

INSTITUTIONAL QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESS

May 5, 2011

INDEX

	Page
I Policy 110: Institutional Quality Assurance Process	1-4
II Policy 112: Development of New Graduate and Undergraduate Programs.....	5-20
III Policy 126: Periodic Program Review of Graduate and Undergraduate Programs	21-34
IV Policy 127: Curriculum Modifications: Graduate and Undergraduate Programs.....	35-37

RYERSON UNIVERSITY
POLICY OF SENATE

INSTITUTIONAL QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESS

Policy Number:	110
Current Policy Approval Date:	May 3, 2011
Policy Review Date:	May 2013 (<i>or sooner at the request of the Provost and Vice President Academic or Senate</i>)
Responsible Committee or Office:	Provost and Vice President Academic

Ryerson University, in its commitment to quality education, and in compliance with the Quality Assessment Framework established by the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (Quality Council), has developed this overarching policy on Quality Assurance and three subsidiary policies which establish policies and procedures for the three pillars of quality: new program development and approval; the periodic review of existing programs; and the modification of existing curricula and programs.

The subsidiary policies are as follows:

Policy 112: Development of New Graduate and Undergraduate Programs

Policy 126: Periodic Program Review of Graduate and Undergraduate Programs

Policy 127: Curriculum Modifications: Graduate and Undergraduate Programs

I. SCOPE: This Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP) governs all graduate and undergraduate programs, both full and part-time, offered solely by Ryerson or in partnership with any other post-secondary institution.

II. AUTHORITY & RESPONSIBILITY:

A. Senate

1. Final internal authority for the approval of all new graduate and undergraduate programs;
2. Final authority for the approval of all graduate and undergraduate periodic program reviews; and
3. Final authority for the approval of all major modifications to curriculum/programs.

B. Academic Standards Committee: Recommendations to Senate for undergraduate programs with respect to implementation of new programs, periodic program reviews and major curriculum modifications.

- C. Yeates School of Graduate Studies Council:** Recommendations to Senate for graduate programs with respect to implementation of new programs, periodic program reviews and major curriculum modifications.
- D. Provost and Vice President Academic**
1. Overall responsibility for the IQAP policies and procedures;
 2. Approval for the development of new program proposals based on Letters of Intent;
 3. Final approval of commencement, implementation and budget of new programs;
 4. Approval of any budget allocations to support program review outcomes;
 5. Responsibility for reporting to the Board of Governors on new program proposals and the outcomes of program reviews; and
 6. Responsibility for reporting to the Quality Council, which may be delegated to the Vice Provost Academic.
- E. Vice Provost, Academic**
1. Receiving undergraduate new program Letters of Intent and submitting them to the Provost;
 2. Submitting full undergraduate new program proposals to the Academic Standards Committee;
 3. Monitoring of new programs, once initiated, in conjunction with the Vice Provost, University Planning;
 4. Forwarding follow-up reports on Periodic Program Reviews to the Academic Standards Committee;
 5. Determining if an undergraduate program/curriculum modification is major or minor, where necessary;
 6. Resolution of disputes between Deans or between a Dean and a Department/School/Faculty Council with respect to curriculum modification;
 7. Establishing the Periodic Program Review schedule;
 8. Reporting to the Quality Council, in consultation with the Provost;
 9. Responsibility for the local implementation of Ryerson's Quality Council Audit Process; and
 10. The posting of Periodic Program Review executive summaries on the Ryerson website.
- F. Dean, Yeates School of Graduate Studies**
1. Acceptance and submission of new graduate program Letters of Intent to the Provost;
 2. Determining if a graduate program/curriculum modification is major or minor, where necessary;
 3. Approval of major and minor modifications to graduate programs;
 4. Submission of new program proposals, curriculum modifications and graduate program reviews to Senate, as chair of the Yeates School of Graduate Studies Council;

5. Responding to the Report of the Program Review Team in a periodic program review of a graduate program;
6. Forwarding follow-up reports on Graduate Periodic Program Reviews to the YSGSC;
7. Monitoring of new programs, once initiated, in conjunction with the Vice Provost, University Planning; and
8. Appointing Peer Review Teams for graduate programs in consultation with the program Dean.

G. Faculty Deans (or Dean of Record for Interdisciplinary Programs)

1. Approval of major and minor modifications to graduate and undergraduate programs;
2. Resolution of disputes between a Department/School Council and Chair/Director with respect to curriculum modification;
3. Submission of Letters of Intent for undergraduate programs to the Vice Provost Academic;
4. Appointing Peer Review Teams for graduate programs in consultation with the Dean of the Yeates School of Graduate Studies.
5. Responding to the reports of Peer Review Teams for undergraduate and graduate programs;
6. Submission of Letters of Intent for graduate programs and new graduate program proposals to the Dean of the Yeates School of Graduate Studies; and
7. Submission of new undergraduate program proposals to the Academic Standards Committee.

H. Department/School or Faculty Councils (where applicable)

1. Approval of Letters of Intent, new undergraduate program proposals, major and minor modifications, and recommending these to the appropriate Deans;
2. Approval of major modifications to curriculum/programs; and
3. Approval of periodic program reviews to be forwarded to Dean.

I. Yeates School of Graduate Studies Council: Approval of new graduate program proposals and periodic program reviews for forwarding to Senate.

J. Department/School Chairs/Directors: Presentation of periodic program review follow-up report to Faculty Dean or Dean of Record and Dean of Graduate Studies for graduate programs, and Provost.

K. Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (Quality Council):

1. The Quality Council has ultimate authority to approve the university's IQAP and any subsequent revisions.
2. The Quality Council audit the university's periodic program review process on an eight year cycle.
3. The university will annually submit a report to the Quality Council on major program modifications approved through the university's internal process, and summarizing outcomes of periodic program reviews.

III. Selection of Peer Review Team (PRT) members

- A.** Peer Review Teams (PRT) are required for periodic program review and new program proposals for both graduate and undergraduate programs.
- B.** The PRT will consist of:
 - 1. two faculty from the relevant discipline(s), field(s) or profession from another university, including universities outside Ontario, where appropriate, who are at arms length from the program school/department; plus
 - 2. for a program review, one additional reviewer, either from within the university but from outside the discipline (or interdisciplinary group) engaged in the program, or external to the university.
 - 3. The membership of the undergraduate PRT will be determined and appointed by the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record for Interdisciplinary Programs, based on written information provided by the program. The membership of the graduate PRT will be determined by the Dean of YSGS in consultation with the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record. Information from the program will include names and brief biographies of four or more faculty external to Ryerson and two or more faculty internal to Ryerson. If graduate and undergraduate reviews are done simultaneously, the Faculty Dean, or Dean of Record, and Dean of YSGS must decide if a combined PRT or separate PRTs are required.
 - 4. The Faculty Dean or Dean of Record for undergraduate programs, and the Dean of YSGS in consultation with the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record for graduate programs, will invite one of the external reviewers to act as Chair of the PRT.

IV. ESTABLISHING AND REVIEWING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

- A.** The three policies that address the development of new programs, periodic review of programs and modifications of curriculum are approved by Senate in compliance with this overall IQAP policy.
- B.** Any revision of this policy or the associated policies requires Senate and the Quality Council approval.
- C.** Procedures associated with each of the policies are reviewed as needed to ensure that they remain current and that they are effective.
- D.** A Handbook for Periodic Program Review and New Program Development, giving further detail on the review process, will be developed by the Academic Standards Committee for undergraduate programs and the Yeates School of Graduate Studies Council for graduate programs.

RYERSON UNIVERSITY
POLICY OF SENATE

DEVELOPMENT OF NEW GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

Policy Number¹:	112
Previous Approval Dates for Policy 112	May 6, 2008, March 1, 2005, May 9, 2002 February 7, 1995 (original policy)
Previous Approval Dates for Policy 127	January 2002 (Reformatted), October 2000 October 1996
Current Policy Approval Date	May 3, 2011
Policy Review Date	May 2013 (<i>or sooner at the request of the Provost and Vice President Academic or Senate</i>)
Responsible Committee or Office	Provost and Vice President Academic

POLICY STATEMENT

I. SCOPE

This policy governs the creation of new degrees, degree programs or programs of specialization at the undergraduate and graduate level, including those offered jointly with other post-secondary institutions. It does not include change of program name only, nor the inclusion of a new streams or options within an existing program.

