



Royal Military College

Royal Military College Institutional Quality Assurance Process Manual

2022

ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE INSTITUTIONAL QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESS MANUAL

1. QUALITY ASSURANCE PRINCIPLES AT RMC

- 1.1 Quality Assurance and Ontario Universities**
- 1.2 Governing Principles of Quality Assurance**
- 1.3 University Degree Level Expectations**
- 1.4 RMC Mission Statement**
- 1.5 Responsibility for Academic Quality**
- 1.6 Elements of Quality Assurance**
 - 1.6.1 Overview of Five Protocols
- 1.7 Remedies (Accountability)**
 - 1.7.1 Possible remedies
- 1.8 RMC Authority Responsible**
- 1.9 Policy on Accessibility of Quality Assurance Documents**

PROTOCOLS FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE AT RMC:

2. PROTOCOL FOR NEW PROGRAM APPROVALS

- 2.1 RMC Institutional Process for New Program Approvals**
 - 2.1.1 Program Proposal
 - 2.1.2 Evaluation Criteria
 - 2.1.2.1 Program Objectives
 - 2.1.2.2 Program Requirements
 - 2.1.2.3 Program requirements for graduate programs only
 - 2.1.2.4 Assessment of Teaching and learning
 - 2.1.2.5 Admission requirements
 - 2.1.2.6 Resources
 - 2.1.2.7 Resources for graduate programs only
 - 2.1.2.8 Quality and other indicators
 - 2.1.3 Submission of Proposal to the RMC Board of Governors (BoG)
 - 2.1.4 Submission of Proposal to the Internal Review Committee (IRC)
 - 2.1.5 Submission for External Review
- 2.2 External Evaluation**
 - 2.2.1 The External Review Committee (ERC)
 - 2.2.1.1 Selection process
 - 2.2.1.2 Site Visit
 - 2.2.2 External Review Report
- 2.3 Internal perspective**
 - 2.3.1 Internal program response
- 2.4 Institutional approval**
 - 2.4.1 Faculty Board/Faculty Council Approval
 - 2.4.2 Senate Approval
- 2.5 Submission to Quality Assurance Secretariat**

- 2.6 **Appraisal process**
 - 2.6.1 Secretariat verification
 - 2.6.2 Appraisal committee reviews
 - 2.6.3 Quality Council decision
 - 2.7 **Announcement of new program**
 - 2.7.1 Reconsideration of appeal committee
 - 2.7.2 Appeals to the Quality Council
 - 2.7.3 Quality Council reports decision on appeal
 - 2.7.4 Waiting Period for resubmission
 - 2.8 **Post Appraisal follow up**
 - 2.8.1 Program approved to commence with report (2.6.3.b)
 - 2.8.2 Appeal follow up report decision
 - 2.9 **Implementing the approved program**
 - 2.9.1 Implementation window
 - 2.9.2 Ongoing monitoring and program implementation
 - 2.9.3 First cyclical review
 - 2.9.4 Selection for Cyclical Audit
- 3. PROTOCOL FOR EXPEDITED APPROVALS**
- 3.1 **Proposal for Expedited Approvals**
 - 3.1.1 Components of the proposal
 - 3.2 **Decision**
 - 3.3 **Selection for cyclical audit**
- 4. PROTOCOL FOR MAJOR MODIFICATION PROGRAM**
- 4.1 **Major modifications to existing programs at RMC**
 - 4.1.1 Objectives
 - 4.1.2 Scope
 - 4.1.3 Process
 - 4.1.3.1 Criteria for Major Modifications
 - 4.1.3.2 Criteria for New Programs
 - 4.1.4 Other Program changes
 - 4.1.4.1 Program changes not to the level of Major Mods
 - 4.2 **Closure of academic Programs**
 - 4.3 **Annual Report to the Quality Council**
 - 4.3.1 Annual submission by Program Chair
 - 4.4 **Selection for Cyclical Audit**
- 5. PROTOCOL FOR CYCLICAL PROGRAM REVIEWS**
- 5.0 **Objective and Scope**
 - 5.1 **RMC Institutional Process**
 - 5.1.1 Schedule of Cyclical Reviews
 - 5.1.1.1 Review of Joint Programs
 - 5.1.2 Initiation of Programs Cyclical Review Process (CPR)

- 5.1.2.1 Application for deferral of CPR
 - 5.1.2.2 Support to Programs under review
 - 5.1.3 Self-Study
 - 5.1.3.0 Structure of the Self-Study Report (SSR)
 - 5.1.3.1 Evaluation Criteria
 - 5.1.3.1.1 Program Objectives
 - 5.1.3.1.2 Program requirements
 - 5.1.3.1.3 Program requirements for graduate programs
 - 5.1.3.1.4 Assessment of Teaching and Learning
 - 5.1.3.1.5 Admission requirements
 - 5.1.3.1.6 Resources
 - 5.1.3.1.7 Resources for graduate programs only
 - 5.1.3.1.8 Quality Indicators
- 5.2 **External Evaluation**
 - 5.2.1 The External Review Committee (ERC)
 - 5.2.1.1 Selection of the external reviewers
 - 5.2.1.2 The Site Visit
 - 5.2.3 The ERC Report
 - 5.2.4 Structure of the ERC Report
- 5.3 **Internal perspective**
 - 5.3.1 Internal response
 - 5.3.1.1 Program Response to the ERC Report
 - 5.3.2 Final Assessment Report and Implementation Plan
 - 5.3.3 Senate Review and Submission Approval
- 5.4 **Reporting Requirements**
 - 5.4.1 Internal reporting requirements
 - 5.4.2 External reporting requirements
- 5.5 **Use of Accreditation and other external reviews in the Institutional Quality Assurance Process**
- 5.6 **Selection of Cyclical Audit**

6. **AUDIT PROTOCOL**

- 6.1 **Purpose and timing of the Audit**
- 6.2 **Cyclical Audit Process**
 - 6.2.1 Pre-orientation and briefing
 - 6.2.2 Assignment of the auditors
 - 6.2.3 Institutional Self-Study
 - 6.2.4 Selection of the sample of QA Activities for audit
 - 6.2.5 Desk audit
 - 6.2.6 Site visit
 - 6.2.7 Audit report
 - 6.2.8 Disposition of the audit report
 - 6.2.9 Transmittal of the audit report
 - 6.2.10 Publication of main audit findings
 - 6.2.11 Institutional Follow up response report

6.2.12 Web publication requirements

6.3 **Focused Audit**

6.3.1 The Focused Audit report

Appendix 1: Definitions

Appendix 2: Acronyms

Appendix 3: RMC Degree-Level Expectations (UUDLEs and GDLEs)

Appendix 4: Tables of Action Items for Faculty and Staff

Appendix 5: Choosing Arm's Length Reviewers

Appendix 6: Scheduled of Cyclical Program Reviews

Appendix 7: RMC Core Curriculum Program Level Learning Outcomes

**ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE
INSTITUTIONAL QUALITY
ASSURANCE PROCESS MANUAL (RMC IQAP)**

Reference A: *Quality Assurance Framework*, Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance, 23 February 2021 (<https://oucqa.ca/resources-publications/quality-assurance-framework/>)

Reference B: *Codicil to RMC IQAP v.3.0*, RMC Internal Review Committee, 15 Jan 2022

1. INTRODUCTION

A glossary of terms used in this manual is found in Appendix 1, and a list of acronyms in Appendix 2.

1.1 Background on Quality Assurance and Ontario Universities

The governing body that oversees and approves the quality of all academic Programs across the province is the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance, hereafter referred to as the OUCQA or the Quality Council (QC). Since 2010, the Quality Assurance Framework developed by the Quality Council (QC) has governed all universities in Ontario. As part of their ongoing commitment to improvement, QC's framework was itself reviewed by an external expert panel in 2018; the results of which formed the basis of the updated framework (ratified in 2021). This new framework reaffirms that systematic reviews of both new and existing Programs are an essential part of responsible self-governance. Moreover, the revised QAF has implemented new recommendations from the external review that seek to strengthen a culture of continuous improvement while promoting accountability and transparency. RMC's IQAP, like the QAF, is organized into Principles and Protocols which have been designed to balance accountability with the need to encourage innovative curricular design.

The Quality Council requires that universities' Internal Quality Assurance processes (IQAP) comply with the Quality Assurance Framework (QAF). This manual specifies the processes that RMC uses to conform to these province-wide standards, while reflecting the unique character, mandate and priorities of RMC as the University of the Canadian Armed Forces. RMC is committed to the Principles and Protocols outlined in this IQAP, which promote a vision of a student centered education that is open, accountable and transparent. This IQAP manual and any future revisions are subject to the approval of the Quality Council.

1.2 Guiding Principles on Quality Assurance at RMC

As part of the ongoing commitment to a robust system of quality assurance that reflects international standards, RMC renews its commitment to quality assurance

as outlined in the Quality Assurance Framework (2021). In particular, RMC commits to the following principles:

Experience of the Student

Principle 1: The best interest of students is at the core of quality assurance activities. Quality assurance is ultimately about the centrality of the student experience in Ontario. It is about student achievement in programs that lead to a degree or diploma; about ensuring the value of the university degree in Ontario, and of ensuring that our highly qualified graduates continue to be strong and innovative contributors to the well-being of Ontario's economy and society.

Oversight by an Independent Body

Principle 2: While primary responsibility for quality assurance in all undergraduate and graduate programs offered by Ontario Universities rests with the institutions themselves, the universities have vested in the Quality Council final authority for decisions concerning all aspects of quality assurance.

Principle 3: The Quality Council operates at arm's length from both the institutions and the government to ensure its independence of action and decision.

Principle 4: With this responsibility to grant and withhold approval comes the Quality Council's recourse to substantial sanctions and remediation for use when necessary and as a last resort.

Principle 5: The Quality Council will have due and iterative processes in consultations with institutions, and have robust appeal processes.

Principle 6: The Quality Council itself will undergo a regular periodic quality assessment review by a review committee that includes, equally, reviewers who are external to the system and to the province, and reviewers who are internal to the system and to the province. This review will take place at least every eight years.

Autonomy of Universities

Principle 7: The Quality Council acknowledges and respects the autonomy of the institutions and the role of senates and other internal bodies in ensuring the quality of academic programs as well as determining priorities for funding, space, and faculty allocation.

Principle 8: The institutions have vested in the Quality Council the final authority for decisions concerning ratification of **Institutional Quality Assurance Processes (IQAPS)**, approval of new programs and compliance with the Audit Protocols. As the primary agents for quality assurance, all institutions have

designed and implemented their own IQAP that is consistent not just with their own mission statements and their university Degree Level Expectations, but also demonstrably embodies the principles and procedures articulated in this Quality Assurance Framework.

Transparency

Principle 9: The Quality Council operates in accordance with publicly communicated principles, policies and procedures. Both the Quality Council's assessment process and the internal quality assurance process of individual institutions is open, transparent, and accountable, except as limited by constraints of laws and regulations for the protection of individuals.

Increased Responsibility for Quality Assurance

Principle 10: The Quality Council facilitates efficient institutional procedures, appreciating that processes for ensuring quality will be different from one institution to another, but requiring that all must comply with the broad processes identified in the Quality Assurance Framework.

Principle 11: The over-riding approach of the Quality Council is education, guidance, persuasion and negotiation. In this regard, the Council recognizes that institutional capacity for quality assurance differs between institutions and so resources of the system will be directed to those institutions that continue to face challenges.

Principle 12: The Quality Council recognizes past performance of institutions and adjusts oversight accordingly.

Continuous Monitoring and Quality Improvement

Principle 13: Quality is not static, and continuous program improvement should be a driver of quality assurance and be measurable. An important goal for quality assurance is to reach beyond merely demonstrating quality at a moment in time and to demonstrate ongoing and continuous quality improvement. The Quality Council is committed to sharing effective best practices in quality assurance to assist institutions in their quality improvement work.

Expert Independent Peer Review

Principle 14: Whether for new programs or cyclical review of existing programs, expert independent peer review is foundational to quality assurance.

Appropriate Standards

Principle 15: The Quality Council's standards are appropriate to the nature and level of degree programs, are flexible and respectful of institutions and international standards, and encourage innovation and creativity in degree programming. In applying these standards, documentation should be significantly relevant to decision-making, and not be burdensome.

1.3 University Degree Level Expectations

[See Appendix 3: RMC Undergraduate and Graduate Degree Level Expectations](#)

The OUCQA quality assurance process consists of two parts: 1) a clear articulation of specific expectations for graduates of a particular academic Program; and 2) systematic processes to identify and assess how the various components of the Program instill those capabilities in its graduates.

The Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents (OCAV) has identified generic benchmarks of student performance at both the undergraduate and graduate levels in the Framework document [Reference A]. These University Undergraduate and Graduate Degree Level Expectations (UUDLEs and GDLEs) outline specific expected skill attainments in individual academic Programs, as well as required knowledge in broader, more general subjects. Each university is expected to articulate its own undergraduate and graduate level expectations so as to meet these minimum OUCQA requirements, as well as to reflect the particular mandate, vision and expertise of the individual institution. RMC has therefore added to these OUCQA expectations to accommodate the priorities and strengths specific to the RMC unique learning environment and its position as Canada's military university. Appendix 3 lists the current approved RMC degree level expectations. In addition, each department may develop its own DLEs, specific to its Program(s), to be housed outside of the RMC IQAP and updated as part of each cyclical review.

1.4 RMC Mission Statement

The mission of the Royal Military College (RMC) is to produce officers with the mental, physical and linguistic capabilities and the ethical foundation required to lead with distinction in the Canadian Armed Forces (CAF). To accomplish this mission, RMC will deliver undergraduate academic Programs, together with a range of complementary Programs. These Programs will be offered in both official languages. As Canada's military university, RMC will also provide undergraduate and post-graduate Programs, and professional development education, both on campus and at a distance, to meet the needs of other members of the CAF and DND. As a national institution, RMC will also endeavour to share its knowledge with civilians with interest in defence issues. RMC will encourage research appropriate to a modern university and seek out research opportunities that support the profession of arms.

Achieving the Mission

The core residential undergraduate programs are focused on Officer Cadets of the Regular Officer Training Plan (ROTP), the Reserve Entry Training Plan (RETP) or the University Training Plan - Non-Commissioned Members (UTPNM). These demanding, multi-faceted Programs are aimed directly at students who will serve in the Canadian Armed Forces as officers immediately upon graduation. Their university Programs are undertaken in parallel with the extensive leadership, athletics and bilingualism training that are key components of their training as future officers.

However, there are also many Canadian Armed Forces members who undertake the same RMC academic Programs via distance education in remote locations within Canada and throughout the world. Others are members of the Canadian Armed Forces Reserves, often distance education students, but sometimes completing the Programs as full time students at the main campus. All these students must complete all components the academic Programs at RMC.

With respect to the undergraduate Programs at RMC, this IQAP applies to the academic, athletic and Second Language components of those Programs. These programs reflect the unique mission of RMC as the Canadian military university with a national vision of educating leaders for the country. Graduates receive an education of atypical breadth which is oriented towards those issues fundamental to the modern profession of arms.

To accomplish this special mission, the combination of arts and sciences common to all liberal undergraduate education in Canada is augmented and refocused to provide graduates with a body of knowledge appropriate for military service in a democracy. All Programs, including science and engineering, require a study of international and Canadian military history, military theory and strategy, civics, Canadian government and military law. Furthermore, all, including humanities Programs, include an exposure to modern science and emerging technology and their impact on all aspects of military affairs. Finally, all Programs include the contemporary theory and practice of leadership, particularly its ethical component.

In post-graduate Programs, there are no standard course requirements specifically aimed at the unique RMC mission. Rather, that mission is expressed, in many Programs, either directly or indirectly through the research undertaken by students and their faculty supervisors. In many cases, this research is oriented towards military topics and the military applications of traditional academic disciplines. Many faculty members form partnerships with the Department of National Defence and the Canadian Armed Forces, which inherently focus the graduate students towards the broader support of the country's military activities and often permit close integration between the scholarly activities of the students and the specific needs and interests of the Forces. Faculty and post-graduate student research that is less directly applicable to the CAF supports the RMC mission by keeping the faculty active in their respective disciplines, to the benefit of the undergraduate and graduate Programs that are central to that mission.

In New Program Proposals and in Self-Study Reports for Cyclical Reviews, the RMC mission statement above is to be supplemented with statements about the Faculty and Program mission.

1.5 Responsibility for Academic Quality

[See Appendix 4: Table of Action Items for Faculty and Staff](#)

RMC jointly bears the responsibility for ensuring the quality of all of its Programs with the Quality Council. There are three levels of assessment for quality assurance: primary, secondary and tertiary. The three levels of assessment provide both internal and external overview that allow for continuous improvement and accountability.

Primary assessment (Annual Implementations Updates and Self-Study Reports) occurs on an ongoing basis internally, Programs at the unit level engage in self-study and self-reflection drawing upon those who participate in the Program (faculty, students, staff and alumni). This activity is ongoing and is captured in annual progress reports provided by programs to RMC's Office of Quality Assurance.

See Protocol on Cyclical Program Review ([Annual monitoring process](#))

Secondary assessment (Cyclical Program Reviews) involves independent external review conducted by qualified peers. This review must be at arm's length to ensure a fair and impartial assessment and review all primary assessment activities to ensure they comply with the QAF. Secondary assessments occur on a cyclical basis no less than every 8 years.

See Protocol on Cyclical Program Review ([5.0 CPR Protocol](#))

Tertiary assessment (Institutional audits) these are audits conducted by the Quality Council of all Quality Assurance activities conducted by RMC. Institutional audits occur every 8yrs, RMC was last audited in 2015 with future audits scheduled in 2023 and 2031. The purpose of these audits is to verify that all Primary and Secondary assessments are comprehensive and meet the standards outlined in the QAF.

See Protocol on Audits ([6.0 Audit Protocol](#))

The scope of this IQAP includes the content and modes of delivery of all programs at RMC as well as all academic and student services that affect their quality. The responsibility for quality assurance extends to all new and continuing undergraduate and graduate degree and diploma Programs, whether offered in full, in part, or conjointly by any institutions affiliated with RMC.

The RMC IQAP has been created to meet the requirements of the Quality Council. It provides the framework and templates to assist programs as they conduct comprehensive, constructive, and meaningful reviews. This manual

specifies the processes to be used for all types of reviews as well as proposals for changes. Some of the processes are completed through to the final approval stage entirely within RMC, following the IQAP processes that themselves have been reviewed and approved by the Quality Council. Others require Quality Council approval as the final step before RMC can implement the proposal.

1.6 The Elements of Quality Assurance:

1.6.1 The Quality Assurance Framework consists of five distinct protocols defined in this IQAP. They are discussed in the following order:

- 1) New program approvals
- 2) Expedited approvals
- 3) Major Modifications to an existing Program
- 4) Cyclical Program reviews (of existing Programs);
- 5) Institutional Audits

These protocols outline the processes to be followed and the responsibilities of the various personnel involved at RMC for each. Specific actions required are outlined in Appendix 4.

With the founding of the QC in 2010 and the subsequent establishment of official, province-wide approval processes for Program reviews, all of these reviews are overseen by the QC. The QC is also responsible for approving new Programs. Previous processes, such as the review of graduate Programs under the auspices of the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies (OCGS), or the Undergraduate Program Review Audit Committee (UPRAC), are now replaced entirely by the new QC processes.

Professional accreditation Programs, such as those carried out under the authority of the Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board (CEAB), will continue. However, institutions are free to add to those existing accreditation processes, where appropriate, in order to allow the professional accreditation process already in place to meet all the requirements of the QC at the same time. RMC has chosen to supplement the CEAB accreditation process with the additional requirements of its IQAP review in order to avoid having to carry out separate IQAP and CEAB processes.

In order to meet the institutional audits undertaken by the QC on all these reviews, the RMC IQAP has been developed using the rubric laid out in the QC's Framework document [Reference A]. Beginning in 2011, all RMC academic Programs began using the IQAP laid out in this manual as the framework for their reviews, adding specific details and objectives as they deem appropriate for their disciplines. At a minimum, all reviews must provide the information outlined in this document relevant to the type of review being conducted.

1.7 Remedies available to the Quality council

One of the significant changes to the revised Quality Assurance Framework (2021) is the increased emphasis placed on institutional accountability. This is achieved through the various stages of assessment (primary, secondary and tertiary). Secondary and tertiary assessments include external reviews which are fundamental to ensuring accountability and continuous improvement of RMC's Programs.

