

**RYERSON UNIVERSITY  
POLICY OF SENATE**

**INSTITUTIONAL QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESS**

**Policy Number:** 110  
**Previous Approval Dates:** May 3, 2011; November 4, 2014  
**Policy Approval Date:** March 6, 2018  
**Next Policy Review Date:** 2023 *(or sooner at the request of the Provost and Vice-President Academic or Senate)*

**Responsible Committee or Office:** Provost and Vice-President Academic

---

Ryerson University, in its ongoing commitment to offer undergraduate and graduate programs of high academic quality, has developed this Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP), which adheres to the Quality Assurance Framework established by the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (Quality Council). Academic programs at Ryerson are aligned with the statement of undergraduate and graduate degree-level expectations adopted by the Council of Ontario Universities (COU). Ryerson's IQAP describes the University's quality assurance process requirements for new program development and approval, the periodic review of existing programs, and the modification of existing curricula and programs.

The University's IQAP includes the following policies:

**Policy 110: Institutional Quality Assurance Process**

Policy 112: Development of New Graduate and Undergraduate Programs

Policy 126: Periodic Program Review of Graduate and Undergraduate Programs

Policy 127: Curriculum Modifications: Graduate and Undergraduate Programs

**1. PURPOSE**

This policy describes the authority and responsibility for Ryerson's IQAP.

**2. SCOPE**

This policy governs all undergraduate degree, graduate degree, and graduate diploma programs, both full and part-time, offered solely by Ryerson or in partnership with any other post-secondary institutions.

### **3. DEFINITIONS**

#### **3.1. Dean of Record**

A Dean named by the Provost and Vice-President Academic and given decanal authority over an interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary program.

#### **3.2. Degree Level Expectations (DLEs)**

The knowledge and skill outcome competencies that reflect progressive levels of intellectual and creative development at specified degree levels (i.e., Bachelor's, Master's, and Doctoral). (See Appendix 1 and Appendix 2). DLEs have been established by the Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents and serve as Ontario universities' academic standards.

#### **3.3. Designated Academic Unit**

Faculty groups that comprise faculty from a single School/Department, from several Schools and/or Departments within a Faculty, from Schools/Departments from different Faculties, from other internal Ryerson units, or from collaborative structures involving other post-secondary institutions.

#### **3.4. Expedited Approvals**

A process that is normally required by Quality Council when the university: (a) requests endorsement of the Quality Council to declare a new Field in a graduate program; or (b) develops proposals for new for-credit graduate diploma programs; or (c) requests it, to approve Major Modifications, as defined through Ryerson University's Policy 127, proposed for an existing degree program. The process is expedited by not requiring the use of external reviewers.

#### **3.5. Field**

In graduate programs, an area of specialization or concentration (in multi/interdisciplinary programs a clustered area of specialization) that is related to the demonstrable and collective strengths of the program's faculty. Declaring Fields at either the master's or doctoral level is not required.

#### **3.6. Final Assessment Report (FAR)**

A report on a periodic review of an undergraduate or graduate program that must be submitted to Quality Council. The FAR includes the University's synthesis of the external evaluation and internal responses and assessments of a periodic program review, along with an associated implementation plan and executive summary.

### 3.7. Graduate Program

The complete set and sequence of courses, combination of courses, or other units of study, research and practice prescribed by the University, for the fulfillment of a Master's or Doctoral degree program or diploma program.

#### 3.7.1. Degree Program

The complete set and sequence of courses, combination of courses and/or other units of study, research and practice prescribed by the University for the fulfillment of a degree. Degrees are granted for meeting the established requirements at a specified standard of performance consistent with the University's Degree Level Expectations (DLEs).

#### 3.7.2. Diploma Program

A graduate program that is one of three types:

3.7.2.1. **Type 1:** Awarded when a candidate admitted to a master's program leaves the program after completing a certain proportion of the requirements. Students are not admitted directly to these programs.

3.7.2.2. **Type 2:** Offered in conjunction with a master's (or doctoral) degree, the admission to which requires that the candidate be already admitted to the master's (or doctoral) program. This represents an additional, usually interdisciplinary, qualification.

3.7.2.3. **Type 3:** A stand-alone, direct-entry program, generally developed by a unit already offering a related master's (and sometimes doctoral) degree, and designed to meet the needs of a particular clientele or market.

### 3.8. Joint Program

A program of study offered by two or more universities or by a university and a college or institute, in which successful completion of the requirements is confirmed by a single degree document.

### 3.9. Letter of Intent

The Letter of Intent (LOI) is a preliminary new program proposal and is the first stage in the development of a new program proposal.

### 3.10. New Program

A new program is defined as any degree program or graduate diploma program, currently approved by Senate, which has not been previously approved for Ryerson University by the Quality Council, its predecessors, or any intra-institutional approval processes that previously applied. A new program has substantially different program requirements and substantially

different learning outcomes from those of any existing approved programs offered by the institution.

### **3.11. Undergraduate Program**

The complete set and sequence of courses, combinations of courses, or other units of study, research and practice prescribed by the University for the fulfillment of a baccalaureate degree. Degrees are granted for meeting the established requirements at a specified standard of performance consistent with the university's Degree Level Expectations (DLEs).

## **4. EXTERNAL AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY**

### **4.1. Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (Quality Council)**

- 4.1.1. Has ultimate authority for the approval of Ryerson University's IQAP and any subsequent revisions.
- 4.1.2. Reviews and approves proposals for all new undergraduate and graduate programs.
- 4.1.3. Reviews undergraduate and graduate periodic program review FARs and major modifications.
- 4.1.4. On an eight-year cycle audits the quality assurance process for periodic program review, new programs and major modifications and determines whether the University has acted in compliance with the provisions of its IQAP. Assesses the extent to which the University has responded to the recommendations and suggestions of the audit report.

## **5. INTERNAL AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY**

### **5.1. Ryerson University Board of Governors**

- 5.1.1. Approves new program proposals based on financial viability.

### **5.2. Senate**

- 5.2.1. Exercises final internal authority for the approval of all new undergraduate and graduate programs.
- 5.2.2. Exercises final authority for the approval of all undergraduate and graduate periodic program reviews.
- 5.2.3. Exercises final authority for the approval of all major modifications to curriculum/programs for all academic programs.
- 5.2.4. Exercises final internal authority for the approval and review of all new and

revised academic policies.

### 5.3. Standing Committees and Governance Council of Senate

- 5.3.1. **Academic Governance and Policy Committee (AGPC):** A Standing Committee of Senate that proposes, oversees, and periodically reviews Senate policies and University procedures regarding any matter within the purview of Senate.
- 5.3.2. **Academic Standards Committee (ASC)<sup>1</sup>:** A Standing Committee of Senate that assesses and provides recommendations to Senate for approval of new undergraduate program proposals, undergraduate periodic program reviews, minor curriculum modifications (Category 3), and major curriculum modifications to undergraduate programs.
- 5.3.3. **Yeates School of Graduate Studies Council (YSGS Council):** A Governance Council of Senate that assesses and provides recommendations to Senate for approval of new graduate program proposals, graduate periodic program reviews, and major curriculum modifications to graduate programs.
  - 5.3.3.1. **YSGS Programs and Planning Committee (PPC):** Assesses and makes recommendations to YSGS Council on new graduate program proposals, graduate periodic program reviews, and major curriculum modifications to graduate programs.