Definitions:

- A. New program:** A new program has substantially different program requirements and substantially different learning outcomes from those of any existing approved programs offered by the institution.
- B. Degree program:** The complete set and sequence of courses, combination of courses and/or other units of study, research and practice prescribed by the University for the fulfillment of a degree. Degrees are granted for meeting the established requirements at a specified standard of performance consistent with the university's Degree Level Expectations (DLEs). (See APPENDIX I and II).

II. AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY

- A. Senate:** Final internal authority for the academic approval of all Ryerson University programs rests with the Senate.

¹ This policy combines Policies on new undergraduate programs (Policy 112) and graduate programs (Previously Policy 127) in keeping with COU guidelines developed in 2010.

Policy 112: Development of New Graduate and Undergraduate Programs

- B. Academic Standards Committee (ASC) and Yeates School of Graduate Studies Council (YSGS Council):** As committees of Senate, these committees will review final proposals for new undergraduate and graduate programs, respectively, and will bring recommendations to Senate with respect to their approval.
- C. Provost and Vice President Academic**
1. approval of the development of program proposals, based on Letters of Intent (LOI); and
 2. final approval of implementation and budget of new programs.
- D. Vice Provost, Academic**
1. accepting undergraduate LOIs and full program proposals for submission to the Provost;
 2. submitting full undergraduate program proposals to the Academic Standards Committee for review and approval; and
 3. monitoring of new programs, once initiated, in conjunction with the Vice Provost, University Planning.
- E. Deans**
1. Faculty Deans, or Deans of Record for Interdisciplinary Programs, have the authority for the submission of:
 - a. new undergraduate program LOIs to the Vice Provost Academic for submission to the Provost;
 - b. new undergraduate program proposals to the Vice Provost Academic for submission to the Provost;
 - c. new graduate program LOIs to the Dean of the Yeates School of Graduate Studies for submission to the Provost; and
 - d. new graduate program proposals to the Dean of the Yeates School of Graduate Studies for submission to the Provost.
 2. Dean of the Yeates School of Graduate Studies has the authority for the submission to the Provost of:
 - a. new graduate program LOIs; and
 - b. new graduate program proposals.
- F. YSGS Programs and Planning Committee:** Reviews and approves graduate program proposals and recommends to YSGS Council.
- G. Department/School and Faculty Councils (where applicable):** The approval of Councils is required for an LOI or new program proposal to proceed to the Dean for submission to the Vice Provost Academic.
- H. Ontario University Council on Quality Assurance:**
1. The Quality Council has the authority to approve or decline new program proposals.
 2. The Provost, through the Vice Provost, Academic, has the responsibility to report to the Quality Council about the approval process for all new programs.
- I. Board of Governors:** Authority for the financial approval of all new programs rests with the Board of Governors.
- J. Disputes:** If there is a disagreement within a Department/School, or between Departments/Schools with respect to the development of a new program, the relevant Dean(s) shall decide how to proceed. Should there be a disagreement between Deans or between a Dean and a Department/School or Faculty Council, the Provost shall decide how to proceed.

Policy 112: Development of New Graduate and Undergraduate Programs

III. IMPLEMENTATION: If a new program does not begin within thirty-six months of its approval to commence, its approval will lapse.

IV. PROCEDURES: The Provost shall establish the procedures related to this policy, and review those procedures as necessary. The procedures associated with this policy shall include all of the steps necessary for the approval of undergraduate and graduate programs.

APPENDIX I: DEGREE LEVEL EXPECTATIONS FOR UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

	UNDERGRADUATE DEGREE
EXPECTATIONS	<i>All undergraduate degree programs at Ryerson will be expected to demonstrate that at the completion of the program students would have acquired the following set of skills.</i>
1. Depth and Breadth of Knowledge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. 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; b. A 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; c. A developed ability to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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; d. A developed, detailed knowledge of and experience in research in an area of the discipline; e. Developed critical thinking and analytical skills inside and outside the discipline; f. The ability to apply learning from one or more areas outside the discipline.
2. Knowledge of Methodologies	<p>An understanding of methods of enquiry or creative activity, or both, in their primary area of study that enables the student to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Evaluate the appropriateness of different approaches to solving problems using well established ideas and techniques; b. Devise and sustain arguments or solve problems using these methods; and describe and comment upon particular aspects of current research or equivalent advanced scholarship.
3. Application of Knowledge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The ability to review, present and critically evaluate qualitative and quantitative information to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Develop lines of argument; ii. Make sound judgments in accordance with the major theories, concepts and methods of the subject(s) of study; iii. Apply underlying concepts, principles, and techniques of analysis, both within and outside the discipline; iv. Where appropriate use this knowledge in the

Policy 112: Development of New Graduate and Undergraduate Programs

	<p>creative process; and</p> <p>b. The ability to use a range of established techniques to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Initiate and undertake critical evaluation of arguments, assumptions, abstract concepts and information; ii. Propose solutions; iii. Frame appropriate questions for the purpose of solving a problem; iv. Solve a problem or create a new work; and <p>c. The ability to make critical use of scholarly reviews and primary sources.</p>
4. Communication Skills	The ability to communicate information, arguments, and analyses accurately and reliably, orally and in writing to a range of audiences.
5. Awareness of Limits of Knowledge	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.
6. Autonomy and Professional Capacity	<p>a. Qualities and transferable skills necessary for further study, employment, community involvement and other activities requiring:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The exercise of initiative, personal responsibility and accountability in both personal and group contexts; ii. Working effectively with others; iii. Decision-making in complex contexts; <p>b. The ability to manage their own learning in changing circumstances, both within and outside the discipline and to select an appropriate program of further study; and</p> <p>c. Behaviour consistent with academic integrity and social responsibility.</p>

APPENDIX II: DEGREE LEVEL EXPECTATIONS FOR GRADUATE PROGRAMS

MASTER'S DEGREE	
EXPECTATIONS	<i>This degree is awarded to students who have demonstrated:</i>
1. Depth and Breadth of Knowledge	A systematic understanding of knowledge, 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.
2. Research and Scholarship	<p>A conceptual understanding and methodological competence that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Enables a working comprehension of how established techniques of research and inquiry are used to create and interpret knowledge in the discipline; b. Enables a critical evaluation of current research and advanced research and scholarship in the discipline or area of professional competence; and c. Enables a treatment of complex issues and judgments based on established principles and techniques; and, <p>On the basis of that competence, has shown at least one of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The development and support of a sustained argument in written form; or b. Originality in the application of knowledge.
3. Level of Application of Knowledge	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.
4. Professional Capacity/Autonomy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The qualities and transferable skills necessary for employment requiring: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. The exercise of initiative and of personal responsibility and accountability; and ii. Decision-making in complex situations; and b. The intellectual independence required for continuing professional development; c. The ethical behaviour consistent with academic integrity and the use of appropriate guidelines and procedures for responsible conduct of research; and d. The ability to appreciate the broader implications of applying knowledge to particular contexts.
5. Level of Communications Skills	The ability to communicate ideas, issues and conclusions clearly.
6. Awareness of Limits of Knowledge	Cognizance of the complexity of knowledge and of the potential contributions of other interpretations, methods, and disciplines.

Policy 112: Development of New Graduate and Undergraduate Programs

DOCTORAL DEGREE	
EXPECTATIONS	<i>This degree extends the skills associated with the Master's degree and is awarded to students who have demonstrated:</i>
1. Depth and Breadth of Knowledge	A thorough understanding of a substantial body of knowledge that is at the forefront of their academic discipline or area of professional practice.
2. Research and Scholarship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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; b. The ability to make informed judgments on complex issues in specialist fields, sometimes requiring new methods; and c. The ability to produce original research, or other advanced scholarship, of a quality to satisfy peer review, and to merit publication.
3. Level of Application of Knowledge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The capacity to 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.
4. Professional Capacity/Autonomy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The qualities and transferable skills necessary for employment requiring the exercise of personal responsibility and largely autonomous initiative in complex situations; b. The intellectual independence to be academically and professionally engaged and current; c. The ethical behaviour consistent with academic integrity and the use of appropriate guidelines and procedures for responsible conduct of research; and d. The ability to evaluate the broader implications of applying knowledge to particular contexts.
5. Level of Communication Skills	The ability to communicate complex and/or ambiguous ideas, issues and conclusions clearly and effectively.
6. Awareness of Limits of Knowledge	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.

