

**Guidelines to Submit a New Degree Program Proposal
– BCI & MEES
(Table of Contents – Outline)**

Table of Contents

I. PREPARATION OF NEW DEGREE PROGRAM DOSSIERS	4
INTRODUCTION	4
SUGGESTED STRUCTURE OF NEW DEGREE PROGRAM DOSSIERS – TABLE OF CONTENTS	5
1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (1-2 pages)	5
2. PROGRAM IDENTIFICATION	5
3. MOTIVES FOR PROPOSING THIS PROGRAM.....	5
4. ACADEMIC DOSSIER	6
5. RESOURCES	8
6. APPENDICES:.....	11
II. FRENCH VERSION OF THE TABLE OF CONTENTS	12
III. BUDGET TEMPLATE PROVIDED BY MEES.....	15
IV. DOSSIERS FOR “MODULATED”/FAST-TRACK EVALUATION BY BCI’S CEP.....	16
INTRODUCTION	16
A. ANOTHER UNIVERSITY’S PROGRAM – PROPOSAL	16
B. JOINT PROGRAM OF EXISTING PROGRAM OR INTER-UNIVERSITY PROGRAM OF EXISTING PROGRAM	17
C. A REVISION TO AN EXISTING PROGRAM IS CONSIDERED AS A MAJOR REVISION BY THE MEES	18

I. PREPARATION OF NEW DEGREE PROGRAM DOSSIERS

INTRODUCTION

Preparation of new program dossiers requiring approval by the Ministry of Education and Higher Education should be done in close collaboration with the Office of the Associate Provost (Teaching and Academic Programs): the contact persons is Yasmine Jouhari, yasmine.jouhari@mcgill.ca, tel. 398-2985. The following elements should be covered in the complete dossier, preferably in this order (the items listed reflect the criteria and evaluation methodology used by the BCI's *Commission d'évaluation des projets de programmes*, CEP; please also refer to: <https://www.bci-qc.ca/comites/affaires-academiques/commission-devaluation-des-projets-de-programmes/>).

For a *joint/inter-university teaching programs* and the *professional programs*, the preparation is similar to a regular dossier. To facilitate the approval process, please take those tips in consideration:

- Joint/inter-university teaching programs:
 - o stress the collaboration between the two institutions and their level of collaboration
 - o demonstrate the participation of both parts in the dossier-making process
 - o emphasize the rationale behind the partnership

- Professionals programs :
 - o include a section with the name of the accreditation organism and/or the professional order
 - o explain how the accreditation process work – when?
 - o develop the professional order rules/process (exam after the degree, direct access, etc.)
 - o list the competencies that students should acquire
 - o stress the correlation between the scientific training and the requirements of the profession order/accreditation

SUGGESTED STRUCTURE OF NEW DEGREE PROGRAM DOSSIERS – TABLE OF CONTENTS**Table of contents****1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (1-2 pages)****2. PROGRAM IDENTIFICATION**

Degree level, discipline or field and degree designation, teaching and administrative unit(s) responsible.

Example:

Bachelor's program in Computer Engineering

B.Eng. Computer Engineering

Unit(s) responsible: Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Faculty of Engineering

3. MOTIVES FOR PROPOSING THIS PROGRAM**3.1 Academic and cultural**

3.1.1 Evolution of the discipline

3.1.2 Originality of the proposal

3.1.3 Definition of body of knowledge

3.1.4 Links with other disciplines

3.1.5 Future developments in the discipline

3.1.6 History and strength of the discipline at McGill

(Provide information on other programs offered in the discipline, student enrolments, related programs, performance of students/graduates and academic staff, list of research activities and support, etc.)

3.1.7 Priority area for Ministry or other organisations

3.2 Academic Staff

3.2.1 Resources available and required

3.3 Institutional orientation

3.3.1 How does the program proposal fit within the Faculty's and the University's development plan and resource allocation?

