

**RYERSON UNIVERSITY**  
**POLICY OF SENATE**

**DEVELOPMENT OF NEW GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS**

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

---

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

- 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.

**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**

	<b>UNDERGRADUATE DEGREE</b>
<b>EXPECTATIONS</b>	<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>
<b>1. Depth and Breadth of Knowledge</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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;</li> <li>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;</li> <li>c. A developed ability to:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Gather, review, evaluate and interpret information; and</li> <li>ii. Compare the merits of alternate hypotheses or creative options, relevant to one or more of the major fields in a discipline;</li> </ul> </li> <li>d. A developed, detailed knowledge of and experience in research in an area of the discipline;</li> <li>e. Developed critical thinking and analytical skills inside and outside the discipline;</li> <li>f. The ability to apply learning from one or more areas outside the discipline.</li> </ul>
<b>2. Knowledge of Methodologies</b>	<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"> <li>a. Evaluate the appropriateness of different approaches to solving problems using well established ideas and techniques;</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>
<b>3. Application of Knowledge</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The ability to review, present and critically evaluate qualitative and quantitative information to:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Develop lines of argument;</li> <li>ii. Make sound judgments in accordance with the major theories, concepts and methods of the subject(s) of study;</li> <li>iii. Apply underlying concepts, principles, and techniques of analysis, both within and outside the discipline;</li> <li>iv. Where appropriate use this knowledge in the</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

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

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

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

---

<sup>2</sup> Hereafter referred to as Provost.

- 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 Committee<sup>2</sup> 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

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.

- 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

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.

- 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.

#### **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;

- 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.

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.