**POLICY 112: DEVELOPMENT AND APPROVAL OF
NEW GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS**

PROCEDURES

The stages of the developmental and approval process are:

1. GENERATION OF A PRELIMINARY PROPOSAL

1.1 Initiation of the Process

Preliminary proposals for new degree programs will be developed by faculty groups ("originating units") that are comprised of faculty from a single school or department, from several schools and/or departments within a Faculty, from schools and departments from different Faculties, or from collaborative structures involving other post-secondary institutions.

1.2 Authorization to Proceed

The authorization of the Provost and Vice President Academic² is required before a full program proposal is developed.

The first step in obtaining this authorization is a *Letter of Intent (LOI)* to be prepared by the originating unit. When the unit has received approval from the relevant Faculty Dean(s), the LOI will be transmitted to the Vice Provost for undergraduate programs or to the Dean of YSGS for graduate programs.

This letter will include:

- a. a brief statement of the consistency of the program with Ryerson's mission and academic plan, the Faculty plan and the Department/School plan;
- b. a brief description of the proposed program including its purpose, anticipated student clientele, and curriculum;
- c. a preliminary statement of existing and/or emerging societal need and the basis on which this has been determined;
- d. a preliminary projection of faculty and other resource requirements, developed in consultation with the University Planning Office;
- e. a schedule for the development of the program, noting that the program proposal must be presented to the ASC or YSGS Council within one year of the approval of the LOI;
- f. the proposed schedule for program implementation;
- g. an executive summary; and
- h. for graduate programs, a statement of whether the program is a professional program and/or a full cost recovery program;

² Hereafter referred to as Provost.

Policy 112: Development of New Graduate and Undergraduate Programs

- i. for graduate programs, letters of support and commitment from the relevant Faculty Dean(s).

The executive summary will be posted by the Provost and, along with the complete LOI, will be available for inspection by any interested member of the Ryerson community. A period of one month is set aside for comment on the proposal.

The Provost will respond to the letter of intent after the expiry of the one-month community response period. If the development of a proposal is authorized, an academic unit will be formally designated to assume responsibility for it and a Faculty Dean will be given primary responsibility. The designated academic unit(s) may correspond to an existing school/department or be newly created for the purpose of developing a formal proposal. In the case of undergraduate inter-Faculty proposals the Provost shall decide which Faculty Dean shall be given primary responsibility.

Authorization to proceed signifies that the University supports the development of a formal program proposal, but it does not commit the University or the Faculty to final endorsement.

2. DEVELOPMENT OF THE FORMAL PROPOSAL

2.1 Proposal Content

A proposal must include:

2.1.2 Basic information

- a. Name of the program and the proposed degree designation(s), identification of the designated academic unit, and the names of the principal faculty members involved in its development.
- b. Statement of the program goals, clearly identifying the rationale for offering this new program as it relates to societal need, Ryerson's mission and academic plan and the academic plans of the Faculty and the Department/School.
- c. Overview of the curriculum, major disciplines/options of the program, and mode of delivery.
- d. A presentation of the program curriculum in a clear tabular format as it would appear in the calendar, specifying the courses, their modes of delivery and scheduled hours per week, for each term of the program.
- e. Discussion of the overlap between, and/or integration of, the program with other existing or planned programs at Ryerson.
- f. Copy of the Provost's authorization to proceed and a summary of major departures from the Letter of Intent.
- g. **New Program Advisory Committee (for undergraduate programs only):** Once authorization to proceed has been given, a New Program Advisory Committee² will be constituted. This Committee will consist of at least 5 members. The designated academic unit will provide the relevant Dean(s) with a list of suggested members and brief biographical sketches. The suggested members may be drawn, as appropriate, from business, industry, labour, agencies, government, and other universities. As the

Policy 112: Development of New Graduate and Undergraduate Programs

proposal is developed, the role of the committee is to provide advice on:

- i. program objectives;
- ii. proposed courses and curriculum structure;
- iii. equipment and other required support (where relevant);
- iv. likely employment patterns for graduates; and
- v. any other aspects of the proposed program related to its objectives, structure, and societal relevance.

In general, the committee's advice will be sought periodically during the development of the proposal. Its working relationship with the designated academic unit should be iterative.

2.1.3 Program details

a. Objectives

- i. Consistency of the program with the institution's mission and academic plans.
- ii. Clarity and appropriateness of the program's requirements and associated learning outcomes in addressing the institution's own undergraduate or graduate Degree Level Expectations.
- iii. Appropriateness of degree nomenclature.

b. Admission requirements

- i. A statement of the admission requirements and the appropriateness of the program's admission requirements for the learning outcomes established for completion of the program.
- ii. Sufficient explanation of alternative requirements, if any, for admission into a graduate, second-entry or undergraduate program, such as minimum grade point average, additional languages or portfolios, along with how the program recognizes prior work or learning experience.

c. Structure

- i. Appropriateness of the program's structure and regulations to meet specified program learning outcomes and degree level expectations.
- ii. For graduate programs, a clear rationale for program length that ensures that the program requirements can be reasonably completed within the proposed time period.

d. Program content

- i. Ways in which the curriculum addresses the current state of the discipline or area of study.
- ii. An analysis of the program's curriculum content in terms of professional licensing/accreditation requirements, if any.
- iii. Identification of any unique curriculum or program innovations or creative components.
- iv. For research-focused graduate programs, clear indication of the nature and suitability of the major research requirements for degree completion.
- v. Evidence that each graduate program requires students to take a minimum of two-thirds of the course requirements from among graduate level courses.

e. Mode of delivery

- i. Appropriateness of the proposed mode(s) of delivery to meet the intended program learning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations.

Policy 112: Development of New Graduate and Undergraduate Programs

- f. **Assessment of teaching and learning**
 - i. Appropriateness of the proposed methods for the assessment of student achievement of the intended program learning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations.
 - ii. Completeness of plans for documenting and demonstrating the level of performance of students, consistent with the institution's statement of its Degree Level Expectations (see Appendix).
 - iii. Promotion and graduation requirements, if variant from Ryerson's graduate or undergraduate policies on grading, promotion and academic standing.

- g. **Resources (Developed in consultation with the University Planning Office where appropriate.)**
 - i. **For all programs**
 - a. Adequacy of the administrative unit's planned utilization of existing human, physical and financial resources, and any current institutional commitment to supplement those resources, to support the program.
 - b. Participation of a sufficient number and quality of faculty who are competent to teach and/or supervise in the program.
 - c. Report by the university library on existing and proposed collections and services to support the program goals and learning objectives.
 - d. Evidence that there are adequate resources to sustain quality graduate and undergraduate research activities, including information technology and laboratory access.

 - ii. **Resources for graduate programs only**
 - 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.
 - c. Evidence of how supervisory loads will be distributed, and the qualifications and appointment status of faculty who will provide instruction and supervision.

 - iii. **Resources for undergraduate programs only:** Evidence of and planning for adequate numbers and quality of:
 - a. faculty and staff to achieve the goals of the program or of plans and the commitment to provide the necessary resources in step with the implementation of the program;
 - b. planned/anticipated class sizes;
 - c. provision of supervision of experiential learning opportunities (if required); and
 - d. the role of adjunct and part-time faculty.

- h. **Quality and other indicators**
 - i. Definition and use of indicators that provide evidence of quality of the faculty (e.g., qualifications, research, innovation and scholarly record; appropriateness of collective faculty expertise to contribute substantively to the proposed program).
 - ii. Evidence of a program structure and faculty research that will ensure the intellectual quality of the student experience.

2.1.4 Appendices - The following information, relevant to the above, should be included as appendices to the proposal.

- a. Calendar-type course descriptions of each of the proposed courses, accompanied by course

Policy 112: Development of New Graduate and Undergraduate Programs

level outcomes, and articulating the relationship of these outcomes to program expectations.

- b. A synopsis of each undergraduate professional and required professionally-related course, identifying the major topics of study, potential text(s), methods of evaluation and related computer, laboratory, or studio experience.
- c. Curriculum Vitae of the faculty members, formatted as per the RFA Collective Agreement in a single volume, who will be involved in the development/delivery of the proposed program.