3.3.2 Define vertical integration (within the discipline), horizontal integration (among several disciplines), and "complementariness" within disciplinary sector

3.4 Relevance to the university network

3.4.1 Similar existing program in the university (name and brief description). Descriptions of other programs offered by McGill in the discipline. Why can existing programs offered at McGill and elsewhere not adequately meet needs?

3.4.2 Similar existing program in Quebec and Canada. Review similar programs offered elsewhere (attach descriptions) in Quebec, Canada, and the United States (and Europe if appropriate):



- Why the proposed new program is original
 - Targeted enrolment pool (demonstrate how different they would be from other similar programs in the Quebec network)
- 3.4.3 Originality and anticipated contribution of the proposed program, taking into account similar and related programs and the needs they already meet
- 3.4.4 Student mobility
- 3.4.5 Inter-university collaboration, “complementariness”, relations with related programs already being offered
- 3.4.6 Relevance to Quebec network

For programs giving access to a Professional Order, please indicate the relevant Order(s) and add the accreditation rules of the program (after the first cohort, etc.) or the state of negotiation.

3.5 Timetable of program implementation and projected student enrolment

State expected date of implementation.

Forecast growth of student enrolment in table form, beginning with first year of implementation, and for the next five years. Indicate how many Quebec, Canadian, and international students are expected.

3.6 Socio-economic

New proposals submitted to the MEES are also judged on socio-economic criteria. This issue should, therefore, be addressed explicitly and carefully.) Please document the following:

- 3.5.1 Target clientele (report on any available surveys)
- 3.5.2 study of the labour market; demand for specialists in the field; current employment of program graduates in the case of *ad hoc* program; recent graduate employment trends; prospective employment opportunities (letters of support from potential future employers)
- 3.5.3 Is this a priority area as defined by the government or other organizations?
- 3.5.4 Documents, individuals or agencies consulted (attach supporting documentation)

4. ACADEMIC DOSSIER

4.1 Program objectives

- 4.1.1 *General* objectives (academic and professional goals for which students will be prepared)
- 4.1.2 *Specific* objectives (specific knowledge, expertise, skills which students will gain)

Please define them in detail so that all dimensions of the program may be fully understood.

The quality of a program is based on the adequate correlation between stated program objectives and the means selected for reaching those objectives. “Means” comprise various elements under the following headings: Structure and academic regulations (le cadre), Academic activities, Human resources, and Physical Resources.



4.2 Structure and academic regulations

4.2.1. Admission requirements and selection procedures:

General and specific requirements and selection criteria

4.2.2 Length of program

- Total number of credits
- Credit distribution by term

Note that students require 12 credits per term to be eligible to receive government student financial assistance in the form of grants and/or loans; any departure from this should be explained.

- Full-time and/or part-time study

Those elements must allow the student to meet specific program objectives while following appropriate progress through the program.

4.2.3 Academic regulations and environment

4.2.4 Program administration

4.3 Required academic activities: Program content and structure:

4.3.1 Academic requirements: total number of credits; credit distribution by term; Full-time and/or part-time study

4.3.2 Advisory Committee

Name and composition of committee; Role of committee (student guidance, program review...). The committee should provide students with the appropriate supervisory structure, ensure periodical program review, as well as revise the program objectives and activities, if necessary.

4.3.3 Courses - Description of a typical sequence of courses or activities (examples of possible pathways)

Detailed description of the program's academic requirements: courses, laboratory work, internships, general/specialised nature of the courses, core courses, balance between required and optional courses (a list of courses and course descriptions should be provided in this section).

4.3.4 Community building activities

3.3.5 Thesis (if applicable)/internship - supervision and logistics

Those elements must allow the student to meet specific program objectives while following appropriate progress through the program.

Supervision and evaluation of students, including grading methodology (:

Academic regulations must include an evaluation process that will ensure that students have met program objectives, on an intellectual and scientific basis, and on a professional basis if such is the case.