### 5.4. Provost and Vice-President Academic

- 5.4.1. Assumes overall responsibility for the IQAP policies and procedures, and policy reviews.
- 5.4.2. Authorizes the development of new program proposals, and authorizes the commencement, implementation and budget of new programs.
- 5.4.3. Following Senate approval, reports to the Board of Governors (i) new program proposals for review of their financial viability; and (ii) outcomes of periodic program reviews.
- 5.4.4. Should there be a disagreement between Faculty Deans or Dean of Record or between a Faculty Dean and a Department/School or Faculty Council, where appropriate, the Provost and Vice-President Academic will decide how to proceed.
- 5.4.5. Reports to the Quality Council, as required. This responsibility may be delegated to the Vice Provost Academic.

---

<sup>1</sup> ASC assesses Chang School certificate proposals, revisions, and reviews within the parameters of Ryerson Senate Policy 76.

- 5.4.6. Approves any budget allocations related to academic programs.
- 5.4.7. Is responsible for the University's participation in the Quality Council cyclical audit process.

### **5.5. Deputy Provost and Vice Provost University Planning**

- 5.5.1. Develops program costing and evaluates societal need, differentiation, sustainable applicant pool, and outcomes of new program proposals.
- 5.5.2. In collaboration with the relevant offices, supports new program development and implementation.
- 5.5.3. Analyzes program costing for major curriculum modifications and other minor curriculum modifications, as required, to programs.
- 5.5.4. Provides institutional data for the development of new programs, periodic program reviews, and major modifications.

### **5.6. Vice Provost Academic**

- 5.6.1. Submits undergraduate new program Letters of Intent to the Provost and Vice-President Academic; submits full undergraduate new program proposals to the Academic Standards Committee (ASC); submits to Senate a brief of a new undergraduate program proposal along with the ASC's recommendations; and, in collaboration with relevant offices, supports new program development and implementation.
- 5.6.2. Maintains periodic program review schedules for undergraduate programs; communicates, advises, and monitors the periodic program review process; assesses the undergraduate periodic program review self study and appendices for completeness prior to giving permission for a peer review team site visit; submits undergraduate periodic program reviews and subsequent Follow-up Reports to the ASC; submits to Senate an undergraduate periodic program review FAR and the ASC's recommendations; submits periodic program review Follow-up Reports to Senate, for information.
- 5.6.3. Advises undergraduate programs on curriculum modifications; submits Category 3 minor curriculum modification proposals and major curriculum modification proposals to the ASC for assessment; submits to Senate Category 3 minor curriculum modifications proposals and major curriculum modification proposals and the ASC's recommendations for approval.
- 5.6.4. Resolves disputes between Faculty Deans or Dean of Record or between a Faculty Dean or Dean of Record and a Department/School/Faculty Council

with respect to undergraduate curriculum modifications.

- 5.6.5. Reports, as required, to the Quality Council, in consultation with the Provost and Vice-President Academic, including an annual report on Senate-approved undergraduate and graduate major curriculum modifications and FARs of periodic program reviews.
- 5.6.6. Implements the Quality Council Audit process, and oversees the undergraduate requirements of the cyclical Audit.
- 5.6.7. Posts the Executive Summary of new undergraduate and graduate programs and the Final Assessment Report of undergraduate and graduate periodic program reviews on the Ryerson University Curriculum Quality Assurance website with links to the Senate website and the Provost and Vice-President Academic's website.

#### **5.7. Vice-Provost and Dean, Yeates School of Graduate Studies (YSGS)**

- 5.7.1. Submits new graduate program Letters of Intent to the Provost and Vice-President Academic; submits new graduate program proposals to the YSGS Council for approval to recommend to Senate; submits to Senate a brief of the new graduate program proposal and YSGS Council's recommendation for approval; and, in collaboration with relevant offices, supports new program development and implementation.
- 5.7.2. Maintains periodic program review schedules for graduate programs; communicates, advises, and monitors the periodic program review process; gives permission for a peer review team site visit following the YSGS Programs and Planning Committee's (PPC) assessment of the graduate periodic program review self-study and appendices for completeness, and submits graduate periodic program reviews and subsequent Follow-up Reports to the YSGS PPC, followed by the YSGS Council. Submits to Senate a graduate periodic program review FAR and the YSGS Council's recommendations; submits periodic program review Follow-up Reports to Senate, for information.
- 5.7.3. Advises programs on curriculum modifications; submits minor curriculum modification proposals to the Programs and Planning Committee for review; submits major curriculum modification proposals to the Programs and Planning Committee followed by the YSGS Council for approval to recommend to Senate, followed by submission to Senate.
- 5.7.4. Submits to Senate the YSGS Council's recommendations regarding new graduate programs, periodic program reviews for graduate programs, Category 3 minor curriculum modifications (for information), and major curriculum modifications.
- 5.7.5. Resolves disputes between Faculty Deans or Dean of Record or between a

Faculty Dean or Dean of Record and a Department/School/Faculty Council with respect to graduate curriculum modifications.

- 5.7.6. Appoints Peer Review Teams for graduate programs, as appropriate, in consultation with the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record.
- 5.7.7. Responds to the Peer Review Team Report as well as to the Program Response and the Faculty Dean's Response to the Peer Review Team Report for new graduate degree program proposals and for periodic program reviews of graduate programs, as applicable.
- 5.7.8. Oversees the graduate requirements of the Quality Council cyclical audit process.

## **5.8. Faculty Dean or Dean of Record**

- 5.8.1. Submits Letters of Intent for new program proposals to the Vice Provost Academic or the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS, as appropriate.
- 5.8.2. Submits full new program proposals to the Vice Provost Academic or the Vice-Provost and Dean of the YSGS, as appropriate, and, in collaboration with relevant offices, supports new program development and implementation.
- 5.8.3. Endorses an undergraduate periodic program review self-study and appendices prior to submission to a Peer Review Team.
- 5.8.4. Endorses a periodic program review self-study and appendices of graduate programs in consultation with the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS.
- 5.8.5. Appoints Peer Review Teams for undergraduate programs.
- 5.8.6. Provides consultation to the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS regarding the appointment of Peer Review Teams for graduate programs, where applicable.
- 5.8.7. Reviews mandated Follow-up Reports to ensure progress with the recommendations from ASC or YSGS Council. If it is believed that there has not been sufficient progress, an additional update and course of action by a specified date may be required.
- 5.8.8. Endorses minor modifications (Category 2 and Category 3) and major modifications to undergraduate programs.
- 5.8.9. Endorses minor modifications (Category 2 and Category 3) and major modifications to graduate programs, in consultation with the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS.

- 5.8.10. Resolves disputes between a Department/School/Program Council and Faculty Council, if applicable, and Chair/ Director with respect to curriculum modification, as required.
- 5.8.11. Responds to reports of the periodic program review and/or new program Peer Review Team and subsequent program responses, as applicable.

**5.9. Chair/Director of Department/School (or designated academic unit)**

- 5.9.1. Oversees the preparation of a Letter of Intent for new program proposals and submits to the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record, as appropriate;
- 5.9.2. Oversees preparation of a new program proposal and submits to the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record, as appropriate;
- 5.9.3. For periodic program reviews of undergraduate and graduate programs, oversees the preparation of the program self-study and appendices and presents the completed documents to the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record for initial review prior to presentation to Department/School/Program and Faculty Councils, where applicable.
- 5.9.4. Prepares a response to the periodic program review reports of Peer Review Teams for undergraduate and graduate programs.
- 5.9.5. Prepares a mandated periodic program review Follow-up Report for submission to the Provost and Vice-President Academic, Faculty Dean or Dean of Record, and Vice Provost Academic or Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS, as appropriate.
- 5.9.6. Prepares minor and major curriculum modifications, as required, and submits to the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record.

