

Guide to New Programs: Undergraduate Programs

[Based on Senate Policy 112: DEVELOPMENT OF NEW GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS](#)

Online Manual available at:
<https://www.torontomu.ca/curriculumquality/>

Prepared by the Office of the Vice-Provost Academic

June 2022

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION	3
KEY CONTACTS	3
PROCESS FOR NEW PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT, REVIEW, APPROVAL AND MONITORING	4
GETTING STARTED	5
STEP 1: THE LETTER OF INTENT (LOI)	5
STEP 2: DEVELOPING THE FULL NEW PROGRAM PROPOSAL	6
STEP 3: ENDORSEMENTS/REVIEW OF NEW PROGRAM PROPOSAL	7
STEP 4: PEER REVIEW AND SITE VISIT	7
STEP 5: RESPONSES TO PEER REVIEW TEAM REPORT	10
STEPS 6-9: ASSESSMENT AND RECOMMENDATION BY ACADEMIC STANDARDS COMMITTEE; APPROVALS BY SENATE, QUALITY COUNCIL, TORONTO METROPOLITAN UNIVERSITY BOARD OF GOVERNORS	10
STEPS 10-12: PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION, MONITORING AND REVIEW	11
APPENDIX A: Template for New Undergraduate Program Letter of Intent (LOI)	12
APPENDIX B: Template for Full New Undergraduate Program Proposal	16
APPENDIX C: Choosing Arm’s Length Reviewers	20
APPENDIX D: Invitation e-Mails to Peer Reviewers	21
APPENDIX E: Sample Peer Review Team Site Visit Agenda	23
APPENDIX F: Template for Peer Review Team Report	25
APPENDIX G: Additional Considerations for Partnership Agreements	30
APPENDIX H: Undergraduate Degree Level Expectations	31

INTRODUCTION

This user's manual to preparing new undergraduate program proposals is based on [Policy #112 - Development of New Graduate and Undergraduate Programs](#). Policy #112 is one of four Senate policies that form [Policy #110 - Toronto Metropolitan University's Institutional Quality Assurance Process \(IQAP\)](#). The manual integrates Senate's formal policy and procedures with supplementary information, explanation, interpretive comments, and templates. It relates to all forms of new undergraduate program proposals, including full-time and part-time as well as those offered solely by Toronto Metropolitan University or in partnership with other post-secondary institutions. If the program involves an international partner, Toronto Metropolitan University International should be contacted early in the process.

Further advice on all aspects of the proposal may be obtained by emailing: ovpa.curriculum@ryerson.ca or by contacting one of the Key Contacts provided in the table below.

KEY CONTACTS

Office of the Provost and Vice-President Academic			
Jennifer Simpson	Provost & Vice-President Academic	Ext 555066	provost@ryerson.ca
Georgina Phillips	Administrative Assistant to the Provost	Ext 555066	georgina.phillips@ryerson.ca
Office of the Vice-Provost Academic			
Cynthia Holmes	Interim Vice-Provost, Academic	Ext 552356	cynthia.holmes@ryerson.ca
Cynthia Dy	Finance and Operations Officer	Ext 552356	cdy@ryerson.ca
General Inquiries			ovpa.curriculum@ryerson.ca
Stéphanie Walsh Matthews	Director, Curriculum Quality Assurance	Ext 556752	stephanie.walsh@ryerson.ca
Paola Borin	Curriculum Development Consultant	Ext 552629	borin@ryerson.ca (on leave)
Michelle Brownstein Horowitz	Curriculum Development Consultant	Ext 553166	mbhorowitz@ryerson.ca
Julia Gingerich	Curriculum Development Consultant	Ext 553166	julia.gingerich@ryerson.ca (on leave)
Yvonne Simpson	Curriculum Development Consultant	Ext 552629	ysimpson@ryerson.ca
University Planning Office (UPO)			
Glenn Craney	Deputy Provost and Vice-Provost, University Planning	Ext 555033	glenn.craney@ryerson.ca
General Inquiries			upo@ryerson.ca
Other Resources at Toronto Metropolitan University			
Dana Thomas	Interim Chief Librarian	Ext 555142	d1thomas@ryerson.ca
Robyn Parr	Registrar	Ext 557253	robyn.parr@ryerson.ca
Brian Lesser	Director, CCS	Ext 556835	blessor@ryerson.ca
General Inquiries	Toronto Metropolitan International	Ext 555026	rihelp@ryerson.ca

PROCESS FOR NEW PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT, REVIEW, APPROVAL AND MONITORING

Steps	Minimum timeline requirement
<p>1. Preliminary Letter of Intent (LOI)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Prepared by originating designated academic unit ● Consultations with Vice-Provost Academic, Vice-Provost University Planning, Registrar, and Chief Librarian. ● Endorsement by relevant Dean/Dean of Record ● Review by Vice-Provost Academic, Vice-Provost University Planning, and Provost ● LOI posted by Provost to Toronto Metropolitan University community for 1 month ● Provost authorizes move to development of a formal proposal 	21-24 months prior to program launch
<p>2. Development of new program proposal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● New Program Advisory Committee is formed by Dean/Dean of Record ● Proposal developed in continued consultation with Vice-Provost Academic, Vice-Provost University Planning, Registrar, and other stakeholders, as required (e.g. Library, CCS) 	18-21 months prior to program launch
<p>3. Endorsements/Review of new program proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Department/School/Faculty Council endorsement ● Dean/Dean of Record endorsement ● Vice-Provost Academic review for completeness prior to sharing with the Peer Review Team 	17-18 months prior to program launch
<p>4. Peer Review and Site Visit</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Appointment and briefing of Peer Review Team ● Peer Review Team site visit ● Peer Review Team Report (1 month to complete) 	14-17 months prior to program launch
<p>5. Responses to Peer Review Team report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Response by designated academic unit to the Dean/Dean of Record (within 1 month) ● Response by the Dean or Dean of Record (within 1 month) ● Proposal revisions, if any, submitted to Dean/Dean of Record and Vice-Provost Academic for review 	12-14 months prior to program launch
<p>6. Assessment and recommendations by Academic Standards Committee</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Proposal submission, with revisions if necessary, along with Peer Review Team Report and associated documentation to the Vice-Provost Academic for assessment and recommendation by Academic Standards Committee 	11-12 months prior to program launch
<p>7. Approval by Senate 8. Approval by Quality Council 9. Approval of financial viability by Toronto Metropolitan University Board of Governors</p>	10-11 months prior to program launch
<p>10. Program Implementation</p>	LAUNCH!
<p>11. Program Monitoring</p>	2 years following program launch

12. Periodic Program Review	no more than eight years following program launch
-----------------------------	---

GETTING STARTED

The development of a new program is an iterative process involving many key stakeholders, including but not limited to: the faculty member(s) and staff who prepare the Letter of Intent (LOI) and full proposal; the Dean/Dean of Record; the Vice-Provost Academic; the Vice-Provost University Planning; and, the Provost and Vice-President Academic. Regular communication among the stakeholders should occur throughout all stages of the proposal development.

