - Tuition level proposed
  - For masters program, indicate whether the program will be Category 1 or Category 2
  - Describe plan for funding students and anticipated average funding per student

- **Resources**
  - Adequacy of unit’s human, physical and financial resources
  - Commitment to support the program
  - Participation of sufficient qualified faculty members
  - If fields are proposed, evidence of sufficient expertise and supervisory capacity for fields
  - Evidence of sufficient funding to support students and research
- Evidence of how supervisory loads will be distributed
- Evidence of how qualifications to supervise will be determined and evidence of the supervisory levels of the faculty members
- Evidence of appropriate library resources
- Evidence of appropriate lab/research facilities/resources/student work space
- Evidence of appropriate resources to foster and support a scholarly community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Indicators (SGPS can provide data for some indicators. Contact SGPS for details.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - Qualifications of faculty
- Evidence of research funding to support students and research
- Evidence of quality of intellectual student experience

### Process:

**Internal**

Prior to beginning the process of preparing the documentation to propose a new program, consultation should occur. See the document *Overview of the Process of Initiating the Proposal for a New Graduate Proposal* for an overview of the process that should precede submission for formal review.

- The program member with primary responsibility for preparation of the brief meets with the Vice-Provost (Graduate & Postdoctoral Studies) and/or the Co-Chairs of SUPR-G to discuss preparation of the brief and the process for appraisal
- The brief is submitted to SUPR-G
- SUPR-G determines Internal Reviewers
- Internal Reviewers review the brief
- The Co-Chairs of SUPR-G and the Vice-Provost (Graduate & Postdoctoral Studies) select two *external consultants* (see the document *Nomination and Selection of External Consultants for Graduate Program Reviews* for criteria)
- On-site visit of the external consultants, accompanied by the Internal Reviewers takes place
- The External Consultants submit a joint report to SUPR-G; the report is sent to the program, Department/School Chair/Director, and Dean with the request for a response
  - The program and department/school are required to submit a response (it can be a joint response or separate responses); the Dean may choose to submit a response.
- Internal Reviewers receive the External Consultants’ report, along with the program/department/school and Dean’s response to the report.
- Internal Reviewers prepare a summary report, including prioritized recommendations
- SUPR-G, on the basis of the external consultants’ report, the responses to the report, and the internal reviewers’ summary, makes one of the following recommended ratings to SCAPA (providing SCAPA with SUPR-G’s summary and recommendations):
  - Approval to commence
  - Approval to commence, with report
  - Deferral for up to one year, allowing the program to address issues raised
  - Against approval
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Simultaneously, SUPR-G provides the program with its summary and recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SCAPA reviews the documentation from SUPR-G and makes one of the following decisions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1) Approval to commence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Approval to commence, with report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3) Deferral for up to one year, allowing the program to address issues raised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4) Against approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Decisions 1 and 2 are forwarded to Senate for approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prior to making a recommendation, SCAPA may invite a representative from the program (e.g., the Department Chair, the Dean) to attend a meeting of SCAPA to provide additional information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SCAPA takes its recommendation to Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senate approves the recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Provost conducts a final review of the budgetary implications associated with the new program and provides final budgetary approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUPR-G submits a report to the GEC annually, summarizing all graduate program reviews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>External</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Provost’s Office submits the brief, the consultants’ report, the responses to the report, SUPR-G’s summary, and the recommendation of Senate to the Quality Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At the time at which this documentation is submitted to the Quality Council, the University can announce its intention to offer the program (noting that final approval is pending)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Quality Council provides all the information to the Appraisal Committee, which reviews all the documentation and makes a recommendation to the Quality Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Appraisal Committee may request additional information from the University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Based on the evaluation by the Appraisal Committee, the Quality Council will make one of the following recommended ratings:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Approval to commence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Approval to commence, with report (can be appealed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Deferral for up to one year, allowing University to address issues raised (can be appealed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Against approval (can be appealed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• When the Quality Council recommends against approval, or recommends deferral until issues are addressed, the brief will return to SUPR-G, who would have responsibility for working with the program to address the issues and/or discuss the viability of pursuing the program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Process for “With Report” Appraisals</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SCAPA and Senate’s recommendation to require a report necessitates the submission of a report, even if the Quality Council’s recommendation does not require a report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|   | In all cases where a report is required (either by SCAPA, the Quality Council, or both), the program submits the report to SUPR-G, which reviews the report on behalf of
SCAPA