For graduate programs: provide procedures and policies for assigning thesis/research supervisors.

The correlation between program objectives and required activities remains the cornerstone of the evaluation of the quality of a proposed program, i.e. how will the



proposed teaching activities allow students to reach each of the program objectives defined in Section 3? Ability to demonstrate this relationship is crucial for convincing the CEP of the relevance of the proposed academic requirements and program coherence. The quality of a program is also reflected in the quality of the training being proposed.

Undergraduate programs and Professional Master’s programs:

The CEP will pay special attention to the following considerations:

- *general or specialised character of the proposed studies*
- *basic knowledge acquisition, if applicable*
- *the relative importance of compulsory and optional activities*
- *the balance between theoretical and practical learning (courses, laboratory work)*
- *internships – and the internship’s pertinence to the program objectives*
- *supervision and student management*
- *sequence of activities and level*
- *professional aspects, if the degree grants access to a professional order or licensing agency*

Research Master’s and Doctoral programs:

The CEP will pay special attention to the following considerations:

- *relationship between program activities and research conducted by faculty;*
- *link between teaching activities (courses and seminars) and student research*
- *activities (thesis or dissertation)*
- *student supervision and management*
- *academic environment (lectures, conferences, symposia, etc.)*

4.4 Specialized areas of research/streams (if applicable)

- 4.4.1 Stream 1
- 4.4.2 Stream 2

4.5 Examples of typical coursework

5. RESOURCES

5.1 Human resources required, available and projected

5.1.1 Teaching staff

The quality of a teaching program is based largely on the qualifications and research output of the members of the academic staff contributing to the program.

5.1.1.1 Academic staff in place (*with title and FT/PT status*) involved in the program (*this may repeat the list provided earlier under section 2.1, but with a different focus*). The CEP



will pay particular attention to the following:

- *individual qualifications of teaching staff (degrees, experience, publications or productions, research grants and/or contracts)*
- *characteristics of the teaching staff: ability to supervise students, coverage of all disciplinary and professional aspects of the program; forecasts with respect to the evolution of the academic staff (growth, renewal)*
- *for Master's and Doctoral programs: procedures and criteria for determining professors' ability to teach in the program and to supervise research (theses, dissertations)*
- *particular situations in which developing institutions and sectors may not have a full complement of academic staff for implementing the proposed program, but may commit themselves to add the necessary resources*

5.1.2 Administrative and support staff:

Other personnel: special attention will be paid to qualifications of lecturers, clinical supervisors, internship supervisors, affiliated professors/researchers, etc.

5.1.3 Staff in place and new staff required

- provisions for faculty growth and renewal
- specific areas where new staff are required (i.e. aspects of the program to be covered)

5.2 Physical and other resources required, available and projected

Physical resources should adequately support the students in their program activities. The CEP will pay particular attention to the following:

5.2.1 Library resources:

- 5.2.1.1 Quality of collections and quantity (provide assessment by Librarian in charge)
- 5.2.1.2 Accessibility; assistance and reference services provided; access to resources available at other institutions

5.2.2 Computer facilities:

- 5.2.2.1 Quality and quantity
- 5.2.2.2 Accessibility
- 5.2.2.3 Technical support; training and maintenance, networks

5.2.3 Laboratories:

- 5.2.3.1 Quality and quantity of equipment and space
- 5.2.3.2 Accessibility of external laboratories
- 5.2.3.3 Paedagogical assistance and supervision

5.2.4 Space

- 5.2.4.1 Teaching space: quality and quantity (classrooms, studios, laboratories)
- 5.2.4.2 Office space

5.2.5 For graduate programs, please add information regarding:

- Study space: accessibility, suitability, proximity to departmental activities
- Financial aid:
 - Assistance given to students applying for external grants
 - Availability of internal funds for students

5.3. Required funding

While academic considerations should always be the primary factor in the development of new programs, and are validated by McGill's approval processes, financial considerations must also be developed to ensure the viability of the proposed program. New programs are normally expected to generate an excess of revenue over expenses from an institutional perspective. This is achieved through increased revenue derived from incremental student enrolment, a full accounting of institutional expenses associated with the new program, and setting appropriate levels of deregulated and self-funded tuition fees where applicable.