New degree programs are developed by “originating designated academic units”, which may be 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, from other internal Toronto Metropolitan University units, or from collaborative structures involving other institutions.

The sections that follow provide a set of templates to build a program’s initial LOI and the subsequent full New Program Proposal, together with guidelines and recommendations for content. New program proposals should follow these templates as closely as possible to help expedite both internal and external review processes. The LOI and the full New Program Proposal must include, but are not limited to, the information outlined in this manual.

The manual also provides guidelines for initiating and managing review and approval processes as you move through the various stages. Expedited Approvals (when appropriate) are included under Policy 112.

STEP 1: THE LETTER OF INTENT (LOI)

Purpose: The Letter of Intent (LOI) is the first formal indication of interest in developing a new program. The purpose is an initial analysis of program feasibility, logistics and fit, as well as a community response before a detailed proposal is prepared. The LOI should be concise, but substantive.

Consultation: Early in the LOI stage, arrange for a group consultation with the Faculty Dean, the Vice-Provost Academic, the University Planning Office and the Registrar’s Office. Consultations may include additional parties (e.g. representatives from other Departments/Schools/Faculties/Institutions), depending on the nature of the proposed new program.

Content: The LOI must include (but is not limited to) the information outlined in [APPENDIX A: Template for new undergraduate program Letter of Intent \(LOI\)](#). If the Provost and Vice-President Academic subsequently authorizes the development of a new program proposal, the LOI is incorporated into the full new program proposal.

LOI Endorsements, Submission to Provost and Vice-President Academic, and Authorizations to Proceed:

The endorsement process should be viewed as an iterative one, whereby feedback is received, considered and, where appropriate, incorporated into the LOI before submission to the next level.

Once the LOI is complete (including Appendices), it is submitted to the originating designated academic unit (department/school/faculty level, as appropriate) for initial review and endorsement. Incorporating any revisions recommended by this level of endorsers, the LOI is then submitted to the relevant Faculty Dean(s).

Following Dean's review and endorsement, the Dean submits the LOI simultaneously to the Vice-Provost Academic and to the Deputy Provost and Vice-Provost University Planning for review and feedback. Incorporating any revisions recommended by this level of endorsers, the Vice-Provost Academic submits the LOI to the Provost and Vice-President Academic, who then decides whether the LOI is ready to be reviewed by the broader Toronto Metropolitan University community. If deemed ready for review, the Executive Summary and the complete LOI is posted on the Provost and Vice-President Academic's website for a period of at least one month.

During the period that the LOI is posted, Toronto Metropolitan University community members are encouraged to submit comments/feedback on the new program proposal directly to the Provost and Vice-President Academic, who, in turn, will provide a response to the LOI at the end of the posting period.

The documentation of each stage of review and endorsement must be included in the full new program proposal, as part of [Appendix VII](#).

If appropriate, the Provost and Vice-President Academic authorizes the development of a full New Program Proposal, and formally designates an academic unit and a Faculty Dean to assume primary responsibility for its development. The designated academic unit(s) may correspond to an existing School/Department or be newly created for the purpose of developing the full New Program Proposal. In the case of undergraduate collaborative new program proposals involving multiple Faculties or institutions, the Provost appoints a Dean of Record to assume primary responsibility.

Once approval to proceed is granted by the Provost & Vice-President Academic, the content of the LOI, together with pertinent feedback gathered from endorsers and the Toronto Metropolitan University community, is incorporated into a full New Program Proposal.

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

STEP 2: DEVELOPING THE FULL NEW PROGRAM PROPOSAL

[APPENDIX B](#) provides a sample template, including required headings and subheadings, and appendices for a Full New Program Proposal. Note: several of the sections may be transferred from the initial LOI document, though they may require additional information or updates, depending on the feedback received from the various levels of endorsement and/or the community consultations.

It is advisable to include a formatted Table of Contents that links to the major headings and appendices in the document. Note: additional appendices may be required, depending on the nature and complexity of the proposed program.

STEP 3: ENDORSEMENTS/REVIEW OF NEW PROGRAM PROPOSAL

The following three levels of internal review and endorsement are required prior to the peer review team site visit:

Level	Details	Timeline
Department/School/ Faculty Council(s)	<p>Once the full proposal is complete, including appendices, a preliminary review is conducted by the Dean/Dean of Record to authorize presentation to the relevant Departmental/School/Program/Faculty Council(s) for review and endorsement. The appropriate Council(s) will be determined in accordance with Senate policies. Where such a Council does not exist, the Faculty Dean/Dean of Record shall establish an appropriate committee, comprising members of related Department/School/Program Councils and Faculty Councils, as appropriate.</p> <p>A record will be kept of the date(s) of the relevant Council meeting(s), along with any qualifications or limitations placed on endorsement by the Council(s). This information must be forwarded to the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record.</p>	<p>1-2 meeting(s) – check local norms for scheduled meeting dates. Include documentation of endorsement in Appendix VII.</p>
Faculty Dean(s)/ Dean(s) of Record	<p>Following Department/School/Program/Faculty Council endorsements, the proposal is returned to the Faculty Dean/Dean of Record for endorsement. Inter-Faculty programs require written endorsement from the Dean(s)/Dean(s) of Record for all involved Faculties.</p>	<p>1 meeting – allow 1-2 weeks for written endorsement(s). Include documentation of endorsement in Appendix VII.</p>
Vice-Provost Academic	<p>Following endorsement, the Faculty Dean/Dean of Record will submit the proposal to the Vice Provost Academic who will conduct a preliminary review for completeness of the proposal prior to authorizing distribution of the proposal to the External Peer Review Team.</p>	<p>1 meeting – allow 1-2 weeks for review and authorization.</p>

STEP 4: PEER REVIEW AND SITE VISIT

Peer review teams (PRTs) are required for new undergraduate program proposals. As soon as possible after a proposal has been endorsed by Departmental/School/Program/Faculty Council(s) and the Faculty Dean/Dean of Record, and reviewed by the Vice-Provost Academic, it will undergo peer review as described below.

Selection of PRT members: All members of the PRT will be at arm’s length from the program under review. The reviewers will be active and respected in their field, and normally associate or full professors with program management experience, including an appreciation of pedagogy and program-level learning outcomes. For more information on arm’s length selection of PRT members, refer to [APPENDIX C](#).