**5.10. Department/School/Program Council and Faculty Council (where applicable)**

- 5.10.1. Endorses Letters of Intent for new undergraduate and graduate programs and recommends these to the appropriate Faculty Dean or Dean of Record.
- 5.10.2. Endorses new program proposals for undergraduate and graduate programs, and recommends these to the appropriate Faculty Dean or Dean of Record.
- 5.10.3. Endorses periodic program review self-studies and appendices to be forwarded to the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record.
- 5.10.4. For undergraduate programs, endorses Category 1 minor curriculum modifications (or designates another approval process), Category 2 and

Category 3 minor curriculum modifications, and major curriculum modifications, and recommends these to the appropriate Faculty Dean of Dean of Record.

- 5.10.5. For graduate programs, endorses minor curriculum modifications (Category 1, Category 2 and Category 3) and major curriculum modifications, and recommends these to the appropriate Faculty Dean or Dean of Record.

## **6. REVIEW OF IQAP POLICIES AND PROCEDURES**

- 6.1. The Academic Governance and Policy Committee (AGPC) recommends to Senate the establishment of a Policy Review Committee, mandated by Senate, to undertake a periodic review or special review of an IQAP policy or policies.
- 6.2. Any revision of the University's IQAP policies requires approval by Senate, and any substantive revisions require ratification by the Quality Council.
- 6.3. Procedures associated with the IQAP policies are reviewed by the Provost and Vice-President Academic, as needed, to ensure their currency and effectiveness.

<b>APPENDIX 1: DEGREE LEVEL EXPECTATIONS FOR UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS</b>	
<b>UNDERGRADUATE DEGREE</b>	<b>Baccalaureate/Bachelor's Degree: honours</b> <i>This degree is awarded to students who have demonstrated the following:</i>
<b>EXPECTATIONS</b>	
<b>1. Depth and Breadth of Knowledge</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. A developed knowledge and critical understanding of the key concepts, methodologies, current advances, theoretical approaches and assumptions in a discipline overall, as well as in a specialized area of a discipline;</li> <li>b. A developed understanding of many of the major fields in a discipline, including, where appropriate, from an interdisciplinary perspective, and how the fields may intersect with fields in related disciplines;</li> <li>c. A developed ability to:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Gather, review, evaluate and interpret information; and</li> <li>ii. Compare the merits of alternate hypotheses or creative options, relevant to one or more of the major fields in a discipline;</li> </ul> </li> <li>d. A developed, detailed knowledge of and experience in research in an area of the discipline;</li> <li>e. Developed critical thinking and analytical skills inside and outside the discipline;</li> <li>f. The ability to apply learning from one or more areas outside the discipline.</li> </ul>
<b>2. Knowledge of Methodologies</b>	<p>An understanding of methods of enquiry or creative activity, or both, in their primary area of study that enables the student to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Evaluate the appropriateness of different approaches to solving problems using well established ideas and techniques;</li> <li>b. Devise and sustain arguments or solve problems using these methods; and describe and comment upon particular aspects of current research or equivalent advanced scholarship.</li> </ul>

<p><b>3. Application of Knowledge</b></p>	<p>a. The ability to review, present and critically evaluate qualitative and quantitative information to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Develop lines of argument;</li> <li>ii. Make sound judgments in accordance with the major theories, concepts and methods of the subject(s) of study;</li> <li>iii. Apply underlying concepts, principles, and techniques of analysis, both within and outside the discipline;</li> <li>iv. Where appropriate use this knowledge in the creative process; and</li> </ul> <p>b. The ability to use a range of established techniques to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Initiate and undertake critical evaluation of arguments, assumptions, abstract concepts and information;</li> <li>ii. Propose solutions;</li> <li>iii. Frame appropriate questions for the purpose of solving a problem;</li> <li>iv. Solve a problem or create a new work; and</li> </ul> <p>c. The ability to make critical use of scholarly reviews and primary sources.</p>
<p><b>4. Communication Skills</b></p>	<p>The ability to communicate information, arguments, and analyses accurately and reliably, orally and in writing to a range of audiences.</p>
<p><b>5. Awareness of Limits of Knowledge</b></p>	<p>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.</p>
<p><b>6. Autonomy and Professional Capacity</b></p>	<p>a. Qualities and transferable skills necessary for further study, employment, community involvement and other activities requiring:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The exercise of initiative, personal responsibility and accountability in both personal and group contexts;</li> <li>ii. Working effectively with others;</li> <li>iii. Decision-making in complex contexts;</li> </ul> <p>b. The ability to manage their own learning in changing circumstances, both within and outside the discipline and to select an appropriate program of further study; and</p> <p>c. Behaviour consistent with academic integrity and social responsibility.</p>

<b>APPENDIX 2: DEGREE LEVEL EXPECTATIONS FOR GRADUATE PROGRAMS</b>	
<b>MASTER'S DEGREE</b>	<i>This degree is awarded to students who have demonstrated:</i>
<b>EXPECTATIONS</b>	
<b>1. Depth and Breadth of Knowledge</b>	A systematic understanding of knowledge, and a critical awareness of current problems and/or new insights, much of which is at, or informed by, the forefront of their academic discipline, field of study,
<b>2. Research and Scholarship</b>	<p>A conceptual understanding and methodological competence that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Enables a working comprehension of how established techniques of research and inquiry are used to create and interpret knowledge in the discipline;</li> <li>b. Enables a critical evaluation of current research and advanced research and scholarship in the discipline or area of professional competence; and</li> <li>c. Enables a treatment of complex issues and judgments based on established principles and techniques; <b>and,</b></li> </ul> <p>On the basis of that competence, has shown at least one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The development and support of a sustained argument in written form; or</li> <li>b. Originality in the application of knowledge.</li> </ul>
<b>3. Level of Application of Knowledge</b>	Competence in the research process by applying an existing body of knowledge in the critical analysis of a new question or of a specific problem or issue in a new setting.
<b>4. Professional Capacity/Autonomy</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The qualities and transferable skills necessary for employment requiring:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The exercise of initiative and of personal responsibility and accountability; and</li> <li>ii. Decision-making in complex situations; and</li> </ul> </li> <li>b. The intellectual independence required for continuing professional development;</li> <li>c. The ethical behaviour consistent with academic integrity and the use of appropriate guidelines and procedures for responsible conduct of research; and</li> <li>d. The ability to appreciate the broader implications of applying knowledge to particular contexts.</li> </ul>
<b>5. Level of Communications Skills</b>	The ability to communicate ideas, issues and conclusions clearly.