2.1.5 *Institutional appropriateness, societal need, and student demand*

- a. Assessment of institutional appropriateness. This assessment should refer to the university's mission and to relevant areas of strength within the university and the designated academic unit. These would include teaching, SRC activity, and others as appropriate.
- b. Description of the existing and/or emerging societal need(s) that will be met by the program's graduates, and any relevant trends in the anticipated societal need, including:
 - i. anticipated student demand for the program, supported with as much evidence as possible;
 - ii. evidence that graduates of the program are and will be needed in appropriate sectors based on such things as: letters from potential employers and, where applicable, professional organizations and /or associations, who have reviewed the proposed curriculum and/or a formal survey of potential students; and/or
 - iii. statistics related to the number of Ontario students leaving the province to study in the same field elsewhere in Canada or abroad, and the comments of relevant student groups.
- c. Indication of any innovative and distinctive aspects of the proposed program, and a comparison with the most similar programs in Ontario. If there are significant similarities between the proposed program and existing programs, a case for duplication should be made.
- d. Examination of potential collaboration/cooperation with other Institutions offering similar or complementary programs, and the rationale for whether such joint arrangements may or may not be beneficial. The outcome of any consultations with other institutions offering similar programs regarding the possibility of cooperation, sharing of resources, facilities and faculty should be indicated.

2.1.6 *Data developed in consultation with the University Planning Office (UPO) and, for Graduate Program, the Yeates School of Graduate Studies*

- a. Projected enrolment levels for at least the first five years of the operation of the new program, leading to the intended steady-state enrolment levels and the year in which such steady-state will be reached.
- b. The facilities, specialized equipment, and other physical resources that will be required to offer the proposed program.
- c. Estimated number of faculty members (total and additional, in FTEs) and support staff that will be required to deliver the program at the steady-state conditions.
- d. Estimated annual operating and capital funds required to deliver the proposed program.

Policy 112: Development of New Graduate and Undergraduate Programs

- e. Space (including work/study space for graduate students), computing and library support that will be required.
- f. For Graduate programs, funding for graduate students.
- g. Tuition proposal for graduate programs.
- h. For PhD programs based on an already existing related Masters program, flow-through cohort data on publication, employment and student funding.

A preliminary assessment of financial viability will be carried out as soon as possible after the required information is gathered. The proposal will not be submitted for Decanal approval prior to this preliminary assessment.

- 2.1.7 *Preliminary External Review*** – If a graduate program so desires, it may engage an external consultant to review the written documents, normally prior to department/school counsel approval. The consultant will be selected in consultation with the Dean and the Dean of YSGS, and may not be a member of the subsequent Peer Review Team.

3. PROCESS FOR PROGRAM APPROVAL

3.1 Departmental/School Approval

The formal proposal for an undergraduate or graduate program will be presented to the relevant Departmental/School Council(s) for review and approval. Where such a Council does not exist the designated Faculty Dean shall establish an appropriate committee consisting of members of related department/school councils.

A record will be kept of the date(s) of the relevant Council meeting(s), along with any qualifications or limitations placed on approval by the Council(s). This information must be forwarded to the designated Faculty Dean.

3.2 Decanal Approval

After the undergraduate program proposal has been approved by the Department/School(s) it will be forwarded to the Faculty Dean(s) for approval. Once the undergraduate program proposal is approved, the Faculty Dean will submit the proposal to the Vice Provost, Academic. The Vice Provost, Academic, will submit the proposal to the ASC for review and approval. Inter-Faculty programs will require the approval of the Deans of all involved Faculties.

After the graduate program proposal has been approved by the School/Department Council(s), it will be forwarded to the Faculty Dean. Once the graduate program is approved, the Faculty Dean will provide a letter of support and the program proposal to the Yeates School of Graduate Studies for review by the Program and Planning Committee of the Yeates School of Graduate Studies Council.

*Policy 112: Development of New Graduate and Undergraduate Programs***4. PEER REVIEW AND SITE VISIT**

As soon as possible after a proposal has been approved by the Dean(s), it will undergo review by a peer review team as described below.

4.1 Requirements

The undergraduate peer review team will be appointed by the designated Faculty Dean based on written information provided by the originating unit. This information will include the names and brief biographies of four faculty external to Ryerson.

The graduate peer review team will be appointed by the Dean of YSGS in consultation with the Faculty Dean. The originating unit will provide a list of names and brief biographies of four or more faculty external to Ryerson.

4.2 Composition and Selection of the Peer Review Team (PRT)

- a. The PRT will consist of two faculty from the relevant discipline(s), field(s) or profession from another university, including universities outside Ontario where appropriate, who are at arms length from the program school/department
- b. The membership of the undergraduate PRT will be determined and appointed by the Dean based on written information provided by the program. The membership of the graduate PRT will be determined by the Dean of YSGS in consultation with the faculty Dean. Information from the program will include names and brief biographies of four or more faculty external to Ryerson and three or more faculty internal to Ryerson.
- c. The Faculty Dean, or Dean of Record for undergraduate programs and the Dean of YSGS, in consultation with the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record for graduate programs, will ask one of the external reviewers to serve as Chair.
- d. There will be a site visit, structured to include the opportunity for the PRT to meet with appropriate faculty, staff and students.

4.3 The Mandate of the Peer Review Team

The general mandate of the Peer Review Team is to evaluate and report in writing on the academic quality of the proposed program and the capacity of the designated academic unit to deliver it in an appropriate manner. The report of the PRT will address:

- a. the currency, rigour, and coherence of the proposed curriculum, including acknowledgement of any innovative aspects of the proposed program;
- b. the appropriateness of the program's goals and learning objectives;
- c. the ability of the proposed curriculum to meet the program's goals and learning objectives;
- d. the proposed number of faculty;
- e. the academic expertise of the faculty in relation to the program's goals and objectives;
- f. the proposed levels of support staff and infrastructure (e.g. space, facilities, technology, library) for the proposed program, within the unit and (to the extent relevant) the university;
- g. for graduate programs, the proposed levels of funding for graduate students;

Policy 112: Development of New Graduate and Undergraduate Programs

- h. for graduate programs, the relevance of the proposed fields of the program;
- i. the proposed admissions criteria; and,
- j. any recommendations for improvement and/or modification to the program.

4.3 Provided to the Peer Review Team Before the Site Visit

The Peer Review Team will be provided with a Letter of Invitation, a site visit agenda and their mandate, along with the formal proposal and all documentation pertinent to its approval to this point. This communication will remind the PRT of the confidentiality of the documents presented.

4.4 Provided to the Peer Review Team During the Site Visit

- a. The PRT will be provided with:
 - 1. access to program administrators, staff, and faculty, administrators of related departments and librarians and students as appropriate; and
 - 2. any additional information that may be needed to support a thorough review.
- b. At the close of the site visit for an undergraduate program, the PRT will hold a debriefing involving the designated Faculty Dean, Vice Provost, Academic, and/or the Provost and any others who may be invited. For a graduate program, the Dean of YSGS will also attend.

4.6 After the Site Visit

Within four weeks of the completion of the site visit, the undergraduate PRT will submit its written report to the designated Faculty Dean and the Provost. The graduate PRT will submit its written report to the Faculty Dean and the Dean of YSGS, also within four weeks of the visit. For undergraduate programs, the designated Faculty Dean will circulate this report to the designated academic unit. For graduate programs, the Dean of YSGS will circulate this report to the designated academic unit and the designated Faculty Dean.

4.4 Response to the PRT Report

Within four weeks of receipt of the PRT report, the designated academic unit will submit its response for undergraduate program proposals to the designated Faculty Dean and for graduate program proposals to the Dean of YSGS. The response will take the form of a statement that identifies any corrections or clarifications, indicates how the PRT recommendations are being accommodated or, if they are not to be accommodated, reasons for this. Alternatively, if the PRT report is strongly favourable, the designated academic unit may respond by resubmitting its proposal incorporating any modifications.

A written response to the PRT report must be provided by the designated Faculty Dean for undergraduate program proposals and the Dean of YSGS for graduate program proposals.

If the proposal is revised following, or as a result of, the PRT review, the original proposal and the revised proposal must be resubmitted to the designated Faculty Dean/Dean of YSGS.

Policy 112: Development of New Graduate and Undergraduate Programs

If the designated Faculty Dean(s) or the Dean of YSGS believes that this revised proposal differs substantially from the appended formal proposal s/he is required to return it to the Department/School Council(s) for further endorsement before providing decanal endorsement.

Undergraduate Programs

The entire proposal, with revisions, including the PRT review and response and the Faculty Dean's approval, is submitted to the Vice Provost, Academic. The Vice Provost, Academic, will submit the proposal to ASC.