If graduate and undergraduate reviews are done simultaneously, the Faculty Dean/Dean of Record, the Vice-Provost Academic, and the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS may authorize a combined PRT, if appropriate. In either case, separate PRT reports are required.

The PRT for new undergraduate degree program proposals will consist of two external reviewers, and the option of one further internal reviewer from within the university, but from outside the discipline (or interdisciplinary group). Internal reviewers are not members of the designated academic unit under review. Internal reviewers will provide external reviewers with an institutional perspective on related policies and processes.

This PRT composition is the same for undergraduate degree programs that will be 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.

External review of new undergraduate program proposals will normally be conducted on-site, but may be conducted by desk review, virtual site visit or an equivalent method if the external reviewer is satisfied that the off-site option is acceptable. When an on-site visit is not appropriate, the Vice-Provost Academic authorizes external review of new undergraduate program proposals to be conducted by one of the alternatives mentioned above, and provides a clear justification for the decision to use these alternatives.

Appointment of PRT Members: The membership of the undergraduate PRT will be determined and appointed by the Faculty Dean/Dean of Record based on written information provided by the designated academic unit. The designated academic unit will provide the Faculty Dean/Dean of Record with names and brief biographies of four or more faculty external to Toronto Metropolitan University and two or more faculty internal to Toronto Metropolitan University(if applicable).

Initial communications to the reviewers, such as interest, availability, and invitation to serve on a PRT, will come only from the Faculty Dean/Dean of Record. The Faculty Dean/Dean of Record will invite one of the external reviewers to act as Chair of the PRT. Refer to [APPENDIX D](#) for a sample letter of invitation.

PRT Honoraria and Expenses: The standard amount set for an honorarium as agreed by the Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents:

- the honorarium per reviewer for undergraduate programs is \$1000
- for a program review combined with an accreditation review the amount is \$1500 per reviewer
- for an internal reviewer the amount is \$500

The Dean's office is responsible for the travel and accommodation expenses of external reviewers, if necessary. The Dean's office is also responsible for any costs during the site visit for agenda activities such as breakfast, lunch, snacks, etc.

Mandate of the PRT: The general mandate of the PRT 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 evaluate the new proposed program, and make explicit recommendations on any essential or otherwise desirable modifications to the proposed program. The

evaluation will be judged against the following criteria (Note: PRT members will be provided with a template for guidance in completing their report):

- Consistency of the program with the institution's mission and academic plans, clarity of its objectives, and appropriateness of the degree nomenclature, given the program's objectives/goals;
- Appropriateness of the program's structure and requirements to meet specified objectives, program-level learning outcomes and degree level expectations, as well as address the current state of the discipline or area of study.
- Appropriateness and effectiveness of proposed modes of delivery and methods to assess student achievement of the program-level learning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations, as well as the appropriateness of the plans to monitor and assess: i) The overall quality of the program; ii) Whether the program is achieving in practice its proposed objectives; iii) Whether its students are achieving the program-level learning outcomes; and iv) How the resulting information will be documented and subsequently used to inform continuous program improvement;
- Appropriateness of the program's admission requirements for the program objectives/goals and program-level learning outcomes established for completion of the program, and sufficient explanation of any alternative admission requirements, such as recognition of prior work or learning experience;
- Given the program's planned class sizes and cohorts as well as its program-level learning outcomes, adequacy of the number and quality of core faculty; appropriateness of the role of adjunct/sessional faculty; sustainability of the program and quality of the student experience; incorporation of EDI into the program, as well as any unique curriculum or program innovations and provision of supervision for experiential learning, if applicable; appropriateness of the administrative unit's planned use of existing human, physical and financial resources; and evidence of adequate resources to sustain quality scholarship, student research and creative activities, and laboratory access;
- Indicators of faculty quality and any other evidence that the program and faculty will ensure the intellectual quality of the student experience, including ways in which an EDI/anti-racism lens has been applied to the program.
- Acknowledge any clearly innovative aspects of the proposed program together with recommendations on any essential or otherwise desirable modifications to it.
- Any additional assessment of the New Program Proposal as a whole or related issues, as appropriate.

Information provided to the PRT before the site visit: The Faculty Dean/Dean of Record will provide the PRT with a Letter of Invitation, along with the PRT's mandate, information on the University, and its mission and mandate (see [APPENDIX D](#)). Once confirmed, the Dean/Dean of Record will provide to the PRT a site visit agenda along with the new program proposal, including all appendices, and all documentation pertinent to its approval to this point. This communication will remind the PRT of the confidentiality of the documents presented.

The Site Visit: The PRT will be provided with 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. Site visits to Ontario institutions offering joint programs (excluding college collaborative programs) will be coordinated, where appropriate, together with any additional information that may be needed to support a thorough review.

At the opening of the site visit the Vice-Provost Academic will review the PRT mandate, the format for the PRT Report (refer to [APPENDIX F](#) for a sample template PRT Report), and the timeline for completion of the PRT Report. At the close of the site visit the PRT will hold a debriefing involving the Provost and Vice-President Academic, the Vice-Provost Academic, the Faculty Dean/Dean of Record, and any others who may be invited by the Faculty Dean or PRT.

PRT Report: Within four weeks of the completion of the site visit, the PRT will submit its written report to the Faculty Dean/Dean of Record and the Vice-Provost Academic. The Faculty Dean/Dean of Record will review the submission for completeness and contact the peer reviewers if further information is required. The Faculty Dean/Dean of Record will circulate this report to the designated academic unit.

STEP 5: RESPONSES TO PEER REVIEW TEAM REPORT

Designated Academic Unit's response: Within four weeks of receipt of the PRT Report, the designated academic unit will submit its response to the Faculty Dean/Dean of Record. The response will identify any corrections or clarifications and will indicate how the PRT recommendations are being accommodated, or if they are not to be accommodated, the reasons informing this decision.

Faculty Dean/Dean of Record's response: Within four weeks of receipt of the designated academic unit's response, a written response to the PRT Report must be provided by the Faculty Dean/Dean of Record, with a response to each of the following:

- the recommendations of the PRT;
- the designated academic unit's response to the PRT Report; and
- any changes in organization, policy or governance required to meet the recommendations.

If the new program proposal is revised following, or as a result of, the PRT's Report, the original and the revised documents must be resubmitted through the Faculty Dean/Dean of Record to the Vice-Provost Academic.

If the Faculty Dean/Dean of Record and the Vice-Provost Academic believe that this document differs substantially from the original, it must be resubmitted to the Department/School/Program/Faculty Council(s), where appropriate, for further endorsement before receiving decanal endorsement.

