

CURRICULUM IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE
REPORT TO SENATE: 05 DECEMBER 2017
Undergraduate Curriculum Renewal
Proposed Policy on Ryerson's Undergraduate Curriculum Structure

1. Introduction

The Curriculum Implementation Committee (CIC) presents to Senate, for its consideration, Policy 2: Undergraduate Curriculum Structure. The proposed policy represents the culmination of the work of the CIC and is a significant milestone in Ryerson's Undergraduate Curriculum Renewal Initiative. This document explains the main features of Policy 2 and outlines a set of recommendations for Senate's consideration.

Given that the Undergraduate Curriculum Renewal Initiative has been underway for over half a decade, it is useful to step back and look at the various steps in the process that have led to this point.

2. History of Ryerson's Undergraduate Curriculum Renewal Initiative

The first review of Ryerson's current undergraduate tripartite curriculum was completed in 2005.¹ Although many recommendations were made for revisions to the curriculum structure, most were not implemented.

Discussions regarding revisions to the tripartite curriculum resumed in 2010 and, in 2011, Senate approved the launch of the Undergraduate Curriculum Renewal Initiative to develop a new curriculum framework. The initiative had four main goals:

- to ensure that Ryerson's curriculum continues to meet evolving career and societal need;
- to provide greater student choice;
- to facilitate the creation of innovative options in programs; and
- to create a more cohesive undergraduate curriculum policy to streamline the set of policies governing curriculum matters at the University.

The initiative was also explicitly aligned with the Undergraduate Degree Level Expectations (UDLEs), which are now part of Ryerson's Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP). A Curriculum Renewal Committee (CRC) was appointed to work out the implications of the new framework.

Curriculum Renewal Committee 2011-2012

As outlined in its green paper of January 2012 and then in more detail in its white paper of June 2012,² the CRC saw a significant transformation of Ryerson's tripartite curriculum as the best way to achieve the initiative's goals. The CRC's main policy proposals included:

- new nomenclature for the main categories in the tripartite curriculum;
- replacing professionally related electives with open electives;
- replacing liberal studies with mandated breadth electives; and
- introducing a new class of required writing intensive courses.

¹ Currie, R.F., B. Cameron, and M. Zeytinoglu (2005) Curriculum Review Report: Ryerson University, May 24, 2005.

² http://www.ryerson.ca/content/dam/provost/AccessiblePDFs/CurriculumRenewalGreenPaper_27Jan2012_FINAL-s.pdf and http://www.ryerson.ca/content/dam/provost/AccessiblePDFs/CRC_White_Paper_May_3_2012_FINAL-s.pdf

The June 2012 white paper included a draft Policy 2, which outlined the proposed curriculum structure. This policy was never approved by Senate. However, based on a proposal in the white paper, Senate established a Curriculum Implementation Committee (CIC) in June 2012 to plan the process of phasing in the new curriculum structure for all undergraduate programs.

Curriculum Implementation Committee 2012-2013

During the 2012-2013 academic year, the CIC discussed strategies and processes for identifying a pool of open elective courses and ensuring student access to open electives. The CIC also discussed implementation issues related to mandated breadth and writing intensive courses. In April 2013, the CIC presented its green paper to Senate.³ Billed as a discussion document, it featured a range of interim proposals. The paper included a range of analysis as well. The first element in this analysis dealt with the likely results of mandated breadth using a hypothetical set of breadth categories and an estimate of the number of breadth elective courses taken by the average undergraduate student. The conclusion of this analysis was that, on an annual basis, 20,000 seats might shift from Arts courses to those delivered by the other five Faculties.

The green paper referred to these enrollment challenges as “extraordinary,” and stated that an enrollment shift of this magnitude “could have a disruptive impact on the University.” It noted that this disruption might take two forms. “First, it could significantly reduce undergraduate teaching in Arts departments, especially those with large numbers of liberal studies courses. Second, it could create a major new set of teaching demands for departments and schools in the rest of the University.” The green paper also made a number of specific interim proposals and also outlined principles for establishing a pool of open elective courses for a pilot program involving new programs.