Graduate Programs

The entire proposal, with revisions, including the PRT review and response and the designated Faculty Dean's approval, is submitted to the Yeates School of Graduate Studies, for submission to the PPC. PPC will make one the following recommendations:

- a. That the program be sent to the YSGS Council with or without qualification; or
- b. That the program proposal be returned to the designated academic unit for further revision.

Upon approval by the PPC, the Dean of YSGS will submit the entire proposal, with revisions, including the PRT review and response, along with the designated Faculty Dean's approval, to the YSGS Council.

5. ACADEMIC STANDARDS COMMITTEE AND YEATES SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES REVIEW

The ASC or the YSGS Council will review the proposal for academic quality and societal need and make one of the following recommendations:

- a. That the program be approved, with or without qualification;
- b. That the program proposal be returned to the originating unit for further revision; or
- c. That the program not be approved.

6. SENATE APPROVAL - The Chair of the Academic Standards Committee or the Dean of YSGS (as Chair of the YSGS Council), will submit a report to Senate. Senate approval is the culmination of the internal academic approval process.

7. QUALITY COUNCIL APPROVAL - Once approved by Senate, the Proposal Brief, together with all required reports and documents, as outlined in the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance Framework, will be submitted to the Quality Council for approval as per the required process. Following submission to the Quality Council, the university may announce its intention to offer the program if it is clearly indicated that QC approval is pending and no offers of admission will be made until that approval is received.

8. REPORT TO THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS - The Provost is responsible for presentation of the program to the Board for approval of financial viability.

9. PROVOST - Final implementation of the program is the responsibility of the Provost.

10. PERIODIC PROGRAM REVIEW - All new programs will be reviewed no more than eight years after implementation and in accordance with Senate Policy 126: Periodic Program Review of Graduate and Undergraduate Programs.

RYERSON UNIVERSITY
POLICY OF SENATE

PERIODIC PROGRAM REVIEW OF GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

Policy Number	126
Current Policy Approval Date	May 3, 2011
Policy Review Date	May 2013 <i>(or sooner at the request of the Provost and Vice President Academic or Senate)</i>
Responsible Committee or Office	Provost and Vice President Academic

POLICY STATEMENT

I. SCOPE

This policy governs the periodic review of all existing undergraduate and graduate programs, including those offered jointly with other post-secondary institutions.

Programs offered jointly with other post-secondary institutions will be subject to the periodic program review policies of all the institutions. These programs are included in the schedule of program reviews which will be published annually.

II. AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY

- A. Senate:** Final authority for the approval of periodic program review of all Ryerson programs rests with the Senate.
- B. Academic Standards Committee (ASC) and Yeates School of Graduate Studies Council (YSGSC):** As committees of Senate, ASC and YSGSC will assess periodic program reviews on Senate's behalf and bring recommendations to Senate with respect to their approval.

Where departments/schools choose to combine an undergraduate and graduate program review, the ASC and YSGSC will coordinate their reports to Senate.

ASC and YSGSC shall publish Periodic Program Review Manuals describing and supporting the review process, including:

- Guidance on the conduct of rigorous, objective and searching self-studies and the potential benefits of such studies;
- The responsibilities for the collection, aggregation and distribution of institutional data and outcome measures required of self studies; and
- The Periodic Program Review schedule.

C. Deans

Policy 126: Periodic Program Review of Graduate and Undergraduate Programs

1. The Faculty Dean, or Dean of Record for an Interdisciplinary program, has the authority to submit undergraduate periodic program reviews to the ASC and graduate periodic program reviews to the Yeates School of Graduate Studies.
2. The Dean of the Yeates School of Graduate Studies, as chair of the YSGSC, has the authority for submission of the graduate periodic program reviews to Senate.

D. YSGS Programs and Planning Committee: Assesses graduate periodic program reviews and makes recommendations to YSGSC.

E. Department/School/Program Councils: Approval of these Councils is required before the periodic program review is submitted to the Faculty Dean. Multidisciplinary and Interdisciplinary Programs shall be reviewed as distinct programs and must establish an administrative entity that will be responsible for both curriculum and program review.

F. Department/School Chairs/Directors and Graduate Program Directors: The Chair/Director/Graduate Program Director is responsible for the presentation of the required follow-up report to the Dean and Provost by the specified date, normally within one year of the review.

G. Vice Provost, Academic: The Vice Provost, Academic shall forward required follow-up reports to the ASC for its information, review, and report to Senate. If it is believed that there has not been sufficient progress in addressing any issues raised by the Program Review, an additional update and course of action by a specified date may be required.

The Vice Provost, Academic will establish the schedule for periodic program reviews.

The Vice Provost, Academic will be responsible for the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (Quality Council) periodic audit process.

Following action by the Senate, the Provost will present a report that summarizes the outcomes of the Program Review to the Board of Governors for its information.

III. PURPOSE

Periodic program reviews serve primarily to help ensure that programs achieve and maintain the highest possible standards of academic quality and continue to satisfy societal need. They also serve to satisfy public accountability expectations through a review process that is transparent and consequential. The process is endorsed by the Council of Ontario Universities (COU) and monitored by the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (Quality Council). Academic programs at Ryerson are also aligned with the statement of undergraduate and graduate degree-level expectations adopted by the COU. These degree-level expectations can be found in Appendix I and II of this policy.

The process is to be applied to all programs on a cycle of eight years. Where there are related undergraduate and graduate programs, reviews of both programs may be combined if the department/school wishes to do so. Program reviews will be coordinated with any professional accreditation review. An accreditation review can be used to satisfy the program review requirement to the extent that it meets that requirement. The program must submit a supplementary report containing additional information required by the program review process, if any.

IV. PROCEDURES

- The Provost shall establish the procedures related to this policy, and review those procedures as necessary.
- The procedures associated with this policy shall include all of the steps necessary for the preparation of an undergraduate or graduate program review.
- For undergraduate programs, the Academic Standards Committee will develop a manual that gives details of the process and supports the preparation of the review. The Yeates School of Graduate Studies Council will prepare a manual for graduate programs.

APPENDIX I: DEGREE LEVEL EXPECTATIONS FOR UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

	UNDERGRADUATE DEGREE
EXPECTATIONS	<i>All undergraduate degree programs at Ryerson will be expected to demonstrate that at the completion of the program students would have acquired the following set of skills.</i>
1. Depth and Breadth of Knowledge	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. 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; b. A 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; c. A developed ability to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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; d. A developed, detailed knowledge of and experience in research in an area of the discipline; e. Developed critical thinking and analytical skills inside and outside the discipline; f. The ability to apply learning from one or more areas outside the discipline.
2. Knowledge of Methodologies	<p>An understanding of methods of enquiry or creative activity, or both, in their primary area of study that enables the student to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Evaluate the appropriateness of different approaches to solving problems using well established ideas and techniques; b. Devise and sustain arguments or solve problems using these methods; and describe and comment upon particular aspects of current research or equivalent advanced scholarship.
3. Application of Knowledge	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The ability to review, present and critically evaluate qualitative and quantitative information to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Develop lines of argument;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii. Make sound judgments in accordance with the major theories, concepts and methods of the subject(s) of study; iii. Apply underlying concepts, principles, and techniques of analysis, both within and outside the discipline; iv. Where appropriate use this knowledge in the creative process; and <p>b. The ability to use a range of established techniques to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Initiate and undertake critical evaluation of arguments, assumptions, abstract concepts and information; ii. Propose solutions; iii. Frame appropriate questions for the purpose of solving a problem; iv. Solve a problem or create a new work; and <p>c. The ability to make critical use of scholarly reviews and primary sources.</p>
4. Communication Skills	The ability to communicate information, arguments, and analyses accurately and reliably, orally and in writing to a range of audiences.
5. Awareness of Limits of Knowledge	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.
6. Autonomy and Professional Capacity	<p>a. Qualities and transferable skills necessary for further study, employment, community involvement and other activities requiring:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The exercise of initiative, personal responsibility and accountability in both personal and group contexts; ii. Working effectively with others; iii. Decision-making in complex contexts; <p>b. The ability to manage their own learning in changing circumstances, both within and outside the discipline and to select an appropriate program of further study; and</p> <p>c. Behaviour consistent with academic integrity and social responsibility.</p>

