**Things to consider:**

* It is recommended to all proponents that the Stage 1 questions are reviewed and considered ***before planning the program***. If the questions cannot be answered, then plan how they will be answered. The biggest change over the past 2 years is that undocumented assertions are no longer accepted: data and documentation are required. Commonly, proponents find it difficult to demonstrate that there is student demand, that graduates of the program meet the needs of the labour market or will contribute to social good, and to demonstrate why their program is novel, better, different than those already offered in the province.
* There are cases where Stage 1 forms are returned with requests for further information.  We are learning a lot about success criteria from the Ministry requests, so please be sure to communicate with the Provost’s office so that we may update our advice to proponents.
* Accredited Programs: It is referenced that if a new accredited program is being developed the accreditation should be considered as part of the approvals. For example, because the degree, Bachelor of Applied Science, is already identified with engineering, its use should be limited to such programs to avoid confusion. Since engineering programs are accredited by the profession, this additional requirement should be a condition of approval for degrees using the phrase Applied Science.
* Consider online courses or certificates as a step towards full programs. They increase access by underserved and isolated communities, bring revenue to defray development costs of the degree, and serve as a simultaneous marketing and recruiting tool for the degree.  Sauder is taking their Masters of Management (MM) dual degree and putting the courses towards the MM that are taken during the undergraduate degree online.  This makes them more accessible to our own students for credit, to the world on a non-credit basis, and allows students to complete the MM in 5 months instead of 9.

The purpose of the Stage 1 Review is to determine the need for the program and how it fits with other programs currently offered by the BC public post-secondary education system. It applies to BC publicly funded post-secondary institutions as a means to ensure public resources are spent effectively.

Submission format:

* To facilitate the Stage 1 Review, institutions must complete this template to ensure that all necessary information is provided for the DQAB review.
* Supporting letters, surveys and other documentary evidence should be included as appendices.
* Use “n/a” or “non-applicable” for a criterion that does not apply and include a brief rationale.
* The submission should be concise and not exceed 12 pages or 4,000 words, excluding appendices.
* Attached to the template are the submission guidelines for each standard. The submission guidelines detail suggested evidence the institution may provide to demonstrate the program meets each criterion.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| INSTITUTION: | PSIPS PROPOSAL #: |
| PROPOSED DEGREE: |

**Introductory Comments:**

Stage 1 is the first step in a multistep approval process in AEST.  AEST is using Stage1 to gate-keep, and to prevent wasting time at the degree quality assessment board (DQAB) on proposals that are missing information in the subsequent steps.   Proponents who have done their homework and answered the questions get approval on the first try. Many proposals are being sent back for revisions that can take the proponents several months to meet (e.g. documented consultation with industry, getting support letters from the Minister if most graduates are hired by government agencies, survey data from students). We are finding that proponents are giving insufficient attention to the Stage 1 form, and are not starting early enough to prevent delays before submission to AEST, or further delays when AEST returns the form for more information.

Stage 1 forms are graded by Ministry staff on a pre-defined rubric. Like any other exam, following the instructions, and answering the questions leads to better results. Not all questions are of equal value. Alignment with government priorities, meeting labour market needs, and demonstrable value to students really matter. Some of the questions are poorly written or ambiguous. The aim here is to document what we have learned, and identify common areas where proponents are unclear about expectations and the best way to answer the questions. The Ministry has complained about proposals that duplicate the language used in previous proposals, so our advice is aimed at showing the general rather than specific form of the answer.

The most common mistakes are:

* **Not answering the question or including material that doesn’t answer the question**
* Failure to address each point of the question in the order asked.
* Lack of conciseness-this will be read by busy people. Get to the point immediately.
* Asserting rather than providing data
* Using the same argument more than once. Choose the best place for each argument, and don’t repeat yourself.

The Provost’s office is more than happy to answer questions, or discuss approaches with proponents.

AEST approval is taking 4-6 months at best, and we have multiple proposals that are approaching the 1 year mark with no decision.  Fastest ever approval in the Stage 1 era was 6 weeks.

# SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF DEGREE PROGRAM

* ***One page maximum*** *executive summary description of the proposed degree program. Include number of program credits, expected time to completion, program concentrations, delivery methods, targeted students, learning outcomes, and employment prospects.*

Items to ensure are included:

How the degree will be supported by the department, unit or faculty.

* Desired answers are: “with existing resources” “resources freed from closing something else” “identified budget from X”

Why it is important to develop this program: growth, student demand, clear correlation to industry and need.