<b>6. Awareness of Limits of Knowledge</b>	Cognizance of the complexity of knowledge and of the potential contributions of other interpretations, methods, and disciplines.
--	--

<b>DOCTORAL DEGREE</b>	<i>This degree extends the skills associated with the Master's degree and is awarded to students who have demonstrated the following:</i>
------------------------	---

<b>EXPECTATIONS</b>
---------------------

<b>1. Depth and Breadth of Knowledge</b>	A thorough understanding of a substantial body of knowledge that is at the forefront of their academic discipline or area of professional practice.
--	---

<b>2. Research and Scholarship</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The ability to conceptualize, design, and implement research for the generation of new knowledge, applications, or understanding at the forefront of the discipline, and to adjust the research design or methodology in the light of unforeseen problems;</li> <li>b. The ability to make informed judgments on complex issues in specialist fields, sometimes requiring new methods; and</li> <li>c. The ability to produce original research, or other advanced scholarship, of a quality to satisfy peer review, and to merit publication.</li> </ul>
------------------------------------	---

<b>3. Level of Application of Knowledge</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The capacity to undertake pure and/or applied research at an advanced level; and</li> <li>b. Contribute to the development of academic or professional skills, techniques, tools, practices, ideas, theories, approaches, and/or materials.</li> </ul>
---	--

<b>4. Professional Capacity/Autonomy</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The qualities and transferable skills necessary for employment requiring the exercise of personal responsibility and largely autonomous initiative in complex situations;</li> <li>b. The intellectual independence to be academically and professionally engaged and current;</li> <li>c. The ethical behaviour consistent with academic integrity and the use of appropriate guidelines and procedures for responsible conduct of research; and</li> <li>d. The ability to evaluate the broader implications of applying knowledge to particular contexts.</li> </ul>
--	---

<b>5. Level of Communication Skills</b>	The ability to communicate complex and/or ambiguous ideas, issues and conclusions clearly and effectively.
---	--

<b>6. Awareness of Limits of Knowledge</b>	An appreciation of the limitations of one's own work and discipline, of the complexity of knowledge, and of the potential contributions of other interpretations, methods, and disciplines.
--	---

POLICY 112

**RYERSON UNIVERSITY  
POLICY OF SENATE**

**DEVELOPMENT OF NEW GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS**

<b>Policy Number:</b>	112
<b>Previous Approval Dates:</b>	February 7, 1995 (original policy), May 9, 2002, March 1, 2005, May 6, 2008, May 3, 2011, November 4, 2014
<b>Current Policy Approval Date:</b>	March 6, 2018
<b>Next Policy Review Date:</b>	2023 <i>(or sooner at the request of the Provost and Vice President Academic or Senate)</i>
<b>Responsible Committee or Office:</b>	Provost and Vice-President Academic

---

A new program is defined as any undergraduate degree program or graduate degree or diploma program currently approved by Ryerson's Senate, which has not been previously approved for Ryerson University by the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (Quality Council), its predecessors, or any intra-institutional approval processes that previously applied. A new program has substantially different program requirements and substantially different program learning outcomes from those of any existing approved programs offered by the institution.

A new program proposal is prepared by a designated academic unit, defined as faculty groups that comprise faculty members from a single School/Department, from several Schools and/or Departments within a Faculty, from Schools/Departments from different Faculties, from other internal Ryerson units, or from collaborative structures involving other post-secondary institutions.

New program development is part of Ryerson University's Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP) which includes the following policies:

Policy 110: Institutional Quality Assurance Process

**Policy 112: Development of New Graduate and Undergraduate Programs**

Policy 126: Periodic Program Review of Graduate and Undergraduate Programs

Policy 127: Curriculum Modifications: Graduate and Undergraduate Programs

**1. PURPOSE**

This policy governs the creation of new programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels that require Quality Council approval.

## **2. SCOPE**

This policy includes all undergraduate and graduate programs, both full and part-time, offered solely by Ryerson or in partnership with any other post-secondary institutions.

## **3. DEFINITIONS**

- 3.1. Refer to Ryerson Senate Policy 110 for definitions related to this policy.
- 3.2. Refer to Ryerson Senate Policy 110 for Degree Level Expectations for Undergraduate and Graduate Programs.

## **4. EXTERNAL AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY**

### **4.1. Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (Quality Council)**

- 4.1.1. The Quality Council requires that new undergraduate and graduate program proposals are appraised by the Quality Council's Appraisal Committee. The Quality Council has the authority to approve or decline new program proposals.
- 4.1.2. The Quality Council audits the University's quality assurance process for new programs on an eight year cycle and determines whether the University has acted in compliance with the provisions of its IQAP.

## **5. INTERNAL AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY**

### **5.1. Ryerson University Board of Governors**

Approves new program proposals based on financial viability.

### **5.2. Senate**

- 5.2.1. Senate has final internal authority for the approval of all new undergraduate and graduate programs.
- 5.2.2. Senate has the final internal authority for the approval of all new and revised academic policies.

### **5.3. Standing Committees and Governance Council of Senate**

- 5.3.1. **Academic Standards Committee (ASC):** A standing Committee of Senate that assesses and provides recommendations to Senate for approval of new undergraduate program proposals.
- 5.3.2. **Yeates School of Graduate Studies Council (YSGS Council):** A Governance Council of Senate that assesses and provides recommendations to Senate for approval of new graduate program proposals.

- 5.3.2.1. **YSGS Programs and Planning Committee (PPC):** Assesses and make recommendations to YSGS Council on new graduate program proposals.

#### **5.4. Provost and Vice-President Academic**

- 5.4.1. Authorizes and oversees the posting of new program Letters of Intent to the Ryerson community.
- 5.4.2. Authorizes the development of new program proposals, and authorizes the commencement, implementation and budget of new programs.
- 5.4.3. Following Senate approval, reports new program proposals to the Board of Governors for review of financial viability.
- 5.4.4. Submits Senate approved new program proposals to the Quality Council for approval.

#### **5.5. Deputy Provost and Vice Provost University Planning**

- 5.5.1. Develops program costing and evaluates societal need, differentiation, and sustainable applicant pool, and evaluates employability of graduates for new program proposals.
- 5.5.2. In collaboration with the relevant offices, supports new program development and implementation.
- 5.5.3. Provides institutional data for the development of new programs.

#### **5.6. Vice Provost Academic**

- 5.6.1. Submits undergraduate new program Letters of Intent to the Provost and Vice-President Academic.
- 5.6.2. Reviews for completeness new undergraduate program proposals, after endorsement by the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record and prior to submission of the proposal to a Peer Review Team (PRT).
- 5.6.3. Submits new undergraduate program proposals to the Academic Standards Committee (ASC).
- 5.6.4. Submits to Senate undergraduate new program proposal briefs and ASC's recommendations for approval.
- 5.6.5. In collaboration with the relevant offices, supports new undergraduate program development and implementation.
- 5.6.6. Posts an Executive Summary of new undergraduate and graduate programs on the Ryerson University Curriculum Quality Assurance website with links

to the Senate website and the Provost and Vice-President Academic's website.

- 5.6.7. Develops a manual that details the process and supports the preparation of new undergraduate degree program proposals.

### **5.7. Vice-Provost and Dean, Yeates School of Graduate Studies (YSGS)**

- 5.7.1. Submits graduate new program Letters of Intent to the Provost and Vice-President Academic.
- 5.7.2. Submits new graduate program proposals to the PPC for a review for completeness, after endorsement by the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record and prior to submission of the proposal to a PRT.
- 5.7.3. Appoints PRTs for graduate programs in consultation with the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record.
- 5.7.4. Submits new graduate program proposals to the PPC and the YSGS Council.
- 5.7.5. Submits to Senate graduate new program proposal briefs and the YSGS Council's recommendations for approval regarding new graduate programs.
- 5.7.6. In collaboration with the relevant offices, supports new graduate program development and implementation.
- 5.7.7. Responds to the PRT Report, the designated academic unit's response to the PRT Report and the Faculty Dean's Response to the PRT Report for graduate programs.
- 5.7.8. Develops a manual that details the process and supports the preparation of new graduate program proposals.