STEPS 6-9: ASSESSMENT AND RECOMMENDATION BY ACADEMIC STANDARDS COMMITTEE; APPROVALS BY SENATE, QUALITY COUNCIL, TORONTO METROPOLITAN UNIVERSITY BOARD OF GOVERNORS

Assessment and Recommendations of Academic Standards Committee (ASC): The designated academic unit submits to the Vice-Provost Academic the full new program proposal, with any revisions, together with the PRT Report, the responses to the PRT Report by the designated academic unit and by the Faculty Dean/Dean of Record, and all associated approvals documentation (*Appendix VII*). The Vice-Provost Academic will submit the full new program proposal to the ASC.

The ASC will assess the proposal for academic quality and societal need and make one of the following recommendations:

- that the new program proposal be recommended for approval by Senate, with or without qualification;
- that the new program proposal be returned to the designated academic unit for further revision; or
- that the new program proposal not be recommended for approval by Senate.

Senate Approval: The Vice-Provost Academic (as Chair of the ASC) will submit a report of the new program proposal to Senate. Senate approval is the culmination of the internal academic approval process for new program proposals.

Quality Council Approval: Once approved by Senate, the new program proposal, together with all required reports and documents, including a brief commentary on the qualifications of external reviewers, as outlined in the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance Framework, will be submitted to the Quality Council for appraisal and approval as per the required process outlined in the Quality Assurance Framework. In the event that the university disagrees with the Appraisal Committee's recommendation, the University can opt to appeal as per the procedures under 2.7.2 of the Quality Assurance Framework. Following submission to the Quality Council, the University may announce its intention to offer the new program if it is clearly indicated that Quality Council approval is pending and no offers of admission will be made until that approval is received.

Presentation to the Board of Governors: The Provost and Vice-President Academic is responsible for presentation of the new program to the Board for approval of financial viability.

Public Announcement of New Programs: Subject to approval by the Provost and Vice-President Academic, the University may publicly announce its intention to offer a new undergraduate or graduate program in advance of receiving approval by the Quality Council. If such an announcement is made at this stage, it must contain the following statement: "Prospective students are advised that the program is still subject to formal approval."

STEPS 10-12: PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION, MONITORING AND REVIEW

Program Implementation: Final implementation of the program is the responsibility of the Provost and Vice-President Academic. A new program must be implemented and commence within thirty-six months of approval by the Quality Council and Toronto Metropolitan University's Board of Governors. After that time, the new program's approval will lapse.

Program Monitoring: No later than the end of the fourth academic year after a new program has commenced, an interim report from the academic unit will be filed with the Office of the Vice Provost Academic for submission to Senate. The report will carefully evaluate the program's success in realizing its objectives, requirements and outcomes, as originally proposed and approved; summarizing student registrations compared to projections; student retention; the status of issues raised in the implementation plan; any changes that have occurred in the interim; any challenges faced by the program together with how these challenges are being addressed; and, a response to any note(s) issued from the Quality Council's Appraisal Committee at the time of the program's approval. The interim monitoring report and its outcomes will be incorporated into the program's first periodic program review.

Periodic Program Review: All new undergraduate degree programs will be reviewed no more than eight years after implementation and in accordance with Toronto Metropolitan University Senate Policy 126: Periodic Program Review of Graduate and Undergraduate Programs. Note that new undergraduate and/or graduate programs that have been approved within the period since the conduct of the previous Audit are eligible for selection for the university's next Cyclical Audit.

APPENDIX A: Template for New Undergraduate Program Letter of Intent (LOI)

Toronto Metropolitan University

Letter of Intent for a new [Degree Designation] in [Program Name]

Submitted on: [Date]

1. Introduction

Provide basic information, including the name and a brief description of the proposed program, the proposed degree designation(s), the designated academic unit developing the program, and the program governance structure.

Where appropriate, describe how the proposed program may overlap or be integrated with other existing or planned programs at Toronto Metropolitan University or at other institutions. Identify the type¹ of proposed partnership program and provide a profile of the partner institution (where applicable).

Provide evidence of societal need for the program. This includes, but is not limited to assessment of labour market demand; student demand; and comparison with the most similar programs within Ontario or beyond, indicating how the proposed program differs from existing programs in one or more significant ways. If there are significant similarities between the proposed program and existing programs, a case for duplication should be made.

2. Program objectives

Provide a list of the program objectives/goals.

Describe the appropriateness of the degree nomenclature given the program's objectives.

Describe the consistency of the program objectives with Toronto Metropolitan University's mission and academic plan.

3. Equity, Diversity & Inclusion

Describe how an EDI/anti-racism lens has been applied in the development of the program. This may involve curricular content, teaching methods, assignments and assessments. Consider how the program's objectives

¹ Partnerships may take a variety of forms, including but not limited to:

- Collaborative program – Degree offered by Toronto Metropolitan University in collaboration with another institution on curriculum/delivery.
- Consecutive program – Both institutions collaborate on curriculum with students enrolled first at one institution and then the other. One degree is granted.
- Concurrent program – Some overlap between two programs with students graduating simultaneously from both with two credentials.
- Joint program – Two fully integrated programs with one point of admission, access to both institutions throughout the process, and graduation with one credential.

Updated June 2022, OVPA

will inform or impact equity within the program.

Identify areas where the program’s curriculum will use an EDI lens to consider the experiences of students, faculty and staff within the program,² with particular focus on students from equity deserving groups³. . Discuss how the program’s work in the area of EDI aligns with the values outlined in TMU’s 2020-2025 Academic Plan.

4. Societal Need

Provide a description of the anticipated societal need for the program and its graduates including a summary of industry and/or disciplinary trends and other relevant information. A source for labour market information and statistics can be found at <https://www.ontario.ca/page/labour-market>.

Provide evidence of student demand and how perceived student interest relates to labour market demands.

Describe whether/how the program provides a uniquely focused, specialized and/or innovative societal need.

Compare the proposed program with similar programs in Ontario or beyond. Indicated how the proposed program differs from comparators in significant ways. If there are significant similarities between the proposed program and existing programs, a case for duplication should be made.

5. Structure

Present the program curriculum in a clear table format. For example:

YEAR 1 FALL	YEAR 1 WINTER
Course code and name	Course code and name
Course code and name	Course code and name
etc.	etc.

Describe how the program’s structure and requirements meet the program objectives and specified program-level learning outcomes. Include a map of core required and core elective courses to program-level learning outcomes (Note: Contact ovpa.curriculum@ryerson.ca to request a consultation with a Curriculum Development Consultant to assist you in developing the map).

Describe how the program’s structure, requirements, and program-level learning outcomes meet the [Undergraduate Degree Level Expectations](#) (UDLEs).

² There are [several resources available from OVPECI](#) that may be helpful in completing this section, including the 2019 Student Diversity Self ID Report and the Anti Black Racism Campus Climate Review Report.