1.7.1 Possible Remedies If the Quality Council is not convinced that the administration of RMC's IQAP meets the QAF standards at any of the stages of assessment it can:

- Require a report on steps taken where deficiencies are minimal
- Issue directives with a response within a short timeframe about steps to be taken
- Where measures are not satisfactory, provide a report or forward a report to the Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents (OCAV) and the Ministry of Colleges and Universities (MCU)
- Initiate rolling or accelerated audits of all institutional internal IQAP processes
- Finally, if these measures fail, decline to approve or suspend enrollment in particular Programs where the processes are deficient, and/or suspend RMC's ability to create new programs.

1.8 RMC Authority Responsible

- a) The authority responsible for the RMC IQAP is the Senate.
- b) The Vice Principal (Academic) is the authoritative contact between RMC and the QC in all matters related to the RMC IQAP.
- c) The RMC Office of Quality Assurance (QA) will provide guidance and support to Faculties carrying out reviews. The chair or head of department responsible for the Program (referred to hereafter as the Program chair) under review takes the primary responsibility in collecting, aggregating and distributing the raw data required. QA will assist by providing quantitative data, standard surveys and templates. Analysis of QA reports and data is the responsibility of the Program Head.
- d) The QA Office is responsible for the systematic maintenance of this IQAP manual and for seeking approval from the QC for any revisions to it. QA will also archive all the documents produced for program reviews in accordance with this IQAP manual, as required by the QC for audit purposes and annual reporting. The Audit Protocol of this document provides a full description of the audit process undertaken by the QC to ensure that Cyclical Reviews, New Program Proposals and Program Change Proposals follow the procedures outlined in the RMC IQAP manual, as approved by the QC.

1.9 Policy on Accessibility of Quality Assurance Documents

The RMC quality assurance processes are open and transparent, comprising input from most members the RMC community, as well as from external reviewers. It is the policy of RMC that all documents produced as part of the IQAP are accessible to all students and staff of the university, with the sole exception of portions that are directly related to confidential personnel issues. The latter will be identified by the responsible Faculty Deans, and will be annotated and dealt with according to RMC and DND document security policies.

As part of the processes described here, QA will receive copies of all documents created under this IQAP and will archive these documents as required for audit purposes by the QC. Further, QA will distribute ‘Action and Document Reception Checklists’ to all Programs undertaking all processes outlined in this manual. Regular verifications between QA and Programs undergoing cyclical review will be maintained throughout the duration of each process. Program chairs will be responsible to respond to requests for information or documents in a timely manner.

2. PROTOCOL FOR NEW PROGRAM APPROVALS

Objective

The Protocol is designed to ensure that in developing new programs, universities ensure that the educational experiences offered to students are engaging and rigorous, and that the approved programs provided are routinely monitored and, if necessary, revised. Continuous improvement is fundamental to quality assurance and, thus, an important objective of this Protocol is to ensure that the universities' IQAPs include sufficient monitoring plans for new programs to ensure continuous improvement.

Scope

The Protocol for New Program Approvals applies to both new undergraduate and new graduate programs (but not to new for-credit graduate diplomas, which go through the Protocol for Expedited Approval) whether offered by one institution or jointly with another institution.

Process

The primary responsibility for the design and quality assurance of new programs lies internally, with universities and their governing bodies. Once approved internally, The Quality Council's Appraisal Committee reviews the Proposals. The Council has the final authority to approve (with or without conditions) or decline New Program Proposals.

2.1 RMC Institutional Process for New Program Approvals

The process by which a new academic program meeting the requirements of OUCQA essentially consists of three aspects. The primary component is the drafting of a detailed proposal by the RMC academic department(s) wishing to initiate a new Program; the RMC Board of Governors' approval to proceed with the proposal; and the internal review of the proposal. This internal approval procedure is augmented by two additional reviews:

- 1) An external peer review of the proposal early in the process.
- 2) A final approval by the Quality Council after the final RMC internal approval but before the Program is actually offered.

Graduate Programs wishing to declare new fields, which are considered to be major modifications, may request the endorsement of the Quality Council before advertising said fields, but this process follows the guidelines for changes to an existing Program outlined below in section 4 of this IQAP.

The VP Academic is the authoritative contact between RMC and the Quality Council, and QA will provide guidance and support, based on this IQAP manual, in the review process if necessary.

2.1.1 Program Proposal

The brief is prepared by the Program Head and designated Program faculty, in accordance with the requirements outlined below. The Proposal will minimally address the evaluation criteria detailed in 2.1.2. Where appropriate, the Proposal should also include the identification of unique curriculum or program innovations, creative components, or significant high impact practices. QA will provide a template for all New Program submissions that is mandatory for all RMC programs.

2.1.2 Evaluation Criteria

All evaluation criteria listed below must be included in the Proposal Brief:

2.1.2.1 Program objectives

- a) Clarity of the program's objectives;
- b) Appropriateness of degree nomenclature given the program's objectives; and
- c) Consistency of the program's objectives with the institution's mission and Academic plans.

2.1.2.2 Program Requirements

- a) Appropriateness of the program's structure and the requirements to meet its objectives and the program-level learning outcomes;
- b) Appropriateness of the program's structure, requirements and program-level learning outcomes in meeting the institution's own undergraduate or graduate Degree Level Expectations;
- c) Appropriateness and effectiveness of the mode(s) of delivery (*definition: mode or delivery*) to facilitate students' successful completion of the program-level learning outcomes; and
- d) Ways in which the curriculum addresses the current state of the discipline or area of study

A review of the RMC and Program-specific Degree Level Expectations for the Program and a map of how the Program requirements fulfill these expectations (for both English and French streams and for general, major and Honours, as applicable, in the case of undergraduate Programs). Appendix 3 lists the current approved RMC degree level expectations. In addition, each department must develop its own Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs), specific to its Program(s), to be housed outside of the RMC IQAP.

2.1.2.3 Program requirements for graduate programs only

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

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

2.1.2.4 Assessment of Teaching and Learning

- a) Appropriateness and effectiveness of the methods for assessing student achievement of the program-level learning outcomes and degree level expectations; and
- b) Appropriateness and effectiveness of the plans to monitor and assess:
 - i. The overall quality of the program;
 - ii. Whether the program continues to achieve in practice its objectives;
 - iii. Whether its students are achieving the program-level learning outcomes; and
 - iv. How the resulting information will be documented and subsequently used to inform continuous program improvement.

2.1.2.5 Admission requirements

- a) Appropriateness of the program's admission requirements given the program's objectives and program-level learning outcomes; and
- b) 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.

2.1.2.6 Resources

Given the program's planned /anticipated class sizes and cohorts as well as its program-level learning outcomes:

- a) Participation of a sufficient number and quality of core faculty who are competent to teach and/or supervise in and achieve the goals of the program and foster the appropriate academic environment;
- b) If applicable, discussion/explanation of 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;
- c) If required, provision of supervision of experiential learning opportunities;

- d) Adequacy of the administrative unit's planned utilization of existing human, physical and financial resources, including implications for the impact on other existing programs at the university;
- e) Evidence that there are adequate resources to sustain the quality of scholarship and research activities produced by students, including library support, information technology support, and laboratory access; and
- f) If necessary, additional institutional resource commitments to support the program in step with its ongoing implementation.

2.1.2.7 Resources for graduate programs only

Given the program's planned/anticipated class sizes and cohorts as well as its program-level learning outcomes:

- a) Evidence that faculty have the recent research or professional/clinical expertise needed to sustain the program, promote innovation, and foster an appropriate intellectual climate;
- b) Where appropriate to the program, evidence that financial assistance for students will be sufficient to ensure adequate quality and numbers of students; and
- c) Evidence of how supervisory loads will be distributed, in light of qualifications and appointment status of the faculty.
- d) Proposed budget for the Program, with clarification of whether the Program is to be cost-recovery.

2.1.2.8 Quality Indicators

- a) 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); and
- b) Any other evidence that the program and faculty will ensure the intellectual quality of the student experience.

2.1.3 Submission of Proposal to the RMC Board of Governors (BoG)

The brief will be vetted by the appropriate Dean then submitted via the appropriate academic channels to the RMC Board of Governors for review and subsequent approval and authority to proceed with the creation of the new Program. A copy of the brief will also be forwarded to QA.

2.1.4 Submission of Proposal to the Internal Review Committee (IRC)

Upon the approval from the BoG to continue with the process, the brief will be submitted through the appropriate Dean to the relevant Internal Review Committee (IRC) – Syllabus Committee for undergraduate

Programs, Graduate Studies Committee for post-graduate Programs, for subsequent recommendation through the Faculty Council, towards a final approval by Senate. The IRC will review the proposal for completeness in accordance with section **3.1.1 Components of the Proposal**. Should the IRC deem that further elaboration or clarification is necessary; the proposal will be returned to the Program Head to make appropriate revisions. The proposal would then be resubmitted to the IRC for its review.

2.1.5 Submission for External Review

After revisions of the New Program Proposal Brief deemed appropriate by the Department following the internal review, the Program Head will submit the document through the appropriate Dean to the external reviewers who have agreed to carry out the review.

2.2. External Evaluation

An external evaluation of the Program is a necessary element of the new program approval process. The external evaluation includes a Site Visit conducted by the External Review Committee (ERC). During the review process, the office of the Faculty Dean will be the liaison between the Program and the ERC while documents are in play; all documentation related to the New Program Proposal, the Reviewer's Report, and the Internal Response is to be handled exclusively by the Dean's Office to obviate direct communication between the Program and the External Reviewers, and copies of all documentation should be forwarded to QA at the time of their circulation.

External review of undergraduate programs will normally be conducted on-site, but the Vice Principal Academic may propose that the review be conducted by desk review, virtual site visit or an equivalent method if the external reviewers are satisfied that the off-site option is acceptable. The VPA must provide a clear justification for the decision to use these alternatives.

External review of a new doctoral Program Proposal must incorporate an on-site visit. Certain master's programs (e.g., professional master's programs that are fully online) may also be conducted by desk review, virtual site visit or an equivalent method if both the VPA and external reviewers are satisfied that the off-site option is acceptable. On-site visits are required for all other master's and doctoral programs.

2.2.1 The External Review Committee (ERC)

The Program Head, in consultation with the program faculty members, will nominate potential external reviewers. There must be at two external reviewers and one internal reviewer who is from within RMC but external to the discipline or interdisciplinary group being reviewed. In the case of bilingual Programs, at least one reviewer should be bilingual. The ERC members will be active and respected in their fields—usually they will be

associate or full professors with Program management experience—and they will be at arm’s length from the Program under review (i.e., not collaborators, supervisors, supervisees, relatives, etc.). Using Appendix 5 **Choosing Arm’s length Reviewers** the Deans will complete an ERC Verification Checklist to be returned to QA. Care will be taken by the appropriate Dean(s) to vet each reviewer for any possible conflict of interest.

The Program Head therefore must confirm with the Dean’s office that the necessary financial resources are available for the cost of any anticipated Site Visit before asking the Dean to extend the invitation to the prospective reviewers.

2.2.1.1 Selection of External Reviewers:

- a) Three to five names of recommended External Reviewers will be put forward, ranked in order of preference, if applicable, and submitted to the appropriate Dean by the Head of the Program under review. The Head will also propose 2-3 names of recommended internal reviewers to the appropriate Dean.
- b) The reviewers will normally be associate or full professors, or the equivalent, with Program management experience, including an appreciation of pedagogy and learning outcomes, and will be at arm’s length from the department proposing the new Program.
- c) At the same time, the Head will identify several two-day blocks suitable for the Site Visit. If the visit is approved to take place virtually, the Program Head will consult with the reviewers to establish alternate scheduling options (online visits should be spread out over 3 to 5 days where possible).
- d) The Dean(s) will make final decisions on the external and internal reviewers, while ensuring that, for the internal reviewer, his/her teaching workload and other duties will not be adversely affected
- e) The Dean will send written invitations to the proposed reviewers inviting them to serve and including the possible dates for the Site Visit. Based on responses from the reviewers, the date of the Site Visit will be finalized.
- f) The Dean’s office will arrange all travel and accommodations for members of the ERC and begin the process of arranging payment of honoraria for the ERC members. All payments associated with the external visitor will be paid from the Dean’s budget.
- g) Once the membership of the ERC is confirmed, the Program Head will submit the Program proposal, including additional documentation such as Faculty CV’s to the Faculty Dean, who will review and approve it before sending it (electronically) to each member of the ERC. The Dean will also forward a copy of this material to QA at this time

specifically noting that the Self-Study has been approved. The ERC is to receive this material at least six weeks before the Site Visit. The Dean will also provide the ERC member(s) the ERC Report Template (QA to provide this).

- g) Deans will complete an ERC Verification Checklist to be returned to QA. Care will be taken by the appropriate Dean(s) to vet each reviewer for any possible conflict of interest. Additional ERC members from industry or professions may be assigned in certain fields as appropriate (i.e., especially in professional Programs).

2.2.1.2 The Site Visit

See section 5.2.1.2 for details pertaining to the site visit.

2.2.2 External Reviewers Report

Once completed, a copy of the ERC's Report will be forwarded to QA. The External Review Report(s) (preferably one joint report, where circumstances permit) will include:

- a) Address the substance of the New Program Proposal;
- b) Respond to the evaluation criteria set out in Framework Section [2.1.2 Evaluation Criteria](#) (see also template for the External Review Report);
- c) Comment on the adequacy of existing physical, human (Based, in part, on the external reviewers' assessment of the faculty members' education, background, competence and expertise as evidenced in their CVs) and financial resources;
- d) Acknowledge any clearly innovative aspects of the proposed program together with recommendations on any essential or otherwise desirable modifications to it.

2.3 Internal perspective

2.3.1 Internal Response

RMC's internal response will be based upon the feedback from the program submitting the proposal and the responsible Dean(s). It is essential that each make clearly separate responses to the External Review Report(s) and recommendations. The exception to this requirement for separate responses is in the case of single-department Faculty, where the Dean is essentially the Divisional Head. Any subsequent amendments to the New Program Proposal should be made through track changes. Once complete, the internal response will be forwarded to the appropriate Dean and to QA.

2.4 Institutional Approval

2.4.1 Faculty Council/Board Approval

In the case of undergraduate Programs, the Program Proposal brief, amended as deemed appropriate by the Internal Review Committee, along with the External Reviewers' Report and the internal response, will be submitted for Faculty Council's recommendation via the Syllabus Committee and Faculty Board, to the Senate for its approval.

In the case of post-graduate Programs, the Program Proposal brief, amended as deemed appropriate by the department, along with the External Reviewers' Report and the internal response, will be submitted for recommendations for approval by Senate via the Graduate Studies Committee and onward transmission directly to Faculty Council. Approval of the Program Brief for graduate Programs goes through the Graduate Studies Committee which is responsible for advising Faculty Council on all aspects of graduate studies, including questions of resources (funding, library, computing, space, etc.) and student quality of life (civilian/military culture, fees, etc.), and for serving as the Graduate Studies Syllabus Committee in recommending graduate studies syllabus changes to Faculty Council, such as approval and deletion of graduate courses, regulations on eligibility, admission to the Graduate Studies faculty, requirements for graduate degrees, etc.

In both cases, the Faculty Dean will present his or her review and recommendations to Faculty Council, including budgetary and staffing implications of the Program, if approved. A copy will be forwarded to QA.

2.4.2 Senate Approval

If the proposal receives the support of Faculty Council, the Brief is submitted to Senate for final internal approval. The Faculty Dean will ensure that the entire package (Proposal Brief, Reviewers' Report and Internal Response) is prepared and submitted to Senate for final approval. The Secretary of the Senate will send a copy of the key portions of the Senate minutes concerning the proposal to QA for audit purposes.

2.5 Submission to Quality Assurance Secretariat

If approved by Senate, the Program proposal package will be sent to the Quality Council Secretariat by the VP Academic, requesting approval to deliver the Program. Submission package should include a brief commentary on the qualifications of the external reviewers.

2.6 Appraisal process

2.6.1 Secretariat verification

The Quality Assurance Secretariat will confirm that all elements of the proposal are included and meet the standards as outlined in section 2.2 – 2.4. If the Proposal is found to be lacking it will be returned to RMC for

resubmission. Once all requirements are met the Proposal and accompanying documents will be forwarded to the Quality Council Appraisal Committee.

2.6.2 Appraisal Committee reviews

The Quality Council's Appraisal Committee will focus its review on the following elements of the submission:

- a) Overall sufficiency of the External Review Report(s);
- b) Recommendations and suggestions made by the external reviewers, including on the sufficiency and quality of the planned human, physical and financial resources;
- c) Adequacy of the internal responses by the unit and Dean(s) to the recommendations, or otherwise for single department Faculty; and
- d) Adequacy of the proposed methods for Assessment of Teaching and Learning given the proposed program's structure, objectives, program-level learning outcomes and assessment methods. (See Evaluation Criteria 2.1.2.4 a) and b)

2.6.3 Quality Council Decision

After considering the recommendation of the Appraisal Committee, the Quality Council will make one of the following decisions:

- a) Approved to commence;
- b) Approved to commence, with report;
- c) Deferred for up to one year during which time the university may address identified issues and report back;
- d) Not approved; or
- e) Such other action as the Quality Council considers reasonable and appropriate in the circumstances.

Reports on new programs will only be required when significant additional action, such as a large number of new hires and/or other new resources, are required to assure the quality of the program.

The decision of the Quality Council will normally be made within 45 days of receipt of the university's submission, provided that the submission is complete and in good order, and that no further information or external expert advice is required. Where additional information is required by the Appraisal Committee, one of the four possible recommendations (see above) to the Council will be made within a further 30 days of receipt of a satisfactory response. The Quality Assurance Secretariat will convey the decision of the Quality Council to the university.

Once a decision is communicated to RMC, the VPA will notify the relevant Dean(s) and program coordinator(s). If a report is required (as stipulated in recommendation b), this requirement will be reported back to RMC's Faculty Council. With input from FC, the Dean responsible for the New Program will produce (or delegate) a report that will be submitted to VPA for final approval prior to submission to the QC.

2.7 Announcement of the New Program

Following its submission to the Quality Council, the institution may announce its intention to offer the Program, provided that clear indication is given that approval by the Quality Council is pending and that no offers of admission will be made until and unless the Program is approved by the Council. When such announcements are made at this stage, they must contain the following statement: "Prospective students are advised that the program is still subject to formal approval." At RMC, departments wishing to announce the planned offering of a new Program awaiting approval by the Quality Council must first receive permission in writing from the VP Academic.

2.7.1 Reconsideration of the Appraisal Committee

RMC may request a meeting and/or reconsideration within 30 days of receiving the appraisal committee's decision. Normally reconsiderations will only be granted if the university is providing new information or if there were errors of fact or with the original process.

2.7.2 Appeals to the Quality Council

RMC may submit an appeal within 30 days of receiving the appraisal committee's decision. The Quality Council will render one of the following decisions:

- a) Approved to commence;
- b) Approved to commence, with report;
- c) Deferred for up to one year, affording the university an opportunity to amend and resubmit its Proposal; or
- d) Not approved.

Decisions of the Quality Council are final and binding.

2.7.3 Quality Council reports decision on appeal

The Quality Council conveys its decision to the VPA and reports it for information to the Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents (OCAV) and to the Ministry of Colleges and Universities (MCU). The Quality Council and the university post information about decisions on approval to commence new programs on their respective websites, together with a brief description of the program. Only at this point may universities make offers of admission to the program.

2.7.4 Waiting period for resubmission

Any proposal declined permission to proceed will normally wait until one year has elapsed from the date of the Quality Council's decision.

2.8 Post Appraisal follow up

2.8.1 Program approved to commence with report (*as per 2.6.3 b*)

When a university has been given approval to commence a program with report, the Appraisal Committee reviews the subsequently submitted report, conducts whatever consultation it requires, and then makes one of the following recommendations to the Council that the program be:

- a) Approved to continue without condition;
- b) Approved to continue, but the Council requires additional follow-up and report within a specified period, prior to the initial cyclical review; or
- c) Required to suspend admissions for a minimum of two years. The Quality Council will then specify the conditions to be met in the interim in order for admissions to the program to resume.