The program proposal must include a budget assessment, including:

- the enrolment plan of the new program;
- the institutional financial analysis of revenues and expenses associated with the new program;
- the internal distribution of revenues and expenses within McGill;
- the need for allocation of central resources, if applicable, including human, financial and physical resources.
- the potential risks associated with the revenue and expense components of the new program.

Please note that although proposals usually come from departments, the budget assessment is conducted at the level of the Faculty to which the department belongs. Departments are expected to involve their Faculty Financial Officers and must obtain decanal approval of the budget before submitting it to the Office of the Associate Provost (Teaching and Academic Programs) for assessment. Deans of Faculties have the authority to prioritize requests for central resources originating from their Faculty and each faculty may have its own allocation mechanisms to departments.

Financial data are generated by the faculty/department/units and assessed by the Office of Associate Provost (Teaching and Academic Programs) (yasmine.jouhari@mcgill.ca), after which recommendations are made to the Provost & Vice-Principal (Academic).

A template is provided by the MEES (see section III). Do not hesitate to contact Yasmine Jouhari (yasmine.jouhari@mcgill.ca, tel. 398-2985) if you have any questions.

PLEASE NOTE: a new program proposal dossier intended to be submitted to BCI and to the MEES is not the appropriate venue for negative comments on the inadequacy of resources in place or on any difficulties internal to the University.

6. APPENDICES:

- I. Courses descriptions
- II. Lists of complementary courses
- III. Lists of grants and contracts – per academic member
- IV. Lists of publications – per academic member
- V. Descriptions of related programs offered by McGill
- VI. Letters from external experts or bodies consulted, if available
- VII. Letters of support (from prospective employers, agencies, other universities...)
- VIII. List of equipment available, if appropriate
- IX. Research funding in comparable departments in other Quebec universities
- X. Full *curricula vitae* of all academic staff members involved in the program, including lists of publications: USB keys (7)

In addition, the following will be required (to be sent to Yasmine Jouhari):

- **A list of six possible external evaluators** (this list will be submitted along with the dossier to BCI's *Commission d'évaluation des projets de programmes*). For ethical purposes, none of these individuals should have had a relationship (collaboration, PhD supervisor, etc.) with any members of the department for at least the past 10 years.
- **A 1-2 page summary of the proposal**