³ The OVPECI has identified six groups as equity deserving groups: women; racialized people (also referred to as people of colour or racial or visible minorities); Black people; First Nations, Métis and Inuit (FNMI) Peoples (also referred to as Indigenous or Aboriginal Peoples); persons with disabilities (also referred to as disabled people); and 2SLGBTQ+ people (an acronym used for individuals who identify in minority groups based on their sexual orientation, gender identity and gender expression).

Where appropriate, provide a rationale for any deviations from the program balance requirements outlined in Section 6 of Toronto Metropolitan University [Senate Policy #2](#).

6. Mode of delivery

Describe the proposed delivery mode(s) and how they will support students in meeting the intended program-level learning outcomes. For example, modes of delivery may include lecture format, distance, on-line, problem-based, compressed part-time, different campus, inter-institutional collaboration, international exchange, or other non-standard delivery forms.

7. Admission requirements

Describe the program's admission requirements, and how they are appropriate for the program objectives/goals and program-level learning outcomes. If applicable, explain any alternative requirements for admission into the program, such as minimum grade-point average, additional languages or portfolios, along with how the program recognizes prior work or learning experience.

Consider projected disparities in participation of students from equity deserving groups for this program, particularly in relation to other departments within the faculty (see footnote below for resources). Discuss potential opportunities to mitigate these disparities to encourage application and participation of such students.

8. Resources

Given the program's planned/anticipated class sizes and cohorts as well as its program-level learning outcomes:

- Describe the administrative unit's planned utilization of existing human, physical and financial resources, including implications for the impact on other existing programs at the university and any current institutional commitment to supplement those resources to support the program. (Note: This section is developed in consultation with the University Planning Office)
- Provide evidence of the intended participation of a sufficient number and quality of core faculty who are competent to teach and/or supervise in and achieve the goals of the program and foster the appropriate academic environment (e.g. Insert a short bio for each current participating faculty member).

8. Appendices

[Appendix I - Course Outlines](#)

Include template (draft) course outlines for each of the proposed core courses, including those taught by Schools/Departments outside of the proposed new program School/Department. For the LOI stage, the course outlines will include, at a minimum, calendar-ready course descriptions for each of the core courses in the proposed curriculum. Once the LOI proceeds to the full proposal stage, course outlines must be fully developed to include course descriptions, course learning outcomes, major topics of study, teaching methods, assessment methods, and potential readings.

Appendix II - Program Development Schedule

Provide a schedule that outlines the timeline for development of the program. Note: The full New Program Proposal must be submitted to the Academic Standards Committee within one year of the Provost and Vice-President Academic's authorization to proceed (i.e. following the 1-month posting of the LOI on the Toronto Metropolitan University website), together with a proposed schedule for program implementation.

Appendix III - Letters of Support

Include letters of support, if appropriate, from community stakeholders.

Appendix IV - Executive Summary

Provide a 1-3 paragraph program summary suitable for posting on the Toronto Metropolitan University Website. The summary may include a program description, societal need, unique strengths or other points of distinction that set it apart from other comparator programs.

Additional Appendices – as required

APPENDIX B: Template for Full New Undergraduate Program Proposal

Toronto Metropolitan University
New Program Proposal for the
[Degree Designation] in [Program Name]
Submitted on: [Date]

1.0 Introduction

Insert Introduction section from the LOI, incorporating any relevant feedback received from the various levels of endorsers as well as the community consultations.

1.1 Program objectives

Insert Program objectives section from the LOI, incorporating any relevant feedback received from the various levels of endorsers as well as the community consultations.

1.2 Equity, Diversity & Inclusion

Insert EDI section from the LOI, incorporating any relevant feedback received from the various levels of endorsers as well as the community consultations.

1.3 Societal Need

Insert Societal Need section from the LOI, incorporating any relevant feedback received from the various levels of endorsers as well as the community consultations.

1.3 Admission requirements

Insert Admission requirements section from the LOI, incorporating any relevant feedback received from the various levels of endorsers as well as the community consultations.

1.4 Structure

Insert Structure section from the LOI, incorporating any relevant feedback received from the various levels of endorsers as well as the community consultations.

1.5 Mode of delivery

Insert Mode of delivery section from the LOI, incorporating any relevant feedback received from the various levels of endorsers as well as the community consultations.

1.5 Program requirements

Provide a more detailed narrative of the proposed program's curriculum, including:

- a discussion of the ways in which the curriculum addresses the current state of the discipline or area of study;
- an analysis of the program’s curriculum content in terms of professional licensing or accreditation requirements, if any;
- identification of any unique curriculum or program innovations, creative components, experiential learning, or other significant high impact practices.

1.6 Assessment of teaching and learning

Describe the proposed methods for the assessment of student achievement and their appropriateness for meeting the intended program-level learning outcomes and [Undergraduate Degree Level Expectations](#). Refer back to the table developed in the LOI (in the [Structure](#) section) that maps program-level learning outcomes to [UDLEs](#), as a starting point, and incorporate assessment information. Assessments should reflect the nature of the related learning outcome. For example, if a learning outcome is focused on the development of *oral* communication skills, then a written test as the method of assessment would be questionable. If an outcome expects students to be able to *apply* specific knowledge in order to develop cognitive and conceptual problem-solving skills, then written tests and assignments may be appropriate. If an outcome involves *demonstration* of hands-on skill, then a practical assignment with, but not limited to, observational assessment may provide a more immediate relation to this outcome.

Discuss how the program plans to document and demonstrate the level of performance of students, consistent with the program-level learning outcomes and Undergraduate Degree Level Expectations. For example, possible ways to document and demonstrate achievement may include, but are not limited to: documenting the grade spread of a graduating cohort; setting a course grade or GPA number that students must achieve for graduation; using consistent rubrics to measure success in achieving specific program-level learning outcomes; calculating placement rates; surveying alumni one-year and then five-years post-graduation; using accreditation criteria to ensure students meet the program-level learning outcomes.

Describe and provide a rationale for any grading, academic continuance, and graduation requirements, if variant from Toronto Metropolitan University’s undergraduate policies.

1.7 Resources

This section extends the preliminary resource analysis conducted for the LOI. Further consultations with the UPO, the Toronto Metropolitan University Library are required in order to address the following information:

Describe the administrative unit’s planned utilization of existing human, physical and financial resources, including implications for the impact on other existing programs at the university and any institutional commitment to supplement those resources, to support the program. Provide evidence of:

- a) Planned/anticipated class sizes;
- b) Planned number of faculty and staff;
- c) Participation of a sufficient number and quality of core faculty and staff to achieve the goals of the program and foster the appropriate academic environment;

- d) The role and approximate percentage of adjunct and part-time faculty/limited term appointments used in the delivery of the program and the associated plans to ensure the sustainability of the program and quality of the student experience;
- e) Supervision of experiential learning opportunities (if required).