2.8.2 Appeal follow-up report decision

The institution may appeal the Appraisal Committee's decision on the follow up report by the same terms as set out in 2.7.1. Quality Council may decide to:

- a) Approve the program without condition;
- b) Approve the program with a further report; or
- c) Require the program to suspend admissions for a minimum of two years. The Quality Assurance Secretariat conveys the decision to the university, and reports it to OCAV and to MCU for information.

2.9 Implementing the approved program

2.9.1 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.

2.9.2 Ongoing Monitoring and Program Implementation

Progress on implementing the new Program is monitored by the Program Head in consultation with Program faculty, and reported to the Faculty Dean by the Head, in writing, not later than 15 June of the first academic year of implementation. The Faculty Dean will assess the progress and initiate any action required. The Dean will send a copy of the Program

implementation report and the follow-on action initiated, in writing, to QA for audit purposes.

A further progress report on implementation will be submitted to the Faculty Dean by the Program Head, in writing, not later than 15 June of the third academic year of implementation. This interim report should carefully evaluate the 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, including in response to any Note(s) from the Appraisal Committee. The monitoring process should also take into consideration the outcomes of the interim monitoring report and any additional areas to be considered in the first cyclical review of the new program.

The Faculty Dean will assess the progress and initiate any action required, including the Dean's decision as to whether any further progress reports are required before the next cyclical review. The Dean will send a copy of the progress report and the follow-on action initiated, in writing, to QA.

All subsequent progress reports will follow the same procedure, including the submission of copies by the Dean to QA.

2.9.3 First cyclical review

The first cyclical review of any new program must be conducted no more than eight years after the date of the program's initial enrolment. As with Cyclical program reviews (see **5.1.2 Initiation of Programs Cyclical Review Process**) RMC will conduct all first reviews of programs 7 years after their initiation. Programs approaching their first cyclical review may apply to defer for to the eight year as per the policy outlined in 5.1.2.1 **Application for deferral of Cyclical Program Review.**

2.9.4 Selection for Cyclical Audit

New undergraduate and/or graduate programs that have been approved within the period since the conduct of the previous Audit are eligible for selection for the university's next Cyclical Audit (see [Audit Protocol](#)). An Audit cannot reverse the approval of a program to commence.

3. PROTOCOL FOR EXPEDITED APPROVALS

Introduction

The Quality Council's Appraisal Committee provides a more expeditious version of external oversight through the processes and steps detailed in the Protocol for Expedited Approvals. The approval of submissions made through this Protocol is expedited because such proposals are not required to go through external review, and the authority for final approval rests with the Appraisal Committee.

Scope

Proposals for new for-credit graduate diplomas (Types 2 and 3, [Definition: Diploma Programs](#)) are to be submitted for approval through the Protocol for Expedited Approvals. RMC may, at its discretion, request for the consideration of a new field(s) in a graduate program by the Quality Council. RMC may also submit a proposed major modification to an existing program for expedited approval.

This Protocol may be invoked by RMC in scenarios b), c) & d) defined below. The Protocol must apply for all New for-credit graduate diplomas as defined in para a):

- a) New for-credit graduate diplomas (Types 2 and 3, [Definition: Diploma Programs](#)) and there is a proposal for a new for-credit graduate diploma, or
- b) New standalone degree program arising from a long-standing field in a master's or doctoral program that has undergone at least two Cyclical Program Reviews and has at least two graduating cohorts
- c) There is a proposal for a new field in a graduate Program, or
- d) The process may apply if the university requests approval of Major Modifications to Existing Programs, as already defined through the RMC IQAP, proposed for a degree Program or Program of specialization.

3.1 Proposals for Expedited Approvals

The Protocol's process requires the submission to the Quality Council of a Proposal.

3.1.1 Components of the Proposal

- a) The Proposal will describe the new graduate diploma program, new field(s), or the significant change(s) being proposed (including, as appropriate, reference to program-level learning outcomes, faculty and resources, and a brief account of the rationale for the changes), and address the Evaluation Criteria (see Section 2.1.2, 8 criteria areas) where they apply. There will not be an external review and its related

processes, nor will Senate approval be needed. Only the following elements will be required in the Proposal brief:

1. Program proposal ([2.1.1 New Program Approval Process](#))
2. Evaluation Criteria ([2.1.2 Evaluation Criteria](#))
3. Internal response ([2.3.1 Internal Response](#))¹
4. Faculty Council/Board approval ([2.4.1 FC/FB approval](#))

After approval by Faculty Council, the proposal is sent to the Quality Council for expedited approval (it does not require Senate approval).

3.2 Decision:

After reviewing the submission, the Quality Council's Appraisal Committee will render one of the following decisions regarding the submission:

- a) Approved to Commence
- b) Approved to Commence, with Report; or
- c) Not Approved (RMC may appeal the decision in accordance with Sections [2.7.1 Policy on Appeal Process](#))

3.3 Selection for Cyclical Audit

Programs created or modified through the Protocol for Expedited Approvals are not normally selected for the institution's Cyclical Audit ([6.2.4 Selection of the sample for audit](#))

¹ For expedited approvals external review will consist of designated reviewers external to the program under consideration but internal to RMC. Internal responses will follow 2.3.1.

4. PROTOCOL FOR MAJOR MODIFICATIONS

4.1 Major Modifications to existing programs at RMC

The fundamental purpose for the Protocol 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. Once approved, major modifications will be included in the scope of future cyclical program reviews.

RMC may, at its discretion, request that the Quality Council review a proposal for a major modification to an existing program. In such cases the proposal will require a description and rationale for the change(s) and application of the relevant evaluation criteria. In cases where there is a question as whether or not a major modification constitutes a new program, the Council has final authority. If proposed changes are deemed to be warrant a New Program Approval, they must adhere to the Protocol [2. Protocol for New Program Approval](#).

4.1.1 Objectives

RMC is committed to promoting the continuous improvement of its programs. The identification of Major modifications is an important part of that ongoing process and allows RMC to:

- Implement the outcomes of a cyclical program review;
- Reflect the ongoing evolution of the discipline;
- Accommodate new developments in a particular field;
- Facilitate improvements in teaching and learning strategies;
- Respond to the changing needs of students, society, and industry; and/or
- Respond to improvements in technology.

4.1.2 Scope

Faculty Board or Faculty Council depending of the level of the program, based on the recommendation of the Syllabus/Graduate Studies Committees will determine whether a change constitutes a:

- a) Minor modification (with no reporting requirements to the Quality Council)
- b) Major Modification (reported to QC annually as per 4.3)
- c) New Program Approval (subject to Protocol 2.1 Process for New Program approvals)

In order to assist in determining the scope of the proposed program change, the Syllabus/Graduate Studies Committees will use the criteria outlined in 4.1.3.1 **Criteria for Major Modifications** and 4.1.3.2 **Criteria for New Program**. Major modifications typically include, but are not limited to, one or more of the following:

- a) Requirements that differ significantly from those existing at the time of the previous cyclical program review;
- b) Significant changes to the program-level learning outcomes that do not, however, meet the threshold of a new program;
- c) Significant changes to the program's delivery, including to the program's faculty and/or to the essential physical resources as may occur, for example, where there have been changes to the existing mode(s) of delivery (e.g., different campus and/or online / hybrid delivery – see below);
- d) Change in program name and/or degree nomenclature, when this results in a change in learning outcomes; and/or
- e) Addition of a single new field to an existing graduate program. Note that universities are not required to declare fields for either master's or doctoral programs. Note also that the creation of more than one field at one point in time or over subsequent years may need to go through the Expedited Protocol.

4.1.3 Process

The processes for the approval of program changes will fall into two categories, those submitted for expedited approval and those that are subject to RMC governance. In both cases, the arbiter will be Faculty Board based upon the recommendation of the Syllabus Committee (for undergraduate programs) or Faculty Council based upon the recommendation of the Graduate Studies Committee (for graduate programs). The decision to submit a major modification for Expedited Approval will be submitted by the VPA to the Quality Council on the recommendation of the Faculty Board/Council.

Procedures for expedited approvals will consist of a streamlined version of the processes in the Protocol on New Program approval (see **3. Protocol for Expedited Approvals**).

Components of Proposals for Expedited Approval (see 3.1.1)

The Proposal will describe the new graduate diploma program, new field(s), or the significant change(s) being proposed (including, as appropriate, reference to program-level learning outcomes, faculty and resources, and a brief account of the rationale for the changes), and address the Evaluation Criteria (see Section 2.1.2, 8 criteria areas) where they apply. There will not be an external review and its related processes, nor will Senate approval be needed. Only the following elements will be required in the Proposal brief:

1. Program proposal: (2.1.1 New Program Approval Process)
2. Application of Evaluation Criteria: (2.1.2 Evaluation Criteria)
3. Internal response (2.3.1 Internal Response)
4. Faculty Council/Board approval (2.4.1 FC/FB approval)

Procedures for Major Modifications

All Proposals for program changes need to describe the significant change(s) being proposed (including, as appropriate, reference to program-level learning outcomes, faculty and resources, and a brief account of the rationale for the changes), and address the Evaluation Criteria (see Section 2.1.2, 8 criteria areas) where they apply. Proposals need to include a statement on the way in which the proposed major modification will improve the student experience. Input from current students and recent graduates must be included in the scope of the proposal submission. The program must further identify how that feedback was incorporated in the report itself. There will not be an external review and its related processes, nor will Senate approval be needed. QA will also provide a ‘Major Modifications to Existing Programs Action and Document Checklist’

Assessing the scope of program changes

As identifying the scope of program changes (minor, major and new programs) determines which approval procedure applies, the following criteria have been developed to ensure consistency in this process. More important than the procedure is the way in which the process encourages and values ongoing and continuous assessment and modification where appropriate of programs. Further, it demonstrates to the institution at large and its stakeholders the value the institution places on this kind of self-assessment.

The listed criteria below are not exhaustive, the Syllabus Committee and the Graduate Studies Committee will adjudicate as required (only applicable to programs already approved, new programs proposals should refer to [2.1 New Program Approval Process](#)).

4.1.3.1 Criteria for Major Modifications:

The listed criteria are not exhaustive, the Syllabus Committee and the Graduate Studies Committee will adjudicate as required (only applicable to programs already approved, new programs proposals should refer to [2.1 New Program Approval Process](#)):

- a) A change of more than 20% in the number or type of required secondary school graduation courses required for admission to an undergraduate Program.
- b) An addition of a minor or concentration to an existing Program

- c) Any change in degree type or levels acceptable for admission to a post-graduate Program.
- d) Any change in the minimum number of total course credits required for graduation from a Program.
- e) Any change greater than 10% in the minimum number of course credits of a specified type required for graduation from a Program (e.g., required courses for a major, number of Arts courses in a Science Program, number of complementary courses in an Engineering Program etc.).
- f) Any addition or deletion of an undergraduate thesis or capstone engineering project.
- g) A change of more than 20% in the number of required courses during the final 50% of an undergraduate Program.
- h) Any change to the requirements for graduate Program candidacy examinations, field studies or residence requirements.
- i) Changes to the Program content that affect the Program-level learning outcomes in more than 10% of the courses in a Program.
- j) The addition of a new major stream or designation of a new named specialization in any degree Program.
- k) A reduction of more than 25% in the number of suitably qualified, full time faculty available to supervise theses in a graduate Program.
- l) An increase of more than 25% in the number of different courses offered in any particular mode of delivery in a given Program.
- m) A change of more than 20% in the laboratory time forming part of an undergraduate science or engineering Program.
- n) Any material reduction in the routine availability to students of library or other essential resources necessary for the completion of a Program.
- o) Any material reduction in the routine availability to students of information technology resources necessary for the completion of a Program.
- p) The merger of two or more Programs.
- q) At the graduate level, the introduction or deletion of a research project, research essay or thesis, course-only, co-op, internship or practicum option.
- r) Significant changes to the faculty delivering the Program: e.g. a large proportion of retirements or of new hires alters the area of research and teaching interests.
- s) A change in the language of Program delivery.

- t) The establishment of an existing degree Program at another institution or location.
- u) Significant changes to full- or part-time Program options.
- v) The Closure of an existing RMC program (see section 4.2)
- w) Where applicable, the CEAB decides that the Program change is significant.
- x) Significant change in a Program's mode of delivery—i.e. onsite courses become offered only online or vice-versa. When changing the mode of delivery consideration of the following criteria is strongly encouraged (These should be included in the Proposal brief):
 - Maintenance of and/or changes to the program objectives and program-level learning outcomes;
 - Adequacy of the technological platform and tools;
 - Sufficiency of support services and training for teaching staff;
 - Sufficiency and type of support for students in the new learning environment; and
 - Access.

4.1.3.2 Criteria for New Programs

- a) Any change of a majority of contributing departments
- b) Changes in emphasis of the major of a program (e.g. Language to Culture)
 - Changes that results in a new accreditation (e.g. MSc to MHSc or MPH)
 - Changes that results in new specialties (e.g. BA Geography TO BA Planning – Rural/Urban)
 - Changes that result in a program changing faculties (i.e. BA Linguistics To BSc Linguistics)
 - Changes in the program emphasis that create new courses
- c) Any program intended to replace an existing one, but has distinct outcomes and courses
- d) The addition of separate program designations to an existing program (e.g. BA Technology adds Biotechnology)
- e) Any program which upgrades a minor to a major
- f) Any addition of new degree levels (e.g. PhD) with a new major component(s) (e.g. Dissertation)
- g) The additions of a new Graduate diploma (G-Dip type 2 or 3 require Expedited Approval). [Definitions: Diploma Programs](#)
- h) Dissolution of a joint program where RMC assumes exclusive control (e.g. Geo-Engineering with Queen's)

- i) Inheriting a program from another institution (but is new to RMC)

4.1.4 Other Program changes

4.1.4.1 Program changes that do not rise to the level of Major Modifications

All changes to existing programs that do not rise to the level of a Major Modification as outlined in 4.1.3.1 as determined by the Syllabus committee or the Graduate Studies Committee will be subject to internal governance approval only. These include, changes to emphasis, option, minor, the creation of micro-credential(s) (see definitions) or undergraduate certificates (see definitions). No combination of credentials can be stacked to meet the requirements of a degree program at RMC. All degree programs are subject to the rigor of the admission process; even in cases where students have completed all required courses for a degree program.

All course description changes, even the most minor, should be submitted to the Chair of the Syllabus Committee. The committee will not consider minor additions or deletions of course content and the Chair will arrive at an agreement with the committee on secretarial privilege and then forward those submissions to be considered major, requiring action by the committee as a whole. All program changes, including those not considered by the Syllabus or Graduate Studies Committees, will be included in the scope of the Cyclical Reviews of all existing programs.

4.1.4.2 Late Major Modifications

In the case of major modifications that have occurred beyond the control of the program, a brief written notification is to be sent immediately to the Faculty Dean by the Program Chair or designate. The Dean and Department Head will investigate the issue, obtain the feedback from Program faculty and, if time permits, present a proposed plan of action to Faculty Board and Faculty Council for further input. Appropriate action might include suspending admission of new students until the issue is resolved, making alternative arrangements for current students or other steps deemed appropriate to the case. The Principal will make the final decision on action and timing, in consultation with the Council of Deans.

4.2. Closure of Academic Programs

At RMC, all program closures are deemed to be major modifications. In cases where RMC deems that a Program no longer fits with its priorities or the interests of students, it will undertake the steps to close the Program. In such cases the Department Head will prepare and submit to the Dean, a brief proposing the closure of a Program, outlining the rationale for the proposal. The Dean will submit the proposal to the Syllabus Committee (for UG Programs) or the Graduate Studies Committee (for PG Programs) for review and subsequent submission to the Senate for approval. A copy of all supporting documents will be

forwarded to QA. During the Annual Report on Major Changes and Modifications, RMC will report this closure to the Quality Council.

4.3 Annual Report to the Quality Council

Each calendar year RMC is required to submit a report to the Quality Council on all Major Modifications that have been approved in accordance with our internal procedures. QA will prepare those reports in both English and French for submission by the VP Academic, based on changes approved by Faculty Council. Minor changes will be scrutinized only at the cyclical review stage.

4.3.1 Annual submission by Program chair

Each program chair will submit a complete list of all Major Modifications approved by Faculty Council to QA by no later than 15 June each academic year. This will coincide with ongoing monitoring reports (see section 2.7) for the cyclical review process. A template for the submission of Major Modifications will be supplied by QA to assist with collecting this data.

4.4 Selection for Cyclical Audit

Major modifications are not normally selected for the institution's Cyclical Audit.

5. PROTOCOL FOR CYCLICAL PROGRAM REVIEWS

Objective

One fundamental element of accountability is continuous improvement, which signals that quality assurance is never static. Continuous improvement is the ultimate goal of the ongoing and fluid work of universities as they create living documents that meet evolving standards and measures of quality in their programs.

Scope

In a Cyclical Program Review the self-study often refers to multiple degree options, undergraduate and graduate, and various streams or concentrations within the program (*Appendix 1: Definition of a Program*). All existing academic Programs at RMC are subject to review on a cyclical basis. Programs which have been closed; as approved by RMC's Senate, or for which admission has been suspended are out of scope for a Cyclical Program Review. In the event of joint programs or inter-institutional programs, RMC will follow its IQAP while considering the IQAP and Cyclical Review schedule of the collaborating institution. RMC will ensure that the schedule of reviews of both collaborating institutions reflect the same review period for the affected program. The schedule of reviews in Appendix 6 (IQAP Schedule of Reviews 2011 -2032) will reflect all program offerings, including those that are joint/inter-institutional, multi-disciplinary, interdisciplinary, at multiple sites and all modes of program delivery. See section **5.1.1.1 Review of Joint Programs** for details as to how collaborating institutions will share responsibility for conducting reviews.

Key Outcome

The key outcome of a Cyclical Program Review is the Final Assessment Report and associated Implementation Plan. The required program changes identified in the Implementation Plan become the basis of a continuous improvement process through monitoring of key performance indicators. The Final Assessment Report (FAR), drafted by the appropriate Dean(s), submitted to the VP Academic and forwarded to QA, must be submitted to the Quality Council following RMC Senate approval, and must include an Executive Summary, exclusive of confidential information, to be posted on the RMC website.

Process

RMC will ensure that programs are evaluated on a cycle not to exceed eight years. The process will assess the quality of existing academic programs, identifying ongoing improvements to programs, and ensuring continuing relevance of the program to stakeholders. The self-study and external assessment provide internal and external perspectives on the institutional goals, program's objectives, program-level learning outcomes, and graduate outcomes.

RMC's Protocol for the conduct of Cyclical Program Reviews has six principal components (for further detail on a) through f), see Sections 5.1.3 – 5.4.2, inclusive):

- a) **Self-study:** The Self-Study is an internal evaluation and report written by the Program Head or chair and Program faculty, and submitted to the appropriate Dean(s). The Dean will review to ensure completeness of the Self-Study and once approved will ultimately send it to the External Review Committee (ERC). Once approved by the appropriate Dean(s), a copy of the Self-Study will be forwarded to QA. The Dean will also notify QA, in writing, that the Self-Study has been approved. If desired, Programs undergoing a combined professional accreditation and IQAP cyclical review may build their Self-Study from the accreditation review template and provide supplementary material to satisfy the additional requirements of this IQAP.
- b) **External evaluation (peer review)** The External Evaluation consists of a review of the Self-Study, a Site Visit, and culminates with an ERC report containing recommendations to improve Program quality. The ERC is composed of two external reviewers and one internal reviewer from RMC but external to the Program under review. In the case of bilingual Programs, at least one member of the ERC should be bilingual in order to capture a more accurate snapshot of the Program under review. ERC members are nominated by the Department Head of the Program under review and approved by the their respective line Dean(s) except in the case of concurrent Cyclical Reviews and CEAB accreditation for engineering Programs, where external reviewers are chosen by the CEAB. The ERC Report will provide recommendations on program quality improvement to be received by the appropriate Dean(s) of the Program under review, copied, and forwarded to both the Program under review and to QA.
- c) **Program Response:** The Program response is a reply to the ERC assessment report. This is a response is drafted by the Head or chair and selected faculty of the Program under review and is submitted to the appropriate Dean(s). The response must reply to all recommendations for program quality improvement contained in the ERC report.
- d) **Decanal Response:** The Decanal response is drafted by the Dean or Associate Dean of the faculty for the program under review. For programs where multiple Deans have a vested interest, the line Dean will be the authority. For all post-graduate programs this will be the Dean of Graduate Studies (DGS). In these cases, the advising Dean will be provided the opportunity to review and provide comments for inclusion in the Decanal response.
- e) **Implementation Plans:** The implementation plans will be included that identify follow up actions, those responsible and an estimated timeline of completion. The primary responsibility for updating and executing those plans lies with the leadership of the program.