II. FRENCH VERSION OF THE TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Résumé exécutif

2. Identification du programme

3. Raison d'être du programme proposé

3.1 Motifs pédagogiques et culturels

3.1.1 Évolution de la discipline des XXXX

3.1.2 Originalité du projet

3.1.3 Définition de l'étendue des connaissances

3.1.4 Liens avec les disciplines traditionnelles des XXXXX

3.1.5 Développements futurs dans les sciences XXXX

3.1.6 Histoire et force des XXXXX à l'Université McGill

3.1.7 Domaine prioritaire tel que défini par le gouvernement ou autres organismes

3.2 Personnel enseignant et professeurs

3.2.1 Ressources en personnel requises, disponibles et prévues

3.3 Orientations institutionnelles

3.3.1 Plan de développement des facultés et de l'Université

3.3.2 Intégration verticale et horizontale

3.4 Pertinence vis-à-vis le réseau universitaire

3.4.1 Programmes connexes

3.4.2 Programmes similaires offerts ailleurs

3.4.3 Originalité et contribution anticipée du programme proposé

3.4.4 Mobilité de la clientèle étudiante

3.4.5 Collaboration entre universités et pertinence pour le réseau du Québec

3.5 Calendrier de mise en œuvre du programme et inscriptions anticipées des étudiants

3.6 Motifs socioéconomiques

3.6.1 Clientèle

3.6.2 Marché du travail

3.7 Références et documents cités

4. Dossier pédagogique

4.1 Objectifs

4.1.1 Objectif général

4.1.2 Objectifs spécifiques

4.2 Structure et règlements pédagogiques

4.2.1 Conditions d'admission et processus de sélection

4.2.2 Durée du programme

4.2.3 Règlements universitaires et environnement

4.2.4 Administration du programme

4.3 Activités universitaires obligatoires

4.3.1 Critères pédagogiques

4.3.2 Comité consultatif

4.3.3 Cours

4.3.4 Activités de développement communautaire

4.3.5 Thèse/stages

4.4 Domaines ou axes spécialisés de recherche

4.4.1 Stream 1/ « spécialisation »1

4.4.2 Stream 2/ « spécialisation »2

4.5 Exemples d'un ordonnancement typique de cours

5. Ressources

5.1 Personnel requis, disponible et prévu

5.1.1 Personnel d'enseignement

5.1.2 Personnel administratif et de soutien

5.1.3 Personnel en place

5.2 Ressources matérielles et autres

5.2.1 Ressources documentaires

5.2.2 Installations informatiques

5.2.3 Laboratoires

5.2.4 Espace

5.2.5 Aide financière aux étudiants au doctorat

ANNEXES

A : Plan de cours – XXXXXXXX : Liste des cours complémentaires

C : Liste des subventions accordées aux membres du corps enseignant D : Liste des publications des membres du corps enseignant

E : Synthèse de l'analyse, planification et budget F : Budget proposé pour les années 2017 à 2023 G : Lettres de soutien

H : CV des membres du corps professoral (sur 7 clés USB)

III. BUDGET TEMPLATE PROVIDED BY MEES

<small>Éducation et Enseignement supérieur</small> Québec						
Université :	Université McGill					
Programme:						
Type de programme ¹ :						
Nombre de crédits:						
Taux d'attrition ² :						
Année		2020-2021	2021-2022	2022-2023	2023-2024	2024-2025
Cohorte 1	Crédits					
	Nombre étudiants					
Cohorte 2	Crédits					
	Nombre étudiants					
Cohorte 3	Crédits					
	Nombre étudiants					
Cohorte 4	Crédits					
	Nombre étudiants					
Cohorte 5	Crédits					
	Nombre étudiants					
CRÉDITS TOTAUX		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
EETP bruts						
Pondération famille CAFF						
EETP pondérés						
CALCUL DES REVENUS TOTAUX						
Revenus du MEES						
	Enseignement (1)	- \$	- \$	- \$	- \$	- \$
	Soutien (2)	- \$	- \$	- \$	- \$	- \$
	Terrains et Bâtiments (3) ³	- \$	- \$	- \$	- \$	- \$
		- \$	- \$	- \$	- \$	- \$
Droits de scolarité nets (4) ⁴		- \$	- \$	- \$	- \$	- \$
REVENUS TOTAUX		- \$	- \$	- \$	- \$	- \$
CALCUL DES DÉPENSES TOTALES						
Dépenses directes de formation						
	Ressources professorales ⁵			- \$		- \$
	Autres ressources humaines					
	Autres dépenses liées au programme					
Sous-total dépenses directes		- \$	- \$	- \$	- \$	- \$
Dépenses de soutien						
DÉPENSES TOTALES		- \$	- \$	- \$	- \$	- \$
Surplus (Déficit)		- \$	- \$	- \$	- \$	- \$

IV. DOSSIERS FOR “MODULATED”/FAST-TRACK EVALUATION BY BCI’S CEP

INTRODUCTION

A Modulated/Fast-Track Evaluation occurs in one of the following cases:

- A. Offer, in an autonomous fashion and without modification, another university’s program which it already offers by means of “extension”, with full agreement of that other university.
- B. Proposal by two or more universities to turn an existing program into a joint or inter-university program OR a proposal by one university to join two or more universities already offering a program jointly.
- C. Proposal by a university to offer a new program in which two thirds of the credits are made up of existing activities, reorganized to meet new needs. The program modification would have been sent beforehand to the MEES, which, after assessment, would require the CEP evaluation. (major revision).