### **5.8. Faculty Dean or Dean of Record<sup>1</sup>**

- 5.8.1. Submits Letters of Intent for new program proposals to the Vice Provost Academic or to the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS, as appropriate.
- 5.8.2. Submits new program proposals to the Vice Provost Academic or to the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS, as appropriate.
- 5.8.3. In collaboration with the relevant offices, supports new program development and implementation.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Dean of Record for Interdisciplinary Graduate Programs that cross faculty lines is the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS (Policy 45).

- 5.8.4. Appoints PRTs for undergraduate programs.
- 5.8.5. Provides consultation to the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS regarding the appointment of PRTs for graduate programs.
- 5.8.6. Responds to the PRT Report as well as to the designated academic unit's response to the PRT Report for undergraduate and graduate programs.

#### **5.9. Designated Academic Unit**

- 5.9.1. Oversees preparation of a Letter of Intent for new program proposals and submits to the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record, as appropriate.
- 5.9.2. Oversees preparation of a new program proposal and submits to the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record, as appropriate.
- 5.9.3. Prepares a written response to the PRT Report for undergraduate and graduate programs.

#### **5.10. Department/School/Program Council and Faculty Council (where applicable)**

- 5.10.1. Endorses Letters of Intent for new undergraduate programs and graduate programs and recommends these to the appropriate Faculty Dean or Dean of Record.
- 5.10.2. Endorses new program proposals for undergraduate and graduate programs, and recommends these to the appropriate Faculty Dean or Dean of Record.

### **6. IMPLEMENTATION**

A new program must be implemented within thirty-six months of its approval to commence by the Quality Council and Ryerson University's Board of Governors. After that time, the new program's approval will lapse.

### **7. REVIEW OF IQAP POLICIES AND PROCEDURES**

- 7.1. The review of Ryerson University's IQAP policies will follow the procedures set out in Ryerson Senate Policy 110.

## **POLICY 112: DEVELOPMENT AND APPROVAL OF NEW GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS**

### **PROCEDURES**

This document outlines the sequential stages of the developmental, review, and approval process of new undergraduate degree programs, graduate degree programs and graduate diploma programs.

As new graduate diploma programs fall under the Expedited Approval process, all of the Policy 112 procedures outlined below, with the exception of Section 4 (External Peer Review), must be completed.

A Field<sup>2</sup> can be declared as part of a graduate new program proposal.

#### **1. LETTER OF INTENT**

The first stage for a new program proposal is the development of a preliminary new program proposal, hereafter referred to as the Letter of Intent. The Letter of Intent is developed by an originating designated academic unit.

Consultations must take place during the development of the Letter of Intent, including, at least, all of the following:

- Faculty Dean or Dean of Record;
- Vice Provost Academic or the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS as appropriate;
- University Planning Office; and
- Registrar's Office.

##### **1.1. LETTER OF INTENT CONTENT**

The Letter of Intent must include all the following information. The Letter of Intent is part of the full new program proposal.

###### **Basic information**

- 1.1.1. Name and brief description of the proposed program, the proposed degree designation(s), identification of the designated academic unit, and the program governance structure; and
- 1.1.2. Discussion of the overlap between, and/or integration of, the program with other existing or planned programs at Ryerson.

---

<sup>2</sup> Refer to Senate Policy 110 for definition

**Program details** (*Quality Council requirements have been italicized*)

**1.1.3. Alignment with University's plans**

1.1.3.1. *Consistency of the program with the University's mission and academic plan;*

1.1.3.2. *Clarity and appropriateness of the program's requirements and associated program learning outcomes in addressing the University's own undergraduate or graduate Degree Level Expectations; and*

1.1.3.3. *Appropriateness of degree nomenclature.*

**1.1.4. Societal Need**

1.1.4.1. Evidence of societal need and labour market demand;

1.1.4.2. Evidence of student demand; and

1.1.4.3. Comparison of the proposed program with the most similar programs in Ontario or beyond and indicating that the proposed program differs from others 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.

**1.1.5. Admission requirements**

1.1.5.1. *A statement of the admission requirements and the appropriateness of the program's admission requirements for the program learning outcomes established for completion of the program; and*

1.1.5.2. *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.*

**1.1.6. Structure**

1.1.6.1. Presentation of the program curriculum in a clear table format;

1.1.6.2. *Appropriateness of the program's structure and regulations to meet intended program learning outcomes and degree level expectations; and*

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

1.1.6.4. For undergraduate programs, a rationale for any deviations from the

program balance requirements outlined in Ryerson Senate Policy #2.

**1.1.7. Mode of delivery**

1.1.7.1. *Appropriateness of the proposed mode(s) of delivery to meet the intended program learning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations.*

**1.1.8. Resources** (developed in consultation with the University Planning Office)

1.1.8.1. *Adequacy of the administrative unit's planned utilization of existing human, physical and financial resources, and any current institutional commitment to support the program;*

1.1.8.2. *Participation of a sufficient number and quality of faculty who are competent to teach and/or supervise in the program; and*

1.1.8.3. For graduate programs: a statement of whether the program is a professional program and/or a full cost recovery program.

**1.1.9. Appendices**

1.1.9.1. Appendix I: Template course outlines of each of the proposed core courses including those taught by Schools/Departments other than the Program Department. The course outline will include course descriptions, course objectives and learning outcomes; major topics of study, teaching methods, assessment methods, and potential text(s).

1.1.9.2. Appendix II: A schedule for the development of the program, noting that the program proposal must be presented to the ASC or YSGS Council within one year of the Provost and Vice-President Academic's authorization to proceed, along with the proposed schedule for program implementation.

1.1.9.3. Appendix III: Letters of support, if appropriate.

1.1.9.4. Appendix IV: An executive summary.

**1.2. ENDORSEMENTS AND REVIEWS OF LETTER OF INTENT (In Order)**

1.2.1. Endorsement of Letter of Intent by originating designated academic unit.

1.2.2. Endorsement to go forward by relevant Faculty Dean or Dean of Record.

1.2.3. Review by Vice Provost Academic or Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS, as appropriate.

1.2.4. Review by Deputy Provost and Vice Provost University Planning.

1.2.5. Review by Provost and Vice-President Academic, who decides whether the

Letter of Intent is ready to be reviewed by the Ryerson community.

- 1.2.6. If the proposal is deemed ready for review, the Provost and Vice-President Academic will post the complete Letter of Intent and the Executive Summary on the Provost and Vice-President Academic's website for a period of one month<sup>3</sup>.
- 1.2.7. Review of the Letter of Intent by any interested member of the Ryerson community. Written comments/feedback on the new program proposal may be submitted to the Provost and Vice-President Academic within the specified community-response period.

### **1.3. AUTHORIZATION TO PROCEED**

- 1.3.1. The Provost and Vice-President Academic will respond to the Letter of Intent after the expiry of the one-month community response period.
- 1.3.2. If the Provost and Vice-President Academic authorizes the development of a new program, an academic unit will be formally designated to assume responsibility for it and a Faculty Dean or Dean of Record will be given primary responsibility. The designated academic unit(s) may correspond to an existing School/Department or be newly created for the purpose of developing a full new program proposal. In the case of undergraduate inter-Faculty proposals, the Provost and Vice-President Academic will decide on a Dean of Record who will be given primary responsibility.
- 1.3.3. 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.