* Note the absence of academic criteria in this sentence, so follow the directions provided. Some academic reasons will be provided in the Senate documents that will be attached as an appendix to this document, and the next paragraph covers those required. Programs that cannot demonstrate student and industry demand are unlikely to be approved.

Proposal in brief – 1 paragraph on credits, year of entry, what the students will require to access and how these will be supported by the ‘why in the question above’.

* Here is where you can put some academic justification: (from their own instructions: “Include number of program credits, expected time to completion, program concentrations, delivery methods, targeted students, learning outcomes, and employment prospects”. Notice that these details should provide evidence/justification for the answers to the previous question.
* Missing from the instructions is “what the students will require to access”, which is an awkward way of framing articulation with, or transfer from, existing programs. AEST prefers to see that students from other institutions can be admitted to new programs, but it is still possible to obtain approval for 4 year programs that do not allow transfer without losing time because of specialized first or second year requirements.

Is the course across faculties, modes of delivery, locations/colleges?

* Partnership and interdisciplinarity are seen as desirable, especially if there are resource or access implications.

|  |
| --- |
| **INSTITUTIONAL MANDATE / CAPACITY**STANDARD: The institution must establish that it has the mandate and capacity to offer the proposed degree program.*Submission Guidelines** + *Describe how this program fits within the mandate of the institution.*
	+ *Indicate how the program supports the current academic and strategic plan of the institution.*
	+ *Describe whether the institution has had successful past performance in related program areas over the past three years and provide supporting evidence, such as student outcome surveys or other relevant information that demonstrate satisfaction of students, employers, graduates and receiving institutions.*
	+ *Describe the possible impact the program may have on existing programs, resources, services and capacity at the institution. Identify plans for reallocating internal resources.*
	+ *Provide an enrolment plan for the program, identifying the projected number of students (full-time and part-time), minimum viable enrolment, and anticipated number of credentials awarded each year.*
	+ *Provide the timeframe required to implement the program and the anticipated launch date.*
 |
| CRITERIA: | COMMENTS: |
| ***A. Mandate*** |
| How does the proposed program fit within the mandate of the institution? | Mandate = by government. UBC’s mandate letter is here: <https://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/education/post-secondary-education/institution-resources-administration/mandate-letters/mandate-ubc.pdf> Link to UBC reporting on these goals in the Institutional Accountability Plan & Report: <http://bog.ubc.ca/?page_id=12623>University strategic plans aren’t mandated, and should be addressed in the next section.  |
| How does the proposed program support the current academic and strategic plan of the institution? | Cite the objectives in the strategic plan that will be met by the new program. Here is a link to the current plan. <https://strategicplan.ubc.ca/> The most effective way to answer is something like the following:UBC’s strategic plan, Shaping UBC’s Next Century, has X goals/strategies that will be met by the new program. Be specific rather than general when linking the proposed program to the priorities. You are better off to choose a shorter list with unforced linkages to the proposed program than a longer list with tenuous connections. |
| For applied degrees offered under the *College and Institute Act*:* Does the proposal lead to a specific occupation?
* Does the proposal provide a diploma exit, if appropriate?
 |  |
| ***B. Capacity*** |
| To what extent does the program build on the institution’s existing infrastructure, resources and experience from offering programs in related fields? | This question is primarily about resources, and secondarily about ability to offer the program. Use of existing infrastructure/programs where possible is highly desirable. Be specific about how the new program differs from existing programs, and how the new program will affect existing programs.  |
| To what extent has the institution assessed the resources required and identified funding sources needed to implement the program? | Review the budget analysis undertaken and provide highlights or justification for developing this program. E.g. What level of assessment has been completed? What is the department funding? The Faculty? What about classrooms? Labs? Other teaching spaces? The aim is to build confidence that the new program is making judicious use of resources. |

|  |
| --- |
| **SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC BENEFIT**Note – informing Ministry on what exactly the degree does and for whom is essential. “Post-secondary education is good for society” is insufficient.STANDARD: The institution must demonstrate that the proposed program will serve the social and economic needs of British Columbians.*Submission Guidelines** + *Prioritize whether the degree primarily provides social benefits or economic benefits.*
	+ *Describe the potential social, cultural, regional, community, environmental, institutional and intellectual benefits of the program. Provide references to documents that support these statements. If the program advances one or more social goals, policies and/or government priorities, provide details.*
	+ *Describe the direct and indirect economic or industrial benefits of the proposed degree program to the student, the community, region or province. If the program advances one or more economic goals, policies and/or government priorities, provide details.*
	+ *Provide evidence of consultation with applicable community groups, employer groups and professional organizations as well as the findings resulting from such consultations.*
	+ *Provide evidence that potential employers require a degree to gain employment in the field.*
	+ *Describe the labour market demand for the credential. Provide supportable evidence, such as relevant statistical/census employment data relevant to the field, dated employment ads, current employer letters of support, labour force projections from government, industry and professional associations, and employer surveys.*
		- *Labour market analyses should use the National Occupational Classification (NOC) codes of Human Resources and Skills Development Canada whenever possible to specify relevant occupation*