Include a synopsis of the report provided by the University library on existing and proposed collections and services to support the program-level learning outcomes. You may also include the full library report as an additional appendix.

Provide evidence that there are adequate resources to sustain the quality of scholarship, research, and creative activities produced by students, including library support, information technology support, and laboratory access, where appropriate.

Describe plans and additional institutional resource commitments, if necessary, to support the program in step with its ongoing implementation.

1.8 Quality and other indicators ([Section 2.1.10](#))

Provide evidence of the quality of the faculty through indicators such as: qualifications, funding, honours, awards, research, innovation, creative, and scholarly record; appropriateness of collective faculty expertise to contribute substantively to the proposed program and commitment to student mentoring). Note: CVs for all faculty members who will be involved in the development/delivery of the proposed program are to be included in [Appendix V](#) (see below) in a standardized format, per local norm.

Provide any other evidence that the program and faculty will ensure the intellectual quality of the student experience.

Describe the plans to monitor and assess⁴:

- i) The overall quality of the program;
- ii) Whether the program is achieving in practice its proposed objectives;
- iii) Whether its students are achieving the program-level learning outcomes; and
- iv) How the resulting information will be documented and subsequently used to inform continuous program improvement.

Appendices

Note: Appendices I – IV are taken from the LOI, incorporating any relevant feedback received from the various levels of endorsers as well as the community consultations.

⁴ More information and resources on the assessment of teaching and learning in new program proposals can be found at <https://oucqa.ca/guide/assessment-of-teaching-and-learning-2-1-4-1-and-5-1-3-1-4/>.

Appendix I - Course Outlines

Appendix II - Program Development Schedule

Appendix III - Letters of Support

Appendix IV - Executive Summary

Appendix V – Faculty CVs

Include Curriculum Vitae of all faculty members involved in the development and/or delivery of the proposed program, formatted as per local norm. Please ensure all personal and confidential information (such as date of birth, gender, home address, etc.) has been removed from CVs.

Appendix VI – Copy of the Provost and Vice-President Academic’s authorization to proceed

Include a copy of the written authorization, received from the Provost and Vice-President Academic following the LOI posting and community member feedback period, as previously outlined in Step 1.

Appendix VII – Documentation of Approvals and Related Communications

Insert all related documentation leading up to the External Peer Review Team visit in this appendix (Refer to Step 3). Reviews, endorsements, approvals and related communications must be documented and retained at every stage of the development of the new program.

Appendix VIII - External Reviewers’ Report

Insert the report of the external reviewers (Refer to Step 4).

Appendix IX - Institutional Response to the Report of the External Reviewers

Insert the institution’s response to the report of the external reviewers (Refer to Step 5).

Additional Appendices – as required. For example, include a copy of the full library report, or, in the case of partnerships with other institutions, refer to [APPENDIX G](#).

APPENDIX C: Choosing Arm's Length Reviewers

Best practice in quality assurance ensures that reviewers are at arm's length from the program under review. This means that reviewers are not close friends, current or recent collaborators, former supervisors, advisors or colleagues.

Arm's length does not mean that the reviewer must never have met or even heard of a single member of the program. It does mean that reviewers should not be chosen who are likely, or perceived as likely to be predisposed, positively or negatively, about the program. It may be helpful to provide some examples of what does and does not constitute a close connection that would violate the arm's length requirement.

Examples of what may **not** violate the arm's length requirement:

- Appeared on a panel at a conference with a member of the program
- Served on a granting council selection panel with a member of the program
- Author of an article in a journal edited by a member of the program, or a chapter in a book edited by a member of the program
- External examiner of a dissertation by a doctoral student in the program
- Presented a paper at a conference held at the university where the program is located
- Invited a member of the program to present a paper at a conference organized by the reviewer, or to write a chapter in a book edited by the reviewer
- Received a bachelor's degree from the university (especially if in another program)
- Co-author or research collaborator with a member of the program more than seven years ago
- Presented a guest lecture at the university
- Reviewed for publication a manuscript written by a member of the program

Examples of what may violate the arm's length requirement:

- A previous member of the program or department under review (including being a visiting professor)
- Received a graduate degree from the program under review
- A regular co-author and research collaborator with a member of the program, within the past seven years, and especially if that collaboration is ongoing
- Close family/friend relationship with a member of the program
- A regular or repeated external examiner of dissertations by doctoral students in the program
- A recent doctoral supervisor (within the past seven years) of one or more members of the program

Additional Advice for Choosing External Reviewers

External reviewers should have a strong track record as academic scholars and ideally should also have had academic administrative experience in such roles as undergraduate or graduate program coordinators, department chair, dean, graduate dean or associated positions. This combination of experience allows a reviewer to provide the most valuable feedback on program proposals and reviews.

APPENDIX D: Invitation e-Mails to Peer Reviewers

INITIAL INQUIRY FROM DEAN'S OFFICE:

Subject Heading: Request to Review Toronto Metropolitan University[degree] in [program name]

To: [insert email of potential peer reviewer]

Dear [insert name],

I am writing to invite you to serve as an external Peer Review Team (PRT) member for the proposed new [insert name of program] undergraduate program to be offered at Toronto Metropolitan University.

In accordance with the University's Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP), the PRT is composed of two reviewers who are at arm's length of the program, active and respected in their field, and normally associate or full professors with program management experience, including an appreciation of pedagogy and program-level learning outcomes. Given your knowledge and standing in your discipline, we believe you would be an excellent reviewer for the proposed [insert program name] program.

As a member of the PRT, you would be expected to review the new program proposal and accompanying documentation; participate in a site visit that includes administrators, faculty, and staff; and participate in composing a reviewers' report, written collaboratively with the other reviewer(s) and submitted within four weeks of the site visit. Toronto Metropolitan University offers an honorarium of \$1,000 on submission of the report and reimburses expenses upon submission of original receipts.

We are tentatively scheduling the site visit to take place [insert dates, or window of time].

Please let me know by [month], [day] if you are interested in serving as a member of the Peer Review Team.

I look forward to hearing from you. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or concerns.

Kind regards,

[Dean's name/title, etc.]

ONCE INVITATION IS ACCEPTED, FOLLOW UP EMAIL FROM DEAN:

Dear [insert name],

Thank you very much for your willingness to participate as a peer reviewer for the proposed new [insert name of program] undergraduate program at Toronto Metropolitan University.

As discussed previously, the peer review site visit will take place on [insert dates/times]. The site visit will provide an opportunity for you to visit the physical facilities and meet with program administrators, faculty, staff, and other key stakeholders. Please arrive at [location] on Day 1 at [insert time]. [Include any additional instructions/directions/persons who will meet PRT member, etc.]