At its June 2013 meeting, Senate approved a pilot project in which the professionally related electives tables in two new undergraduate programs being launched in 2013-14 (Professional Communication and Biomedical Sciences) were based on the prospective new open electives list in the proposed curriculum model. A full list of courses submitted by programs for open electives was provided to Senate as an appendix to the June meeting’s agenda.⁴

Discussions with Stakeholders 2013-2015

In the months following June 2013, when the CIC was moving from its green paper recommendations to develop a white paper, the Undergraduate Curriculum Renewal Initiative was put on hold. This decision was related to the development of the University’s new academic plan. However, the Vice Provost Academic continued discussions with various stakeholders and undertook to monitor the open electives pilot.

At the October 2014 Senate meeting, the Vice Provost Academic presented an update on the initiative.⁵ The curriculum model envisioned in his report highlighted the breadth elective category, and the potential negative impact of introducing mandated breadth for the reasons outlined in the CIC’s green paper. This Senate presentation also gave an update on the open elective pilot project. By this time, the pilot included three new undergraduate programs besides Professional Communication and Biomedical Sciences – Financial Mathematics, Mathematics and its Applications and Sport Media.

³ http://www.ryerson.ca/content/dam/provost/AccessiblePDFs/CIC_Green_Paper_Final_May7_Senate_FINAL-s.pdf

⁴ <http://www.ryerson.ca/content/dam/senate/agenda/2013/20130604agendamin.pdf>

⁵ http://www.ryerson.ca/senate/agenda/2014/Curriculum_Renewal_Senate_Update_Slides_Oct_2014.pdf

Based on a preliminary analysis of open elective choices by students in one of the pilot programs, the Vice Provost Academic concluded the open elective model had the potential to provide students with a wider range of courses than did existing professionally related elective tables, while also providing program areas with scope for curriculum innovation. The conclusions in the presentation concerning breadth electives were less positive. It was noted that mandated breadth as a concept has merit, but that if implemented immediately it would disrupt the operation of the curriculum.

During the ensuing months, the discussions that the Vice Provost Academic had with various constituencies were dominated by the significant challenges that the CIC green paper had revealed with the breadth elective element of the proposed new curriculum. In particular, the risks associated with the huge shift in seats from Arts to other parts of the University was the subject of considerable comment.

At the April 2015 Senate meeting, the Vice Provost Academic made another presentation on curriculum renewal. He suggested it might be better if breadth electives were not a feature of the proposed new curriculum model and that instead the liberal studies component should stay substantially the same in the proposed new model.

The proposed retention of the liberal studies model meant that not only the class of breadth electives courses but also the writing course component were no longer part of the proposed new curriculum model. It was proposed that the liberal studies category of the curriculum remain largely unchanged, with writing as an essential feature of all courses in this category, but that changes be considered both to the definition of liberal studies courses, to more clearly include science courses, and to the governance structure of liberal studies. In addition, it was suggested that strategies could be developed to ensure that, in the years ahead, the range of liberal studies courses cover all Faculties. The proposal to keep liberal studies rather than replacing this element with breadth electives greatly simplified the issues relating to the implementation of the new curriculum model.

Curricular Developments 2013-2016

Although formal work on the curriculum renewal initiative ceased after the CIC's green paper in 2013, Ryerson's curriculum has continued to evolve since that time in the direction of the goals of the proposed curriculum model. By Fall 2016, a total of 13 undergraduate programs revised their curriculum structure to allow students to select their professionally related courses from the open elective table, and the number of courses on the open elective table had increased from 696 to 922.

Although Ryerson's curriculum is evolving, it is doing so in the absence of a Senate-approved policy on the revised curriculum structure. As a result, there has been confusion over what policy provisions apply now. In addition, existing programs that were not part of the original pilot have come onto the system without a Senate-approved policy. Another pertinent issue is that there are no guidelines for adding courses to the open elective table.