- f) **Annual reporting:** Annual updates will follow-up reporting on the principal findings of the Final Assessment Report (FAR) and the implementation of the recommendations to provide ongoing monitoring. Each program head or chair for programs that have completed a Cyclical Program Review will submit an update on the progress of all recommendations approved in the FAR. These updates will be submitted for review to the relevant Dean (or designate) for approval by June 15th annually.
- g) **Accountability to the Quality Council:** RMC will submit an omnibus report on all Cyclical Program Review activities for the year in review to the Quality Council for review ([5.4.2 External reporting](#)). This report will include an Executive Summary and will provide links to all Implementation Plans and associated monitoring reports (published on RMC's website). The Office of Quality Assurance will draft the omnibus report, VPA will approve and submit to the Quality Council by August 1st of each year.

5.1 RMC Institutional Process

5.1.1 Schedule of Cyclical Reviews

Programs to be reviewed in a given calendar year will be reminded by the VP Academic on October 15 with a QA-led presentation in mid-November of the year prior to the year of review and again by January 15 of the year in which the review takes place. Follow-up meetings will take place as required.

Representatives from the Athletics, the Second Language Centre as well as affected Program Heads, faculty, support staff, the Chief Librarian, Registrar's Office and the Teaching and Learning Support Group will participate in this briefing. The External Review Committee (ERC) Site Visit will normally occur in October or November of the same year. Before beginning the review of a Program, all distinct modalities (methods of delivery: classroom, online), locations (multi-site, multi-institution), languages of delivery (English, French), and levels of the Program (general, major, honours, master's, doctorate) must be identified in order to ensure the accuracy and comprehensiveness of the review. It is likely that RMC will combine reviews of Programs that offer degrees at multiple levels where possible, and, in these cases, both the Faculty Dean and the Dean of Graduate Studies will oversee the review process. The cyclical review of different levels of the Program may use elements of a common self-study, be done concurrently and by the same review team if appropriate. In the event of bundling of program reviews, the quality of each program and the learning environment of students in each program will be explicitly addressed in the self-study and the external reviewers' report. When to bundle programs will remain at the discretion of the program chairs and will be subject to Decanal approval.

The Final Assessment Report and the Executive Summary will available in both official languages. A copy of all of the documents circulated internally and externally (i.e., between the Program under review and the Dean, ERC, Quality

Council, etc.) for each step of the process will be forwarded at the time of circulation to QA.

Where Programs are subject to accreditation reviews and an IQAP cyclical review in the same year, the Dean may, at their discretion, elect to conduct a combined review. In the case of undergraduate engineering programs at RMC, CEAB and IQAP visits will be conducted separately. These visits, though separate, will occur on a 6-year basis to follow CEAB timelines. All Program reviews whether combined or separate must be sure to meet all of the requirements of the IQAP.

The Head of the Program under review will submit a short brief to the VP Academic through the appropriate Dean(s), listing all modalities, locations, languages of delivery and levels of the Program under review. After the VP Academic approves this brief, the review process can begin. The cyclical review of an existing Program has four principal components:

1. Self-Study Report (SSR) (*link to 5.1.3*)
2. External Evaluation (*link to 5.2*)
3. Program Response and implementation (*link to 5.3.1.1*)
4. Final Assessment Report (FAR) (*link to 5.3.2*)
5. Implementation updates and external reporting (*link to 5.4.2*)

Each of these components and its related requirements is described further below.

5.1.1.1 Review of Joint Programs

At the time of writing, RMC has only one joint Program, a graduate Program in Geoenvironmental Engineering which it offers in collaboration with Queen's University. Should other joint Programs be instituted at the university, however, it is anticipated that the review process will adhere to the process established by the example of Geoenvironmental Engineering. For the sake of convenience, Cyclical Reviews of this Program will be carried out according to the schedule and procedures established by Queen's University in its QUQAP, but the responsibility to prepare the Self-Study, select external reviewers, provide feedback on the ERC report, and prepare the FAR and Implementation Plan will be split between the two universities, with both universities participating in all of these processes. In addition, both campuses will be visited by the external reviewers and both institutions will post identical FAR on their respective websites. The FAR and Implementation Plan will, however, go through the appropriate governance processes at each institution, and at RMC these reports and other important documentation related to the review process will be made available in both official languages, in accordance with RMC policy.

5.1.2 Initiation of Programs Cyclical Review Process

[See Appendix 4: Table of Action Items for Faculty and Staff](#)

The cyclical review of a Program is initiated by the Vice-Principal (Academic) based on an established university-wide schedule. Programs tied to cyclical

professional accreditation reviews will follow the schedule set by the relevant accreditation board—for example, engineering Programs under review will follow the CEAB schedule (6-year cycle) and perform the reviews concurrently. In the interest of streamlining collaborative processes, the review of RMC and Queen's University's joint Program in Geoenvironmental Engineering will follow the Queen's Cyclical Review schedule and IQAP. **All RMC programs will follow a 7-year schedule for Cyclical Program Reviews** (except in cases where the relevant accreditation schedule is on a cycle of less than seven years or if they are approved for deferral as per 5.1.2.1 below). Program chairs may submit an application for deferral to the Dean of the program scheduled for review.

5.1.2.1 Application for deferral of Cyclical Program Review

As per the QAF requirement, all existing programs must conduct Cyclical Program Reviews at minimum every 8 years. The default stance at RMC will be to begin CPRs on the 7th year since their last scheduled review. Program Chairs may apply to defer the commencement of their review until the 8th year by notifying the relevant Dean NLT November 30th (6 weeks from initial reminder from VPA/QA on Oct 15th). The Dean(s) may recommend and submit requests to the Vice Principal Academic for final approval if they support the request. Examples of grounds for deferral are:

- a) Circumstances beyond the control of the program prevent a successful review (i.e. loss of RMC network).
- b) Staffing/personnel shortages or IQAP subject matter experts are unavailable (i.e. on sabbatical)
- c) There are significant, anticipated changes to the program structure in the 8th year that would benefit from inclusion in a deferred CPR.

All approved deferrals will be reported by the VPA to the QC in the annual report (see [Accountability to the QC](#)). Programs approved for deferral will have to provide an Initial Implementation brief to the VPA, by way of the relevant Dean, outlining the scope and timelines for the program submitted for deferral.

5.1.2.2 Support to Programs scheduled for Cyclical Program Reviews

RMC recognizes that Cyclical Program Reviews represent a significant commitment of resources, personnel and time by departments. In an effort to support programs, course relief will be available to a single faculty member for each program under review. Should extenuating circumstances justify additional assistance, all requests can be submitted to the VPA by way of the Dean of the program under review.

5.1.3 Self-Study

The Self-Study process consists of two elements: the gathering of information and the writing of the Self-Study report. The QAF emphasizes that the opinions of faculty, staff, students and, where relevant, industry representatives, should be intrinsic to the Self-Study; and the Self-

Study report must document both how these views were obtained and how they will be taken into account.

RMC meets these requirements by administering confidential surveys to full-time and sessional faculty, current students and recent graduates, by arranging for discussions with focus groups of students, faculty, staff and other stakeholders as appropriate, and by inviting faculty to provide written input. All professional Master's programs must include feedback from relevant professional associations. These programs must also include the views of employers (recognizing that RMC produces graduates that in the short term are predominantly employed by the Canadian Armed Forces). All feedback from employers and professional associations will be included the Self-Study report for review by the ERC.

The Chief Librarian will prepare a report on library resources for each Program under review. The Athletics and Second language pillars will each prepare reports on the performance of students for each program under review.

The Program Head/Chair will provide comments on the reports provided by the Library, Athletics and Second Language Training. Additionally the chair will also comment on all other support services that contribute to the running of the Program, such as the Division of Graduate Studies and Research, College Information Services, the Writing Centre, the Math Centre, the Language Centre, Physical Plant, the Comptroller, the Registrar and the Bookstore. Upon completion, the Self-Study will be submitted to the appropriate Dean for approval. Once approved, the Dean will notify QA (in writing) that the Self-Study has been approved for distribution to the ERC.

Structure of Self-Study Report

[See Appendix 3: RMC Degree Level Expectations \(link to POs & PLOs\)](#)

The Self-Study should be broad based, reflective and forward looking, and includes critical analysis of the program(s). Programs undergoing a combined accreditation and IQAP cyclical reviews may build their Self-Study from the accreditation review template and provide supplementary material to satisfy the additional requirements of this IQAP.

When programs choose to review of different program levels (for example, graduate and undergraduate), program modes, the self-study must, in accordance with their respective IQAPs, prepare separate reports for each discrete program or address each program within a single omnibus report.

The Self-Study will be reviewed by the appropriate Dean(s) to ensure that it follows the criteria set out in the IQAP manual. QA will provide certain

quantitative data, support and guidance to departments. Analysis of QA reports and data is the responsibility of the Program Head.

The following elements for the preparation and writing of the self-study are required and must be addressed in the IQAP:

- a) Description of how the self-study was written, including how the views of faculty, staff and students were obtained and considered;
 - i. This section should establish the scope of the review by listing:
 - Programs to be reviewed, must identify each discrete program (
 - Faculty delivering the program
 - Student numbers (full and part-time), including rates of completion since the last cyclical review (or the past 3 years if the Program is undertaking its initial Program review).
 - ii. Comments on how data were obtained, and their integrity: explicitly note the sources of data and factors relating to collection. The study must explain the level and degree of participation of Program faculty, staff, and students in the Self-Study, and how their views have been obtained and taken into account. Where possible and applicable, the study will include comments solicited from current students and graduates of the Program. Sample templates for these surveys are available from QA.
 - iii. Evidence that all faculty members have been provided the opportunity to participate in the self-appraisal process and to comment on the Self-Study report. Part-time faculty who regularly teach in the Program are also to be given this opportunity. If there are differing views among the faculty these should be noted.
- b) The Self-Study must include the evaluation criteria and quality indicators identified in Framework (see [5.1.3.1 Evaluation Criteria](#)), for each discrete program being reviewed (*see section 5.1.3.1 below*);
- c) Program-related data and measures of performance, including applicable provincial, national and professional standards (where available), with a notation of all relevant data sources;
 - i. Measures of performance, including comparison to applicable provincial, national, and professional standards.
 - ii. State of the Discipline: articulate how the Program meets/reflects the current standard in the discipline.
- d) Description of how concerns and recommendations raised in previous reviews have since been addressed, especially those detailed in the

Final Assessment Report, Implementation Plan and subsequent monitoring reports from the previous Cyclical Review of the program;

- i. A complete listing of all recommendations from the previous FAR
 - ii. This should have a particular focus on previous problem areas and steps taken to remedy them.
- e) For the first Cyclical Review of a new program, the steps taken to address any issues or items flagged in the monitoring report for follow-up (see Section 2.9.2), and/or items identified for follow-up by the Quality Council (for example, in the form of a note and/or report for the first Cyclical Program Review in the Quality Council's approval letter – see Section 2.6.3 a) or b));
 - f) Where appropriate, any unique curriculum or program innovations, creative components, or significant high impact practices;
 - g) Areas that the program's faculty, staff and/or students have identified as requiring improvement, or as holding promise for enhancement and/or opportunities for curricular change; and
 - h) Assessment of the adequacy of all relevant academic services that directly contribute to the academic quality of each program under review.
 - i) Assessment of student performance in the following non-academics pillars, Physical Educations (Athletics) and Second Language Training (SLT).

5.1.3.1. Evaluation Criteria

5.1.3.1.1 Program objectives:

Program Objectives are broader in scope than program level objectives and describe the goals of the program ([see definition](#)). This section should include:

- a) A general preamble on the RMC Mission. A mission statement to be supplemented as necessary is found in Section 1.4 ([RMC Mission statement](#)). It explains the special role of RMC as a federal and military institution and discusses how the expectations which go along with this status affect the curriculum and general approach to studies here.
- b) Articulation of how Program objectives are consistent with RMC's mission and academic plans.

5.1.3.1.2 Program requirements:

- a) Appropriateness of the program's structure and the requirements to meet its objectives and the program-level learning outcomes;
- b) Appropriateness of the program's structure, requirements and program-level learning outcomes in meeting the institution's own undergraduate or graduate Degree Level Expectations;
- c) Appropriateness and effectiveness of the mode(s) of delivery (*definition: mode or delivery*) to facilitate students' successful completion of the program-level learning outcomes; and
- d) Ways in which the curriculum addresses the current state of the discipline or area of study

A review of the RMC and Program-specific Degree Level Expectations for the Program and a map of how the Program requirements fulfill these expectations (for both English and French streams and for general, major and Honours, as applicable, in the case of undergraduate Programs). Appendix 3 lists the current approved RMC degree level expectations. In addition, each department must develop its own Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs), specific to its Program(s), to be housed outside of the RMC IQAP.

5.1.3.1.3 Program requirements for graduate programs only:

- a) Clear rationale for program length that ensures that students can complete the program level learning outcomes and requirements within the time required;
- b) 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
- c) For research-focused graduate programs, clear indication of the nature and suitability of the major research requirements for degree completion.

5.1.3.1.4 Assessment of Teaching and Learning:

- a) Appropriateness and effectiveness of the methods for assessing student achievement of the program-level learning outcomes and degree level expectations; and
- b) Appropriateness and effectiveness of the plans to monitor and assess:
 - i. The overall quality of the program;
 - ii. Whether the program continues to achieve in practice its objectives;
 - iii. Whether its students are achieving the program-level learning outcomes; and

- iv. How the resulting information will be documented and subsequently used to inform continuous program improvement.

5.1.3.1.5 Admission requirements

- a) Appropriateness of the program's admission requirements given the program's objectives and program-level learning outcomes; and
- b) 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.

5.1.3.1.6 Resources

Given the program's class sizes and cohorts as well as its program-level learning outcomes:

- a) 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;
- b) If applicable, discussion/explanation of 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 (see Guidance);
- c) If required, provision of supervision of experiential learning opportunities;
- d) Adequacy of the administrative unit's utilization of existing human, physical and financial resources; and
- e) Evidence that there are adequate resources to sustain the quality of scholarship and research activities produced by students, including library support, information technology support, and laboratory access.

5.1.3.1.7 Resources for graduate programs only

Given the program's class sizes and cohorts, as well as its program-level learning outcomes:

- a) Evidence that faculty have the recent research or professional/clinical expertise needed to sustain the program, promote innovation, and foster an appropriate intellectual climate;
- b) Where appropriate to the program, evidence that financial assistance for students will be sufficient to ensure adequate quality and numbers of students; and
- c) Evidence of how supervisory loads will be distributed, in light of qualifications and appointment status of the faculty

5.1.3.1.8 Quality Indicators

- a) **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);

Sub-report on state of faculty produced by the Program Head. To be included:

1. Statistics on individual teaching loads for full-time and part-time faculty for a 5-year summary.
 2. A summary of all its full-time as well as part-time faculty members, including their qualifications, areas of specialization, current CVs, and current research. All CVs must provide completely up-to-date information on teaching activities. The current format template for CVs is available from QA.
 3. Comments on the impact of budget changes, retirements, etc. and plans to fill future positions.
 4. Listing of awards, recognition, internal and external honours for faculty; research groups, professional associations, etc.
- b) Any other evidence that the program and faculty ensure the intellectual quality of the student experience
- c) **Evidence of student performance:** grade-level for admission, scholarly output, success rates in provincial and national scholarships, competitions, awards and commitment to professional and transferable skills, and times-to-completion and retention rates

Sub-report of in-Program performance of students since the last cyclical review (or past three years if this is the initial Program review), produced by the Program Head (with the support of QA if necessary). To be included:

1. Student pass/fail rates in individual undergraduate courses.
2. Analysis of student grade distributions and averages.
3. In accordance with the requirements of Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy legislation, a random sampling of undergraduate student performance, especially in the graduating year, including, for example, examination scripts, research reports, theses and publications.
4. A survey of current undergraduate students highlighting opinions on strengths and weaknesses of the Program and suggestions for improvement. Templates for these surveys are available from QA, and Programs are free to add to, but not delete, questions on the survey. Once the Program Head has gathered contact

information for those being surveyed, the surveys will be administered online by QA. QA will then relay the results of the surveys to the Program Head for analysis.

5. A survey of recent graduates of the Program highlighting opinions on strengths and weaknesses of the Program and suggestions for improvement. Templates for these surveys are available from QA, and Programs are free to add to, but not delete, questions on the survey. Once the Program Head has gathered contact information for those being surveyed, the surveys will be administered online by QA. QA will then relay the results of the surveys to the Program Head for analysis.

5.2 External Evaluation

An external evaluation of the Program is a necessary element of the cyclical review process. The external evaluation includes a Site Visit conducted by the External Review Committee (ERC). The Dean (for the program undergoing review) will be responsible for ensuring the adequacy of the administrative unit's existing human, physical and financial resources.

The external review of a doctoral program must incorporate an on-site visit. External review of undergraduate programs will normally be conducted on-site, but the Vice Principal Academic may propose that the review be conducted by desk review, virtual site visit or an equivalent method if the external reviewers are satisfied that the off-site option is acceptable. The VPA must provide a clear justification for the decision to use these alternatives.

Certain master's programs (e.g., professional master's programs that are fully online) may also be conducted by desk review, virtual site visit or an equivalent method if both the VPA and external reviewers are satisfied that the off-site option is acceptable. On-site visits are required for all other master's and doctoral programs.

The Self-Study Report, the ERC Report template as well as samples of students' work must be made available to all members of the ERC at least 6 weeks prior to their visit. The ERC produces its report after having read the Self-Study and completed the Site Visit. During the Review process, the office of the Faculty Dean will be the liaison between the Program and the ERC while documents are in play; all documentation related to the Self-Study, the ERC Report, and the Program Response is to be handled exclusively by the Dean's Office to obviate direct communication between the Program Head and the ERC. The Site Visit is also arranged through the office of the Faculty Dean, and should normally occur in October or November; the schedule for the Site Visit should be prepared at least a month in advance to allow for any necessary changes.

5.2.1 The External Review Committee (ERC)

The ERC is composed of three members: two external reviewers and one internal reviewer who is from within RMC but external to the discipline or interdisciplinary group being reviewed. In the case of Programs delivered in both English and French, at least one member of the ERC should be bilingual. The ERC members will be active and respected in their fields—usually they will be associate or full professors with program management experience, including an appreciation of pedagogy and learning outcomes and will be at arm’s length from the Program under review (i.e., not collaborators, supervisors, supervisees, relatives, etc.). Appendix 5 Outlines the roles for External and Internal reviewers as well as provides detailed examples of what do and do not violate the arm’s length requirement. Deans will complete an ERC Verification Checklist to be returned to QA. Care will be taken by the appropriate Dean(s) to vet each reviewer for any possible conflict of interest.

Additional appropriately qualified ERC members from industry or professions may be assigned in certain fields as appropriate (i.e., especially in professional Programs).

5.2.1.1 Selection of External Reviewers:

- a) Three to five names of recommended external reviewers will be put forward, ranked in order of preference, if applicable, and submitted to the appropriate Dean(s) by the Program Head under review. The Head will also propose 2-3 names of recommended internal reviewers to the appropriate Dean.
- b) The reviewers will normally be associate or full professors, or the equivalent, with Program management experience, including an appreciation of pedagogy and learning outcomes, and will be at arm’s length from the department proposing the new Program.
- c) At the same time, the Head will identify several two-day blocks suitable for the Site Visit. If the visit is approved to take place virtually, the Program Head will consult with the reviewers to establish alternate scheduling options (online visits should be spread out over 3 to 5 days where possible).
- d) The Dean(s) will make final decisions on the external and internal reviewers, while ensuring that, for the internal reviewer, his/her teaching workload and other duties will not be adversely affected.
- e) The Dean(s) will send written invitations to the proposed reviewers inviting (both internal and external) them to serve and including the possible dates for the Site Visit. Based on responses from the reviewers, the date of the Site Visit will be finalized. The letter should include a definition of the role and obligations of external reviewers,

including recognition of the university's autonomy to determine priorities for funding, space, and faculty allocation, and the confidentiality required for all aspects of the review process.