## **2. NEW PROGRAM PROPOSAL**

### **2.1. New Program Advisory Committee (for undergraduate programs only)**

Once authorization to proceed has been given, a New Program Advisory Committee will be constituted. This Committee will comprise at least five (5) members. The designated academic unit will provide the relevant Faculty Dean or Dean of Record with a list of suggested members and brief biographical sketches. The suggested members may be drawn, as appropriate, from business, industry, labour, agencies, government, and other universities. The Dean or Dean of Record will select the Advisory Committee members, in consultation with the designated academic unit, and will invite members to serve on the committee. As the proposal is developed, the role of the committee is to provide advice on:

---

<sup>3</sup> At the discretion of the Provost and Vice-President Academic the posting requirement may vary for graduate diplomas at the Master's and Doctoral level.

- 2.1.1. program learning outcomes;
- 2.1.2. proposed courses and curriculum structure;
- 2.1.3. equipment and other required support (where relevant);
- 2.1.4. likely employment patterns for graduates; and
- 2.1.5. any other aspects of the proposed program related to its learning outcomes, structure, societal relevance, and experiential learning opportunities.

## **2.2. Full New Program Proposal**

### **2.2.1. Letter of Intent**

- 2.2.1.1. The full new program proposal includes all of section 1.1, as described above in the Letter of Intent Content.

### **2.2.2. Program content**

- 2.2.2.1. *Ways in which the curriculum addresses the current state of the discipline or area of study;*
- 2.2.2.2. An analysis of the program's curriculum content in terms of professional licensing/accreditation requirements, if any;
- 2.2.2.3. *Identification of any unique or creative curriculum or program innovations or components, and experiential learning components;*
- 2.2.2.4. *For research-focused graduate programs, clear indication of the nature and suitability of the major research (scholarly, research and creative) requirements for degree completion; and*
- 2.2.2.5. *Evidence that each graduate program requires students to take a minimum of two-thirds of the course requirements from among graduate level courses.*

### **2.2.3. Assessment of teaching and learning**

- 2.2.3.1. *Appropriateness of the proposed methods for the assessment of student achievement of the program learning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations;*
- 2.2.3.2. *Completeness of plans for documenting and demonstrating the level of performance of students, consistent with the University's statement of its Degree Level Expectations; and*
- 2.2.3.3. Grading, academic continuance, and graduation requirements, if variant from Ryerson's graduate or undergraduate policies.

2.2.4. **Resources** (developed in consultation with the University Planning Office)

**For all new program proposals**

2.2.4.1. Report by the University library on existing and proposed collections and services to support the program's learning outcomes; and

2.2.4.2. *Evidence that there are adequate resources to sustain the quality of scholarship produced by undergraduate students as well as graduate students' scholarship, research, and creative activities, including information technology support, and laboratory access.*

**Resources for undergraduate programs only**

2.2.4.3. *Evidence of and planning for adequate numbers and quality of:*

*i) faculty and staff to achieve the learning outcomes of the program;*

*ii) evidence of plans and the commitment to provide the necessary resources in step with the implementation of the program;*

*iii) planned/anticipated class sizes;*

*iv) provision for supervision of experiential learning opportunities (if required); and*

*v) projection of the role of adjunct and part-time faculty.*

**Resources for graduate programs only**

2.2.4.4. *Evidence that faculty have the recent research (scholarly, research and creative) or professional/clinical expertise needed to sustain the program, promote innovation and foster an appropriate intellectual climate;*

2.2.4.5. *Where appropriate to the program, evidence that financial assistance for students will be sufficient to ensure adequate quality and numbers of students; and*

2.2.4.6. *Evidence of how supervisory loads will be distributed, and the qualifications and appointment status of faculty who will provide instruction and supervision.*

2.2.5. **Quality and other indicators**

2.2.5.1. *Definition and use of indicators that provide evidence of quality of the faculty (e.g., qualifications, research, innovation, creative, and scholarly record; appropriateness of collective faculty expertise to contribute substantively to the proposed program); and*

- 2.2.5.2. *Evidence of a program structure and faculty research (scholarly, research and creative) that will ensure the intellectual quality of the student experience.*
- 2.2.6. **Fields in a graduate program** (*optional - if a graduate program wishes to have a Quality Council endorsed field*)
- 2.2.6.1. *A list of Fields, if applicable, in the proposed Master's program; and/or*
- 2.2.6.2. *A list of the Fields, if applicable, in the proposed PhD program.*
- 2.2.7. **Appendices (in addition to Appendices I-IV, as described in Section 1.1.9 above)**
- 2.2.7.1. *Appendix V: Curriculum Vitae of the faculty members who will be involved in the development/delivery of the proposed program, formatted as per local norm.*
- 2.2.7.2. *Appendix VI: Copy of the Provost and Vice-President Academic's authorization to proceed.*
- 2.2.7.3. *Appendix VII: Documentation of approvals and related communications<sup>4</sup>.*
- 2.2.8. **Preliminary External Review for Graduate Programs**
- 2.2.8.1. *If a graduate program so desires, it may engage an external consultant to review the written documents, normally prior to presenting the proposal to the Department/School/Program Council and Faculty Council for endorsement, where appropriate. The consultant will be selected in consultation with the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record and the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS, and may not be a member of the subsequent PRT.*

### **3. ENDORSEMENT AND REVIEW OF NEW PROGRAM PROPOSAL**

#### **3.1. Faculty Dean or Dean of Record Endorsement**

- 3.1.1. The Faculty Dean or Dean of Record assumes involvement with all stages of the full proposal including review of the proposal before presentation to Department/School/Program Council(s) and Faculty Council(s), where appropriate. After the new program proposal has been endorsed by the Department/School/Program Council(s) and Faculty Council(s), where appropriate, it will be forwarded to the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record for

---

<sup>4</sup> Reviews, endorsements, approvals and related communications must be documented and retained at every stage of the development of the new program. The documentation (Appendix VII) accompanies the new program proposal that is submitted to the ASC or YSGS Council.

endorsement. Inter-Faculty programs will require the endorsement of the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record of all involved Faculties.

### **3.2. Departmental/School/Faculty Council Endorsement**

3.2.1. The full proposal for a new undergraduate or graduate program will be presented to the relevant Departmental/School/Program Council(s) and Faculty Councils, where appropriate, 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 or Dean of Record shall establish an appropriate committee, comprising members of related Department/School/Program Councils and Faculty Councils, where appropriate.

3.2.2. 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.

### **3.3. Undergraduate Review for Completeness**

3.3.1. Once an undergraduate new program proposal is endorsed by the participating Department/School Council(s) and the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record, the Faculty Dean or 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 the Peer Review Team receiving the proposal.

### **3.4. Graduate Review for Completeness**

3.4.1. Once a graduate new program proposal has been endorsed by the participating Program Council(s), it will be forwarded to the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record who will submit their letter of endorsement and the new program proposal to the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS. The Program and Planning Committee of YSGS Council will conduct a preliminary review for completeness of the proposal prior to the Peer Review Team receiving the proposal.

## **4. PEER REVIEW**

Peer review teams are required for new program proposals for both undergraduate degree programs and graduate degree programs. New graduate diplomas fall under an Expedited Approval process, as defined by the Quality Council (see Ryerson University's Policy 110) and do not require external reviewers.

As soon as possible after a proposal has been endorsed by Departmental/School Council(s) and Faculty Council, where appropriate, and by Faculty Dean or Dean of Record, and reviewed by the Vice Provost Academic, for undergraduate degree programs, or YSGS Council, for graduate degree programs, it will undergo review by

a PRT as described below.

#### **4.1. SELECTION OF PEER REVIEW TEAM (PRT) MEMBERS**

- 4.1.1. All members of the PRT will be at arm's length<sup>5</sup> from the program under review.
- 4.1.2. The external and internal reviewers will be active and respected in their field, and normally associate or full professors with program management experience.
- 4.1.3. If graduate and undergraduate reviews are done simultaneously, the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record, and the Vice Provost Academic and the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS must decide if a combined PRT or separate PRTs are required. Separate PRT reports are required.