Reactivated Curriculum Implementation Committee 2016-2017

Work on the development of the new curriculum model resumed in April 2016 when Senate approved the reactivation of the Curriculum Implementation Committee. The CIC's mandate was to continue refining the key principles comprising the general goals of the new curricular structure; to ensure that these curricular principles reflect the principles and values as outlined in the University's academic plan; to further elaborate, and revise where necessary, the draft omnibus curriculum policy; to

make policy implementation recommendations; and to hold at least one round of public consultations.

Since its reactivation, the CIC has undertaken several tasks related to this mandate. These include:

- completing a concentrations policy;
- drafting the principles and goals governing Ryerson's undergraduate curriculum structure;
- assessing the open elective pilot running since 2013;
- examining a variety of issues related to the pilot and its potential extension to all undergraduate programs;
- consulting with the Deans, Chairs and Directors in all Faculties and in the G. Raymond Chang School of Continuing Education about the proposed changes; and
- seeking feedback from the Ryerson community about the proposed policy through town halls and via email.⁶

3. Proposed Policy 2: Undergraduate Curriculum Structure

The proposed Policy 2, appended to this report, completes the CIC's work. First, it solidifies the guiding principles underlying the proposed new curricular model. Second, it incorporates the various proposed revisions to the model summarized in this document, including changes to the way open electives are incorporated into the model and an amended liberal studies governance structure. Third, it provides a full specification of curricular elements, including standard definitions of key curricular terms. Finally, it consolidates all Senate undergraduate curriculum policies into one consistent omnibus document, and would allow for the rescinding of a wide collection of policies that deal with individual aspects of the curriculum. It is useful to examine some of the main features of the proposed policy in more detail.

3.1. Guiding Goals and Principles

The guiding goals and principles of Ryerson's curriculum structure highlighted in the proposed policy are drawn from Ryerson's unique mission and aims, its Undergraduate Degree Level Expectations (UDLEs) as part of the Institutional Quality Assurance Process, and its core values, as outlined in the University's academic plan, *Our Time to Lead*. Further, the principles include consideration of equity, diversity, and inclusion (EDI), considerations of Indigenous culture and traditions, and a focus on student choice.

3.2 Refinement of the Proposed Curriculum Model

The proposed policy maintains three broad categories of study for all undergraduate students while providing students with the ability to define their own educational paths. The table below compares the current tripartite model with the proposed model after these various refinements.⁷

⁶ For detailed information on the CIC's work and findings, refer to the committee's update reports to Senate: http://www.ryerson.ca/content/dam/provost/AccessiblePDFs/CIC-Update_for_Senate_September_2016_copy_2_FINAL-s.pdf; <http://www.ryerson.ca/content/dam/provost/AccessiblePDFs/CIC Update Report to Senate Final January 31 2017 FINAL-s.pdf>; and <http://www.ryerson.ca/content/dam/provost/AccessiblePDFs/CIC Report %26 Draft Policy - Senate June 5, 2017 FINAL-s.pdf>

⁷ Because of accreditation needs, undergraduate Engineering programs received Senate-approved exemption from meeting the percentages for professionally-related electives and liberal studies in the current tripartite model and this will apply to the proposed model.

Current Versus Proposed Curriculum Structure

Current Model	Proposed Model
Professional Studies 50-75%	Core Studies 60-75%
Professionally Related Studies 10-40%	Open Electives 10-25%
Liberal Studies 8-20%	Liberal Studies 15-20%

Core Studies

In the proposed model, the category “professional studies” has been renamed “core studies” to reflect the diversity of Ryerson’s current undergraduate programs, many of which prepare students for a range of careers rather than for a single professional path. Core studies in the current model include courses considered foundational and integral to the primary area(s) of study. Unlike professional courses in the current model, core courses in the proposed model may include those provided by a Teaching Department or School with expertise in the subject matter that the Program Department or School has recognized as integral to the program area. As an example, in the BSW Social Work program, POL101/102, PSY 102/202, and SOC111/112 are all required in first year, and these would be part of core studies and would be considered as such in the calculation of program balance.