a) Report to SUPR-G (as required by SCAPA and/or the Quality Council)
   o The report is submitted by the program to SUPR-G
   o SUPR-G makes one of the following recommended ratings to SCAPA:
     • Approved to continue without condition
     • Approved to continue, but additional information and report is required
     • Required to suspend admissions for a minimum of two years; specified
       conditions must be met before admissions can resume
   o SCAPA, prior to making its recommendation, may invite a representative of
     the program to a meeting of SCAPA to provide more information or clarification
   o SCAPA reports to Senate the outcome and recommendations following the review of
     the program’s report [reports will need to be submitted to SCAPA two months
     before they are due to the Quality Council to allow sufficient time for SCAPA to
     review the report and convey the outcome to Senate]

b) Report to the Quality Council
   o The report is submitted to the Quality Council by the Provost’s Office
   o The Quality Council makes one of the following recommended ratings:
     • Approved to continue without condition
     • Approved to continue, but additional information and report is required
     • Required to suspend admissions for a minimum of two years; specified
       conditions must be met before admissions can resume (the University can appeal
       this decision of the Appraisal Committee to the Quality Council)
   o In response to an appeal, the Quality Council will decide one of the following:
     • Approve the program without condition
     • Approve the program to continue with a further report
     • Require program to suspend admissions for a minimum of two years – this
       decision is final

| Quality Council reports its decisions to the University, to OCAV, and to MTCU. |
| The new program must commence within 36 months of the approval. |
| The first periodic appraisal of the new program must occur within 8 years after the first |
| intake into the program. |

Monitoring of the new program:
  • The Vice-Provost (SGPS), in collaboration with the Dean, will monitor the program to
    ensure that recommendations raised in the review process are addressed. During the
    period between the introduction of the new program and its first periodic review, the
    Dean will comment on the progress of the new program in the Faculty’s Annual Plan,
    addressing any concerns and resource limitations/needs.
  • The Vice-Provost (SGPS) will report on the progress of all new programs in the SGPS
    Annual Plan, identifying any concerns.
### Summary of Steps:

**Internal University Process**

1. Develop brief for new program (ensure that new program is supported by the Dean and is included in the Faculty Plan)
2. Submit brief to SUPR-G
3. SUPR-G assigns the brief to an Internal Reviewers
4. SUPR-G Co-Chairs and Vice-Provost appoint the external consultants
5. The consultants and internal reviewers review the brief, conduct an onsite visit, and submit a written report
6. The program, department/school, and Dean submit a response to the consultants’ report to the Internal Reviewers
7. The Internal Reviewers submit a summary, including prioritized recommendations, to SUPR-G
8. SUPR-G reviews the summary and makes a recommendation to SCAPA
9. SCAPA makes a recommendation to Senate and submits the final report to Senate and the program
10. The Provost provides final budgetary approval
11. The Provost submits the brief, the Consultants’ report, the responses, and the University’s recommendation to the Quality Council (university can announce intention to offer the program, stating that the program is pending final approval)

**Quality Council Process**

12. The Quality Council reviews the documentation for completeness and assigns the brief to an Appraisal Committee
13. The Appraisal Committee reviews the documentation and makes a recommendation to the Quality Council
14. The Quality Council gives approval to commence and notifies MTCU

**Follow-up Process**

15. The University begins intake into the program and monitors the progress of the program
16. The Dean reports on the recommendations in the final report through the annual planning process
17. If required, a report is submitted to SUPR-G and the Quality Council
18. The first periodic appraisal of the program is conducted within 8 years of the first intake into the program.

**Copies of all briefs, communication and documents related to the programs reviews, and the recommendations related to all reviews are stored in the office of the Vice-Provost, Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies**

- Dean’s and Department/Program Chairs will have access to these documents
- Senate will receive the executive summary of the review from SCAPA
- The summary, prioritized recommendations and evaluation rating will be posted publicly