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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 - Ryerson’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 Ryerson or in partnership with other post-secondary institutions. If the program involves an international partner, Ryerson 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office of the Provost and Vice-President Academic</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael Benarroch</td>
<td>Provost &amp; Vice-President Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phyllis Markle</td>
<td>Exec. Assistant to the Provost</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office of the Vice-Provost Academic</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kelly MacKay</td>
<td>Vice-Provost Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Dy</td>
<td>Admin &amp; Finance Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Inquiries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tina West</td>
<td>Director, Curriculum Quality Assurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paola Borin</td>
<td>Curriculum Development Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia Gingerich</td>
<td>Curriculum Development Consultant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University Planning Office (UPO)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glenn Craney</td>
<td>Deputy Provost and Vice-Provost, University Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Inquiries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Resources at Ryerson University</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carol Shepstone</td>
<td>Chief Librarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charmaine Hack</td>
<td>Registrar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Lesser</td>
<td>Director, CCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Inquiries</td>
<td>Ryerson International</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# PROCESS FOR NEW PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT, REVIEW, APPROVAL AND MONITORING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Minimum timeline requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Preliminary Letter of Intent (LOI)</td>
<td>21-24 months prior to program launch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prepared by originating designated academic unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consultations with Vice-Provost Academic, Vice-Provost University Planning, Registrar, and Chief Librarian.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Endorsement by relevant Dean/Dean of Record</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Review by Vice-Provost Academic, Vice-Provost University Planning, and Provost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• LOI posted by Provost to Ryerson community for 1 month</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provost authorizes move to development of a formal proposal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Development of new program proposal</td>
<td>18-21 months prior to program launch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New Program Advisory Committee is formed by Dean/Dean of Record</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Proposal developed in continued consultation with Vice-Provost Academic, Vice-Provost University Planning, Registrar, and other stakeholders, as required (e.g. Library, CCS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Endorsements/Review of new program proposal:</td>
<td>17-18 months prior to program launch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Department/School/Faculty Council endorsement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dean/Dean of Record endorsement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Vice-Provost Academic review for completeness prior to sharing with the Peer Review Team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Peer Review and Site Visit</td>
<td>14-17 months prior to program launch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Appointment and briefing of Peer Review Team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Peer Review Team site visit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Peer Review Team Report (1 month to complete)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Responses to Peer Review Team report</td>
<td>12-14 months prior to program launch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Response by designated academic unit to the Dean/Dean of Record (within 1 month)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Response by the Dean or Dean of Record (within 1 month)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Proposal revisions, if any, submitted to Dean/Dean of Record and Vice-Provost Academic for review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Assessment and recommendations by Academic Standards Committee</td>
<td>11-12 months prior to program launch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 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</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Approval by Senate</td>
<td>10-11 months prior to program launch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Approval by Quality Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Approval of financial viability by Ryerson Board of Governors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Program Implementation</td>
<td>LAUNCH!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Program Monitoring</td>
<td>2 years following program launch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Periodic Program Review</td>
<td>no more than eight years following program launch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 Ryerson units, or from collaborative structures involving other institutions.

The sections that follow provide a set of templates to build your initial LOI and the subsequent full New Program Proposal, together with guidelines and recommendations for content. Please 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.

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. You may wish to 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).

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 Ryerson 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, Ryerson 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.

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 Ryerson community, is incorporated into a full New Program Proposal.

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. You will note that several of the sections may be transferred from the initial LOI document, though 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: you may require additional appendices, 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department/School/Faculty Council(s)</td>
<td>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 Department/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.</td>
<td>1-2 meeting(s) – check local norms for scheduled meeting dates. Include documentation of endorsement in Appendix VII.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Dean(s)/Dean(s) of Record</td>
<td>Following Department/School/Program/Faculty Council endorsements, the proposal is returned to the Faculty Dean/Dean of Record for endorsement. Inter-Faculty</td>
<td>1 meeting – allow 1-2 weeks for written endorsement(s). Include documentation of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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. 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 must decide if a combined PRT visit or separate PRT visits are required. In either case, separate PRT reports are required.