Open Electives (OEs)

In the current model, professionally related courses “...develop an understanding of the theoretical disciplines upon which the career field is based, or which synthesize the diverse elements of professional study” (Policy 124). These courses are determined by the Program Department or School and, in most cases, provide students with only a limited choice of offerings outside students’ professional studies. They include courses that lead to select minors deemed by the Program Department or School to be most relevant to the students’ primary area of study.

In contrast, open electives in the proposed model give students more control over their educational choices with the ability to select courses related either to their career paths or to their personal interests. This represents a significant change from the current curriculum model’s professionally related component, in which it is the program rather than the student who determines what electives a student will choose from, and also makes the decision over whether to sign a course directive that allows a student to take courses not on the program’s professionally related elective table. Many of the community members we consulted noted that students often don’t know that course directives exist, which makes current implementation of this option variable and inequitable. In addition, some programs refuse to sign course directives, which adds to the perceived unfairness.

With the proposed system, students may choose open electives that are outside their core area or gain additional depth in their core area of study by selecting core electives. Open elective courses also enable students to pursue any minor offered by Ryerson. Another advantage is that Program Departments will be able to grant more transfer credits for courses since those that do not meet liberal studies or core requirements can be directed to fulfill open elective requirements. Finally, the new system allows students who need more courses for post-graduate studies to specialize by taking more courses in their program area and have them counted towards their degree.

Liberal Studies

As the third category in the tripartite curriculum model, liberal studies remain unchanged in the proposed model, with one exception. The definition has been expanded to explicitly include science courses. The italicized words in the definition have been added: “Liberal studies, as a category, develop students’ capacity to understand and critically appraise the social, cultural, *natural and physical context* in which they will work as a professional and live as an educated citizen.”

3.3 A New Proposed Open Elective System

The proposed policy replaces the current open elective table with a structure in which **open electives include all degree-level courses, except those identified as liberal studies courses and those courses specifically excluded by program or Teaching Departments and Schools.** In contrast to the current open elective table, a ‘no-table’ open elective system would provide substantial benefits for all stakeholders, especially students, by enhancing their registration experience as they choose courses best suited to their career plans and personal interests.

The chart below shows the main features of the student registration experience associated with the current and proposed open elective systems. As outlined in the chart, there are several key features shared by the current and proposed systems. As with the current system, the proposed system would allow students to utilize the student enrolment interface when registering for their courses and would allow them to see the full range of open elective choices when they register. Again, paralleling the current system, the proposed system would allow Teaching Departments and Schools to apply course restrictions to their courses and would allow programs to apply course restrictions for their own students. Finally, the proposed system would provide the possibility for course requisites (i.e. prerequisites, corequisites and antirequisites) to effectively manage student progression through courses – a feature also found in the current system.

Current Versus Proposed Open Elective Systems

Feature of Student Registration Experience	Current System (Table)	Proposed System
Students can utilize the student enrolment interface to register for courses	Yes	Yes
The full range of open elective choices are displayed to students when registering	Yes	Yes
Teaching Departments and Schools can apply course restrictions on their courses	Yes	Yes
Programs can apply course restrictions for their own students	Yes	Yes
Course requisites can effectively manage student progression	Yes	Yes
Courses not used to satisfy program core requirements automatically default to count as open electives	No	Yes
Course directives are no longer required to move ‘one-off’ course choices to the open elective table	No	Yes
Courses needed as prerequisites and/or to complete a minor are always part of student choice	No	Yes
New courses are automatically part of student choice	No	Yes
Student course requirements can be grouped by Faculty in the Academic Advising Report	No	Yes

The features of the student registration experience that differ with the current and proposed systems are also outlined in the chart. First, only in the proposed system would courses not used to satisfy program course requirements automatically default to count as open electives, streamlining the curriculum audit process to the benefit of both students and staff. This feature would also negate the need for course directives to move “one-off” course choices to the open elective table. Furthermore, given that the proposed system would mandate programs to clearly outline requisite paths for courses that may be used as the open electives, courses required as prerequisites would always be included among the set of open elective courses from which students could choose, minimizing the chance of registration errors. This same feature would also apply to courses needed to complete a minor in the proposed system. Finally, new courses would automatically be part of the student selection process in the proposed system, while it would become possible to group student course requirements in the academic advisement report by Faculty, enhancing the report’s usefulness for both students and staff. There will be additions to RAMMS that facilitate open electives in general.