##### **4.1.4. PRT for Undergraduate New Program Proposals**

The PRT for new undergraduate degree program proposals will consist of:

- 4.1.4.1. One external reviewer; and
- 4.1.4.2. 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.
- 4.1.4.3. 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, if applicable, one internal reviewer will be appointed from each participating institution.
- 4.1.4.4. 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.

##### **4.1.5. PRT for Graduate New Program Proposals**

The PRT for graduate new program proposals will consist of:

- 4.1.5.1. Two external reviewers qualified by discipline and experience to review the program(s); and

---

<sup>5</sup>. See Appendix A for information on arm's length selection of PRT members.

4.1.5.2. 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.

4.1.5.3. This PRT composition is the same for graduate programs that will be taught in collaboration with colleges or institutions outside of Ontario, Canada. In a joint program with other Ontario universities, unless one internal reviewer is agreed upon by all participating institutions, if applicable, one internal reviewer will be appointed from each participating institution.

4.1.5.4. External review of new graduate program proposals must be conducted on-site.

## **4.2. APPOINTMENT OF PEER REVIEW TEAM (PRT) MEMBERS**

### **4.2.1. Undergraduate**

4.2.1.1. The membership of the undergraduate PRT will be determined and appointed by the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record based on written information provided by the designated academic unit.

4.2.1.2. The designated academic unit will provide the Faculty Dean or 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).

4.2.1.3. Initial communications to the reviewers, such as interest, availability, and invitation to serve on a PRT, will come only from the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record.

4.2.1.4. The Faculty Dean or Dean of Record will invite one of the external reviewers to act as Chair of the PRT.

### **4.2.2. Graduate**

4.2.2.1. The membership of the graduate PRT will be determined by the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS in consultation with the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record and designated academic unit.

4.2.2.2. The designated academic unit will provide the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS with names and brief biographies of four or more faculty external to Ryerson and two or more faculty internal to Ryerson (if applicable).

4.2.2.3. Initial communications to the reviewers, such as interest, availability, and invitation to serve on a PRT, will come only from the Vice-Provost

and Dean, YSGS.

4.2.2.4. The Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS in consultation with the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record for graduate programs, will invite one of the external reviewers to act as Chair of the PRT.

### **4.3. THE MANDATE OF THE PEER REVIEW TEAM (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 address all of the following:

- 4.3.1. the consistency and alignment of the program's learning outcomes with the institution's mission, academic plans and degree level expectations, and appropriateness of the degree nomenclature;
- 4.3.2. the alignment of the program's learning outcomes with the admission requirements and sufficient explanation of any alternative admission requirements;
- 4.3.3. the appropriateness of the program's structure and regulations to meet specified program learning outcomes and degree level expectations, and for graduate programs a rationale for program length;
- 4.3.4. the effectiveness of the curriculum in reflecting the current state of the discipline, and the effectiveness of innovative or creative curriculum components. For graduate programs an indication of the nature and suitability of the major research (scholarly, research and creative) requirements and evidence of the requirement to take a minimum of two-thirds of the course requirements from among graduate level courses;
- 4.3.5. the appropriateness of the mode(s) of delivery to meet the program's learning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations;
- 4.3.6. the appropriateness of methods used to assess, document and demonstrate student achievement of the program's defined learning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations;
- 4.3.7. the appropriateness and effectiveness of the use of human, physical and financial resources, evidence of a sufficient number and quality of faculty, and evidence of resources to sustain quality scholarship, research, and creative activities;
- 4.3.8. the qualifications, appointment status and recent research (scholarly, research and creative) or professional/clinical expertise of faculty, and evidence of sufficient student financial assistance to ensure quality and numbers of students;

- 4.3.9. the evidence of adequate numbers and quality of faculty and staff to achieve the learning outcomes of the program, of planned/anticipated class sizes, of supervision for experiential learning opportunities (if required) and of adjunct and part-time faculty; and
- 4.3.10. indicators of quality including faculty, program structure and faculty research (scholarly, research and creative) that will ensure the intellectual quality of the student experience.

#### **4.4. INFORMATION PROVIDED TO THE PEER REVIEW TEAM BEFORE THE SITE VISIT**

- 4.4.1. The PRT will be provided with a Letter of Invitation from the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record for undergraduate programs or the Vice-Provost and Dean YSGS for graduate programs, along with the PRT's mandate, information on the University, and its mission and mandate. The designated academic unit 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.

#### **4.5. THE PEER REVIEW TEAM (PRT) SITE VISIT**

The PRT will be provided with:

- 4.5.1. 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.
- 4.5.2. Coordination of site visits to Ontario institutions offering joint programs (excluding college collaborative programs), where appropriate, and any additional information that may be needed to support a thorough review.
- 4.5.3. **Undergraduate**
  - 4.5.3.1. At the opening of the site visit the Vice Provost Academic will review the PRT mandate, the format for the PRT Report, and the timeline for completion of the PRT Report.
  - 4.5.3.2. 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 or Dean of Record, and any others who may be invited by the Faculty Dean or PRT.

#### **4.5.4. Graduate**

- 4.5.4.1. At the opening of the site visit the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS will

review the PRT mandate, the format for the PRT Report, and the timeline for completion of the PRT Report.

- 4.5.4.2. At the close of the site visit, the PRT will hold a debriefing involving the Provost and Vice-President Academic, the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS, the Faculty Dean, and any others who may be invited.

## **4.6. PEER REVIEW TEAM (PRT) REPORT**

### **4.6.1. Undergraduate**

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

### **4.6.2. Graduate**

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

## **5. RESPONSES TO THE PEER REVIEW TEAM (PRT) REPORT**

### **5.1. DESIGNATED ACADEMIC UNIT'S RESPONSE**

#### **5.1.1. Undergraduate and Graduate**

- 5.1.1.1. Within four weeks of receipt of the PRT Report, the designated academic unit will submit its response to the Faculty Dean or 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, reasons for this.

### **5.2. FACULTY DEAN OR DEAN OF RECORD'S RESPONSE**

#### **5.2.1. Undergraduate**

- 5.2.1.1. 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 or Dean of Record. The Faculty Dean or Dean of

Record will provide a response to each of the following:

- 5.2.1.1.1. the recommendations of the PRT;
- 5.2.1.1.2. the designated academic unit's response to the PRT Report;  
and
- 5.2.1.1.3. any changes in organization, policy or governance required to meet the recommendations.
- 5.2.1.1.4. 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 or Dean of Record to the Vice Provost Academic.
- 5.2.1.1.5. If the Faculty Dean or 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 Council(s) and Faculty Councils, where appropriate, for further endorsement before providing decanal endorsement.

### **5.3. FACULTY DEAN OR DEAN OF RECORD'S RESPONSE and VICE-PROVOST AND DEAN, YSGS RESPONSE**

#### **5.3.1. Graduate**

5.3.1.1. 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 or Dean of Record and by the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS. The Faculty Dean or Dean of Record and the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS will each provide a response to the following:

- 5.3.1.1.1. the recommendations of the PRT;
- 5.3.1.1.2. the designated academic unit's response to the PRT Report;
- 5.3.1.1.3. any changes in organization, policy or governance required to meet the recommendations; and
- 5.3.1.1.4. the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS will also provide a response to the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record's Response.

5.3.1.2. 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 or Dean of Record to the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS.