- f) The Dean's office will arrange all travel and accommodations for members of the ERC and begin the process of arranging payment of honoraria for the ERC members. All payments associated with the external visitor will be paid from the Dean's budget.
- g) Once the membership of the ERC is confirmed, the Program Head will submit the Self-Study Report, including additional documentation such as examples of student work, Faculty CV's etc., to the Faculty Dean, who will review and approve it before sending it (electronically) to each member of the ERC. The Dean will also forward a copy of this material to QA at this time specifically noting that the Self-Study has been approved. The ERC is to receive this material at least six weeks before the Site Visit. The Dean will also provide the ERC member(s) the ERC Report Template (QA to provide this).
- h) Deans will complete an ERC Verification Checklist to be returned to QA. Care will be taken by the appropriate Dean(s) to vet each reviewer for any possible conflict of interest. Additional ERC members from industry or professions may be assigned in certain fields as appropriate (i.e., especially in professional Programs)
- i) In the case of concurrent cyclical and accreditation Reviews, the ERC will be selected by the relevant accreditation board. If the ERC selected by the accreditation board does not satisfy the minimum requirements of the IQAP, additional reviewers will be selected, external to RMC, according to the process described above.

5.2.1.2 The Site Visit

Site Visits normally lasts two days (unless approved to occur virtually), during which time, the ERC will meet first with the VPA who will brief them about their role and obligations, essential to achieving a productive site visit. The ERC will proceed to meet with the Dean(s), followed by key faculty members, including the Program Head, Associate Chairs, staff, and undergraduate and graduate students. Each of these meetings will be confidential and will be conducted privately, with only the ERC and the other party/parties involved present (i.e., only staff, or only undergraduate students, etc.).

The ERC will conduct a tour of the physical resources of the Program under review, including classrooms, labs, offices and libraries. In the event of a virtual visit, every attempt should be made to provide an equivalent tour or presentation of the physical resources and campus experience.

The ERC will not discuss the outcomes of these meetings, and of the Site Visit in general, except with each other and in the ERC Report. In addition, the ERC should be given an office space on campus to use as a base and as a place to hold private discussions about their experiences of the Site Visit and about their plans for the review report. The ERC will meet privately at the end of the first day to discuss the progress of the Site Visit and to compare notes. Time must also be set aside in the afternoon of the second day for the ERC to discuss the report and to divide up the tasks associated with it before the end of the Site Visit.

The ERC team is expected to:

- a. Address the substance of the self-study (see Section 5.1.3), with particular focus on responding to the evaluation criteria detailed therein;
- b. Identify and commend the program's notably strong and creative attributes;
- c. Describe the program's respective strengths, areas for improvement, and opportunities for enhancement;
- d. Provide evidence of any significant innovation or creativity in the content and/or delivery of the program relative to other such programs;
- e. Make at least three recommendations for specific steps to be taken that will lead to the continuous improvement of the program, distinguishing between those the program can itself take and those that require external action; and
- f. Identify the distinctive attributes of each discrete program documented in the self-study in those cases where a university chooses to simultaneously review more than one program / program level (for example, graduate and undergraduate), program modes, and/or programs offered at different locations.

It is important to note that, while the external reviewers' report may include commentary on issues such as faculty complement and/or space requirements when related to the quality of the program under review, recommendations on these or any other elements that are within the purview of the university's internal budgetary decision-making processes must be tied directly to issues of program quality or sustainability.

5.2.3 External Review Report

Once the Site Visit has been completed, the ERC will compile its report (template provided by QA) and submit it electronically to the Dean(s). Once received, the appropriate Dean(s) will review the report. If in the Dean's opinion the ERC Report does not address components as required,

it may be returned to the ERC members to highlight areas requiring further commentary or revision. Should the ERC Report be satisfactory, the Dean will forward it to the VPA, the Head of the Program under review, and to QA. The ERC should take no longer than 6 weeks after the site visit to compile and submit its report. The report is to be submitted electronically. It is acknowledged that, in the case of CEAB visits, the report timing follows a different schedule and may differ greatly from lead-times cited here. ERC claims for travel and expenses may be submitted to the Dean's Office directly after the completion of the Site Visit, and reviewers' honoraria will be paid by the Dean's Office upon receipt of the ERC report.

5.2.4 Structure of the ERC Report

Although recommendations from the ERC Report will ultimately be accessible to all students and staff of the university, with the sole exception of portions that are directly related to confidential personnel issues, until such time as the FAR has been approved by RMC Senate, ERC members shall consider the content of the ERC Report confidential.

The ERC report will be prepared based on input from all ERC members, though members of the ERC may divide as they like the tasks associated with producing the various components of the report. The report presents in detail the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the ERC members. The report's structure should use same criteria of the Self-Study report so that each section corresponds to the same section of the Self-Study. Reviewers should use the '*RMC External Reviewers Report Template*' which uses the evaluation criteria listed in section 5.1.3.1 of the IQAP manual ([Evaluation Criteria](#)).

Reviewers should include comments on the Program's plans for the continued development at both the undergraduate and graduate levels and makes recommendations for improvements to the Program to be implemented in the next 6 or 8 years, depending on the degree.

The report may include additional sections as the ERC deems necessary, including a confidential section dealing with personnel; this section would be made available only to the Head, the Dean(s), and the VP Academic.

5.3 Internal perspective

5.3.1 Internal response

RMC's internal response will be based upon the feedback from the programme reviewed and the responsible Dean(s). It is essential that each make clearly separate responses to the External Review Report(s) and recommendations. The exception to this requirement for separate

responses is in the case of single-department Faculty, where the Dean is essentially the Divisional Head.

5.3.1.1 Program Response to the ERC Report

Upon receipt of the ERC Report from the Dean, the Program Head will make it available for comment to faculty, staff and administrators who were involved in the preparation of the Self-Study. The commentary gathered in this exercise will constitute an informal response to the ERC report. In addition to commenting on the findings and recommendations of the report itself, respondents may offer to the Program Head feedback on the Site Visit and make suggestions about how the visit could be improved. The Program Head can solicit feedback about experiences with the ERC from students and other groups at this stage as well. These responses should go directly to the Program Head/Chair and need not reflect a consensus, but may reflect a range of opinions from the Programs various stakeholders.

Next, the Program Head/Chair will use the ERC report and information obtained from the consultation to create the Program Response to the ERC report. It should, include commentary on the following:

- a) The plans and recommendations proposed in the Self-Study report.
- b) The comments and recommendations advanced by the ERC.
- c) The Program response to the ERC comments and recommendations.

The Program Head will submit the entire file, including the Self-Study report, ERC Report and the Program response to the appropriate Dean(s) in order to assist the latter in preparing the Final Assessment Report (FAR).

5.3.2 Final Assessment Report and Implementation Plan

- a) The Final Assessment Report provides the institutional synthesis of the external evaluation of the program and strategies for continuous improvement. The appropriate Dean(s) will assess the Program Response for completeness and request clarification or elaboration if necessary. Using information from the Program Response and the recommendations from the ERC report the appropriate Dean(s) will prepare the FAR.

Essential components of the FAR:

1. Identifies any significant strengths of the Program.

2. Identifies opportunities for Program improvement and enhancement with a view towards continuous improvement
 3. Lists all recommendations of the external reviewers and the associated separate internal responses and assessments from the program and from the Dean(s). The Dean's response should amplify the program response rather than simply approve or deny it. Best practice is to focus on the issue identified by the ERC rather than only on the specific remedy proposed. The Dean may ask the program to reconsider its response if it focuses only on feasibility of the recommendation without considering the larger area identified for improvement;
 4. Explains why any external reviewers' recommendations not selected for further action in the Implementation Plan have not been prioritized;
 5. Includes any additional recommendations that the program, the Dean(s) and/or the university may have identified as requiring action as a result of the program's review;
 6. May include a confidential section (where personnel issues are addressed);
 7. Identifies who will be responsible for approving the recommendations set out in the Final Assessment Report.
- b) The Final Assessment Report must include an Executive Summary, excluding any confidential information, which is to be published on the institution's website alongside the associated Implementation Plan.
- c) The Final Assessment Report will also include an Implementation Plan:
1. Sets out and prioritizes those recommendations that are selected for implementation;
 2. Identifies the group or individual responsible for providing resources needed to address recommendations from the external reviewers or action items identified by the university;
 3. Identifies who will be responsible for acting on those recommendations; and
 4. Provides specific timelines for acting on and monitoring the implementation of those recommendations.

5.3.3 Senate Review and Submission Approval

The VP Academic will submit the Final Assessment Report including the institutional Executive Summary to the Senate for its approval.

5.4 Reporting Requirements

5.4.1 Internal reporting requirements

RMC acknowledges that to meet the objectives of its internal reporting requirement it must balance transparency with the confidentiality of sensitive documents. In order to accomplish this, access to documents will be controlled by the Office of Quality Assurance. Information will be provided to Senate (for approval), while approved documentation will be disseminated to all relevant stakeholders via:

1. RMC's QA website (<https://www.rmc-cmr.ca/en/quality-assurance/iqap-cyclical-programme-reviews>) and;
2. RMC's SharePoint (<https://dept.rmc.ca/sites/QA/SitePages/Home>)

RMC's IQAP requires that:

- a) The VP Academic, upon approval, will have the Final Assessment Report (FAR) and associated Implementation Plan translated in both official languages and distributed (excluding all confidential information) to the QC and Senate. A copy of the Report will also be forwarded to QA.
- b) The approved Final Assessment Report (excluding all confidential information, as appropriate), Executive Summary and Implementation Plan will be posted to RMC's internal SharePoint site. Access to this site will be provided to Faculty Deans, Program Heads/Chairs as well as designated departmental faculty (as stipulated in section e) **Access control**). Once posted it will be understood that ownership of these files transfers to the program for ongoing monitoring.
- c) QA will ensure that the Executive Summary and Implementation Plan are translated and posted to the QA website.
 1. QA strongly recommends that Departmental webpages include the link to Executive summaries and Implementation Plans posted on the QA website;
- d) Annual monitoring of the recommendations from the FAR will be updated by the Program Head/Chair in consultation with Program faculty. Reports will be due to the appropriate Dean(s), in writing, by June 15th, each academic year. Once approved by the appropriate Dean, QA will arrange to have the implementation reports updated to the QA website.
- e) **Access control:**

1. **RMC QA website:** Documents posted on RMC's QA website will be available to all students, faculty and staff at RMC. These include:
 - i. The Executive summary (once approved by the Senate)
 - ii. The Implementation Plan from the FAR (updated annually).

2. **RMC SharePoint (access controlled by QA):** The following documents will be posted on the SharePoint site and will be restricted to Program Head/Chairs, responsible Deans and designated faculty (as requested by the Head/Chair). These will include:
 - i. The Self-study report (SSR) and supporting documentation.
 - ii. The External Review Committee (ERC) Report.
 - iii. The Programme responses to the ERC report.
 - iv. The Final Assessment Report (FAR).

5.4.2 External reporting requirements

RMC recognizes that it must report on the outcomes of Cyclical Program Review activities to the Quality Council.

RMC will submit an annual report to the Quality Council (as per QAF 5.4.2 b), listing the past year's completed Final Assessment Reports, Implementation Plans, monitoring reports and provide an attestation by the VPA that all IQAP-required Cyclical Program Review processes have been followed. The report will also include a link to the RMC QA website with completed Executive Summaries and Implementation Plans, as well as any monitoring reports that have also been completed over the prior year. The report will be due to the Quality Council Secretariat by 1 August each year.

The annual report and related Cyclical Program Review processes described in 5.4.2 a) will occasionally be reviewed for compliance by the Quality Council. Only when members find an issue or potential area of concern will the report be discussed by the Quality Council. Should the Council then determine that a substantive issue(s) appears to exist, it may decide to initiate a Focused Audit (see Section 6.3 of the Audit Protocol and associated Definition).

5.5 Use of Accreditation and other external reviews in the Institutional Quality Assurance Process

RMC will adhere to the established schedule of cyclical review for all programs (as outlined in Appendix 6: Schedule of reviews).

It will remain at the discretion of the program chair, subject to the Dean(s) approval as to whether programs will combine, coordinate or completely segregate the reviews depending on a number of factors, including²:

- Levels and complexity of program offered (undergraduate, graduate, professional);
- Review cycle;
- Qualifications required for reviewers;
- Evaluation criteria; and
- Issues currently faced by program and/or university

One common characteristic of both accreditation and quality assurance cyclical program review is the development of a self-study by the program undergoing review. However, combining a Cyclical Program Review and 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 5.1.3.1 above 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 Section 5.3.2 and 5.4, must be produced and approved for all programs.

A Record of Substitution or Addition, and the grounds on which decisions were made, is eligible for Cyclical Audit.

5.6 Selection for Cyclical Audit

The Cyclical Review of undergraduate and/or graduate programs that were undertaken within the period since the conduct of the previous Audit are eligible for selection for the university's next Cyclical Audit (see Audit Protocol).

² Deviations from **Appendix 6: Schedule of Cyclical Program Reviews** must never exceed 8 years from the last scheduled review.

6. AUDIT PROTOCOL

6.1. Purpose and timing of the Audit

The objective of the Quality Council audit is to determine whether or not RMC, since the last audit, has acted in compliance with the provisions of its IQAP for Cyclical Program Reviews, as ratified by the Quality Council. The Cyclical Audit thus provides necessary accountability to post-secondary education's principal stakeholders—universities (individually and collectively, as a system), students, government, employers, and the public—by assessing the degree to which a university's internally-defined quality assurance processes, procedures, and practices align with and satisfy the internationally agreed upon standards, as set out in the Framework

The routine audit process will occur once every eight years. Additional audits for specific institutions may take place within any cycle, as described below. The Quality Council consults with OCAV in establishing the schedule of institutional participation in the audit process within the eight-year cycle and publishes the agreed schedule on its website.

6.2 Cyclical Audit Process

6.2.1 Pre-orientation and briefing

This in-person half-day briefing occurs in the year prior to a university's scheduled Cyclical Audit (see the Schedule of Audits). The Quality Assurance Secretariat and a member of the Audit Team provides an orientation on what to expect from the Cyclical Audit to the Key Contact and any other relevant stakeholder(s) (such as key staff members, Deans, the committee(s) responsible for quality assurance, etc.)

6.2.2 Assignment of Auditors

Normally three auditors, selected from the Audit Committee's membership by the Quality Assurance Secretariat, conduct a Cyclical Audit. These auditors will be at arm's length from the university undergoing the audit. Members of the Quality Assurance Secretariat accompany the auditors on their site visit and constitute the remainder of the Audit Team.

6.2.3 Institutional Self-study

RMC will present and assess its quality assurance processes, including challenges and opportunities, within its own institutional context. This occurs through an institutional quality assurance self-study. The self-study is prepared by the Office of Quality Assurance and submitted to the Quality Assurance Secretariat by the Vice Principal Academic. This document will be due the year prior of the institutional review and forms the foundation of the Cyclical Audit. The self-study will pay particular attention to any issues flagged in the previous audit.

6.2.4 Selection of the Sample of Quality Assurance activities for Audit

Auditors independently select Programs for audit, typically four undergraduate and four graduate cyclical Program reviews. At least one of the undergraduate Programs and one of the graduate Programs will be a New Program or Major Modifications to an Existing Program approved within the period since the previous audit.

Specific Programs may be added to the sample when the previous audit documented causes for concern, and when so directed in accordance with the *Framework* document, Section 5.2.5 (b) [Reference A]. When the institution itself so requests, specific Programs may also be audited. The RMC VP Academic will determine whether a specific audit is to be requested, in consultation with the Dean's Council.

6.2.5 Desk Audit of the Institutional Quality Assurance Practices

In preparation for a scheduled on-site visit, the auditors undertake a desk audit of the university's quality assurance practices. Using the university's self-study and records of the sampled programs, together with associated documents, this audit tests whether the university's practice is in compliance with its IQAP, as ratified by the Quality Council.¹² In addition, the audit will note any misalignment of its IQAP with the QAF.

It is essential that the auditors have access to all relevant documents and information to ensure they have a clear understanding of the university's practices. The desk audit serves to raise specific issues and questions to be pursued during the on-site visit and to facilitate an effective and efficient audit.

The documentation to be submitted for audit will include:

- a) The relevant documents and other information related to the programs selected for audit, as requested by the Audit Team;
- b) The record of any revisions of the university's IQAP, as ratified by the Quality Council; and
- c) The annual report of any minor revisions of the university's IQAP that did not require Quality Council re-ratification.

Program Heads or Deans wishing to provide any additional documents for a scheduled audit must request approval in writing, directed to the VP Academic. If approved, the VP Academic will direct QA accordingly.

During the desk audit, the auditors will also determine whether the university's web-based publication of the Executive Summaries, and subsequent reports on the implementation of the review recommendations for the programs included in the current audit, meet the requirements of Framework Section 5.4.1.

The auditors undertake to preserve the confidentiality required for all documentation and communications and to meet all applicable

requirements of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (FIPPA).

6.2.6 Site Visit

After the desk audit, auditors normally visit the university over two or three days. The principal purpose of the on-site visit is for the auditors to get a sufficiently complete and accurate understanding of the university's application of its IQAP in its pursuit of continuous improvement of its programs. Further, the site visit will serve to answer questions and address information gaps that arose during the desk audit and assess the degree to which the institution's quality assurance practices contribute to continuous improvement of its programs.

In the course of the site visit, the auditors speak with the university's senior academic leadership including those who the IQAP identifies as having important roles in the QA process. The auditors also meet with representatives from those programs selected for audit, students, and representatives of units that play an important role in ensuring program quality and success. These include, but are not limited to, the Library, Teaching and Learning Services, Institutional Research, Instructional Media, and other technical support service representatives. The Dean of the program under review, in consultation with the auditors, will establish the schedule for these interviews prior to the Site Visit.

6.2.7 Audit Report

Following the conduct of an audit, the auditors prepare a report that will be considered "draft" until it is approved by the Quality Council. The report, which is to be suitable for subsequent publication, comments on the institution's commitment to the culture of engagement with quality assurance and continuous improvement and will:

- a) Describe the audit methodology and the verification steps used;
- b) Comment on the institutional self-study submitted for audit;
- c) Describe whether the university's practice is in compliance with its IQAP as ratified by the Quality Council, on the basis of the programs selected for audit;
- d) Note any misalignment of its IQAP with the QAF;
- e) Respond to any areas the auditors were asked to pay particular attention to;
- f) Identify and record any notably effective policies or practices revealed in the course of the audit of the sampled programs; and
- g) Comment on the approach that the university has taken to ensuring continuous improvement in quality assurance through the implementation of the outcomes of cyclical program reviews and the monitoring of new programs.

The report shall not contain any confidential information. A separate addendum provides the university with detailed findings related to the audited programs. This addendum is not subject to publication.

The report may include findings in the form of:

Suggestions, which are forward-looking, and are made by auditors when they identify opportunities for the university to strengthen its quality assurance practices. Suggestions do not convey any mandatory obligations and sometimes are the means for conveying the auditors' province-wide experience in identifying good, and even on occasion, best, practices. Universities are under no obligation to implement or otherwise respond to the auditors' suggestions, though they are encouraged to do so.

Recommendations, which are recorded in the auditors' report when they have identified failures to comply with the IQAP and/or there is misalignment between the IQAP and the required elements of the Quality Assurance Framework. The university must address these recommendations in its response to the auditors' report. Causes for concern, which are potential structural and/or systemic weaknesses in quality assurance practices (for example, inadequate follow-up monitoring, as called for in Framework Section 5.4.1 d)) or a failure to make the relevant implementation reports to the appropriate statutory authorities (as called for in Framework Section 5.4.2).

Causes for Concern require that the university take the steps specified in the report and/or by the Quality Council to remedy the situation.

