



**Saint Mary's
University**

Name: Senate Policy on Program Proposals
Policy Number: TBC
Approving Authority: University Senate, Committee on Academic Planning
Approved: February 18, 2022
Responsible Office: University Secretariat
Responsibility: University Senate, Committee on Academic Planning
Revision Date(s): N/A
Supersedes: N/A
Next Required Review: February 2027

1 Preamble

1.1 The Saint Mary's University Act, 1970 (including amendments in December, 2007), states that "Subject to the powers of the Board, the Senate shall be responsible for the educational policy of the university." The approval of new undergraduate and graduate programs, program terminations and modifications are carried out under the Authority of the Academic Senate. Maritime Provinces Higher Education Commission (MPHEC) assesses all academic programs offered at universities in Nova Scotia prior to implementation to ensure they meet agreed upon standards. The required forms may be downloaded from the MPHEC website (mphec.ca).

2 Purpose

2.1 This document is a reference tool that is designed to provide faculty, departments, and/or program committees at Saint Mary's University with detailed information on the University and Maritime Provinces Higher Education Commission (MPHEC) requirements for the preparation and submission of program proposals.

3 Jurisdiction/Scope

3.1 The Academic Senate is responsible for the approval of courses of study, admission standards, qualifications for diplomas, certificates and degrees.

4 Policy (refer to Appendix A: Proposal Process Flow Map)

4.1.1 Informal Discussions

The Departmental/Program proponents will draft an executive summary (**refer to Appendix B**). This executive summary is used to facilitate discussions regarding their ideas with their departmental colleagues and Department Chair(s) at a departmental/program meeting.

Informal discussions proceed with respective Dean(s), Associate Dean(s), Program Coordinators and the Manager, Academic Program Development and Review.

4.1.2 Informal Discussions continued

The "List of Questions for Proponents of New Undergraduate/Graduate Programs" (**refer to Appendix C**) is a required reference for individuals or groups considering the development of a new program proposal. If the proposal involves another program(s) or is joint with another University, these discussions must go on with related program(s) and/or partnering institutions. Consultation with the Library and EIT regarding resources is recommended (if appropriate).

4.2 Formal "Notice of Intent" (NOI)

A Notice of Intent (**refer to the Appendix D template** and hereafter referred to as NOI) is submitted in writing to the Dean and Associate Dean (Curriculum) of the relevant Faculty [Arts, Commerce or Science - hereafter referred to as the "Home Faculty"], and the Dean of FGSR (if a graduate program) with copy to department chair(s), program coordinator(s) and director(s). The NOI will include the information referred to in **Appendix C** (the "List of Questions for Proponents of New Undergraduate/Graduate Programs.") The Dean(s) and Associate Deans (Curriculum) will review and consider the submission for circulation. Consultation with the Library and EIT regarding resources is required at this stage (if appropriate). Please note: if the proponents of a new program think that additional resources are needed, a business plan at this stage is required in consultation with the EMG (**refer to Appendix E Table 5.3 Budget**).

4.3 Formal "Notice of Intent" (NOI) continued

If approved, each Faculty will see that the NOI is appropriately distributed according to the individual internal faculty process (e.g. faculty curriculum committee, faculty council, etc.). The NOI acts as an early alert for budget proposals and triggers formal discussion on the proposal, Committee activity/scheduling, etc. Feedback will be reviewed and incorporated as appropriate.

4.4.1 **Preparation of the Proposal: Proposals requiring MPHEC approval**

If the proposed program results in a credential, proposal proponents must adhere to the MPHEC format (see <http://www.mphec.ca/quality/assessmentacademicprograms.aspx> for related proposal templates).

- Following Senate Policy 8-1013 on Submissions to the Senate Curriculum Committee and using the form for submitting new programs for the Academic Calendar, in collaboration with the Manager, Academic Program Development and Review, the Proponents will create and submit the text for the section in the Academic Calendar through the existing Faculty Curriculum Process.
- Manager, Academic Program Development and Review communicates MPHEC approval to the relevant stakeholders.

4.4.2 **Preparation of the Proposal: Proposals not requiring MPHEC approval**

If the proposed program does not require MPHEC approval (e.g. minor programs, non-stand-alone certificates), proponents must adhere to the guidelines provided in 4.15 in the Senate Policy on New Program Proposal Submissions and should consult with the Manager, Academic Program Development and Review, the Faculty and other relevant members of the University as they proceed with the development of the Proposal.