3.4 Liberal Studies Courses and Open Electives

The proposed policy **excludes liberal studies as open electives**. The feedback we received – from our survey of open elective pilot programs as well as broader consultations with the university community – revealed a widespread concern that the inclusion of lower level liberal studies would lead to the possibility that some students might fulfill all their open elective requirements with a range of lower level courses. The exclusion of lower level liberal studies courses partly addresses this concern.

The exclusion of upper level liberal studies courses is driven primarily by logistical considerations. Because liberal studies courses are scheduled in special bands to ensure their wide availability, students may find it easier to timetable upper level liberal studies courses than they would many other open electives. Without some constraint, large enrolment shifts might then occur between Faculties, and because the large bulk of liberal studies courses are offered by the Faculty of Arts, this might end up privileging what are mostly Arts courses within the constellation of open electives. However, in cases where students cannot access or timetable other open electives, the use of course directives will allow their Program Departments and Schools to direct, as an exceptional measure, upper level liberal studies courses to fulfill open elective requirements.

3.5 New Liberal Studies Governance Structure

For historical reasons and by Senate policy, the Dean of Arts currently chairs the Liberal Studies Council, the University-wide committee with the authority to recommend to Senate the approval of new liberal studies courses. The Dean of Arts also chairs the Liberal Studies Curriculum Committee, which makes recommendations to the Council regarding the approval of new liberal studies courses.

In the proposed Policy 2, the **Academic Standards Committee is given responsibility for recommending to Senate the approval of new liberal studies courses and the Vice Provost Academic (or designate) chairs the Liberal Studies Curriculum Committee**. The Liberal Studies Curriculum Committee would then make its recommendations to the Academic Standards Committee. The proposed composition of the Liberal Studies Curriculum Committee includes representatives from each of the six Faculties, the Chang School, and students.

3.6 Full Specification of Curricular Elements

At present, some curricular elements, such as concentrations and minors, have separate Senate

policies. The proposed Policy 2 incorporates these separate policies. Other curricular elements, including over 40 curricular terms, are formally defined for the first time in a **glossary** that is appended to the policy.

3.7 Streamlining Curriculum Policies

Adoption of the proposed policy would **rescind a total of 12 Senate policies** that address some aspect of Ryerson's undergraduate curriculum structure. A few of these policies (e.g., Policy 148: Minors and Policy 149: Concentrations) have been integrated completely into the proposed policy. Other Senate policies would become obsolete. All current liberal studies regulations now outlined in six separate Senate policies are integrated as well.

4. Implementation Plan

The CIC has developed a comprehensive open elective implementation plan. Phase 1 will involve the proposed no-table open elective system. Since every course (except liberal studies) in this system would be an open elective unless otherwise designated, this phase would require all departments and schools to conduct a course requisite review of all their undergraduate courses to determine the precise nature of any restrictions that may be applied. Phase 2 will involve establishing timelines for undergraduate programs in all Faculties to revise their curricula in accordance with the proposed new model. The implementation plan is outlined in a separate document to Senate.

5. Recommendations

In addition to Policy 2, and a schedule for its implementation, the CIC is providing Senate with a set of recommendations, which derive from extensive community consultations by the CIC. We believe the recommendations address the multifaceted changes that are required to make the new open elective system function smoothly across the undergraduate curriculum. The recommendations deal primarily with ways to assist students in choosing open electives as well as procedures to ensure that optimal access exists for the open elective courses they choose. Additional recommendations touch on Policy 2 and its glossary, liberal studies courses, course numbering, the formatting of the undergraduate calendar and the need to review several outdated policies.