*destinations of program graduates. Please identify no more than the top five occupation destinations for graduates of the program.** + *If the main employer is the provincial or federal government, provide evidence of the relevant ministry’s or department’s support for the program.*
	+ *Describe the potential earnings for graduates and provide evidence such as student outcome surveys.*
	+ *Indicate whether the proposed degree is preparatory to work in a regulated field. If this is a regulated field, state whether the proposed degree represents a change in the “entry to Practice” standard and provide evidence of consultation with and support from pertinent regulatory/licensing bodies.*
 |
| CRITERIA: | COMMENTS: |
| ***A. Priority of Program Focus*** |
| Is the program focus primarily on meeting social benefit(s) or economic benefit(s)? | Pick only one. One strong answer is better than 2 weak answers…. When choosing, consider that:* Social benefits = link to published government priorities like underserved/isolated communities, poverty, aboriginal.
* Economic benefits = employable grads to fill an existing or projected need.

<http://bcbudget.gov.bc.ca/2017/stplan/Strategic_Plan_2017-18_2020-21.pdf><http://www2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/governments/about-the-bc-government><http://www.budget.gc.ca/2017/docs/plan/chap-01-en.html> |
| ***B. Social Benefit*** |
| What social, cultural, regional, community, environmental, institutional and/or intellectual benefits would the proposed program provide? | Provide a brief answer for each of the 7 things listed. It is time for reflection whether you made the right choice of social vs economic if only 3-4/7 have plausible answers. |
| How would the proposed program advance social goods or government priorities? | Overlaps with previous question so address broader government’s social priorities here (indigeneity, under-served communities, opportunities for disadvantaged populations, access to education, sustainability are examples). |
| ***C. Economic Benefit*** |
| What direct and/or indirect economic, industrial or labour market benefits would the program offer the student, community, region or province? | Direct = jobs, meeting labour market shortages.Indirect = increase ability of graduates to get experience or training that leads to jobs.Your answer must address all 4 of “student, … province”, and if there is something specific about community (e.g. underserved, aboriginal) or region (e.g. northern BC, coastal BC) add this. |
| How would the proposed program support economic growth and/or government economic priorities? | Make direct links between specific policies or documents and quote them (eg BC Jobs plan, national plans) and provide a factual link to program. Some websites that may help in gathering this information:<https://bcjobsplan.gov.bc.ca/>https://www.bcbudget.gov.bc.ca/2018/stplan/2018\_Strategic\_Plan.pdf<http://www.budget.gc.ca/2017/docs/themes/Innovation_en.pdf><http://www.ic.gc.ca/eic/site/062.nsf/eng/home><https://www.welcomebc.ca/Immigrate-to-B-C/BC-PNP-Skills-Immigration> |
| What labour market needs would the proposed program meet for the province? Please include no more than 5 applicable National Occupational Classification (NOC) codes.) | Supply a list of 5 NOC codes in order of priority for the potential jobs that will be filled by grads, along with estimates from government sources on the number of employees required in the next x years (x=end date of labour market demand estimate).<http://noc.esdc.gc.ca/English/noc/welcome.aspx?ver=11><https://www.workbc.ca/getmedia/00de3b15-0551-4f70-9e6b-23ffb6c9cb86/LabourMarketOutlook.aspx> |
| Do potential employers require a degree for graduates to gain employment in the field? | Yes (good). If the answer is “yes” the answer can be one sentence. If the answer is “a degree is required”, then you need to explain why the new degree then you need to show why the new degree differs from, or offers advantages to, other existing degrees. Make sure you link this to the all the employers you listed in the “economic benefits” section, and in the previous question. If the answer is “no” then showing how the program is needed to advance into graduate studies that are a requirement for employment is useful.  |
| If the main employer will be government or another public agency, what support does the program have from relevant ministry/public employers? | If Governments are the main employer, the obligatory answer is “The letter from the Minister dated Month day year is attached in Appendix X…”). If public agencies are the main employer, get support letters from the agencies (e.g. hospitals, municipalities, crown corporations). If the answer is no, just say “not applicable”. Don’t say anything you can’t back up (e.g. “Public agencies support our proposed program”). The underlying concern behind the question is that the new degree will add to government/public costs. Letters that say “we will employ graduates” or “we will provide coops/work experience/internships” are the best. |
| ***D. Consultation*** |
| What feedback from relevant community groups, employer groups, and professional organizations was incorporated into the proposed program? | This is an important place to justify the choice between social or economic benefits:* Community groups = social good was chosen
* Employer and professional groups = economic benefit was chosen