APPENDIX II: DEGREE LEVEL EXPECTATIONS FOR GRADUATE PROGRAMS

MASTER'S DEGREE	
EXPECTATIONS	<i>This degree is awarded to students who have demonstrated:</i>
1. Depth and Breadth of Knowledge	A systematic understanding of knowledge, 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.
2. Research and Scholarship	<p>A conceptual understanding and methodological competence that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Enables a working comprehension of how established techniques of research and inquiry are used to create and interpret knowledge in the discipline; b. Enables a critical evaluation of current research and advanced research and scholarship in the discipline or area of professional competence; and c. Enables a treatment of complex issues and judgments based on established principles and techniques; and, <p>On the basis of that competence, has shown at least one of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The development and support of a sustained argument in written form; or b. Originality in the application of knowledge.
3. Level of Application of Knowledge	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.
4. Professional Capacity/Autonomy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The qualities and transferable skills necessary for employment requiring: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. The exercise of initiative and of personal responsibility and accountability; and ii. Decision-making in complex situations; and b. The intellectual independence required for continuing professional development; c. The ethical behaviour consistent with academic integrity and the use of appropriate guidelines and procedures for responsible conduct of research; and d. The ability to appreciate the broader implications of applying knowledge to particular contexts.
5. Level of Communications Skills	The ability to communicate ideas, issues and conclusions clearly.
6. Awareness of Limits of Knowledge	Cognizance of the complexity of knowledge and of the potential contributions of other interpretations, methods, and disciplines.

Policy 126: Periodic Program Review of Graduate and Undergraduate Programs

DOCTORAL DEGREE	
EXPECTATIONS	<i>This degree extends the skills associated with the Master's degree and is awarded to students who have demonstrated:</i>
1. Depth and Breadth of Knowledge	A thorough understanding of a substantial body of knowledge that is at the forefront of their academic discipline or area of professional practice.
2. Research and Scholarship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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; b. The ability to make informed judgments on complex issues in specialist fields, sometimes requiring new methods; and c. The ability to produce original research, or other advanced scholarship, of a quality to satisfy peer review, and to merit publication.
3. Level of Application of Knowledge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The capacity to 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.
4. Professional Capacity/Autonomy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The qualities and transferable skills necessary for employment requiring the exercise of personal responsibility and largely autonomous initiative in complex situations; b. The intellectual independence to be academically and professionally engaged and current; c. The ethical behaviour consistent with academic integrity and the use of appropriate guidelines and procedures for responsible conduct of research; and d. The ability to evaluate the broader implications of applying knowledge to particular contexts.
5. Level of Communication Skills	The ability to communicate complex and/or ambiguous ideas, issues and conclusions clearly and effectively.
6. Awareness of Limits of Knowledge	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.

POLICY 126: PERIODIC PROGRAM REVIEW OF GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

PROCEDURES

I. THE SELF-STUDY REPORT

The self-study has descriptive, explanatory, evaluative and formative functions. It provides an opportunity for programs to assess academic quality and societal need. It is essential that the self-study is reflective, self-critical and analytical, and that it actively involve both faculty and students in the process. The self-study consists of two parts: a narrative that addresses key areas, and appendices that include the data and information that form the basis for the narrative.¹

- A. **NARRATIVE** – The narrative must provide a reflective, self-critical and analytical review of the program based on data and surveys, and must be the result of active involvement of faculty and students. The narrative must include, but is not limited to:
1. **Program History:** a brief history of the program's development; and
 2. **Program Outcomes:** a statement of the goals, learning objectives and program expectations and their consistency with the University's mission and academic plan, the Faculty academic plan, the school/department academic plan and the undergraduate and graduate Degree-Level Expectations found in Appendix I and II of the policy.
 3. **Development Since Previous Program Review** – a report on how the program has met the goals and objectives of the developmental plan submitted in the previous Program Review and how it has addressed the Senate recommendations on that Program Review.
 4. **Societal Need²**
 - a. a description of current and anticipated societal need; and
 - b. an assessment of existing and anticipated student demand.
 5. **Admission Criteria**
 - a. a statement of admission requirements and an analysis showing they are appropriately aligned with the learning outcomes of the program; and
 - b. for graduate programs, the grade level for admission
 6. **Academic Quality**
 - a. description of the program curriculum and structure, including the relationship of the curriculum and individual courses to the Degree Level Expectations, program goals and learning objectives;
 - b. a description of how the curriculum reflects the current state of the discipline or area of study;
 - c. a description, where appropriate, of how the curriculum addresses issues of diversity and inclusion;
 - d. evidence of any significant innovation or creativity in the content and/or delivery of the program relative to other such programs;
 - e. an analysis and evaluation of the appropriateness and effectiveness of the mode of delivery (including, where applicable, distance or on-line delivery) to meet the program's learning objectives;
 - f. the appropriateness and effectiveness of the methods of assessing student achievement of the defined learning outcomes and degree learning expectations, particularly in students' final year of study;

¹ The ASC and YSGSC will advise programs throughout the review process on matters of content and format and to ensure that policy requirements are met.

² Elements of employer surveys/focus groups may be relevant in this section.

Policy 126: Periodic Program Review of Graduate and Undergraduate Programs

- g. an analysis and evaluation of the level of achievement of students, consistent with the defined learning outcomes and degree learning expectations;
- h. for graduate programs, evidence of a program structure and faculty research that will ensure the intellectual quality of the student experience;
- i. for graduate programs, 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;
- j. a statement of any variations from Ryerson's GPA policy and an analysis and evaluation of the appropriateness of these variations;
- k. a summary and evaluation of any partnership or collaborative agreements with other institutions.
- l. a summary and evaluation of any experiential learning opportunities.
- m. a summary and evaluation of library resources;
- n. a summary and analysis of the results of student surveys/focus groups and graduate surveys, including the quality of support to students and general student satisfaction with the program.

7. Academic Quality Indicator Analysis (Data to be included in Appendices). A summary and analysis of the following areas:

a. Faculty:

- faculty qualification and SRC record;
- class size
- percentage of classes taught by full and part-time faculty;
- numbers, assignment and qualifications of part-time faculty;
- for graduate programs:
 - the quality and availability of graduate supervision
 - faculty funding, honours and awards
 - faculty commitment to student mentoring

b. Students

- Number of applications and registrations;
- Attrition rates;
- Time-to-completion (for graduate programs), including evidence that that students' time-to-completion is both monitored and managed in relation to the program's defined length and program requirements;
- GPAs on graduation
- Graduation rates
- Faculty Course Survey results
- Academic awards and for graduate students, success rates in provincial and national scholarships and competitions
- For graduate students, scholarly output and commitment to professional and transferable skills.
- For graduate students, the level of funding.

c. Graduates

- Employment six months and two years after graduation
- Post-graduation study
- Alumni reports
- Results of employer surveys/focus groups (for graduate programs, where appropriate)

8. Resources: An analysis and evaluation of the appropriateness and effectiveness of the use of existing human, physical and financial resources, (e.g. laboratory, studio and computer facilities)

Policy 126: Periodic Program Review of Graduate and Undergraduate Programs

and space, respecting Ryerson's autonomy to determine priorities for funding, space, and faculty allocation) to support the program.

- 9. Strengths, Weaknesses and Opportunities** - a self-critical analysis of the strengths, weaknesses and opportunities of the program, addressing:
 - a. academic quality based on the elements in sections 5-7 above;
 - b. opportunities for program improvement and enhancement; and
 - c. the ability of the program to meet its goals and Degree Level Expectations.
- 10. Developmental Plan** - a 3-5 year developmental plan including:
 - a. priorities for implementation of the recommendations;
 - b. relationship of the priorities to the university, faculty and department/school/program academic plan; and
 - c. timeline for implementation.
- 11. An Executive Summary** suitable for posting on the university website.

B. APPENDICES

1. Appendix I: All data and survey information on which the narrative is based³, including but not limited to:
 - a. Program specific Degree Level Expectations;
 - b. Admissions requirements, admissions data, and information on student demand;
 - c. Student satisfaction survey (and/or focus group comments where appropriate);
 - d. Faculty Course Survey results as compared to the faculty and university;
 - e. Comments from service departments (for undergraduate programs);
 - f. Faculty data (faculty members listed by field, courses taught, full/part-time, class size, and, for graduate programs, funding, supervisory privileges etc.);
 - g. Data on enrolment in all program courses (required and elective);
 - h. Retention and graduation data (cohort data for graduate programs);
 - i. Student funding for graduate programs;
 - j. Recent graduate survey;
 - k. Employer survey (and/or focus group comments where appropriate);
 - l. Employment and publication data for graduate programs (where appropriate);
 - m. Library resources report;
 - n. Additional relevant data.
2. Appendix II: Faculty Curriculum Vitae
 - a. For Undergraduate programs
 - all faculty members in the program school or department; and
 - all other faculty who have recently taught required courses to program students.
 - b. For Graduate programs
 - all faculty members in the program school or department; and
 - all adjunct faculty.
3. Appendix III: Courses
 - a. List of courses offered (including mode of delivery, faculty member responsible, etc.)
 - b. Course outlines for all courses offered by the program.

