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POLICY STATEMENT

I. SCOPE

This policy governs the periodic review of programs which require Quality Council approval at the undergraduate and graduate levels. These include, but are not necessarily restricted to, new degrees, degree programs, programs of specialization and graduate diplomas¹ at the Masters and Doctoral level, including those programs 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, respectively, for undergraduate degree programs and for graduate degree programs and graduate diplomas as defined by the Quality Council, 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

¹ At Ryerson, graduate diplomas are referred to as Professional Masters Diplomas or Professional Doctoral Diplomas, as appropriate.
• The Periodic Program Review schedule.

C. Deans
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 and graduate diploma 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 and graduate diploma reviews to Senate.

D. YSGS Programs and Planning Committee: Assesses graduate periodic program reviews and graduate diploma 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 accountable. 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.

---

2 At the discretion of the Provost, in consultation with the Dean of the Yeates School of Graduate Studies, the length of the cycle may vary for graduate diplomas at the Masters and Doctoral level.
3 At the discretion of the Provost, in consultation with the Dean of the Yeates School of Graduate Studies, the length of the cycle may vary for graduate diplomas at the Masters and Doctoral level.
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, graduate, and graduate diploma 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 and graduate diplomas.

APPENDIX I: DEGREE LEVEL EXPECTATIONS FOR UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPECTATIONS</th>
<th>UNDERGRADUATE DEGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Depth and Breadth of Knowledge
   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:
      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
   An understanding of methods of enquiry or creative activity, or both, in their primary area of study that enables the student to:
   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
   a. The ability to review, present and critically evaluate qualitative and quantitative information to:
      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 creative process; and
   b. The ability to use a range of established techniques to:
      i. Initiate and undertake critical evaluation of arguments,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Communication Skills</th>
<th>The ability to communicate information, arguments, and analyses accurately and reliably, orally and in writing to a range of audiences.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Awareness of Limits of Knowledge</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 6. Autonomy and Professional Capacity | a. Qualities and transferable skills necessary for further study, employment, community involvement and other activities requiring:  
  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;  
  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  
  c. Behaviour consistent with academic integrity and social responsibility. |
# APPENDIX II: DEGREE LEVEL EXPECTATIONS FOR GRADUATE PROGRAMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MASTER’S DEGREE</th>
<th>EXPECTATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPECTATIONS</strong></td>
<td><em>This degree is awarded to students who have demonstrated:</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Depth and Breadth of Knowledge</strong></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Research and Scholarship</strong></td>
<td>A conceptual understanding and methodological competence that: 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, On the basis of that competence, has shown at least one of the following: a. The development and support of a sustained argument in written form; or b. Originality in the application of knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Level of Application of Knowledge</strong></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Professional Capacity/Autonomy</strong></td>
<td>a. The qualities and transferable skills necessary for employment requiring: 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Level of Communications Skills</strong></td>
<td>The ability to communicate ideas, issues and conclusions clearly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Awareness of Limits of Knowledge</strong></td>
<td>Cognizance of the complexity of knowledge and of the potential contributions of other interpretations, methods, and disciplines.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**DOCTORAL DEGREE**

**EXPECTATIONS**

*This degree extends the skills associated with the Master’s degree and is awarded to students who have demonstrated:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Depth and Breadth of Knowledge</th>
<th>A thorough understanding of a substantial body of knowledge that is at the forefront of their academic discipline or area of professional practice.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2. Research and Scholarship     | 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 | 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 | 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.4

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. Basic Information: program information, including a history of the program’s development, its mode of delivery (e.g. traditional, online, intensive) and its administrative structure.

2. Developments 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.

3. Societal Need5
   a. a description of current and anticipated societal need
   b. an assessment of existing and anticipated student demand

4. Program Outcomes: a statement of the program learning outcomes 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.

5. Academic Quality
   a. a description of the program curriculum and structure, including a description of how the curriculum reflects the current state of the discipline or area of study;
   b. a description, where appropriate, of how the program addresses issues of diversity and inclusion;
   c. an analysis of the relationship of the curriculum and individual courses to the degree level expectations, learning outcomes and learning objectives;
   d. a description of how curriculum development occurs; for graduate programs and graduate diplomas, evidence of a program structure and faculty research that will ensure the intellectual quality of the student experience;
   e. an analysis of enrolment data for all required and elective courses for the previous 3 years;
   f. a description of how the curriculum reflects the current state of the discipline or area of studies;
      • a description, where appropriate, of how the program ensures that students are made aware of their future professional responsibilities
      • information, if applicable, on external accreditation requirements
   g. student engagement:
      • an analysis and evaluation of the appropriateness and effectiveness of the teaching methods (including, where applicable, distance or on-line delivery) to meet the program’s learning outcomes;
      • evidence of any significant innovation or creativity in the content and/or delivery of the program relative to other such programs;
      • a summary and evaluation of any partnership or collaborative agreements with other institutions;
      • a summary and evaluation of any experiential learning opportunities.
   h. 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;
   i. analysis and evaluation of the level of achievement of students, consistent with the defined learning outcomes and degree learning expectations;