To prepare for your visit, we have attached the following documents:

1. Site visit agenda [prepared by the program department, in consultation with the Dean, VPA and Provost offices]
2. New Program Proposal [attached, or via link to Google folder]
3. Template for completing the Peer Review Team Report
4. Map of Toronto Metropolitan University campus
5. [Any other pertinent information, as required]

Please bear in mind that the documents provided here are to be treated as confidential.

Please note that within four weeks of the site visit, the PRT report should be submitted to [insert name of Faculty Dean/Dean of Record] [insert email address] and the Vice-Provost Academic [insert email address]. Please be sure to allocate sufficient time to complete the report in collaboration with the other PRT member(s).

As previously mentioned, you will receive an honorarium of \$1,000 (CDN) on submission of the report, and expenses will be reimbursed upon submission of original receipts.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact [insert name] at [insert phone number] or by email at [add email].

Thank you again for your willingness to assist in this important process. We look forward to your visit and feedback!

Kind regards,

[Dean's name/title, etc.]

APPENDIX E: Sample Peer Review Team Site Visit Agenda

Note: This schedule has been designed to assist with the planning of the PRT site visit. Programs/departments may vary it according to their needs.

Date:			
DAY 1			
TIME	ACTIVITY FOR REVIEWERS	PERSONNEL	LOCATION
8:45 am	Meet in lobby of Hotel XXX (if reviewers are from out-of-town) and proceed to campus or meet in predetermined location on campus	Program Chair/Director, PPR Team representative(s)	Hotel XXX lobby or predetermined location on campus
9:00–9:45 am	Introductions and overview of the university, and the New Program review process	Vice Provost Academic, Dean, New Program Team representative(s)	JOR 1200 or JOR 1214 (call 5011 to book) OR other meeting room
9:45–10:00 am	Curriculum overview	New Program Team representative(s)	same as above
10:00–11:00 am	Tour of campus and facilities	New Program Team representative(s)	
11:00–11:15 am	BREAK		
11:15–11:30 pm	Meet with Chief Librarian and Library representative for program/department	New Program Team representative(s), Chief Librarian, Library Representative	Room:
11:30–12:15 pm	Meet with faculty members representing new program		Room:
12:15–1:00 pm	Lunch with Dean(s) and/or faculty members	New Program Team representative(s), and/or Dean(s), and/or other faculty members representing new program	Room:
1:00–1:15 pm	BREAK		
1:15–2:00 pm	Meet with staff support personnel		Room:
2:00–3:00 pm	Curriculum discussion	New Program Team representative(s) Others: e.g. members of Curriculum Committee	Room:
3:00–4:00 pm	Meet with students	Suggest representatives with interest in new program	Room:
4:00–4:30 pm	Wrap-up of day	Reviewers only	Room:
4:30–6:00 pm	BREAK		

6:00–8:00 pm	DINNER (optional)	Dean(s) and/or New Program Team representative(s)	Location:
Date: DAY 2			
8:45 am	Meet in lobby of Hotel XXX (if reviewers are from out-of-town) and proceed to campus or meet in predetermined location on campus	New Program Team representative(s)	Hotel XXX lobby or predetermined location on campus
9:00–10:00 am	Meet faculty involved in the Program		Room:
10:00–11:00 am	Meet with members of Advisory Council (if applicable)		Room:
11:00–11:15 am	BREAK		
11:15–12:00 pm	Meet with New Program Team representative(s)	New Program Team representative(s)	Room:
12:00–2:00 pm	Working lunch and debriefing/report preparation for reviewers	Reviewers only	Room:
2:00–2:45 pm	Reviewers' debriefing session with senior administration	Dean(s), Provost and Vice-President Academic, Vice-Provost Academic	Room:
2:45 pm	SITE VISIT ENDS		

APPENDIX F: Template for Peer Review Team Report

Reviewers' Report on the Proposed
(INSERT DEGREE) Program in (INSERT PROGRAM NAME)
at Toronto Metropolitan University

(REVIEWER 1 NAME) (REVIEWER 1 TITLE)	(REVIEWER 2 NAME) (REVIEWER 2 TITLE)
UNIVERSITY ADDRESS	UNIVERSITY ADDRESS
(INTERNAL REVIEWER (if used) NAME)	

1. OUTLINE OF THE VISIT

Was the site visit:

In person Virtual site visit [Desk Review](#)

If the review was conducted either virtually or via desk review, was this format agreed to by both external reviewers?

Yes No

For those reviews that included a site visit, please indicate the following (or insert the site visit schedule below):

Who was interviewed?

What facilities were seen?

Comment on any other activities relevant to the appraisal.

Or: insert the site visit schedule below

In order to continuously improve the effectiveness and efficiency of site visits/virtual site visits, please comment on the following:

- How effective was the proposal brief in preparing you for the visit/virtual site visit?
- How could the logistics of the visit/virtual site visit be improved?

2. EVALUATION CRITERIA

Please provide feedback on each of the following Evaluation Criteria.

2.1 Objectives

- Are the program’s [objectives](#) clearly described?
- Is the degree nomenclature appropriate, given the program’s objectives?
- Are the program’s objectives consistent with the institution’s mission and academic plans?

2.2 Program Requirements

NOTE: The Quality Assurance Framework requires a clear distinction between program objectives, program-level learning outcomes, and [Degree Level Expectations](#). See the [Guidance on program objectives and program-level learning outcomes](#) for details on the distinction.

- Are the program’s structure and the requirements to meet the program objectives and program-level learning outcomes appropriate?
- Do the program’s structure, requirements and program-level learning outcomes ensure students meet Toronto Metropolitan University’s Undergraduate or Graduate Degree Level Expectations?
- Does the (proposed) mode of delivery facilitate students’ successful completion of the program-level learning outcomes?
- Does the curriculum address the current state of the discipline or area of study?

2.3 Assessment of teaching and learning

NOTE: Programs should ensure that the plans for monitoring and assessing student achievement provide an assessment of students currently enrolled as well as post-graduation metrics. Please see [Guidance on Assessment of Teaching and Learning](#) for further details and examples of measures for assessing teaching and learning that meet the requirements of the Quality Assurance Framework.

- Are the methods used to assess student achievement of the program-level learning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations appropriate and effective?
- Are the plans in place to monitor and assess the following, both appropriate and effective?
 - i. The overall quality of the program;
 - ii. Whether the program is achieving in practice its proposed objectives;
 - iii. Whether its students are achieving the program-level learning outcomes; and
 - iv. How the resulting information will be documented and subsequently used to inform continuous program improvement.

2.4 Admission requirements

- Are the program’s admission requirements appropriate, given the program objectives and program-level learning outcomes?
- Are there any applicable alternative admission requirements, including how the program recognizes prior work or learning experience, and if so, are they appropriate?