The Audit Report includes recommendations that the Quality Council take one or more of the following steps, as appropriate:

- Direct specific attention by the auditors to the issue(s) within the subsequent audit, as provided for in Framework Section 6.2.4;
- Schedule a larger selection of programs for the university's next audit;
- Require a Focused Audit;
- Adjust the degree of oversight and any associated requirements for more or less oversight (see Guidance);
- Require a Follow-up Response Report, with a recommended timeframe for submission; and/or
- Any other action that is deemed appropriate. Ultimately, the Audit Report includes an assessment of the overall performance of the university and contains recommendations to the Quality Council, as appropriate, based on that assessment. See also "Remedies Available" in Section 1.7.1

6.2.8 Disposition of the Audit Report

The Quality Assurance Secretariat submits the Audit Report to the Audit Committee for consideration. Once the Audit Committee is satisfied with the Report, it makes a conditional recommendation to the Quality Council for approval of the Report, subject only to minor revisions resulting from the fact checking stage described below. Quality Assurance Framework

The Quality Assurance Secretariat provides a copy to the university's "authoritative contact" identified in Framework Section 1.2, for fact checking. This consultation is intended to ensure that the report does not contain errors or omissions of fact but not to discuss the substance or findings of the report.

That authority submits its report on the factual accuracy of the draft report within 30 days. If needed, the authority can request an extension of this deadline by contacting the Quality Assurance Secretariat and providing a rationale for the request. This response becomes part of the official record and the audit team may use it to revise their report. However, the university's fact checking response will not be published on the Quality Council's website. When substantive changes are required, the draft report will be taken back to the Audit Committee.

The Chair of the Audit Committee takes the Audit Committee's recommendation for approval of the report to the Quality Council.

The Council either accepts the report, or refers it back to the Audit Committee for modification.

6.2.9 Transmittal of the Audit Report

Upon approval by the Quality Council, the Quality Assurance Secretariat sends the approved report to the university with an indication of the timing for any required follow-up

6.2.10 Publication of Main Audit Findings

The Quality Assurance Secretariat publishes the approved report of the overall findings, absent the addendum that details the findings related to the audited programs, together with a record of the recommendations on the Quality Council's website. The university will also publish the report (absent the previously specified addendum) on its website. RMC will further translate the Main Audit Findings in order to comply with the Official Languages Policy for publishing materials on government websites

6.2.11 Institutional Follow-up Response Report

When a Follow-up Response Report is required (as per Section 6.2.7), the university will submit the Report within the specified timeframe, detailing the steps it has taken to address the recommendations and/or Cause(s) for Concern.

If the Audit Team is satisfied with the university's Follow-up Response Report, it drafts a report on the sufficiency of the response. The auditors' report, suitable for publication, is then submitted to the Audit Committee for consideration.

If the Audit Team is not satisfied with the institutional response, the Audit Team will consult with the institution, through the Quality Assurance Secretariat, to ensure the follow-up response is modified to satisfy the requirements of the Audit Report. In so doing, the institution will be asked to make any necessary changes to the follow-up response within a specified timeframe. The Audit Committee submits a recommendation to the Quality Council to accept the university's follow-up response and associated auditors' report.

See also "Remedies Available" in section 1.7.1.

6.2.12 Web Publication of Follow-up Report

The Quality Assurance Secretariat publishes the Follow-up Response Report and the auditors' report on the scope and adequacy of the university's response on the Quality Council website and sends a copy to the university for publication on its website.

6.2.13 Additional reporting requirements

A report on all audit-related activity is provided to OCAV, COU and MCU through the Quality Council's Annual Report.

6.3 Focused Audit

As RMC remains committed to the continuous improvement of its programs and quality assurance practices, the institution is willing to participate in a focused audit as required to promote these. When an Audit Report has identified at least one Cause for Concern, the Report will describe the deficiencies related to the aspect(s) of the university's quality assurance processes in question. The Audit Committee will then recommend to the Quality Council that the specific area(s) of concern may require closer scrutiny and further support through a Focused Audit.

A Focused Audit may also be triggered by the Quality Council when it has some concerns about the quality assurance processes at a particular university. In such instances, the Quality Council will ask the Audit Committee to initiate a Focused Audit.

A Focused Audit may take the form of a desk audit and/or an additional site visit. The Audit Committee will also recommend to the Quality Council a proposed timeframe within which the Focused Audit should take place. A Focused Audit does not replace the Cyclical Audit.

6.3.1 The Focused Audit Report

Following the conduct of a Focused Audit, the auditors prepare a report that will be considered “draft” until it is approved by the Quality Council. The report, which is to be suitable for subsequent publication will:

- a) Describe the Focused Audit methodology and the verification steps used;
- b) Respond to the area(s) of focus the auditors were asked to pay particular attention to; and
- c) Indicate whether the Cause(s) for Concern has been satisfactorily addressed, or whether any further action is required.

The Focused Audit Report may also include Suggestions, Recommendations, and/or Cause(s) for Concern. The report will be published on both the Quality Council and university websites. Other standard elements associated with a Cyclical Audit, such as the requirement for a one-year response, will be determined on a case-by-case basis.

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.

Accreditation Review:

Professionally accredited Programs are subject to review by the relevant professional body (ex. The CEAB), on a cyclical basis. For the sake of expediency, RMC combines accreditation reviews with cyclical reviews.

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.

Arm's Length Reviewer:

Best practice in quality assurance ensures that reviewers are at arm's length from the Program under review. This means that reviewers/consultants are not close friends, current or recent (< 6 years) collaborators, former supervisors, advisors or colleagues.

Arm's length does not mean that the reviewer must never have met or even heard of a single member of the Program. It does mean that reviewers should not be chosen who are likely, or perceived to be likely, to be predisposed, positively or negatively, about the Program.

Audit Report:

After the desk audit and Site Visit of the relevant Programs, Quality Council auditors prepare a draft report, together with a summary of the principal findings suitable for subsequent publication. The VP Academic must submit a response to the draft report and summary within 60 days. The Executive Director of the Quality Council submits the final audit report and associated summary, together with the institutional response, to the Audit Committee of the Quality Council.

Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board (CEAB):

The CEAB is part of Engineers Canada and oversees the cyclical accreditation of all engineering Programs in Canada.

Changes to Existing Programs:

Course changes will continue to follow the existing RMC processes. However, major Program changes of any significance other than simple housekeeping must meet the requirements of the IQAP outlined in Protocol 4 on Major Modifications.

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 a number of 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 brought to bear on the area of specialization. This course may serve as an elective in the student's home program.
- Clear and explicit requirements for each Collaborative Specialization. In programs requiring a major research paper, essay, or thesis, the topic must be in the area of the Quality Assurance Framework collaborative specialization. In course-only master's programs, at least 30% of the courses must be in the area of specialization including the core course described above. Courses in the area of specialization may be considered electives in the home program.
- Only core faculty that are those faculty members in the participating home programs who have an interest and expertise in the area of the collaborative specialization (this may include faculty primarily appointed to an interdisciplinary academic unit – for example, an Institute of American Studies – that provides the anchor for the specialization).
- Appropriate administrative and academic oversight/governance to ensure requirements associated with the specialization are being met.

Combined Programs

A program of study that combines two existing degree programs of different types. The combination may, for example, consist of two existing graduate programs, or a graduate and an undergraduate program. In most cases, the combination will involve at least one professionally oriented program. As students normally pursue one degree program at a time, and if two qualifications are sought, the degree programs would best be pursued consecutively. However, there are cases where the combination of two programs may be advantageous from a student's point of view.

If a combined program is proposed, there must be a demonstration that it provides such advantages to students through time efficiency, benefits to scholarship, professional development, or other considerations. Students must be made fully aware of the requirements and the schedule for completion of both programs, before embarking upon the combined degree.

Cyclical Review:

All existing academic Programs at RMC are subject to review on a cyclical basis and according to a university-wide schedule. The cyclical review of an existing Program has four principal components: a Self-Study, an External Evaluation, a Program Response and Implementation Plan, and a Final Assessment Report with an Executive Summary.

Degree

An academic credential awarded on successful completion of a prescribed set and sequence of requirements at a specified standard of performance consistent with the OCAV's Degree Level Expectations and the university's own 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 Degree Level Expectations detailed in Appendix 2 are the Quality Assurance Framework's link to the OQF. Degree Level Expectations 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 degree level expectations 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. Quality Assurance Framework

Department:

The academic unit responsible for administering Programs. A department may be involved in the administration of more than one Program, especially in the case of interdisciplinary studies.

Degree Program

The complete set and sequence of courses, combinations of courses and/or other units of study, research and practice prescribed by a university for the fulfillment of the requirements for each particular degree.

Desk Audit

The process associated with the Audit Team's auditing of documents that have been submitted for a university's audit, as required as a preliminary step of the Cyclical Audit (see Section 6.2.5). A desk audit is one part of the process to determine an institution's compliance with its own IQAP and/or the Quality Assurance Framework.

Desk Review

A review of a New Program Proposal or Self-study conducted by external reviewers that is conducted independently of the university (i.e., does not typically include interviews or in-person or virtual site visits). Such a review may, with the agreement of both the external reviewers and the Provost, replace the external reviewers' in-person or virtual site visit in the New Program Approval process and Cyclical Program Review process for certain undergraduate and master's program reviews (see Sections 2.2.1 and 5.2.1).

Diploma Programs

The complete set and sequence of courses, combinations of courses and/or other units of study prescribed by a university for the fulfillment of the requirements for each particular for-credit or not-for-credit undergraduate and graduate diploma. Not-for-credit and for-credit undergraduate or post-graduate diploma programs are not subject to approval or audit by the Quality Council. The Quality Council recognizes only three types or categories of Graduate Diploma (see definitions below and Guidance), with specific appraisal conditions (and an associated submission template) applying to each. In each case, when proposing a new graduate diploma, a university may request an Expedited Approval process (see definition below). All such programs, once approved, will be subject to the normal cycle of program reviews, typically in conjunction with the related degree program.

Type 1: Awarded when a candidate admitted to a master's program leaves the program after completing a prescribed proportion of the requirements. Students are not admitted directly to these programs.

When new, these programs require approval through the university's Protocol for Major Modification (Program Renewal and Significant Change) prior to their adoption. Once approved, they will be incorporated into the university's schedule for cyclical reviews as part of the parent program.

Type 2: Offered in conjunction with a master's or doctoral degree, the admission to which requires that the candidate be already admitted to the master's or doctoral program. This represents an additional, usually interdisciplinary, qualification.

When new, these programs require submission to the Quality Council for an Expedited Approval (no external reviewers required) prior to their adoption. Once approved, they will be incorporated into the university's schedule for cyclical reviews as part of the parent program.

Type 3: A stand-alone, direct-entry program, generally developed by a unit already offering a related master's or doctoral degree, and designed to meet the needs of a particular clientele or market.

Where the program has been conceived and developed as a distinct and original entity, the university will use the Expedited Approval (see below). Although the Expedited Approval protocol does not involve external reviewers, new Type 3 GDips are to be included in the Schedule for Cyclical Reviews and will be subject to external review during the CPR process.

Emphasis, Option, Minor Program (or similar):

An identified set and sequence of courses, and/or other units of study, research and practice within an area of disciplinary or interdisciplinary study, which is completed on an optional basis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the awarding of a degree, and may be recorded on the graduate's record. While requiring recognition in the IQAP, proposals for their introduction or modification do not require reference to the Quality Council unless they are part of a New Program.

Expedited Approvals:

Apply where a) an institution requests endorsement of the Quality Council to declare a new Field in a graduate Program or b) there is a proposal for a new Collaborative Program; or c) there are proposals for new for-credit graduate diplomas; or d) there are Major Modifications to Existing Programs, proposed for a degree Program or Program of specialization.

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. Only the applicable criteria outlined in Framework Part Two Section 2.1 will be applied to the proposal. The process is further expedited by not requiring the use of external reviewers; hence Framework Part two Sections 2.2 does not apply. Furthermore, the Council's appraisal and approval processes are reduced. (See Framework Section 3). The outcomes of these submissions will be conveyed to the proposing university directly by the Quality Assurance Secretariat and reported to the Quality Council.

External Review:

All cyclical reviews and new Program proposals must include a review by qualified referees from outside RMC. External review of new graduate Program proposals must incorporate a Site Visit. External review of new undergraduate Program proposals will normally be conducted on-site, but

may be conducted by desk audit, video-conference or an equivalent method. 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 department proposing the new Program.

External Review Committee (ERC):

The ERC for a cyclical review is composed of either two or three members. ERC members will be active and respected in their fields and they will be at arm's length from the Program under review. Additional ERC members from industry or professions may be assigned in certain fields as appropriate (i.e., especially in professional Programs).

External Review Committee Report:

Once the ERC has completed its Site Visit it prepares a single joint report, which presents in detail the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the ERC. The report's structure echoes that of the Self-Study report.

Field:

In graduate Programs, field refers to 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. Institutions are not required to declare fields at either the master's or doctoral level. Institutions may wish, through an expedited approval process, to seek the endorsement of the Quality Council.

Final Assessment Report:

The report is prepared by the appropriate Dean(s) on behalf of the VP Academic. It assesses the Program response to the self-study and external evaluation. The Final Assessment Report should be submitted no more than 6 weeks after receipt of the ERC report, and should include an Executive Summary, exclusive of any confidential information to be published on the university's website.

Focused Audit

A close examination of a specific aspect of an institution's quality assurance processes and practices that have not met the standards/requirements set out by the Quality Council in the QAF or in the institution's IQAP. A Focused Audit does not replace a Cyclical Audit.

Graduate Level Course

A course offered by a graduate program and taught by institutionally-approved graduate faculty, where the learning outcomes are aligned with the Graduate Degree Level Expectations and the majority of students are registered as graduate students.

Implementation Plan:

A prioritized list of activities that will take place over a given period which includes tasks, the person or people in charge of carrying out the tasks, the resources required to achieve the task and the timeline to expected completion.

Intended Learning Outcomes:

Specific expected skill attainments in individual degree Programs, as well as required knowledge in broader, more general subjects. Each Program will identify its own intended learning outcomes with reference to RMC's UDLEs and GDLEs, listed in Appendix 3, and update them as necessary as part of each Cyclical Review.

Inter-Institutional Program Categories

1. Conjoint Degree Program: A program of study, offered by a postsecondary institution that is affiliated, federated or collaborating with a university, which is approved by the university's Senate or equivalent body, and for which a single degree document signed by both institutions is awarded.

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

In the case of the Cotutelle, since this arrangement relates to an existing, approved program, no separate appraisal or review processes will apply.

3. Dual Credential/Degree Program: A program of study offered by two or more universities or by a university and a college or institute, including Institutes of Technology and Advanced Learning, in which successful completion of the requirements is confirmed by a separate and different degree/diploma document being awarded by each of the participating institutions.

4. Joint Degree Program: A program of study offered by two or more universities or by a university and a college or institute, including an Institute of Technology and Advanced Learning, in which successful completion of the requirements is confirmed by a single degree document. (See Guidance)

The Protocol for New Program Approvals or the Protocol for Major Modifications (Significant Change and Program Renewal) will be used, as appropriate. For existing inter-institutional programs in which all partners are institutions within Ontario, the Quality Council's Cyclical Program Review Processes will apply to all elements of those programs as offered by all partner institutions involved (including, e.g., Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology and Institutes of Technology and Advanced Learning). For joint programs in which some partners are institutions outside Ontario, the elements of the programs Quality Assurance Framework

Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP):

A protocol for reviews of academic Programs. IQAPs must comply with the Quality Council's Framework document, but institutions also add to the Framework guidelines to reflect their own unique identities and goals.

Internal Response:

The written response to external review of a new Program proposal.

Internal Review Committee:

Refers to the Syllabus Committee for undergraduate Programs, and the Graduate Studies Committee for post-graduate Programs.

Major Modifications to Existing Programs:

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. Examples include:

- a) Requirements that differ significantly from those existing at the time of the previous cyclical Program review;
- b) Significant changes to the learning outcomes;
- c) Significant changes to the faculty engaged in delivering the Program and/or to the essential physical resources as may occur, for example, where there have been changes to the existing mode(s) of delivery (e.g., different campus, online delivery, inter-institutional collaboration);
- d) The addition of a new field to an existing graduate Program.

For a complete list of what RMC considers to constitute a Major Modification see section 4.1.3.1 Criteria for Major Modifications.

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 industry, employers, and/or the community. They have fewer requirements and are of shorter duration than a qualification and focus on learning outcomes that are distinct from diploma/degree programs. While requiring recognition in the IQAP, proposals for the introduction or modification of a micro-credential do not require reference to the Quality Council unless they are part of a New Program.

Mode of Delivery

The means or medium used in delivering a program (e.g., lecture format, distance, online, synchronous/asynchronous, problem-based, compressed part-time, multi-campus, inter-institutional collaboration or other non-standard forms of delivery).

New Program

Any degree credential (e.g., BMus, Bachelor of Integrated Studies) or degree program (within an existing degree credential), currently approved by Senate or equivalent governing body, which has not been previously approved for that institution by the Quality Council, its predecessors, or any intra-institutional approval processes that previously applied. A change of name, only, does not constitute a new program; nor does the inclusion of a new program of specialization where another with the same designation already exists (e.g., a new honours program where a major with the same designation already exists). To clarify, for the purposes of this Framework, a ‘new program’ is brand-new: that is to say, the program has substantially different program objectives, program requirements and program-level learning outcomes from those of any existing approved programs offered by the institution. Examples of what constitutes a ‘new program’ are provided in Guidance (<https://oucqa.ca/guide/distinguishing-between-major-modifications-and-new-programs-examples/>).

The approval process for the introduction of new undergraduate and graduate programs follows the New Program Approval Protocol in Framework Part Two Section 2. All Proposal Briefs submitted to the Quality Council will report whether the program is a professional program and/or a full cost recovery program.

New Program Proposals:

A brief prepared by the Program Head and designated Program faculty outlining the proposed Program’s rationale, requirements, title, etc. This brief is then reviewed by an internal review committee and then by external reviewers. If, after these reviews and appropriate revisions the Senate approves the new Program, the proposal is submitted to the Quality Council for approval. Upon approval, the new Program may be announced.

Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (OUCQA or Quality Council):

The quality assurance body for Ontario universities established in 2010 by the Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents. The Quality Council operates at arm’s length from universities and from government to ensure that Ontario has a rigorous quality assurance framework.

Program:

The complete set and sequence of courses, combinations of courses and/or other units of study, research and practice prescribed by an institution for the fulfillment of the requirements of a particular degree. Not to be confused with a department or a degree. A Program is administered by a department, or in the case of interdisciplinary Programs, by more than one department. A department may administer more than one Program, and a Program may lead to more than one choice of degree.

Program Head:

All references to Program Heads apply to Department Heads or to Program Chairs when the Program is governed by an interdepartmental Program committee.

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-Level Student Learning Outcomes (PLOs)

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 (POs)

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 particular 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 Proposal Brief:

To initiate the process of launching a new Program, this brief is prepared by the Program Head and designated Program faculty and submitted to the relevant internal review committee – Syllabus Committee for undergraduate Programs, Graduate Studies Committee for post-graduate Programs.

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. Quality Assurance Framework

Program Response:

Produced by the Program Head, this document responds in detail to the issues raised by the External Evaluation during a Cyclical Review. The Program Response should recommend plans to implement suggestions made by the ERC.

Quality Assurance Framework:

The specifications set forth by the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance with which all Ontario universities' Institutional Quality Assurance Processes must comply. The Framework

identifies minimum standards for the conduct of New Program Approvals, Expedited Approvals, Cyclical Reviews, and Audits of IQAPs by the Quality Council.

Quality Council Audit:

An audit conducted to determine whether or not RMC, since the last audit, has acted in compliance with the provisions of its IQAP for Cyclical Program Reviews, as ratified by the Quality Council.

Quality Indicators:

Measures of Program performance, including comparison to applicable provincial, national, and professional standards. Quality indicators may include admission requirements, curriculum structure, examples of student work, pass/fail rates in courses, faculty teaching loads, etc.

Reviewers' Report:

This report is produced when a new Program is reviewed by external reviewers.

Self-Study:

An internal evaluation and report written by the Program Head or chair and department members, and submitted to the appropriate Dean(s), the VP Academic and the External Review Committee (ERC).

Self-Study Brief:

The Head of a Program under review submits a short brief to the VP Academic through the Faculty Dean, listing all modalities, locations and levels of the Program under review. After the VP Academic approves this brief, the review process can begin.

Self-Study Report:

An internal evaluation and report written by the Program Head and Program faculty, and submitted to the appropriate Dean, the VP Academic and, ultimately, to the External Review Committee (ERC). A template for the Self-Study is found online

Site Visit:

External reviewers conduct Site Visits for cyclical reviews and for Program audits. These visits are arranged through the office of the Faculty Dean, and the schedule for the Site Visit should be prepared at least a month in advance to allow for any necessary changes.