- Following Senate Policy 8-1013 on Submissions to the Senate Curriculum Committee and using the form for submitting new programs for the Academic Calendar, in collaboration with the Manager, Academic Program Development and Review, the Proponents will create the section for the Academic Calendar. An electronic copy of the calendar text is submitted to the Dean(s) and Associate Dean(s) Curriculum for processing through the existing Faculty Curriculum Process.
- Proponents must consider budgetary implications (if any).

4.4.3 **Calendar Draft Preparation**

The program description information for the Academic Calendar is entered into CourseLeaf and submitted to workflow.

4.5 **Budget Review**

The Dean and/or Dean(s) and the Senior Director of Financial Services review the Budgetary implications only (refer to Appendix E Table 5.3 Budget). If revisions are required to the budget, the Dean(s) of the appropriate Faculties will notify the Department Undergraduate/Graduate Program.

4.6 **Submission of the Proposal to the Department(s) – Undergraduate/Graduate Program**

- If the proposed program is undergraduate, the proposal will be submitted to the relevant Department Head(s) or Program Coordinator(s) to oversee that it will be vetted by the relevant parties involved for observations and recommendations.
- If the proposed program is for a PhD from an existing Master's graduate program, the proposal will be submitted to the relevant Graduate Program Coordinator who will work with the relevant Department Head(s) to oversee that it will be vetted by the relevant Graduate Program Committee and Department Councils for observations and recommendations.
- If the proposed program is for Masters or PhD in a new graduate program to SMU, the proposal will be submitted to the relevant Department Head(s) to oversee that it will be vetted by the relevant and Department Councils for observations and recommendations.

4.7 **Submission of the Proposal to the Faculty**

The completed formal proposal package (including budget if applicable) is submitted to the Dean(s) and Associate Dean(s) Curriculum for approval.

4.8 **External Review**

- External consultant(s)/reviewer(s) is/are engaged (refer to Appendix D according to MPHEC mandated external reviewer TOR and related Guidelines) if required.
- The Faculty, in collaboration with the Manager, Academic Program Development and Review, will facilitate the external review process.
- Once the external report is received, the proponents will have the opportunity to respond to the comments.

4.9 **Vetting of the Proposal by the Home Faculty**

- The Executive/Faculty Council of the home Faculty will vet the proposal and make its observations and recommendation.
- The proponents will have the opportunity to respond to the comments of the Home Faculty and the result of the budget review, and these comments will be forwarded to the Executive of the appropriate Faculty.

4.10 **Vetting of Undergraduate Proposals**

- The proponents will have the opportunity to respond to comments from the relevant Executive and Faculty Councils.
- If the budget reviews and the Department/Program responses are positive, the proposal is sent to the Senate Academic Planning

Committee via the Dean's Office.

4.11 **Vetting of the Proposal by the FGSR**

- Once approved by the Executive Faculty Council of the Home Faculty, the FGSR Executive and Faculty Council will vet the proposal and make its observations and recommendations.
- The proponents will have the opportunity to respond to comments from the relevant Executive and Faculty Councils.
- If the budget reviews and the Department/Program responses are positive, the proposal is sent to the Senate Academic Planning Committee via the FGSR Dean's Office.

4.12 **Vetting of the Proposal by the Senate Academic Planning Committee**

The Proponents will have the opportunity to participate during the APC vetting process * If the recommendation is positive, the proposal is sent to Senate.

4.13 **Vetting of the Proposal by Senate**

If Senate approval is received:

- The Proponents will have the opportunity to make final revisions to the proposal before it is sent to the MPHEC. (follow 4.14 below)
- Proposals not requiring MPHEC approval follow the step 4.15 immediately below.

4.14 **Following Senate Approval: Proposals requiring MPHEC approval**

- The Proposal is sent by the Office of the President or VPAR to the MPHEC.
- Once MPHEC approval is received, the following actions will be taken:
 - The new proposed program in CourseLeaf is submitted through the workflow process.

4.15 **Following Senate Approval: Proposals not requiring MPHEC approval**

The new proposed program in CourseLeaf is submitted through the workflow process.

5 Relevant Legislation

- 5.1 The Saint Mary's University Act, 1970 (including amendments to December, 2007).

6 Related MPHEC Policies, Procedures & Documents

- 6.1 <http://www.mphec.ca/quality/assessmentacademicprograms.aspx>

7 Revision Policy

Every policy must be reviewed at least once every 5 years. Review date will be established by University Secretary