The PRT for new undergraduate degree program proposals will consist of one external reviewer, and either one further external reviewer or an internal reviewer from a related discipline (or interdisciplinary group) within the university. 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 audit, videoconference or an equivalent method if the external reviewer is satisfied that the off-site option is acceptable.

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 Ryerson and two or more faculty internal to Ryerson (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.
**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 against the following criteria:

- consistency of the program with the institution’s mission and academic plans, clarity and appropriateness of its requirements and associated learning outcomes in addressing degree level expectations, and appropriateness of the degree nomenclature;
- appropriateness of the program’s admission requirements for the learning outcomes established for completion of the program, and sufficient explanation of any alternative admission requirements;
- appropriateness of the program's structure and regulations to meet specified program learning outcomes and degree level expectations;
- ways in which the curriculum addresses the current state of the discipline or area of study, and identification of innovative or creative curriculum components;
- appropriateness of the proposed mode(s) of delivery to meet the intended program learning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations;
- appropriateness of proposed methods to assess, document and demonstrate student achievement of the program’s defined learning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations;
- adequacy of the administrative unit’s planned use of human, physical and financial resources and institutional commitment to supplement the resources where necessary, evidence of a sufficient number and quality of faculty, and evidence of adequate resources to sustain quality scholarship, research, and creative activities;
- evidence of planning for adequate numbers and quality of faculty and staff to achieve the program goals, of plans and commitment to provide the necessary resources for implementation of the program, of planned/anticipated class sizes, of supervision for experiential learning opportunities (if required) and of adjunct and part-time faculty; and
- indicators of quality including faculty, program structure and faculty research (scholarly, research and creative) that will ensure the intellectual quality of the student experience.

**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 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 E 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, RYERSON 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, as outlined in the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance Framework, will be submitted to the Quality Council for approval as per the required process. Following submission to the Quality Council, the University may announce its intention to offer the 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.

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 Ryerson’s Board of Governors. After that time, the new program’s approval will lapse.

Program Monitoring: At the end of the second academic year after a new program has commenced, a brief report from the academic unit will be filed with the Office of the Vice Provost Academic for submission to Senate, summarizing student registrations compared to projections; student retention; the status of issues raised in the implementation plan; and, any challenges faced by the program together with how these challenges are being addressed.

Periodic Program Review: All new undergraduate degree programs will be reviewed no more than eight years after implementation and in accordance with Ryerson University Senate Policy 126: Periodic Program Review of Graduate and Undergraduate Programs.
APPENDIX A: Template for New Undergraduate Program Letter of Intent (LOI)

Ryerson 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 Ryerson or at other institutions. Identify the type of proposed partnership program and provide a profile of the partner institution.

Provide evidence of societal need for the program. This may include, but is not limited to assessment of labour market demand; student demand; and comparator programs within Ontario or beyond. Indicate how the proposed program differs from existing programs in one or more significant ways.

2. Program objectives

Describe the consistency of the program with Ryerson’s mission and academic plans.

Describe the program’s goals/requirements and associated program learning outcomes. Demonstrate how the learning outcomes address Ryerson’s undergraduate Degree Level Expectations. (Note: Contact ovpacurriculum@ryerson.ca to request a consultation with a Curriculum Development Consultant who will assist you in developing effective program learning outcomes)

Identify and discuss the rationale for the proposed degree nomenclature (e.g. type of Bachelors degree; inclusion of ‘Honours’ degree designation).

3. Admission requirements

Describe the program’s admission requirements, and how they are appropriate for the learning outcomes established for completion of the program. If applicable, explain any alternative requirements, for admission

---

1 Partnerships may take a variety of forms, including but not limited to:
   - Collaborative program – Degree offered by Ryerson 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.

2 Refer to Appendix H for the list of Undergraduate Degree Level Expectations.
into the program, such as minimum grade-point average, additional languages or portfolios, along with how the program recognizes prior work or learning experience.

4. Structure

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR 1 FALL</th>
<th>YEAR 1 WINTER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course code and name</td>
<td>Course code and name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course code and name</td>
<td>Course code and name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etc.</td>
<td>etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Where appropriate, provide a rationale for any deviations from the program balance requirements outlined in Section 6 of Ryerson Senate Policy #2.