2.5 Resources

Given the program’s class sizes and cohorts as well as its program-level learning outcomes:

- A. Is the number and quality of core faculty who are competent to teach and/or supervise sufficient to achieve the goals of the program and foster the appropriate academic environment?
- B. When adjunct/sessional faculty play a large role in the delivery of the program, is their role appropriate? Are plans in place to ensure the sustainability of the program and the quality of student experience and if so, are these suitable?
- C. Has sufficient planning gone into the sustainability of the program and quality of the student experience?
- D. Have EDI and the needs of equity deserving groups⁵ been adequately addressed through the curriculum and faculty planning?
- E. Is the provision of supervision of experiential learning opportunities adequate, if applicable?
- F. Taking into consideration implications for other existing programs at the university, is the administrative unit's planned use of existing human, physical and financial resources appropriate?

NOTE: External Reviewers are not expected to assess the financial viability of a program, and internal budgets are not under the purview of the External Review of a New Program Proposal. Provide a general assessment of the administrative unit's planned use of existing financial resources.

- G. Are there adequate resources available to sustain the quality of scholarship and research activities produced by students, including library support, information technology support, and laboratory access?

2.6 Quality and other indicators

- Comment on the quality of the faculty (e.g., qualifications, funding, honours, awards, research, innovation and scholarly record, appropriateness of collective faculty expertise to contribute substantively to the program and commitment to student mentoring).
- Comment on any other evidence that the program and faculty will ensure the intellectual quality of the student experience.

2.7 Structure

- Appropriateness of the program's structure and regulations to meet specified program-level learning outcomes and degree level expectations.

2.8 Program content

- Ways in which the curriculum addresses the current state of the discipline or area of study.
- Identification of any unique curriculum or program innovations or creative components.

2.9 Mode of delivery

⁵ The Office of the Vice President, Equity and Community Inclusion has identified six groups as equity deserving groups: women; racialized people (also referred to as people of colour or racial or visible minorities); Black people; First Nations, Métis and Inuit (FNMI) Peoples (also referred to as Indigenous or Aboriginal Peoples); persons with disabilities (also referred to as disabled people); and 2SLGBTQ+ people (an acronym used for individuals who identify in minority groups based on their sexual orientation, gender identity and gender expression).

- Comment on the appropriateness of the proposed mode(s) of delivery to meet the intended program-level learning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations.

2.10 Assessment of teaching and learning

- Appropriateness of the proposed methods for the assessment of student achievement of the intended program-level learning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations.
- Completeness of plans for documenting and demonstrating the level of performance of students, consistent with the institution's statement of its Degree Level Expectations.

2.11 Resources

- Adequacy of the administrative unit's planned utilization of existing human, physical and financial resources, and any institutional commitment to supplement those resources, to support the program.
- Participation of a sufficient number and quality of faculty who are qualified to teach and/or supervise in the program.
- Evidence that there are adequate resources to sustain the quality of scholarship produced by undergraduate students, including library support, information technology support, and laboratory access.
- Evidence of and planning for adequate numbers and quality of: (a) faculty and staff to achieve the goals of the program; or (b) of plans and the commitment to provide the necessary resources in step with the implementation of the program; (c) planned/anticipated class sizes; (d) provision of supervision of experiential learning opportunities (if required); and (e) the role of adjunct and part-time faculty.

2.12 Quality and other indicators

- 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).
- Evidence of a program structure and faculty research that will ensure the intellectual quality of the student experience.

NOTE: Reviewers are urged to avoid using references to individuals. Rather, they are asked to assess the ability of the faculty as a whole to deliver the program and to comment on the appropriateness of each of the areas of the program (fields) that the university has chosen to emphasize, in view of the expertise and scholarly productivity of the faculty.

3. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

- **Include any additional assessment of the New Program Proposal as a whole, as appropriate.**
- **Comment on any other issues, as applicable.**

4. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Provide a brief summary of the review. Please include commentary on any clearly innovative aspects of the proposed program together with recommendations on any essential or otherwise desirable modifications to it, as applicable.

Recommendations that are clear, concise, and actionable are the most helpful for universities as they prepare to launch new programs. Include specific steps to be taken on any essential or otherwise desirable modifications to the proposed program.

NOTE: The responsibility for arriving at a recommendation on the final classification of the program belongs to the Appraisal Committee. Individual reviewers are asked to refrain from making recommendations in this respect.

Recommendation 1:

Recommendation 2:

Recommendation 3:

[Add more as required.]

Signature: _____

Date: __

Signature: _____

Date: __

APPENDIX G: Additional Considerations for Partnership Agreements

Partnership development may proceed following the acceptance of the LOI by the Provost and Vice-President Academic.

Consultations - Many departments and resource areas of the University may be affected by partnership initiatives. These areas are already considered in the development of a new program, but additional consideration should be given to how or whether they will be impacted by a partnership with another institution. Areas to consider more carefully may include:

- Program department or designated academic unit
- Other affected academic departments
- Faculty (Dean)
- Registrar's Office
- Library
- Computer Resources
- Student Services
- Vice-Provost Faculty Affairs
- University Planning Office
- Financial Services
- Facilities Management and Development
- Toronto Metropolitan University International

Partnership Specifics - the following information should be included in the New Program Proposal, either within the body of the proposal or as a separate appendix:

- Partner institution information, including relevant prior partnership agreements, governance structure, applicable financial resources, and status within host country (for international agreements).
- Specific admissions requirements, if differences exist between the institutions.
- Curriculum responsibilities of each partner institution (for example, courses delivered by each institution, any variations in the curriculum delivery among partners, specific award criteria where more than one is offered, commitment of the partner institution(s) to Toronto Metropolitan University's students).
- Specific timeline for the development, approval and implementation of the partnership.
- Outline of recruitment activities and each partner's responsibility.
- Timeline and procedures for partnership review and renewal.

APPENDIX H: Undergraduate Degree Level Expectations

The degree level expectations in the Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents (OCAV) “Guidelines” elaborate the intellectual and creative development of students and the acquisition of relevant skills that have been widely, yet implicitly, understood. Ontario universities have agreed to use OCAV’s guidelines as a threshold framework for the expression of their own degree level expectations – and may go beyond them. Below are Toronto Metropolitan University’s undergraduate degree level expectations, as presented in Senate Policy 110:

Baccalaureate/Bachelor’s Degree: Honours	
<i>This degree is awarded to students who have demonstrated the following:</i>	
EXPECTATIONS	
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 c. 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 creative process. b. The ability to use a range of established techniques to: <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;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> iv. Solve a problem or create a new work. c. The ability to make critical use of scholarly reviews and primary sources.
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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Qualities and transferable skills necessary for further study, employment, community involvement and other activities requiring: <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; 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.