The letter accompanying the dossier must include the MEES statement (if situation C) and indicate to which of the various categories the proposal belongs. The University may attach to the dossier all other information which it deems useful: any relevant program review report, for example. Regarding the completeness of the dossier, experience has shown that it is preferable to submit a “complete” dossier (as if it were undergoing the full evaluation process) in order to avoid being asked to submit additional information at a later stage.

A. ANOTHER UNIVERSITY’S PROGRAM – PROPOSAL

The CEP will focus its attention on the human and physical resources which enable the university to offer the program. Required in dossier:

1. Brief presentation of the program (with detailed statement of objectives and activities)
2. Motives for implementing the program
3. Description of target clientele (enrolment, graduation rates)
4. Academic staff resources: information should enable the CEP to assess the adequacy of human resources with respect to program objectives, in particular on staff expertise in relation to teaching activities. For example, program promoters may wish to submit a table showing how staff expertise is linked to the academic activities for which they will be responsible. *Curricula vitae* could also be appended (in the abridged format required by granting agencies).
5. Other human resources: such information will enable the CEP to judge whether the need for



laboratory work and/or internships is well met. Support and administrative staff are excluded from this evaluation.

6. Physical resources: such information will enable the CEP to verify the adequacy of such resources in relation to program objectives and activities; recent reports prepared by directors of relevant services could be appended.
7. Budget
8. Consent of parties and, if applicable, reports from experts, support letters, and a list of persons consulted

Will be evaluated by CEP:

- *Academic human resources*
- *Other human resources*
- *Physical resources.*

B. JOINT PROGRAM OF EXISTING PROGRAM OR INTER-UNIVERSITY PROGRAM OF EXISTING PROGRAM

CEP will focus its attention on the way the partnership will be managed and on the new partner's human and physical resources. Required in dossier:

1. Brief presentation of the program (with detailed statement of objectives and activities)
2. Motives for implementing program
3. Nature of partnership (interaction among institutions, impact on students)
4. Academic human resources at new partner institution: such information should enable the CEP to judge whether academic resources are adequate for meeting program objectives, in particular with respect to staff expertise in relation to teaching activities. For example, program promoters may wish to submit a table showing how staff expertise is linked to the academic activities for which they will be responsible. *Curricula vitae* could also be appended (in the abridged format required by granting agencies).
5. Physical resources at new partner institution: such information should enable the CEP to verify the adequacy of such resources in relation to program objectives and activities; recent reports prepared by directors of relevant services could be appended.
6. Budget
7. Consent of parties, experts' reports, support letters, list of persons consulted

Will be evaluated by CEP:

- *The partnership agreement as defined by the institutions involved, the ability of those institutions to manage that partnership, the ability of the proposed model to bring added-value to the program*



- *Academic human resources assembled by the new partner*
- *Physical resources assembled by the new partner.*

***C. A REVISION TO AN EXISTING PROGRAM IS CONSIDERED AS A MAJOR REVISION
BY THE MEES***

CEP will focus its attention on the academic advantages and coherence of the new program being proposed, on the relation between program objectives and proposed activities, as well as on human resources. Required in dossier:

1. Program identification
2. Field(s) of study
3. Motives for program proposal
4. General and specific objectives
5. Program structure
6. Required activities
7. Academic human resources
8. Reports of experts consulted in a formal cyclical review exercise or excerpts from recent reports underlining need to meet new demands
9. Support letters, a list of persons consulted
10. Letter from the MEES

Will be evaluated by CEP:

- *Academic relevance of proposed program*
- *Coherence of program*
- *Relation between program objectives and activities*
- *Capacity of staff to offer the program.*

/YJ.