

TERMS OF REFERENCE

NEW ACADEMIC PROGRAM ADVISORY COMMITTEE (NAPAC)

Approval Authority: Senate

Reports To: Provost and Vice President Academic

Established: October 10, 2024

1.0 Preamble and Mandate

As detailed in the Senate-approved Framework for the Development of New Academic Programs, the New Academic Program Advisory Committee (NAPAC) is tasked with evaluating new academic program proposals submitted to the Office of the Provost and Vice President Academic. Specifically, NAPAC's mandate involves reviewing the Statement of Intent (SOI) for a New Academic Program submissions, which details the feasibility, relevance, need, and alignment of proposed academic programs with the institution's mission, vision and values. This committee acts in an advisory capacity to the Provost to guide decision-making processes.

2.0 Purpose and Goals

The main purpose and goals of the NAPAC are to:

- 2.1 **Ensure alignment of new program development with the university's mission**: Ensure all proposed programs directly contribute to the university's mission of improving the health of Northern Ontarians by fostering socially accountable education and advocating for health equity.
- 2.2 Uphold university values: Integrate the university's values of innovation, social accountability, collaboration, inclusiveness, and respect throughout the evaluation process. This means considering proposals that demonstrate innovative approaches, address social needs, encourage collaboration across disciplines, promote inclusivity in student recruitment and curriculum design, and treat all stakeholders with respect.
- 2.3 Conduct rigorous and fair evaluations: Conduct a thorough and objective evaluation of SOIs based on established criteria that consider academic merit, market demand for graduates of the proposed program, potential impact on Northern Ontario health, program feasibility, and alignment with the university's strategic goals.
- 2.4 **Identify promising programs**: Recognize SOIs with the potential to become high-quality academic programs that contribute to both academic excellence and positive societal impact, particularly in Northern Ontario.
- 2.5 **Recommend for further development:** Endorse SOIs that demonstrate strong potential and warrant further development into full program proposals.

3.0 Committee Responsibilities

- 3.1 Develop clear and transparent criteria for the evaluation of SOIs.
- 3.2 Review all SOIs submitted for new academic programs. This will involve a careful examination of submitted materials.
- 3.3 Assess the alignment of proposed programs with the university's mission, vision, and values. The committee will consider how each proposal contributes to improving the health of Northern Ontarians and reflects the university's commitment to social accountability, innovation, collaboration, inclusiveness, and respect.
- 3.4 Evaluate the merit, market demand, and potential impact of proposed programs on the health of Northern Ontarians. The Committee will assess the strength of the curriculum, the qualifications of the proposed faculty, the job market outlook for graduates, and the program's potential to address health priorities in Northern Ontario.
- 3.5 Analyze the feasibility of proposed programs in terms of resources, faculty expertise, and infrastructure. This will involve considering the financial resources required, the availability of qualified faculty members, and the adequacy of existing facilities and technologies to support the program.
- 3.6 Consider recommendations from relevant academic units and stakeholder groups (when applicable). The committee may seek input from faculty members, program directors, and external stakeholders with expertise relevant to the proposed program.
- 3.7 Recommend endorsement or non-endorsement of SOIs, providing clear and constructive feedback in both cases.
- 3.8 Maintain confidentiality regarding all proposal information and deliberations. Committee members will be expected to treat all submitted materials and discussions with strict confidentiality.
- 3.9 Members must declare a real or perceived conflict of interest at the beginning of (or any other time during) a meeting.

4.0 Membership

- Provost and Vice President Academic (Chair)
- Voting Members
 - O Assistant Dean, Graduate Studies
 - o 2 Full-time Faculty Members from Medical Sciences Division 1 must be a Senator
 - o 2 Full-time Faculty Members from Human Sciences Division 1 must be a Senator
 - o 2 Faculty Members from Clinical Sciences Division 1 must be a Senator
 - o 1 Representative from the Academic Indigenous Health Education Committee (AIHEC)
 - 1 Representative from the Academic Education Committee on Francophone Health (AECFH) *
- Non-voting Members

- O Director, Health Sciences & Program Development
- Government Relations Representative
- Finance Representative
- O Other non-voting members as deemed necessary

<u>Criteria</u>: Members should be familiar with academic program development as well as program evaluation. Of the faculty representation on the committee, at least 2 of the 6 faculty members should have experience delivering care and/or education in rural/remote regions of Northern Ontario.

<u>Selection</u>: The Provost's Office will send a request for nominations to Division Heads (MSD, HSD, CSD) and to Committee Chairs (AIHEC and AECFH) to help identify appropriate representatives to serve on NAPAC.

<u>Term:</u> Membership will be for a term of 3 years.

<u>Recommendations</u>: The recommendations will be made by consensus of the members present at the meetings. Voting to recommend or not recommend a proposed program will be based on the majority of members present at the meeting. There are 9 voting members and the chair would vote to break a tie if needed.

A recommendation by NAPAC to endorse a new proposed program will not in itself commit the institution to develop the program given the subsequent analyses and requirements involved in the development of the full program proposal as detailed in the framework for developing new academic programs at NOSM University.

5.0 Reporting

Minutes of the NAPAC meetings will be kept centrally by the Office of the Provost and Vice President Academic. As appropriate, the Provost will provide summary briefing notes to the Senate on the activities of the NAPAC.

6.0 Meetings

Meetings will be quarterly or more frequently at the call of the Chair.

Review Period: As required. **Next Review:** October 2026

^{*}Creation of the AECFH is currently under review at Senate.