Recommendation 1: Student Choice and Access to Open Electives

Recommendation 1a: Enhance Student Choice of Open Electives

The following ways to assist students to choose open elective courses should be considered:

- Develop a communication strategy to inform students of the benefits of freedom of choice with open electives, which will include;
 - Develop targeted online video tutorials and other advising tools on how students select and register in open elective courses on RAMSS.
 - Enhance current advising tools to include FAQs on what an open elective is, how an open elective applies toward satisfying program graduation requirements, which programs may or may not have open electives incorporated into their curriculum and why, the benefits of having 'free choice' in selecting an open elective, etc.
 - Work closely with Program Departments and Schools to help improve awareness of advising resources so that better support can be provided to students – especially first-year students who are seeking information on how to plan for optional curricular pathways such as minors.

- Provide information sessions for academic advisors, both faculty and staff, on how to support students to choose minors, open electives, concentrations, etc.
- Consider a mechanism acceptable to all stakeholders to make template course outlines, with information on the course learning outcomes, readings, methods of assessment and topics, available to students in an easily accessible common repository.

Recommendation 1b: Ensure Access to Open Electives

The following ways to ensure access to open elective courses should be considered:

- Encourage Teaching Departments and Schools to make available during the course intentions period as many open electives as possible.
 - Schedule presentations by the University Planning Office to relevant administrators (i.e., Deans, Chairs, and Directors) on the funding mechanics of the new open elective system, to ensure that these administrators better understand the existing incentives associated with providing enhanced student access to these courses.
 - Institute regular tracking each Fall and Winter semester on the number of seats occupied by non-program students in open elective courses, and share the tracking results, along with estimates of seating needs, with relevant administrators (i.e., Deans, Chairs, Directors) to ensure that sufficient spaces exist across the University for undergraduates to complete their open elective requirements.
- Expand the number of open elective courses offered online.
- Increase the number of open elective course offerings through the Chang School.
- Develop open elective-specific courses in diverse disciplines across the Faculties.
- Encourage departments and schools to establish meaningful and academically relevant requisites, particularly prerequisites, for all courses.

Recommendation 1c: Additional Open Elective Recommendations

The following long-term changes that could enhance open elective choice and access should be considered:

- Provide more open electives slots in programs' curricula to ensure students can earn a minor (or minors) and take the prerequisite courses.
- Inform students before the course intentions period which open electives are offered in each semester and year and when they will be offered next. Not knowing beforehand when open electives will be offered makes planning difficult.
- Remove from the visible calendar courses that are no longer offered or haven't been offered in more than five years.
- Inform programs annually about the addition of new courses as open electives to allow programs to assess whether program-specific exclusions need to be added to the undergraduate calendar.
- Evaluate whether upper level liberal studies courses should be included as open electives.
- Find a readily recognizable means to distinguish between lower and upper level open electives (see "course numbering" below).

Recommendation 2: Policy 2 Glossary Review

- The Vice Provost Academic, in collaboration with Curriculum Management, should conduct an annual review of the Policy 2 Glossary and bring to the Academic Governance and Policy Committee (AGPC) its recommendations for revisions and additions.

Recommendation 3: Liberal Studies Reporting and Procedures

- The Academic Standards Committee (ASC) should present an annual report in the Fall term that includes: a) a list of all new liberal studies course proposals submitted to the Liberal Studies Curriculum Committee that year; and b) ASC's recommendations to Senate.
- New courses approved as liberal studies should be publicized annually to students and Program Departments and Schools.
- The Liberal Studies Curriculum Committee should develop procedures to address such issues as: ongoing compliance with liberal studies requirements, in particular the writing component and template information for course outlines that identifies the course as a liberal studies elective and highlights liberal studies restrictions.
- There should be ongoing education, particularly to instructors of liberal studies courses, as to the goals of liberal studies in Ryerson's undergraduate curriculum structure.