5. Mode of delivery

Describe the proposed delivery mode(s) to meet the intended program learning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations. 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.

6. Resources

Describe the administrative unit’s planned utilization of existing human, physical and financial resources, and any current institutional commitment to supplement those resources to support the program. (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 faculty who are competent to teach and/or supervise in the program (e.g. Insert a short bio for each current participating faculty member).

7. 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. The (draft) course outlines will include, at a minimum, calendar-course descriptions, course objectives and learning outcomes, major topics of study, teaching methods/delivery modes, assessment methods, and potential reading(s).

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 Ryerson 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 Ryerson 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

Ryerson 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 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.

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

1.4 Program content
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 or creative components.

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.

1.6 Assessment of teaching and learning
Describe the proposed methods for the assessment of student achievement and their appropriateness for meeting the intended program learning outcomes and Undergraduate Degree Level Expectations. Refer back to
the table developed in the LOI (in Program objectives section) that maps Program 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 Ryerson’s 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 learning outcomes; calculating placement rates; surveying alumni one-year post-graduation and then five-years later; using accreditation criteria to ensure students meet the program learning outcomes.

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

1.7 Resources

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

Describe 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. Provide evidence of:

a) participation of a sufficient number and quality of faculty and staff to achieve the goals of the program; or
b) plans and the commitment to provide the necessary resources in step with the implementation of the program;
c) planned/anticipated class sizes;
d) providing supervision of experiential learning opportunities (if required); and
e) the role of adjunct and part-time faculty.

Include a synopsis of the report provided by the University library on existing and proposed collections and services to support the program’s 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 produced by undergraduate students’ scholarship and research activities, information technology support, and laboratory access, where appropriate.

1.8 Quality and other indicators (Section 2.1.10)

Identify and define the indicators that will be used to provide evidence of the quality of the faculty (e.g. qualifications, research, innovation and scholarly record; appropriateness of collective faculty expertise to contribute substantively to the proposed program). 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 evidence of a program structure and faculty research (scholarly, research and creative) that will ensure the intellectual quality of the student experience.

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.

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, 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/consultants 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
- The doctoral supervisor of one or more members of the program

Additional Advice for Choosing External Reviewers/Consultants

External reviewers/consultants 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 Ryerson [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 Ryerson 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. 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. Ryerson 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 Ryerson 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 Ryerson 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>DAY 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TIME</strong></td>
<td><strong>ACTIVITY FOR REVIEWERS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:45 am</td>
<td>Meet in lobby of Hotel XXX (if reviewers are from out-of-town) and proceed to campus or meet in predetermined location on campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00–9:45 am</td>
<td>Introductions and overview of the university, program and the PPR process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:45–10:00 am</td>
<td>Curriculum overview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00–11:00 am</td>
<td>Tour of campus and facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00–11:15 am</td>
<td>BREAK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:15–11:30 pm</td>
<td>Meet with Chief Librarian and Library representative for program/department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30–12:15 pm</td>
<td>Meet with faculty members representing new program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:15–1:00 pm</td>
<td>Lunch with Dean(s) and/or faculty members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00–1:15 pm</td>
<td>BREAK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:15–2:00 pm</td>
<td>Meet with staff support personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00–3:00 pm</td>
<td>Curriculum discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00–4:00 pm</td>
<td>Meet with students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00–4:30 pm</td>
<td>Wrap-up of day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30–6:00 pm</td>
<td>BREAK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00–8:00 pm</td>
<td>DINNER (optional)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date:** DAY 2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:45 am</td>
<td>Meet in lobby of Hotel XXX (if reviewers are from out-of-town) and proceed to campus or meet in predetermined location on campus</td>
<td>New Program Team representative(s) Hotel XXX lobby or predetermined location on campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00–10:00 am</td>
<td>Meet faculty involved in the Program</td>
<td>Room:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00–11:00 am</td>
<td>Meet with members of Advisory Council (if applicable)</td>
<td>Room:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00–11:15 am</td>
<td><strong>BREAK</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:15–12:00 pm</td>
<td>Meet with New Program Team representative(s)</td>
<td>New Program Team representative(s) Room:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00–2:00 pm</td>
<td>Working lunch and debriefing/report preparation for reviewers</td>
<td>Reviewers only                    Room:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00–2:45 pm</td>
<td>Reviewers’ debriefing session with senior administration</td>
<td>Dean(s), Provost and Vice-President Academic, Vice-Provost Academic Room:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:45 pm</td>
<td><strong>SITE VISIT ENDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F: Template for Peer Review Team Report