³ Relevant statistical information is available from the University Planning Office.

Policy 126: Periodic Program Review of Graduate and Undergraduate Programs

4. Appendix IV: Documentation of Advisory Council comments (for undergraduate programs), Department/School/Program Council Approvals, and approval by the Dean(s).

Detailed guidelines for the above are contained in a Program Review Manual.

- II. PROTOCOL FOR JOINT PROGRAMS:** For programs offered jointly with another university the following should be followed:
- A. Feedback on the reviewers' report should be solicited from the partner institution(s), including relevant Deans.
 - B. Preparation of a single Final Assessment Report and Implementation Plan should have input from the partner institution(s), be part of the appropriate governance approval of all partner institution(s), and posted on each institutions website.
 - C. Partner institutions should agree on an appropriate monitoring process for the Implementation Plan.
 - D. The Final Assessment Plan and Developmental Plan should be submitted to the Quality Council by all partners.

III. REVIEWS AND APPROVALS AT THE PROGRAM AND DECANAL LEVELS

A. Department/School/Program Council

The Chair/Director of the program will forward the full self-study report to the Faculty Dean⁴ and, for graduate programs, the Dean of YSGS who will review it and either refer it back to the program for further development or for presentation to the Department/School/Program Council (or other appropriate administrative entity in the case of multi-disciplinary or interdisciplinary programs) for its review and approval. A record will be kept of the date(s) of the relevant Council meeting(s), along with any qualifications or limitations placed by the Council on the approval.

B. Program Advisory Council (for Undergraduate programs)

Following approval by the Department/School/Program Council, the self-study report, along with any Department/School/Program Council qualifications or limitations, will be sent to the Faculty Dean for presentation to the Program Advisory Council (PAC) for its review and comments. A record will be kept of the date(s) of the meeting(s) and members attending the meeting(s).

C. Dean of the Faculty

The Dean will approve the program review for preliminary submission to either the Academic Standards Committee or the Yeates School of Graduate Studies.

D. Assessment Prior to Submission to an External Peer Review Team

1. Undergraduate Program reviews: The ASC will review the program review to determine if there are any issues prior to submission to a Peer Review Team.
2. Graduate Program Reviews: The Programs and Planning Committee of the YSGS Council will review the program review to determine if there are any issues prior to submission to a Peer Review team.

⁴ For multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary programs, a Dean will be designated to serve as the Faculty Dean.

IV. PEER REVIEW AND RESPONSE

The program must undergo an external evaluation by a Peer Review Team (PRT). Members of the PRT will be given information on the University and its mission, a complete copy of the self-study report and a copy of the PRT Mandate.

A. Composition and Procedure⁵

1. The PRT will consist of:
 - a. two faculty from the relevant discipline(s), field(s) or profession from another university, including universities outside Ontario, where appropriate, who are at arms length from the program school/department; and
 - b. one additional reviewer, either from within the university but from outside the discipline (or interdisciplinary group) engaged in the program, or external to the university. This includes programs taught in collaboration with colleges or institutions outside of Ontario. In a joint program with other Ontario universities, unless one internal reviewer is agreed upon by all participating institutions, one internal reviewer will be appointed from each participating institution.
2. The membership of the undergraduate PRT will be determined and appointed by the Dean based on written information provided by the program. The membership of the graduate PRT will be determined by the Dean of YSGS in consultation with the faculty Dean. All members of the PRT will be at arm's length from the program under review. Information from the program will include names and brief biographies of four or more faculty external to Ryerson and two or more faculty internal to Ryerson. The external and institutional reviewers will be active and respected in their field, and normally associate or full professors with program management experience. If graduate and undergraduate reviews are done simultaneously, the Faculty Dean and Dean of YSGS must decide if a combined PRT or separate PRTs are required.
3. The Faculty Dean or Dean of Record for undergraduate programs, and the Dean of YSGS in consultation with the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record for graduate programs, will invite one of the external reviewers to act as Chair of the PRT.
4. There will be a site visit, structured to include the opportunity for PRT discussion with students, faculty and staff.
5. In the case of accredited programs, at his or her discretion, the Vice Provost, Academic may require a separate Peer Review when the accrediting body's assessment does not fully cover all of the areas required by the University's program review process or may require an Addendum to the materials presented to an accreditation board associated with the academic discipline under review.

B. The Peer Review Team Mandate

The general mandate of the PRT is to evaluate the academic quality of the program and the capacity of the School or Department to deliver it in an appropriate manner. More specifically, the Peer Review will address:

1. the appropriateness of the program's goals and learning objectives and the consistency of the program's curriculum with these goals and objectives;
2. the currency, rigour, and coherence of the program's curriculum;
3. the appropriateness of the mode of delivery and methods used for the evaluation of student progress;

⁵ The Peer Review procedures are outlined in the *Peer Review Team Guide* found in the Program Review Manual.

4. the appropriateness of the program's admissions requirements to the program goals and learning objectives;
5. the appropriateness and effectiveness of the use of existing human, physical and financial resources, (e.g. laboratory, studio and computer facilities and space, respecting Ryerson's autonomy to determine priorities for funding, space, and faculty allocation) to support the program;
6. the quality of support to students and general student satisfaction with the program;
7. the degree to which the scholarly, research and creative activity in the offering unit provides support for the program goals and learning objectives;
8. for graduate programs, the level of funding for graduate students; and
9. for graduate programs, the relevance of any fields within the program.

The PRT should, at the end of its report, specifically comment on:

1. the program's strengths, weaknesses and opportunities;
2. the program's developmental plan; and
3. recommendations for actions to improve the quality of the program, if any, distinguishing between those that the program can itself take and those that would require external action, where possible.

C. Provided to the Peer Review Team Before the Site Visit

The Peer Review Team will be provided with a Letter of Invitation, a site visit agenda and their mandate, along with the formal proposal and all relevant documentation. For This communication will remind the PRT of the confidentiality of the documents presented.

D. Provided to the Peer Review Team During the Site Visit

1. The PRT will be provided with:
 - a. access to program administrators staff, and faculty (including representatives from joint or collaborative Ontario institutions), administrators of related departments and librarians, and students (including representatives from joint or collaborative Ontario institutions), as appropriate;
 - b. coordination of site visits to Ontario institutions offering joint programs (excluding college collaborative programs), where appropriate; and
 - c. any additional information that may be needed to support a thorough review.
2. At the close of the site visit for an undergraduate program, the PRT will hold a debriefing involving the designated Faculty Dean, Vice Provost, Academic, and/or the Provost and any others who may be invited. For a graduate program, the Dean of YSGS will also attend.

E. Peer Review Team Report

1. At the close of the site visit for an undergraduate program, the PRT will hold a debriefing involving the designated Faculty Dean, Vice Provost, Academic, and/or the Provost and any others who may be invited. For graduate programs, the Dean of YSGS is included.
2. The PRT shall submit a written report to the Deans and Vice Provost, Academic within four weeks of its site visit.
3. A copy of the PRT report will be forwarded to the Chair/Director.

F. Response to the PRT Report

Within four weeks, the program will submit a written response to the PRT report for undergraduate program proposals to the Faculty Dean and for graduate program proposals to the Dean of YSGS. The written response may include any of the following: corrections or clarifications of items raised in the PRT report; a revised developmental plan with an explanation of how the revisions reflect the recommendations or respond to the weaknesses or deficiencies identified in the report; and/or an explanation of why recommendations of the PRT will not be acted upon.

A written response to the PRT report must be provided by the designated Faculty Dean for undergraduate and graduate programs and the Dean of YSGS for graduate programs. The Dean(s) will provide a response to each of the following:

1. The plans and recommendations proposed in the self-study report;
2. The recommendations of the PRT.
3. The program's response to the PRT report.