Specialization (major, honours Program, concentration or similar):

An identified set and sequence of courses, and/or other units of study, research and practice within an area of disciplinary or interdisciplinary study, which is completed in full or partial fulfillment of the requirements for the awarding of a degree, and is recorded on the graduate's academic record.

University Undergraduate and Graduate Degree Level Expectations (UUDLEs and GDLEs):

These expectations outline specific expected skill attainments in individual degree Programs, as well as required knowledge in broader, more general subjects. Appendix 3 lists the current, approved RMC degree level expectations, and all Programs are expected to develop their own Program-specific DLEs to be housed outside of the RMC IQAP and to be updated as part of each Cyclical Review.

Undergraduate Certificate

A short form credential that forms a coherent program of study organized around a clear set of learning outcomes. Undergraduate certificates are comprised of undergraduate level academic content normally equivalent to a minimum of half a year of full-time study. While requiring recognition in the IQAP, proposals for the introduction or modification to an undergraduate certificate do not require reference to the Quality Council unless they are part of a New Program.

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 stakeholders. 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.

Appendix 2

ACRONYMS

Acronym	Full Title
CEAB	<i>Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board</i>
CAF	<i>Canadian Armed Forces</i>
COU	<i>Council of Ontario Universities</i>
DND	<i>Department of National Defence</i>
DLE	<i>Degree Level Expectations</i>
ERC	<i>External Review Committee</i>
FAR	<i>Final Assessment Report for Cyclical Program Reviews</i>
FB	<i>Faculty Board</i>
FC	<i>Faculty Council</i>
FIPPA	<i>Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act</i>
GDLES	<i>Graduate Degree Level Expectations</i>
GSC	<i>Graduate Studies Committee</i>
IQAP	<i>Institutional Quality Assurance Process</i>
ITAL	<i>Institute of Technology and Advanced Learning</i>
LO	<i>Learning Outcomes</i>
MCU	<i>Ministry of Colleges and Universities</i>
OCAV	<i>Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents</i>
OCGS	<i>Ontario Council on Graduate Studies</i>
OUCQA	<i>Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance, or the Quality Council</i>
QA	<i>Quality Assurance, or RMC Office of Quality Assurance</i>
PO	<i>Program Objectives</i>
PLO	<i>Program Learning Objectives</i>
QAF	<i>Quality Assurance Framework</i>
QC	<i>Quality Council, or the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance</i>
RETP	<i>Reserve Entry training Plan</i>
RMC	<i>Royal Military College</i>
ROTP	<i>Regular Officer Training Plan</i>
UPRAC	<i>Undergraduate Program Review Audit Committee</i>
UTPNM	<i>University Training Plan for Non-Commissioned Members</i>
UUDLES	<i>University Undergraduate Degree Level Expectations</i>

APPENDIX 3

RMC Degree Level Expectations (UUDLEs and GDLEs)

Note: Departments must articulate their own Programme Level Learning Outcomes, to be housed by the department in question.

	Baccalaureate/ bachelor's degree (general degrees)	Baccalaureate/ bachelor's degree honours (majors, honours and engineering)	Master's degree	Doctoral degree
1. Depth and breadth of knowledge	<p>a) General knowledge and understanding of many key concepts, methodologies, theoretical approaches and assumptions in a discipline</p> <p>b) Broad understanding of some of the major fields in a discipline, including, where appropriate, from an interdisciplinary perspective, and how the fields may intersect with fields in related disciplines</p> <p>c) Ability to gather, review, evaluate and interpret information relevant to one or more of the major fields in a discipline</p> <p>d) Some detailed knowledge in an area of the discipline</p> <p>e) Critical thinking and analytical skills inside and outside the discipline</p>	<p>a) Developed knowledge and critical understanding of the key concepts, methodologies, current advances, theoretical approaches and assumptions in a discipline overall, as well as in a specialized area of a discipline</p> <p>b) Developed understanding of many of the major fields in a discipline, including, where appropriate, from an interdisciplinary perspective, and how the fields may intersect with fields in related disciplines</p> <p>c) Developed ability to: i) gather, review, evaluate and interpret information; and ii) compare the merits of alternate hypotheses or creative options, relevant to one or more of the major fields in a discipline</p> <p>d) Developed, detailed knowledge of and experience in research in an area of the discipline</p> <p>e) Developed critical thinking and analytical skills inside and outside the discipline</p> <p>f) Ability to apply learning from one or more areas outside the discipline</p>	<p>A systematic understanding of knowledge, including, where appropriate, relevant knowledge outside the field and/or discipline, and a critical awareness of current problems and/or new insights, much of which is at, or informed by, the forefront of their academic discipline, field of study, or area of professional practice.</p>	<p>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>2. Knowledge of methodologies/ Research and scholarship</p>	<p>An understanding of methods of enquiry or creative activity, or both, in their primary area of study that enables the student to:</p> <p>a) evaluate the appropriateness of different approaches to solving problems using well established ideas and techniques; and</p> <p>b) devise and sustain arguments or solve problems using these methods.</p>	<p>An understanding of methods of enquiry or creative activity, or both, in their primary area of study that enables the student to:</p> <p>a) evaluate the appropriateness of different approaches to solving problems using well established ideas and techniques;</p> <p>b) devise and sustain arguments or solve problems using these methods; and</p> <p>c) describe and comment upon particular aspects of current research or equivalent advanced scholarship.</p>	<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; and</p> <p>c) Enables a treatment of complex issues and judgments based on established principles and techniques; and, On the basis of that competence, has shown at least one of the following:</p> <p>a) The development and support of a sustained argument in written form; or</p> <p>b) Originality in the application of knowledge.</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 new methods; and</p> <p>c) The ability to produce original research, or other advanced scholarship, of a quality to satisfy peer review, and to merit publication.</p>
--	--	---	--	--

<p>3. Level of application of knowledge</p>	<p>The ability to review, present, and interpret quantitative and qualitative information to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) develop lines of argument; b) make sound judgments in accordance with the major theories, concepts and methods of the subject(s) of study; and 	<p>The ability to review, present and critically evaluate qualitative and quantitative information to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) develop lines of argument; b) make sound judgments in accordance with the major theories, concepts and methods of the subject(s) of study; c) apply underlying concepts, principles, and techniques of analysis, both within and outside the discipline; d) where appropriate use this knowledge in the creative process; and 	<p>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>The capacity to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Undertake pure and/or applied research at an advanced level; and b) Contribute to the development of academic or professional skills, techniques, tools, practices, ideas, theories, approaches, and/or materials.
<p>The ability to use a basic range of established techniques to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) analyze information; b) evaluate the appropriateness of different approaches to solving problems related to their area(s) of study; c) propose solutions; and d) make use of scholarly reviews and primary sources. 	<p>The ability to use a range of established techniques to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) initiate and undertake critical evaluation of arguments, assumptions, abstract concepts and information; b) propose solutions; c) frame appropriate questions for the purpose of solving a problem; d) solve a problem or create a new work; and e) to make critical use of scholarly reviews and primary sources. 	<p>The ability to communicate information, arguments, and analyses accurately and reliably, orally and in writing to a range of audiences.</p>	<p>The ability to communicate ideas, issues and conclusions clearly.</p>	<p>The ability to communicate complex and/or ambiguous ideas, issues and conclusions clearly and effectively.</p>
<p>4. Communication skills</p>	<p>The ability to review, present, and interpret quantitative and qualitative information to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) develop lines of argument; b) make sound judgments in accordance with the major theories, concepts and methods of the subject(s) of study; and 	<p>The ability to review, present and critically evaluate qualitative and quantitative information to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) develop lines of argument; b) make sound judgments in accordance with the major theories, concepts and methods of the subject(s) of study; c) apply underlying concepts, principles, and techniques of analysis, both within and outside the discipline; d) where appropriate use this knowledge in the creative process; and 	<p>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>The capacity to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Undertake pure and/or applied research at an advanced level; and b) Contribute to the development of academic or professional skills, techniques, tools, practices, ideas, theories, approaches, and/or materials.

		<p>RMC undergraduates undertaking 4 pillar degrees must also demonstrate the ability to communicate in their Second Official Language (French or English) by passing the Public Service Second Language Evaluation (BBB/BBB).</p>		
<p>5. Awareness of limits of knowledge</p>	<p>An understanding of the limits to their own knowledge and ability, and an appreciation of the uncertainty, ambiguity and limits to knowledge and how this might influence analyses and interpretations.</p>	<p>Qualities and transferable skills necessary for further study, employment, community involvement and other activities requiring:</p> <p>a) the exercise of initiative, personal responsibility and accountability in both personal and group contexts;</p> <p>b) working effectively with others;</p> <p>c) decision-making in complex contexts; programme of further study; and</p> <p>d) behaviour consistent with academic integrity and social responsibility.</p> <p>e) the ability to manage their own learning in changing circumstances, both within and outside the discipline and to select an appropriate</p>	<p>Cognizance of the complexity of knowledge and of the potential contributions of other interpretations, methods, and disciplines.</p>	<p>An appreciation of the limitations of one's own work and discipline, of the complexity of knowledge, and of the potential contributions of other interpretations, methods, and disciplines.</p>
<p>6. Autonomy and professional capacity</p>	<p>Qualities and transferable skills necessary for further study, employment, community involvement and other activities requiring:</p> <p>a) the exercise of personal responsibility and decision-making;</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 programme of further study; and</p> <p>d) behaviour consistent with academic integrity and social responsibility.</p>	<p>Qualities and transferable skills necessary for further study, employment, community involvement and other activities requiring:</p> <p>a) the exercise of initiative, personal responsibility and accountability in both personal and group contexts;</p> <p>b) working effectively with others;</p> <p>c) decision-making in complex contexts; programme of further study; and</p> <p>d) behaviour consistent with academic integrity and social responsibility.</p> <p>e) the ability to manage their own learning in changing circumstances, both within and outside the discipline and to select an appropriate</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>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>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; and</p> <p>d) The ability to evaluate the broader implications of</p>

	<p>RMC undergraduates must also attain qualities and transferable skills for the profession of arms, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) leadership skills in complex and difficult situations b) ethical behaviour in positions of power and morally complex situations 	<p>d) The ability to appreciate the broader implications of applying knowledge to particular contexts.</p>	<p>applying knowledge to particular contexts.</p>
<p>7. Physical Fitness Knowledge and Ability (only applies to 4 pillar degrees)</p>	<p>RMC undergraduates must also attain qualities and transferable skills for the profession of arms, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) leadership skills in complex and difficult situations b) ethical behaviour in positions of power and morally complex situations 	<p>RMC undergraduates must also attain qualities and transferable skills for the profession of arms, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) leadership skills in complex and difficult situations b) ethical behaviour in positions of power and morally complex situations 	<p>All students should have demonstrated the following competencies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Successful completion of basic military swim skills evaluation. b) Theoretical and practical knowledge of fitness practices in the CF. c) Understanding of basic fitness training principles d) Knowledge of Health and Wellness principles e) Ability to apply basic unarmed combat techniques f) Demonstrate knowledge of self-defense theory. g) Developed ability to apply safety practices in a group setting.

		<p>h) Demonstrated ability to achieve and maintain fitness standards (PPT).</p> <p>i) Demonstrated understanding of individual and collective sports theories as they apply to leadership and team cohesion.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

APPENDIX 4
TABLES OF ACTION ITEMS FOR FACULTY & STAFF

Table A4-1
ACTION ITEMS AND RESPONSIBILITIES FOR PROGRAMME CYCLICAL REVIEWS

Item (Table A4-1)	Programme Head	Faculty Dean	VP Academic	Timing	QA	Comments
Preliminary Email to advise departments of upcoming cyclic programme reviews for the following calendar year.			X	Mid-October		This will include info attachments, info QA including 'Cyclical Programme Review Action and Document Receipt Checklist'
Cyclic Programme Review Presentation	X		X	Mid-Nov	X	All stakeholders (Deans, Heads, Chairs, Librarian, Athletics, Second Language Centre, Academic services (Math Centre, Writing Centre etc...) Admin Assist, VPA) Copy to QA
Memo to initiate Cyclical Review Begin Self-Study	X		X	15 Jan		Programme Head and Team
Brief to VP Academic to define scope of review	X			due 15 Feb		Template will be provided by QA; submitted through the Faculty Dean; copy to QA
Solicit Survey Data				Mid-Feb	X	Email addresses of current/past students, faculty, instructors and technical staff Copy to QA
Approval of scope of review			X	End-Feb		
Distribute Surveys				15 Mar – 30 Apr	X	Class Climate Programme Review Surveys
Propose names of external reviewers to Faculty Dean	X			31 March		Arm's Length Review guide (Appendix 5)
Selection of external reviewers		X		15 Apr		Dean selects and approves members ERC Verification Checklist to be signed off by Dean(s), notifies QA

Item (Table A4-1)	Programme Head	Faculty Dean	VP Academic	Timing	QA	Comments
Invitations sent to external reviewers		X		30 Apr		Form letter available from the QA (Letter sent out from Dean)
Draft Self-Study Report to the Dean for his/her review and approval.	X			due 30 Jul		Template will be provided by QA; programmes to update programme-specific DLEs with each review; Submit to Dean(s) for review and approval. Dean will notify QA in writing that the SSR has been approved
Self-Study Report sent to reviewers (samples of student work).		X		Minimum of 6 weeks before Site Visit date		Dean sends (electronically) SSR and accompanying documents (ERC Report Template, copies of student work, etc). Copy to QA
Site Visit		X		Normally October – November		Site Visits held in Oct & Nov Dean to arrange timing, funding and administrative details for Site Visit; Dean sets agenda for Site Visit (ERC meets with VPA first for briefing and instruction). Dean instructs ERC on their responsibilities. All travel, hospitality and other expenses associated with the Site Visit, including honoraria, are paid for from the Dean's budget.
ERC report received (electronically)		X		Due 6 weeks after Site Visit		Sent electronically to Dean (to review) to Head, VP Academic; copy to QA. Note that the Dean may return the ERC Report to the ERC if deemed incomplete
Programme Response document	X			4 weeks after receipt of the ERC Report		Drafted after internal response from programme faculty; submitted to Faculty Dean; copy to QA
Draft FAR and Executive Summary (includes Implementation Plan)		X	X	2 weeks after receipt of Programme Response		Drafted by Faculty Dean; reviewed by VPA, copy to QA.
Present Final Assessment Report		X				Faculty Dean via the VPA (for review) and subsequent submission and approval from the Senate, copy to QA

Item (Table A4-1)	Programme Head	Faculty Dean	VP Academic	Timing	QA	Comments
Submit FAR and Executive Summary for translation following approval					X	QA budget to pay for translation.
Submit Final Assessment Report without confidential personnel section, if any			X	Due at QC not later than 2 weeks after translation of ERC Report		To QC - Copies to Senate, Dean, Programme Head, Programme Faculty, QA
Post Executive Summary of the Final Assessment Report on the RMC website		X	X			Following QC approval, QA to post FAR and Executive Summary on RMC website.
Monitor Implementation Plan	X	X				Continuous process throughout year.
Annual Implementation Report (including Major changes to program)	X	X			X	Progress on changes reported to Dean(s) in writing by June 15 each academic year; reported on RMC website; copy to QA
Omnibus Report to QC by RMC for the Year in Question			X		X	Report will attest that all Quality Assurance activities for the reporting year (annual monitoring and Cyclical Program Reviews) were completed and have been posted on RMC's website. Report will be drafted by QA and approved by VPA. Submission deadline for the report is 1 Aug of each academic year.

**Table A4-2
ACTION ITEMS AND
RESPONSIBILITIES FOR
NEW PROGRAMME PROPOSALS**

Item (Table A4-2)	Programme Head	Faculty Dean	Syllabus or Graduate Studies Committee	Faculty Board & Council	Dean's Council	VPA	Senate	BoG	QA	Comments
Preparation of the New Programme Proposal Brief	X								X	Submitted to the Faculty Dean; copy to QA, QA to provide 'New Programme Action and Document Checklist'
Submission to the BoG for approval to proceed	X							X		Submitted to the BoG via from Head/Chair, Dean, VPA then Principal
Submission to the Internal Review Committee		X								Faculty Dean is the intermediary between the Programme and the Review Committee; Syllabus Committee for undergraduate proposals, Graduate Studies Committee for post-graduate proposals; copies to QA
Written response to the Programme Head			X						X	Comments on the proposed programme itself, as well as the completeness of the brief in meeting the OUCQA requirements. QA to provide template. The comments are submitted to the Faculty Dean for onward transmission to the Programme Head. A copy is also submitted to QA

Item (Table A4-2)	Programme Head	Faculty Dean	Syllabus or Graduate Studies Committee	Faculty Board & Council	Dean's Council	VPA	Senate	BoG	QA	Comments
Propose names of External Reviewers to Faculty Dean	X									
Selection of External Reviewers		X								ERC Verification Checklist must be signed off by Dean(s). Copy to QA
Invitations sent to external reviewers by Dean(s)		X								Form letter available from QA. Copy to QA
Proposal Brief sent to Reviewers		X								The Faculty Dean is the intermediary for all communication and documentation between the Programme and the External Reviewers
Site Visit		X								Dean to arrange timing, funding and administrative details for Site Visit or obtain written confirmation that external reviewers do require a Site Visit. (ERC meets with VPA first). Dean sets agenda for Site Visit, and all travel, hospitality and other expenses associated with the Site Visit, including honoraria, are paid for from the Dean's budget.
External Reviewers' Report received		X								The Faculty Dean is the intermediary for all communication and documentation between the Programme and the External Reviewers; copy to QA (template from QA)

Item (Table A4-2)	Programme Head	Faculty Dean	Syllabus or Graduate Studies Committee	Faculty Board & Council	Dean's Council	VPA	Senate	BoG	QA	Comments
Programme Response (Internal Reponse)	X									Submitted to Syllabus or Graduate Studies Committee by the Programme Head through the Faculty Dean; copy to QA
Institutional Perspective document			X							Syllabus or GS Committee submits proposal package to Faculty Board or Faculty Council with their comments and recommendations; copy to QA
Comments on budgetary and other issues		X								
Recommendations				X						Recommendation to Senate
Final Internal Approval							X			Key portions of Senate minutes sent to QA for audit purposes
Submission to Quality Council							X			VP Academic to make submission on behalf of Senate; copy to QA
Announcement of the New Programme	X									Only after receipt of Quality Council approval to deliver the new programme; approval lapses if programme not delivered within 36 months
Monitoring of New Programme implementation	X									Written report to Dean(s) by June 15 of first year of implementation
Assessment of New Programme implementation		X								Initiates any action required and sends copy of Implementation Report and actions required to QA for audit purposes

**Table A4-3
 ACTION ITEMS AND RESPONSIBILITIES
 FOR
 MAJOR PROGRAMME CHANGES**

Item (Table A4-3)	Programme Head	Faculty Dean	Syllabus or Graduate Studies Committee	Faculty Board & Council	VP Academic	QA	Comments
Preparation of the Programme Change Proposal Brief	X					X	Proposal is submitted to Faculty Dean; copy to QA, QA to provide 'Programme Changes Action and Document Checklist'
Submission to the Internal Review Committee		X					Faculty Dean is the intermediary between the Programme and the Review Committee; Syllabus Committee for undergraduate proposals, Graduate Studies Committee for post-graduate proposals; copy to QA
Written response to the Programme Head			X			X	Comments on the proposed programme itself, as well as the completeness of the brief in meeting the OUCQA requirements are submitted to the Programme Head through the Faculty Dean. QA to provide template

Programme Response (Internal Response)	X							Submitted to Syllabus or Graduate Studies Committee through the Faculty Dean; copy to QA.
Institutional Perspective document			X					Syllabus or GS Committee submits proposal package to Faculty Board or Faculty Council with their comments and recommendations; copy to QA
Comments on budgetary and other issues		X						
Recommendations			X					
Final Internal Approval			X					Final approval by Faculty Council; copy to QA
Submission to Quality Council following the Expedited Approval process						X		If it is a proposal for a new collaborative programme or a new for-credit graduate diploma
Decision on submitting major changes for Expedited Approval						X		Decision made by the VP Academic after discussion of each particular case at the Deans' Council.
Announcement of the Programme Change	X							Only after receipt of Faculty Council approval, or Quality Council approval if submitted to QC for Expedited Approval; copy of documentation forwarded to QA

Cyclical Review							As scheduled in normal cyclical review cycle
Annual Report to Quality Council					X	X	Only major changes included in annual report drafted by Office of Quality Assurance for submission by VP Academic

APPENDIX 5: CHOOSING ARM'S LENGTH REVIEWERS

Best practice in quality assurance ensures that reviewers are at arm's length from the programme under review. This means that reviewers/consultants are not close friends, current or recent collaborators, former supervisors, advisors or colleagues.