Reviewers’ Report on the Proposed

(INSERT DEGREE) Program in (INSERT PROGRAM NAME)

at Ryerson University

(REVIEWER 1 NAME)  
(REVIEWER 1 TITLE)

(REVIEWER 2 NAME)  
(REVIEWER 2 TITLE)

UNIVERSITY ADDRESS  
UNIVERSITY ADDRESS

1. OUTLINE OF THE REVIEW

Please indicate whether this review was conducted by desk audit or site visit. For those reviews that included a site visit, please indicate the following:

● Who was interviewed

● What facilities were seen

● Any other activities relevant to the appraisal

2. EVALUATION CRITERIA

Please provide feedback on each of the following Evaluation Criteria.

2.1 Objectives

● Consistency of the program with the institution’s mission and academic plans.

● Clarity and appropriateness of the program’s requirements and associated learning outcomes in addressing the institution’s undergraduate Degree Level Expectations.

● Appropriateness of degree nomenclature.

2.2 Admission requirements

● Appropriateness of the program’s admission requirements for the learning outcomes established for completion of the program.

● Sufficient explanation of alternative requirements, if any, for admission into a graduate, second-entry or undergraduate program, such as minimum grade point average, additional languages or portfolios, along with how the program recognizes prior work or learning experience.

2.3 Structure
• Appropriateness of the program’s structure and regulations to meet specified program learning outcomes and degree level expectations.

• For graduate programs, a clear rationale for program length that ensures that the program requirements can be reasonably completed within the proposed time period.

2.4 **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.

2.5 **Mode of delivery**

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

2.6 **Assessment of teaching and learning**

• Appropriateness of the proposed methods for the assessment of student achievement of the intended program 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.

2.7 **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 competent 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.

2.8 **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. OTHER ISSUES

4. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

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.

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
- Ryerson 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 Ryerson 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

**Baccalaureate/Bachelor's Degree: honours**

This degree is awarded to students who have demonstrated the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPECTATIONS</th>
<th>Depth and Breadth of Knowledge</th>
<th>Knowledge of Methodologies</th>
<th>Application of Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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. 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. A developed ability to: • gather, review, evaluate and interpret information; and • compare the merits of alternate hypotheses or creative options, relevant to one or more of the discipline. A developed, detailed knowledge of and experience in research in an area of the discipline. Developed critical thinking and analytical skills inside and outside the discipline. The ability to apply learning from one or more areas outside the discipline.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An understanding of methods of enquiry or creative activity, or both, in their primary area of study that enables the student to: • evaluate the appropriateness of different approaches to solving problems using well established ideas and techniques; • devise and sustain arguments or solve problems using these methods; and • describe and comment upon particular aspects of current research or equivalent advanced scholarship.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ability to review, present and critically evaluate qualitative and quantitative information to: • Develop lines of argument • Make sound judgments in accordance with the major theories, concepts and methods of the subject(s) of study • Apply underlying concepts, principles, and techniques of analysis, both within and outside the discipline • Where appropriate, use this knowledge in the creative process The ability to use a range of established techniques to: • Initiate and undertake critical evaluation of arguments, assumptions, abstract concepts and information • Propose solutions • Frame appropriate questions for the purpose of solving a problem • Solve a problem or create a new work The ability to make critical use of scholarly reviews and primary sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Communication Skills</td>
<td>The ability to communicate information, arguments, and analyses accurately and reliably, orally and in writing to a range of audiences.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 6. Autonomy and Professional Capacity | Qualities and transferable skills necessary for further study, employment, community involvement and other activities requiring:  
  - the exercise of initiative, personal responsibility and accountability in both personal and group contexts;  
  - working effectively with others; and  
  - decision-making in complex contexts.  
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.  
Behaviour consistent with academic integrity and social responsibility. |