Recommendation 4: Course Renumbering

- In consultation with Program Departments and Schools, the Registrar's Office, Curriculum Management, Academic Advising, and the Provost, a comprehensive plan should be developed, contingent on financial and other implications, to re-catalogue all Ryerson courses to a defined, university standard (i.e., first year courses as "100," second year courses as "200," etc.).

Recommendation 5: Bulletin year calendar/bulletin year graduation requirements

- Consider the potential of the University moving from a dynamic calendar and dynamic program graduation requirements to a bulletin year calendar and bulletin year graduation requirements.⁸ With a bulletin year calendar, students are expected to follow the curriculum requirements that were published in the calendar in the year in which they entered their program. This allows students and their advisers to know what courses they are expected to complete over four years in order to graduate and facilitates long-term planning. The model currently exists (by default) in programs where curriculum changes have been nil over time and is the model applied for part-time programs.

Recommendation 6: Evaluation of the revised curriculum structure

- After the revised curriculum structure is fully implemented in all programs, the Provost should strike a committee to investigate and report on the extent to which the revised curriculum structure is meeting stated objectives.

Recommendation 7: Review of Policy 21 and Policy 155

- The CIC identified two policies that are outdated: Policy 21 and Policy 155. The CIC recommends that the Academic Governance and Policy Committee (AGPC) initiate a review of these policies.

⁸ Currently, with a dynamic calendar, program changes become part of students' graduation requirements *after they have been admitted and as they move through their program toward graduation*. This allows students to graduate with the most recent version of their program's curriculum. Although a dynamic calendar has its advantages, students and faculty cannot easily engage in long-term planning. In addition, as program changes occur, students who are out of phase or who reach ahead may need course substitutions/course exemptions to satisfy their new/changing graduation requirements.

[Policy 21: Academic Jurisdiction](#): Policy 21 has not been reviewed since it was approved in 1978. The policy offers guidelines for the assignment of academic responsibility for courses.

[Policy 155: Approval of Collaborative Academic Programs](#): Policy 155 was last amended in 2010, prior to the 2011 adoption of the Quality Assurance Framework for Ontario Universities and the approval of Ryerson's Institutional [Quality Assurance Process \(IQAP\)](#). [Policy 112: Development of New Graduate and Undergraduate Programs](#), which is part of Ryerson's IQAP, outlines the current requirements for new program proposals. Policy 155 must be reviewed and amended to be consistent with Policy 112 and its procedures.

Acknowledgements

Thanks are in order to members of the Curriculum Implementation Committee (CIC) for their dedicated service; to CIC sub-Committee members Neil Thomlinson, Sarena Knapik, Michelle Horii Edwards and Deanne Wright for their sage advice on curriculum and technical matters and for developing the glossary; to faculty, staff and students, especially those from open elective pilot programs, who provided feedback; and to Jona Zyfi and Mark Lovewell for aid in facilitating the CIC's work. Thanks are also in order to members of the Curriculum Renewal Committee (CRC), whose work the CIC used as its starting point. This includes the CRC Chair, Vice Provost Academic Chris Evans.

Respectfully submitted,

Marcia Moshé, PhD
Interim Vice Provost Academic
Chair, Curriculum Implementation Committee

Committee Members:

Elizabeth Evans, Ted Rogers School of Management (to June 2016)
Jacob Friedman, Faculty of Engineering and Architectural Science
Desmond Glynn, G. Raymond Chang School of Continuing Education (to June 2016)
Charmaine Hack, Registrar
Sarena Knapik, Assistant Registrar – Curriculum Management
Linda Koechli, G. Raymond Chang School of Continuing Education (from July 2016)
Marcia Moshé (Chair)
Katherine Penny, Director – Curriculum Quality Assurance
Catherine Schryer, Faculty of Communication and Design (to June 2017)
Neil Thomlinson, Faculty of Arts
John Turtle, Secretary of Senate
Janice Waddell, Faculty of Community Services
Bettina West, Ted Rogers School of Management (from July 2016)
Stephen Wylie, Faculty of Science