Effective answers will include documented evidence of who you talked to and what they said, attached as letters in an appendix. The ones that matter are from large community groups or CEOs of businesses, or associations representing them. |
| If the program relates to a regulated profession, what feedback did the regulatory or licensing bodies and the responsible Ministry provide? | Summarize the feedback from regulatory or a licensing body, and include the evidence as part of the appendices. Obtaining documented feedback is not optional.Or, state “Not Applicable”. |

|  |
| --- |
| **SYSTEM COORDINATION / PROGRAM DUPLICATION****To note:** AEST has moved to outcomes being the parameter for judging whether programs are new/different/the same. Outcomes are not tied to courses, but to the program. To determine if an existing and a proposed new degree are the same or different, sharing >80% of learning outcomes=same (e.g. MDS at UBCV vs MDS at UBCO; MDS vs MDS in CL).STANDARD: The institution must establish whether the proposed program fills a need within the post-secondary system and that there is no unnecessary duplication with existing programs.*Submission Guidelines** + *Identify degree programs with similar learning objectives offered by other post-secondary institutions in British Columbia and briefly explain how or whether this degree will differ from the others.*
	+ *Describe the consultation that has occurred with other institutions in British Columbia offering similar programs.*
	+ *If there are programs with similar learning objectives or outcomes available in the province, explain why an apparent duplication in programming is warranted (e.g.: demand for graduates exceeds system capacity; the program is unavailable online or within reasonable commuting distance; etc.).*
	+ *Outline any plans for collaboration and/or sharing resources and identify the prospective collaborating institutions/organizations.*
	+ *Provide documentary evidence such as letters of support.*
 |
| CRITERIA: | COMMENTS: |
| ***A. System Context*** |
| What differentiates the proposed program from all other related programs in the province? Please provide a list of Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) codes for related programs. | List all programs offered in BC. For each one, identify what is the same/different about the proposed program for each one. AEST staff, and DQAB members check this thoroughly! “Because we are UBC” is never the answer desired. |
| ***B. Consultation*** |
| To what extent has the institution consulted other institutions in British Columbia offering similar programs and responded to their feedback? | The ideal answer is a letter or email from each one agreeing with your answer if “there is no overlap” above, attached in an appendix. If you responded to their feedback, include it as well. Do not go ahead without documented feedback. The Ministry expects that “boundary disputes” will be solved before you submit the Stage 1 form, and thus that disputes will not arise in public during the public consultation phase (Stage 2). If you claimed that everything is fine in this section, it will be perceived negatively if the public comments say otherwise, so don’t bluff. |
|  |  |
| ***C. Rationale for Duplication*** |
| If programs with similar learning objectives are currently available in the region or online within the province, what is the rationale for establishing another program? | If there is duplication, there must be a clearly defensible reason why this new program is different/better. Be factual and polite (e.g.’ Our students have access to the following resources x,y,z not found elsewhere in BC’; ‘our program is unique because of industry-sponsored internships’; or “our project and competency-based approach gives students the tools they need to….’; or ‘Existing programs target younger students with no background, whereas the proposed program targets experienced professionals who wish to upgrade their skill’. Please (please please) avoid any answer that assumes, or appears to assume, that UBC programs are inherently better than programs offered by other institutions. |
| ***D. Collaboration*** |
| To what extent has the institution explored appropriate ways to collaborate and/or share resources with other institutions offering related programs? | Where there is overlap, the ideal is a signed agreement of cooperation. Where this is not possible, the answer to “Rationale for duplication” needs be robust and based on detailed comparison. Best possible answer is a joint program. |