Arm's length does not mean that the reviewer must never have met or even heard of a single member of the programme. It does mean that reviewers should not be chosen who are likely, or perceived to be likely, to be predisposed, positively or negatively, about the programme. It may be helpful to provide some examples of what does and does not constitute a close connection that would violate the arm's length requirement.

Examples of what may not violate the arm's length requirement:

- Appeared on a panel at a conference with a member of the programme.
- Served on a granting council selection panel with a member of the programme.
- Author of an article in a journal edited by a member of the programme, or a chapter in a book edited by a member of the programme.
- External examiner of a dissertation by a doctoral student in the programme.
- Presented a paper at a conference held at the university where the programme is located.
- Invited a member of the programme to present a paper at a conference organized by the reviewer, or to write a chapter in a book edited by the reviewer.
- Received a bachelor's degree from the university (especially if in another programme).
- Co-author or research collaborator with a member of the programme more than seven years ago.
- Presented a guest lecture at the university.
- Reviewed for publication a manuscript written by a member of the programme.

Examples of what may violate the arm's length requirement:

- A previous member of the programme or department under review (including being a visiting professor).
- Received a graduate degree from the programme under review.
- A regular co-author and research collaborator with a member of the programme, within the past seven years, and especially if that collaboration is ongoing.
- Close family/friend relationship with a member of the programme.
- A regular or repeated external examiner of dissertations by doctoral students in the programme.
- The doctoral supervisor of one or more members of the programme.

Additional Criteria for Choosing External Reviewers/Consultants

External reviewers/consultants should have a strong record of accomplishment as academic scholars and ideally should also have had academic administrative experience in such roles as undergraduate or graduate programme coordinators, department chair, dean, graduate dean or associated positions. Additionally, one the reviewers on each review team should possess a background in curriculum development so they may assess the evaluation criteria used in cyclical program reviews and New Program proposals. This combination of experience allows a reviewer to provide the most valuable feedback on program proposals and reviews.

Appendix 6: RMC IQAP Cyclical Review Schedule: 2018 - 2033						
CYCLE 2: 2018 - 2025						
Last Reviewed	Current Year	Programs to be Reviewed	Responsible Dean	Comments	Programs Reviewed	
2012	2018	BEng Aeronautical Engineering	Dean of Engineering		1	
		BEng Civil Engineering	Dean of Engineering		1	
		BEng Mechanical Engineering	Dean of Engineering		1	
		BEng Electrical Engineering	Dean of Engineering		1	
		BEng Computer Engineering	Dean of Engineering		1	
2011	2019	BEng Chemical Engineering	Dean of Engineering		1	
		BA History	Dean of Social Sciences and Humanities		1	
2012	2020	BA Military and Strategic Studies	Dean of Social Sciences and Humanities		1	
2013	2021	BSc Chemistry	Dean of Science		1	
2014	2022	<i>No programs scheduled for review</i>				
		BA Politics	Dean of Social Sciences and Humanities		1	
		BA French, Literature and Culture	Dean of Social Sciences and Humanities		1	
		BSc Physics	Dean of Science		1	
		BSc Space Science	Dean of Science		1	
2016		MSc, PhD Physics	Dean of Science/Dean of Grad Studies	moved from 2024	1	
2015	2023	BA General Arts	Dean of Social Sciences and Humanities		1	
		BA English, Culture and Communication	Dean of Social Sciences and Humanities		1	
		BMAsc	Dean of Social Sciences and Humanities		1	
		Masters Defence Studies	Dean of SSH/Dean of Grad Studies		1	
		MSc/PhD Chemistry	Dean of Science/Dean of Grad Studies		2	

				Dean of Engineering/Dean of Grad Studies		3
		MASc/MEng/ PhD Civil Engineering		Dean of Engineering/Dean of Grad Studies		3
		MASc/MEng/ PhD Electrical and Computer Engineering		Dean of Engineering/Dean of Grad Studies		3
		MASc/MEng/ PhD Mechanical Engineering		Dean of Engineering/Dean of Grad Studies		2
		MASc/MEng Aeronautical Engineering		Dean of Engineering/Dean of Grad Studies		2
		MASc/PhD Chemical Engineering				
		BA Psychology		Dean of SSH/Dean of Grad Studies		1
		BA Business Administration		Dean of Social Sciences and Humanities		1
		BA Economics		Dean of Social Sciences and Humanities		1
		Joint BA Psychology and Business Administration		Dean of Social Sciences and Humanities		1
		BA Business Administration and Economics		Dean of Social Sciences and Humanities		1
		Masters of Business Administration (MBA)		Dean of SSH/Dean of Grad Studies		1
		MA/PhD War Studies	2024	Dean of SSH/Dean of Grad Studies		2
		Masters Public Administration (MPA)		Dean of SSH/Dean of Grad Studies		1
		BSc General		Dean of Science	7-Year cycle begins (Deferral option to 8th year in effect IQAP 5.1.2.1.)	1
		BSc Mathematics		Dean of Science		1
		BSc Computer Science		Dean of Science		1
		MSc/PhD Mathematics		Dean of Science	IQAP 5.1.2.1 in effect from 2025 onward	1
		MSc/PhD Computer Science	2025	Dean of Science		1
					Total	2
				total programs		47

CYCLE 3: 2025 - 2033						
Last Reviewed	Current Year	Programs to be Reviewed	Responsible Dean	Comments	Programs Reviews	
2018	2025	BEng Aeronautical Engineering	Dean of Engineering	Separate visits for IQAP/CEAB.	1	
		BEng Civil Engineering	Dean of Engineering		1	
		BEng Mechanical Engineering	Dean of Engineering		1	
		BEng Electrical Engineering	Dean of Engineering		1	
		BEng Computer Engineering	Dean of Engineering		1	
		BEng Chemical Engineering	Dean of Engineering		1	
2020		MASc/MEng/PhD Geo Engineering (in collaboration with Queen's university)	Dean of Engineering		1	
		BSc Chemistry	Dean of Science		1	
2019	2026	BA History	Dean of SSH		1	
		BA Military and Strategic Studies	Dean of SSH		1	
2020	2027	<i>No programs scheduled for review</i>				
2021	2028	Core Curriculum Review (4 pillar degrees only)	Vice Principal Academic			
2022	2029	BA Politics	Dean of Social Sciences and Humanities		1	
		BA French, Literature and Culture	Dean of Social Sciences and Humanities		1	
		BSc Physics	Dean of Science		1	
		BSc Space Science	Dean of Science		1	
2023		BA English, Culture and Communication	Dean of Social Sciences and Humanities	moved from 2030	1	
2023	2030	BA General Arts	Dean of SSH		1	
		BMASc	Dean of Continuing Studies		1	
		Masters Defence Studies	Dean of SSH/Dean of Grad Studies		1	
		MSc/PhD Chemistry	Dean of Science/Dean of Grad Studies		2	
		MASc/MEng/ PhD Civil Engineering	Dean of Engineering/Dean of Grad Studies		3	

				MIASc/MEng/ PhD Electrical and Computer Engineering	Dean of Engineering/Dean of Grad Studies		3
				MIASc/MEng/ PhD Mechanical Engineering	Dean of Engineering/Dean of Grad Studies		3
				MIASc/MEng Aeronautical Engineering	Dean of Engineering/Dean of Grad Studies		2
				MEng/PhD Chemical Engineering	Dean of Engineering/Dean of Grad Studies		2
				BA Psychology	Dean of Social Sciences and Humanities		1
				BA Business Administration	Dean of Social Sciences and Humanities		1
				BA Economics	Dean of Social Sciences and Humanities		1
				Joint BA Psychology and Business Administration	Dean of Social Sciences and Humanities		1
				BA Business Administration and Economics	Dean of Social Sciences and Humanities		1
2024	2031			MA/PhD War Studies	Dean of SSH/Dean of Grad Studies		2
				Masters of Business Administration (MBA)	Dean of SSH/Dean of Grad Studies		1
				Masters Public Administration (MPA)	Dean of SSH/Dean of Grad Studies		1
				BSc General	Dean of Science		1
				BSc Mathematics	Dean of Science		1
				BSc Computer Science	Dean of Science		1
				BEng Aeronautical Engineering	Dean of Engineering		1
				BEng Civil Engineering	Dean of Engineering	Separate visits for IQAP / CEAB.	1
				BEng Mechanical Engineering	Dean of Engineering		1
2025	2031			BEng Electrical Engineering	Dean of Engineering		1
				BEng Computer Engineering	Dean of Engineering		1
				BEng Chemical Engineering	Dean of Engineering		1
				BSc Chemistry	Dean of Science		1
2025	2032			MSc/PhD Mathematics	Dean of Science		1
				MSc/PhD Computer Science	Dean of Science		1
2025	2033			No programs scheduled for review			
					total programs		53*

*7 Programs reviewed twice in Cycle 3 due to CEAB schedule (2025/2031)

APPENDIX 7

RMC Core Curriculum Program Level Learning Outcomes (Undergraduate programs only)

Note: See Table 1 for a complete listing of CMC Core Curriculum courses ([Table 1: Core Curriculum courses](#))

Program Learning Outcome	Description	Learning Outcomes (students must be able to)
<p>1. Practice a shared ideology and apply the ethical reasoning required to make sound judgements and serve with honour.</p>	<p>Officers must demonstrate leader effectiveness, which forms an integral part of CAF effectiveness, through a commitment to the CAF military ethos and the highest standards of professionalism. Officers must display integrity, moral courage, and Canadian military values. Graduates must exemplify and apply ethical reasoning and establish an ethical culture</p>	<p>a. Demonstrate the ability to engage in abstract ethical reasoning, b. Demonstrate an understanding of the concepts and practices of the profession of arms, c. Demonstrate an understanding of the standards associated with professional identity (e.g., adherence to both military and occupational code), d. Demonstrate an understanding of the principles of the Defence Ethics Program, e. Apply moral sensitivity and moral judgment to understand the moral and ethical implications of different courses of action and potential ethical dilemmas before determining the best course of action, and f. Demonstrate an understanding of the central role that leadership has in shaping ethical attitudes and behaviours of subordinates.</p>
<p>2. Understand the principles of sound leadership</p>	<p>Officers must build and foster team relationships in order to optimize team performance, morale, communication, and collaboration. They must be able to understand, influence, and lead others at the tactical and operational levels. Officers must actively change social and environmental conditions in order to positively influence resilience, as well as individual and collective performance, in order to exert an impact on the performance and the effectiveness of the mission and the CAF. Officers must understand organizational and interpersonal structures and appreciate</p>	<p>a. Develop leadership abilities of self and others in accordance with CAF doctrine, b. Apply the understanding of team dynamics and performance, as well as individual behaviour and performance to leading at the tactical and operational levels, c. Demonstrate an understanding of, and an ability to assess and identify, the individual, group, organizational, and social factors that influence performance, resilience, and well-being, d. Analyze individual, group, and organizational factors and understand how they impact performance, and</p>

	<p>how these structures influence work dynamics.</p> <p>Officers must understand that “the legitimacy of the profession of arms in Canada essentially depends on members fulfilling their professional responsibilities in accordance with Canadian values, Canadian and international laws, and the Canadian military ethos.</p>	<p>e. Demonstrate an understanding of the appropriateness of various leadership styles, motivational strategies, and conflict management strategies in various situations and in shaping the attitudes and behaviours of individuals.</p> <p>a. Demonstrate an understanding of Indigenous cultures and peoples both historically and in the present,</p> <p>b. Demonstrate an understanding of Canadian history,</p> <p>c. Demonstrate an understanding of Canadian values, including multiculturalism, diversity, equity, and inclusion, and the role of these values in Canadian society and government,</p> <p>d. Demonstrate an understanding of the concepts inherent in the legal political framework that guides the ideals and practice of Canadian democracy, and</p> <p>e. Demonstrate an understanding of the basic organizational structures that underpin the Canadian government and the relationship between those organizations and the military.</p>
<p>4. Understand diverse national and international contexts.</p>	<p>Officers must apply organizational awareness within the context of wider national and international defence and security environments and military doctrine.</p> <p>Officers must understand current CAF structures, processes, objectives, and key players, and they must apply the CAF’s current and emerging priorities to make recommendations, gain cooperation and support, and achieve unit objectives.</p> <p>Officers must be able to contribute to international and multinational operations. This ability requires not only a knowledge of the laws, governance, and agencies involved in operations, but also a strong geopolitical awareness, a global historical perspective, and an understanding of cultural diversity. A</p>	<p>a. Demonstrate knowledge of the different agencies with the potential to be involved in international operations and responses to the wide variety of international threats,</p> <p>b. Demonstrate knowledge of geopolitical factors in the international environment,</p> <p>c. Demonstrate knowledge of global historical trends,</p> <p>d. Demonstrate broad cultural awareness, including the principles of diversity, equity, and inclusion,</p> <p>e. Demonstrate knowledge of theories that deal with race, ethnicity, culture, gender, sexuality, religion and spirituality, international relations, nationalism, and post colonialism,</p> <p>f. Demonstrate knowledge of international law and governance, and</p> <p>g. Demonstrate knowledge of multinational operations</p>

	critical and adaptable approach to security environments and international threats requires a familiarity with foundational theories in such areas as international relations, race, nation, and ethnicity.	
<p>5. Think critically and creatively in order to address the risks and ambiguities inherent in the demands of the profession.</p>	<p>Officers must be able to operate within a complex and ever-changing security environment that “is non-linear, unpredictable, and constantly changing in ways that cannot be precisely anticipated. Analytical, reductionist thinking will therefore be insufficient.” Officers must be flexible and critical thinkers who are able to challenge their assumptions and the assumptions of others. They must be able to translate ambiguous information and experience into concrete and logical decisions to achieve stated goals</p>	<p>a. Apply logical reasoning principles, such as inductive and deductive reasoning, when addressing issues and creating effective solutions,</p> <p>b. Comprehend, analyze, synthesize, and evaluate information from a variety of sources, in order to create effective solutions and courses of action,</p> <p>c. Establish priorities, compare alternative solutions, and analyze risks,</p> <p>d. Appraise the complex relationship between competing issues and develop effective solutions that balance competing demands, and</p> <p>e. Demonstrate the ability to engage in critical analysis in the context of a changing decision-making environment.</p>
<p>6. Demonstrate the technical and scientific literacy needed to operate in complex environments.</p>	<p>Officers must be able to apply fundamental mathematical principles, scientific methods, physical concepts, algorithmic problem solving, and computational thinking. These foundations are essential to officers who must operate effectively within security environments that have been destabilized by the rapid evolution, obsolescence, or unavailability of technology.</p>	<p>a. Apply scientific principles and reasoning to understand and appreciate current and future technology in order to recognize vulnerabilities, counter emerging threats, and take advantage of evolving opportunities,</p> <p>b. Demonstrate an understanding of basic mathematical concepts, principles, and techniques of scientific and mathematical analysis,</p> <p>c. Apply scientific knowledge and reasoning to design and implement solutions to technical problems,</p> <p>d. Apply algorithms to problem solving,</p> <p>e. Demonstrate an understanding of hypothesis testing and experimental design,</p> <p>f. Demonstrate an awareness of current experimental, theoretical, and computational frontiers in research and the technologies that enable them,</p> <p>g. Demonstrate an understanding of the interplay between fundamental research, technology development, and research for military applications, in the context of Canadian values and interests, and</p>

<p>7. Communicate effectively within an information-rich environment.</p>	<p>Officers must communicate, orally and in writing, well beyond the rudimentary qualifications necessary for non-professionals. Officers must speak and write in a manner that is timely, clear, concise, organized, and appropriate to the situation, and is grammatically correct and rational. As a professional, officers must have the facility to address groups in a variety of settings.</p>	<p>h. Apply scientific knowledge and reasoning to understand the interaction between Canadian military activities, environmental considerations, and sustainable development.</p> <p>a. Communicate in a clear, concise, organized, and timely manner in the appropriate format, as dictated by the situation,</p> <p>b. Write simple and complex documents in a well-organized and articulate manner that is grammatically correct and rational,</p> <p>c. Communicate in a professional, succinct, and convincing manner that is well suited for its purpose, with substantiated, in-depth arguments,</p> <p>d. Address groups verbally in a variety of settings using appropriate communication skills,</p> <p>e. Adapt communication and interactive styles to audience and situation to facilitate and enhance understanding of the message,</p> <p>f. Develop communication skills that clarify understanding, resolve conflicts, and bridge differences, and</p> <p>g. Demonstrate the ability to read critically and listen actively.</p>
<p>8. Understand the nature and changing character of armed conflict.</p>	<p>Officers must operate in a wide variety of conflict environments, some of which have not yet been experienced or envisaged. Their ability to adapt and respond effectively in such environments is founded on a strong base of past practice and knowledge, and the capacity to use that knowledge base, in conjunction with critical analysis skills, to determine the appropriate level of force required for a given situation, and to make decisions to fulfil policy and operational decisions at all levels.</p>	<p>a. Demonstrate a comprehensive understanding of the theory and practice of armed conflict, and its history,</p> <p>b. Demonstrate an understanding of the way in which national and international law regulates armed conflict,</p> <p>c. Demonstrate a strong knowledge of international norms and laws that influence the objectives of international military operations, and</p> <p>d. Understand the social, cultural, political, psychological, and technological influences in the changing nature of armed conflict</p>

Table 1: Current Canadian Military College (CMC) Core Curriculum Courses

RMC Core Curriculum Courses³ (CMC is comprised of RMC (Kingston) and CMRSJ (St-Jean)						
Theme 1 (Sciences)	SSH RMC	SSH CMRSJ	Science RMC	Science CMRSJ	Engineering RMC	Engineering CMRSJ
Math (logic)	MAE/F103 MAE/F113	201-103-RE	MAE/F101	201-NYA-05 201-NYB-05	MAE/F101	201-NYA-05 201-NYB-05
Math (logic)	MAE/F106	360-300-RE	MAE/F129	201-NYC-05	MAE/F129	201-NYC-05
Information Technology	BAE220/ AAF220 or CSE260/ INF260	20-GEA-03	CSE101/ INF101	420-GEB-05	CSE101/ INF101	420-GEB-03
Sciences (chemistry)	CCE/F200 or CCE/F204	Any biology or chemistry course	CCE/F101	202-NYB-05 202-024-ST	CCE/F101	202-NYB-05 202-024-ST
Sciences (physics)	PHE/F260 or PHE/F280	Any physics course	PHE/F104	203-NYA-05 203-NYB-05	PHE/F104	203-NYA-05 203-NYB-05
Theme 2 (Social Sciences and Humanities)	SSH RMC	SSH CMRSJ	Science RMC	Science CMRSJ	Engineering RMC	Engineering CMRSJ
Canadian History / Canadian Civics	HIE/F102	330-053-ST 330-033-ST	HIE/F207	No Sci program past 1st Year	HIE/F207	No Eng program past 1st Year
Canadian History / Canadian Civics	POE/F205	POE/F205	POE/F205		POE/F205	

³ Course listings in this table reflect the core curriculum courses as of 31 Aug 2018.

Canadian Military History	HIE/F202 or HIE/F203	HIS203	HIE/F203	HIE/F203	
Strategy and Military Theory	HIE/F270 or HIE/F271	HIS271	HIE/F271	HIE/F271	
International Relations / Transnational Culture	POE/F116	385-204-ST	POE/F116		
Ethics, Human Interaction, and Leadership	PSE/F103	350-C13-ST	PSE/F103	PSE/F103	
Ethics, Human Interaction, and Leadership	PSE/F301	PSY301	PSE/F301	PSE/F301	
Ethics, Human Interaction, and Leadership	PSE/F401	PSY401	PSE/F401	PSE/F401	
Language and Culture	ENE110 or FRF152	603-103-MQ 603-P24-ST or 601-103-MQ 601-P14-ST	ENE100 or FRF152	ENE100 or FRF152	
Language and Culture	ENE 210 or FRF 262	ENG210 ENG211 or FRA260 FRA261			