The Dean(s) will also describe:

1. Any changes in organization, policy or governance required to meet the recommendations.
2. The resources that would be provided to support the implementation of selected recommendations.
3. A proposed timeline for the implementation of any of those recommendations.

If the self appraisal report or the developmental plan is revised following, or as a result of, the PRT review, the original and the revised documents must be resubmitted to the Faculty Dean/Dean of YSGS.

If the Faculty Dean(s) or the Dean of YSGS believes that this document differs substantially from the original s/he is required to return it to the Department/School Council(s) for further endorsement before providing decanal endorsement.

Undergraduate Programs

The entire report, with revisions, including the PRT review and response and the Faculty Dean's approval, is submitted to the Vice Provost, Academic. The Vice Provost, Academic, will submit the proposal to ASC.

Graduate Programs

The entire report, with revisions, including the PRT review and response and the Faculty Dean's approval, is submitted to the Yeates School of Graduate Studies, for submission to the PPC. PPC will make one the following recommendations:

- a. That the report be sent to the YSGS Council with or without qualification;
- b. That the report be returned to the program for further revision.

Upon approval by the PPC, the Dean of YSGS will submit the entire report, with revisions, including the PRT review and response, along with the Faculty Dean's approval, to the YSGS Council.

V. ACADEMIC STANDARDS COMMITTEE OR YEATES SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES REVIEW

Policy 126: Periodic Program Review of Graduate and Undergraduate Programs

The ASC or the YSGS Council will review the report and make one of the following recommendations:

- a. Approval of the review as submitted, with or without recommendations for further action.
- b. Conditional approval of the review, with conditions specified.
- c. Referral of the review to the Dean for further action in response to specified weaknesses and/or deficiencies.
- d. Rejection of the review as submitted.

If there is a concurrent review of an undergraduate and a graduate program, the chairs of the ASC and YSGSC will consult to provide a joint report to Senate.

VI. SENATE APPROVAL

The Chair of the ASC and/or YSGS Council, will submit a Final Assessment Report to Senate that summarizes the findings and conclusions of the review of the program, including the program's strengths and weaknesses, and outlining the actions to be taken on the recommendations arising from the review.

Senate is charged with final academic approval of the Program Review. Senate shall publish the Executive Summary, Final Assessment Report and the associated Developmental Plan, and the action of Senate for each Periodic Program Review on the Senate website following Senate action. Copies will be provided to the Quality Council and the Board of Governors, for their information. Complete documentation, respecting the provisions of FIPPA, will be made available through the Senate office.

VII. FOLLOW-UP REPORT AND IMPLEMENTATION

If the report includes a recommendation for approval of the program review, it will include a date for a required follow-up report to be submitted to the Dean and Provost on the progress of the developmental plan and any recommendations or conditions attached to the approval. The initial follow-up report is normally due by June 30 of the academic year following Senate's resolution. The Provost may require additional follow-up reports.

If the report is referred to the Dean, a date will be specified for the completion of a revised report. If the revised report is not filed by that date, the program review will be rejected.

The Chair/Director and Dean are responsible for requesting any additional resources identified in the report through the annual academic planning process. The relevant Dean(s) is responsible for providing identified resources, and Provost is responsible for final approval of requests for extraordinary funding. Requests should normally be addressed, with a decision to either fund or not fund, within 2 budget years of the Senate approval.

The follow-up report to Senate will include an indication of the resources that have been provided.

VIII. QUALITY COUNCIL

The Provost will annually report outcomes of all Periodic Program Reviews to the Quality Council as per the required process.

IX. REPORT TO THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS

The Provost is responsible for presentation of the Final Assessment Report to the Board for its information.

RYERSON UNIVERSITY
POLICY OF SENATE

CURRICULUM MODIFICATIONS: GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

Policy Number:	127
Approval Date:	May 3, 2011
Policy Review Date	May 2013 (<i>or sooner at the request of the Provost and Vice President Academic or Senate</i>)
Responsible Committee or Office:	Provost and Vice President Academic

POLICY STATEMENT

I. SCOPE

This policy governs changes to existing minors, undergraduate and graduate programs, including those offered jointly with other post-secondary institutions, recognizing that the university must be responsive to professional developments and advances in disciplinary knowledge. This applies to all programs, whether offered in full, in part, or in partnership with any other postsecondary institution.

II. DEFINITIONS

Major Modifications: Substantial changes in program requirements from those which existed at the time of the previous periodic program review, significant changes to program learning outcomes, or a significant change to the faculty engaged in delivering the program and/or to the essential resources, such as when there is a change in mode(s) of delivery (e.g. online delivery or institutional collaboration).

Examples of major modifications are provided in Appendix A of this policy.

Minor Modifications: Changes which are not considered major modifications, such as: changes in course description, title or requisites; alteration to the number of course hours; repositioning of a course in a curriculum; adding or deleting a required course; changes in course weight; change in mode of a single course delivery; reconfiguration or minor changes to courses in a Minor; change in admission policy; variation in policy for grading, promotion, graduation or academic standing; or change in program name and/or degree designation.

III. AUTHORITY

Vice Provost Academic: Where necessary, the Vice Provost Academic has final authority to determine if a modification is considered major or minor.

Major Modifications: Major Modifications must first be approved by Department/School Councils, Chairs/Directors and Deans (including Dean of the Yeates School of Graduate Studies for graduate programs), and then submitted to either the Academic Standards Committee (ASC) or the Yeates School of Graduate Studies Council (YYSGS) for its review and recommendation to Senate with respect to approval. For the addition of a new field to an existing graduate program, Expedited Approval of the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance is required.

Proposals must also include a statement on any additional resources that will be required (e.g. faculty, space, technology) and the Degree Level Expectations¹ which will be affected, if any. Reference must be included to any related changes that had occurred since the last program review.

Minor Modifications: Minor Modifications require Department/School Council, Chair/Director and Decanal approval (including the Dean of Graduate Studies for graduate programs). Consultation with other affected departments/schools/programs, including the Chang School of Continuing Education and the library, where relevant, is required. A statement of any changes in resource requirements is also required.

Information with appropriate sign-offs is forwarded for implementation as per Procedures, and changes are sent to Senate for information.

Senate: Senate has the ultimate authority to approve Major Modifications to curriculum, and may discuss and act upon any Minor Modification brought for information.

Disputes: If there is a disagreement within a department/school/program, or between departments/schools/programs with respect to any curriculum modification, the relevant Dean(s) shall decide how to proceed. Should there be a disagreement between Deans or between a Dean and a Department/School/Program or Faculty Council, the Vice Provost Academic shall decide how to proceed.

IV. PROCEDURES

Procedures related to this policy will be developed and reviewed annually by the Chairs of the ASC, YYSGS and delegates from the Registrar's Office and the Yeates School of Graduate Studies. These procedures will incorporate the process for undergraduate and graduate calendar changes.

¹ Degree Level Expectations for graduate and undergraduate programs have been established by the Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents (OCAV). A list of the DLEs can be found appended to Senate Policies 112 and 127. Programs establish their program outcomes based on these.

APPENDIX A EXAMPLES OF MAJOR MODIFICATIONS

Requirements that differ significantly from those existing at the time of the previous cyclical program review

- The merger of two or more programs
- New bridging options for college diploma graduates
- Significant change in the laboratory time of an undergraduate program
- The introduction or deletion of an undergraduate thesis or capstone project
- The introduction or deletion of a work experience, co-op option, internship or practicum, or portfolio
- At the master's level, the introduction or deletion of a research project, research essay or thesis, course-only, co-op, internship or practicum option
- The creation, deletion or re-naming of a field in a graduate program
- Any change to the requirements for graduate program candidacy examinations, field studies or residence requirements
- Major changes to courses comprising a significant proportion of the program.

Significant changes to the learning outcomes

- Changes to program content, other than those listed in a) above, that affect the learning outcomes, but do not meet the threshold for a 'new program'

Significant changes to the faculty engaged in delivering the program and/or to the essential resources such as when there have been changes to the existing mode(s) of delivery (e.g. online delivery or inter-institutional collaboration)

- Changes to the faculty delivering the program: e.g. a large proportion of the faculty retires; new hires alter the areas of research and teaching interests
- The establishment of an existing degree program at another institution or location
- The offering of an existing program substantially online where it had previously been offered in face-to-face mode, or vice versa
- Change to full- or part-time program options, or vice versa
- Changes to the essential resources, where these changes impair the delivery of the approved program