|  |
| --- |
| **STUDENT DEMAND AND OUTCOMES**STANDARD: The institution must demonstrate that the proposed degree program will have sufficient ongoing student interest and provide benefit to students.*Submission Guidelines** + *Provide evidence of student demand for the program, such as:*
		- *The results of a survey indicating current student demand for the program. If a survey is used, describe the survey instrument used and questions posed.*
		- *Student waitlists of comparable programs offered in British Columbia.*
	+ *Describe what plans and/or arrangements are in place to establish articulation agreements with other post-secondary institutions in the province. Provide a website link to the institution policy on admissions and transfer.*
	+ *If relevant, provide anticipated enrolment figures from other institutions that may have students wishing to articulate into the proposed program.*
	+ *Describe the opportunities that graduates of the program have for progression to further study in this field or in professional fields. Provide evidence of consultation with graduate/professional post- secondary programs.*
	+ *If non-degree and/or degree programs in the same field are offered at this institution, explain:*
		- *The expected added value for students taking this proposed degree program (e.g., promotion or employment opportunities) and provide evidence that these anticipated benefits are justified.*
 |
| CRITERIA: | COMMENTS: |
| ***A. Student Demand*** |
| How robust is the demonstrated potential student demand to sustain the proposed program? | They are serious about “demonstrated”, so the answer requires documentable numbers of students derived from: student surveys (try your own alumni, or students in yr 3-4); from demand for existing courses in another degree (waiting lists); or unmet demand at other institutions (e.g. U of X turns away 90% of its applicants for program Y). Data-free assertions will not be accepted, and your proposal will be sent back.  |
| ***B. Benefit to Students*** |
| To what extent will students be able to transfer to and from other post-secondary institutions in the province? | Start with “Students will be able to transfer…..” or “Students will not be able to transfer…” and explain. |
| What opportunities are available to program graduates for further study in the field or in professional fields? | The best answers have data on career paths. If degrees aren’t on that path say so. If they are, answer by category (e.g. X% of graduates from life science undergraduate programs pursue further training in health professions)  |
| What added value will the proposed program offer graduates in terms of employment opportunities? | Answer requires government data showing that the proposed degree increases employability and/or salary of graduates, with a clear consideration of career pathways. It’s a good idea to include evidence of opportunities, and changes in expected salary. We are now being asked explicitly to provide evidence for the latter, and applications without these data are being sent back. |

**Additional Information on CIP codes:**

The Stage 1 form is being further modified to require a single CIP code ([www.statcan.gc.ca/eng/concepts/classification)](http://www.statcan.gc.ca/eng/concepts/classification%29). Formerly institutions were providing the codes after the fact, but now proponents have been requested to supply them.

CIP codes get more specialized as the number of digits increase, so a proponent can make the code more specific or more general by deciding how many digits to include.

The purpose of the codes is so that AEST can decide the degree of overlap between programs at BC institutions. Careful consideration is advised when choosing a CIP code to minimize the unintentional overlap of programs across institutions. Discussion with the VPAO before a final decision is made may be helpful in this situation.

**Program requirements for going to AEST:**

If the name of the degree on the parchment is the same as an existing degree, it does NOT require approval by AEST.  It does require a short “letter of information” announcing for example that we are creating a specialization of the MDS called “computational linguistics”. In this case 80% of the learning objectives must be the same for the existing degree and the new specialization. A specialization is now requested by Ministry with a completed stage 1 form. This will enable DQAB to review the specialization against the original degree program and ensure it isn’t a new degree. A letter will be submitted by the Provost office with the stage 1 form.

Conversely, any program that creates a new parchment, or has less than 80% of learning objectives in common must go to AEST for approval.

To determine if changes to an existing degree (with or without name change) are sufficient to allow a revision of tuition because the degrees are no longer comparable, the new degree must have >50% of its learning outcomes be different. The Provost’s office will write the letter in consultation with the proponents. Do not hesitate to contact us if you have any questions.

**Appendix information:**

Include information as indicated in the template above:

* Surveys of students are essential-clearly for new programs, all you can do is survey prospective students.
* Letters from Ministry, Government agencies, industry, other institutions, as indicated in the template

Senate docs:

* Stage 1 doesn't affect our internal timing.
* Ministry approval is the last step, occurs after Senate and Board approvals, and requires the Senate documentation. **Please choose carefully what goes in Senate materials if it precludes the best answer to the** Stage 1 form.

Submission Guidelines

The submission guidelines detail suggested evidence the institution may provide to demonstrate the program meets each criterion.

**SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF DEGREE PROGRAM**

* One page maximum executive summary description of the proposed degree program. Include number of program credits, expected time to completion, program concentrations, delivery methods, targeted students, learning outcomes, and employment prospects.

**INSTITUTIONAL MANDATE / CAPACITY**

***STANDARD: The institution must establish that it has the mandate and capacity to offer the proposed degree program***.

***Submission Guidelines***

* Describe how this program fits within the mandate of the institution.
* Indicate how the program supports the current academic and strategic plan of the institution.
* Describe whether the institution has had successful past performance in related program areas over the past three years and provide supporting evidence, such as student outcome surveys or other relevant information that demonstrate satisfaction of students, employers, graduates and receiving institutions.
* Describe the possible impact the program may have on existing programs, resources, services and capacity at the institution. Identify plans for reallocating internal resources.
* Provide an enrolment plan for the program, identifying the projected number of students (full-time and part-time), minimum viable enrolment, and anticipated number of credentials awarded each year.
* Provide the timeframe required to implement the program and the anticipated launch date.

**SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC BENEFIT**

***STANDARD: The institution must demonstrate that the proposed program will serve the social and economic needs of British Columbians***.

***Submission Guidelines***

* Prioritize whether the degree primarily provides social benefits or economic benefits.
* Describe the potential social, cultural, regional, community, environmental, institutional and intellectual benefits of the program. Provide references to documents that support these statements. If the program advances one or more social goals, policies and/or government priorities, provide details.
* Describe the direct and indirect economic or industrial benefits of the proposed degree program to the student, the community, region or province. If the program advances one or more economic goals, policies and/or government priorities, provide details.
* Provide evidence of consultation with applicable community groups, employer groups and professional organizations as well as the findings resulting from such consultations.
* Provide evidence that potential employers require a degree to gain employment in the field.
* Describe the labour market demand for the credential. Provide supportable evidence, such as relevant statistical/census employment data relevant to the field, dated employment ads, current employer letters of support, labour force projections from government, industry and professional associations, and employer surveys.
	+ Labour market analyses should use the National Occupational Classification (NOC) codes of Human Resources and Skills Development Canada whenever possible to specify relevant occupation destinations of program graduates. Please identify no more than the top five occupation destinations for graduates of the program.
* If the main employer is the provincial or federal government, provide evidence of the relevant ministry’s or department’s support for the program.
* Describe the potential earnings for graduates and provide evidence such as student outcome surveys.
* Indicate whether the proposed degree is preparatory to work in a regulated field. If this is a regulated field, state whether the proposed degree represents a change in the “entry to Practice” standard and provide evidence of consultation with and support from pertinent regulatory/licensing bodies.

**SYSTEM COORDINATION / PROGRAM DUPLICATION**

***STANDARD: The institution must establish whether the proposed program fills a need within the post‑secondary system and that there is no unnecessary duplication with existing programs.***

***Submission Guidelines***

* Identify degree programs with similar learning objectives offered by other post-secondary institutions in British Columbia and briefly explain how or whether this degree will differ from the others.
* Describe the consultation that has occurred with other institutions in British Columbia offering similar programs.
* If there are programs with similar learning objectives or outcomes available in the province, explain why an apparent duplication in programming is warranted (e.g.: demand for graduates exceeds system capacity; the program is unavailable online or within reasonable commuting distance; etc.).
* Outline any plans for collaboration and/or sharing resources and identify the prospective collaborating institutions/organizations.
* Provide documentary evidence such as letters of support.

**STUDENT DEMAND AND OUTCOMES**

***STANDARD: The institution must demonstrate that the proposed degree program will have sufficient ongoing student interest and provide benefit to students.***

***Submission Guidelines***

* Provide evidence of student demand for the program, such as:
	+ - The results of a survey indicating current student demand for the program. If a survey is used, describe the survey instrument used and questions posed.
		- Student waitlists of comparable programs offered in British Columbia.
* Describe what plans and/or arrangements are in place to establish articulation agreements with other post-secondary institutions in the province. Provide a website link to the institution policy on admissions and transfer.
* If relevant, provide anticipated enrolment figures from other institutions that may have students wishing to articulate into the proposed program.
* Describe the opportunities that graduates of the program have for progression to further study in this field or in professional fields. Provide evidence of consultation with graduate/professional post-secondary programs.
* If non-degree and/or degree programs in the same field are offered at this institution, explain:
	+ The expected added value for students taking this proposed degree program (e.g., promotion or employment opportunities) and provide evidence that these anticipated benefits are justified.