---

4 The Vice Provost Academic (undergraduate programs) and the YSGS Associate, Dean Students and Programs (graduate programs, including graduate diplomas) will advise programs throughout the review process on matters of content and format and to ensure that policy requirements are met.

5 Elements of employer surveys/focus groups may be relevant in this section.
• 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 library resources;

l. 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.

6. Academic Quality Indicator Analysis: A summary and analysis of the following areas (data to be included in appendices):

a. Faculty:
   • faculty qualifications 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:
     o the quality and availability of graduate supervision;
     o faculty funding, honours and awards.

b. Students and Graduates:
   • a statement of admission requirements;
     o an analysis showing admission requirements are appropriate for program learning outcomes;
     o for graduate programs and graduate diplomas the grade level for admission.
   • Number of applications and registrations;
   • Attrition rates;
   • GPAs on graduation;
   • Graduation 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;
   • Academic awards and for graduate program students, success rates in provincial and national scholarships and competitions;
   • For graduate program students, scholarly output and commitment to professional and transferable skills;
   • For graduate program students, the level of funding;
   • Employment six months and two years after graduation;
   • Results of Student Satisfaction Survey Post-graduation study;
   • Alumni reports;
   • Results of employer surveys/focus groups (for graduate programs, where appropriate).

7. Resources: An analysis and evaluation of the appropriateness and effectiveness of the use of existing human resources (faculty, support staff, teaching assistants and graduate assistants, and curriculum counseling and advising) and physical and financial resources, (e.g. space allocation; laboratory, studio and computing facilities, respecting Ryerson’s autonomy to determine priorities for funding, space, and faculty allocation) to support the program.

8. 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 learning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations.

9. 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.
10. 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 based\(^6\), 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 and graduate diplomas);
   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 and graduate diplomas
      • all faculty members in the program school or department; and
      • all adjunct faculty.

3. Appendix III: Courses
   a. Course outlines for all courses offered by the program.

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 Dean\(^7\) and, for graduate programs and graduate diplomas, the Dean of YSGS who will review it and either refer it back to the program

\(^6\) Relevant statistical information is available from the University Planning Office.
\(^7\) For multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary programs, a Dean will be designated to serve as the Faculty Dean.
for further development or for presentation to the Department/School/Program Council (or other appropriate administrative entity in the case of multi-disciplinary or inter-disciplinary 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 and Graduate Diploma 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.

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 Procedure

1. The PRT will consist of:
   a. At least one and no more than two external reviewers for an undergraduate program;
   b. Two such reviewers for a graduate program or graduate diploma, qualified by discipline and experience to review the program(s);
   c. Two such reviewers for the concurrent review of an undergraduate and graduate program;
   d. One further 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 for graduate programs, will invite one of the external reviewers to act as Chair of the PRT.

---

8 The Peer Review procedures are outlined in the Peer Review Team Guide found in the Program Review Manual.
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. Clarity of the program’s learning outcomes and their consistency with the institution’s mission and academic plans, and alignment of the program’s learning outcomes with the institution’s degree level expectations;

2. Alignment of the program’s learning outcomes with admission requirements;

3. Effectiveness of the curriculum in reflecting the current state of the discipline, evidence of innovation and/or creativity in content and delivery, and appropriateness of delivery to meet the program’s learning outcomes;

4. Appropriateness and effectiveness of methods used to assess achievement of the program’s learning outcomes and learning objectives;

5. Appropriateness and effectiveness of the academic unit’s use of human, physical and financial resources and support services;

6. Quality indicators relating to students, graduates and faculty;

7. Additional graduate program criteria including time-to-completion, graduate student supervision, and faculty, student and program quality; and

8. Initiatives taken to enhance the quality of the program and the associated learning and teaching environment.

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. 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 or graduate diploma, 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 a graduate program or graduate diploma, 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 reviews to the Faculty Dean and for graduate program reviews 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 and graduate diplomas. 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; and
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; and
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 and Graduate Diplomas
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
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 YSGS 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.