5.3.1.3. If the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record and the Vice-Provost and Dean,

YSGS believe that this document differs substantially from the original, it must be resubmitted to the Department/School/Program Council(s) for further endorsement before providing decanal endorsement.

## **6. ASSESSMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF ACADEMIC STANDARDS COMMITTEE (ASC) OR YSGS COUNCIL**

### **6.1. Undergraduate**

6.1.1. The designated academic unit submits to the Vice Provost Academic the 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 or Dean of Record, and the associated documentation (see Section 2.2.7). The Vice Provost Academic will submit the full new program proposal to the ASC.

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

6.1.2.1. that the new program proposal be recommended for approval by Senate, with or without qualification;

6.1.2.2. that the new program proposal be returned to the designated academic unit for further revision; or

6.1.2.3. that the new program proposal not be recommended for approval by Senate.

### **6.2. Graduate**

6.2.1. The designated academic unit submits to the YSGS, for submission to the PPC, the new program proposal, with any revisions, together with the PRT Report, the responses to the PRT Report by the Designated Academic Unit, the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record, and the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS, and the associated documentation (see Section 2.2.7). The PPC will make one the following recommendations:

6.2.1.1. that the new program proposal be sent to the YSGS Council with or without qualification; or

6.2.1.2. that the new program proposal be returned to the designated academic unit for further revision.

6.2.2. Upon recommendation by the PPC, the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS will submit the new program proposal, to the YSGS Council.

6.2.3. The YSGS Council will assess the proposal for academic quality and societal need and make one of the following recommendations:

6.2.3.1. that the new program proposal be recommended for approval by Senate, with or without qualification;

6.2.3.2. that the new program proposal be returned to the designated academic unit for further revision; or

6.2.3.3. that the new program proposal not be recommended for approval by Senate.

## **7. SENATE APPROVAL**

7.1. The Vice Provost Academic (as Chair of the ASC) for undergraduate program proposals, or the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS (as Chair of the YSGS Council) for graduate program proposals, will submit a report of the new program proposal to Senate, as appropriate. Senate approval is the culmination of the internal academic approval process for new program proposals.

## **8. QUALITY COUNCIL APPROVAL**

8.1. 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.

## **9. PRESENTATION TO THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS**

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

## **10. PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION**

10.1. Final implementation of the program is the responsibility of the Provost and Vice-President Academic.

## **11. PERIODIC PROGRAM REVIEW**

11.1. All new undergraduate degree programs, graduate degree programs, and graduate diploma 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

### 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 supervisor, advisor or colleague.

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 to be likely, to be predisposed, positively or negatively, about the program.

#### 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 of 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.

**Source: Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (Quality Council)**



**RYERSON UNIVERSITY  
POLICY OF SENATE**

**PERIODIC PROGRAM REVIEW OF GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE  
PROGRAMS**

<b>Policy Number:</b>	126
<b>Previous Approval Dates:</b>	April 5, 2005; May 6, 2008; November 2, 2010; May 3, 2011, May 3, 2011, May 7, 2013, November 4, 2014
<b>Current Policy Approval Date:</b>	March 6, 2018
<b>Next Policy Review Date:</b>	May 2023 <i>(or sooner at the request of the Provost and Vice- President Academic or Senate)</i>
<b>Responsible Committee or Office:</b>	Provost and Vice-President Academic

---

Periodic program review (PPR) serves primarily to ensure that programs achieve and maintain the highest possible standards of academic quality and continue to satisfy societal need. All undergraduate and graduate programs are required to undertake a periodic program review on an eight-year cycle.

Periodic program review is part of Ryerson University's Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP) which includes the following policies:

Policy 110: Institutional Quality Assurance Process

Policy 112: Development of New Graduate and Undergraduate Programs

**Policy 126: Periodic Program Review of Graduate and Undergraduate Programs**

Policy 127: Curriculum Modifications: Graduate and Undergraduate Programs

**1. PURPOSE**

This policy governs the review of undergraduate and graduate programs that have been approved by Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (Quality Council).

**2. SCOPE**

This policy includes all undergraduate and graduate programs, both full and part-time, offered solely by Ryerson or in partnership with any other post-secondary institutions. Programs offered jointly with other post-secondary institutions will be subject to the periodic program review policies of all the institutions.

### **3. DEFINITIONS**

3.1. Refer to Policy 110 for definitions related to this policy.

3.2. Refer to Policy 110 for Degree Level Expectations for Undergraduate and Graduate Programs.

### **4. EXTERNAL AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY**

#### **4.1. Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (Quality Council)**

4.1.1. The Quality Council reviews PPR Final Assessment Reports (FARs) on an annual basis.

4.1.2. The Quality Council audits the quality assurance process for PPR on an eight-year cycle and determines whether the University has acted in compliance with the provisions of its IQAP.

### **5. INTERNAL AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY**

#### **5.1. Senate**

5.1.1. Senate has the final authority for the approval of PPRs of all Ryerson programs.

5.1.2. Senate has the final internal authority for the approval of all new and revised academic policies.

#### **5.2. Standing Committees and Governance Council of Senate**

5.2.1. **Academic Standards Committee (ASC):** A Standing Committee of Senate that assesses and provides recommendations to Senate for approval of undergraduate PPRs and assesses PPR Follow-up Reports as an information item for Senate. An additional update and course of action by a specified date may be requested of the program if ASC believes that there has not been sufficient progress.

5.2.2. **Yeates School of Graduate Studies Council (YSGSC):** A Governance Council of Senate that assesses and provides recommendations to Senate for approval of graduate program PPRs, and assesses PPR Follow-up Reports as an information item for Senate. An additional update and course of action by a specified date may be requested of the program if the YSGSC believes that there has not been sufficient progress.

- 5.2.2.1. **YSGS Programs and Planning Committee (PPC):** A committee of the YSGSC that reviews the PPR self studies and appendices of graduate programs for completeness and determines if there are any issues prior to submission to a peer review team. Assesses complete graduate PPRs and provides recommendations to YSGSC.

### **5.3. Provost and Vice-President Academic**

- 5.3.1. Following Senate approval, reports the outcomes of a PPR to the Board of Governors.
- 5.3.2. Submits FARs, including Implementation Plans and Executive Summaries, for all undergraduate and graduate PPRs to Quality Council annually, as per Quality Council's required process.
- 5.3.3. Is responsible for the University's participation in the Quality Council cyclical audit process.

### **5.4. Deputy Provost and Vice Provost University Planning**

- 5.4.1. Provides institutional data for PPRs.

### **5.5. Vice Provost Academic**

- 5.5.1. Has authority for PPRs of all undergraduate degree programs.
- 5.5.2. Is responsible for the undergraduate PPR schedule, for informing programs in written format of their forthcoming review, and for providing an orientation to PPR.
- 5.5.3. Is responsible for advising and monitoring throughout the PPR process.
- 5.5.4. Assesses PPR self studies and appendices for completeness and determines if there are any issues prior to submission to a Peer Review Team (PRT).
- 5.5.5. Forwards complete PPRs to the ASC for their review and recommendation for approval to Senate.
- 5.5.6. Ensures that there is a FAR, Implementation Plan, and Executive Summary for each PPR.
- 5.5.7. Submits an undergraduate program FAR, including recommendations from ASC, for assessment and approval by Senate.
- 5.5.8. Forwards mandated Follow-up Reports to the ASC for their information, assessment, and report to Senate, then forwards to Senate for information.
- 5.5.9. Develops a manual that details the process and supports the preparation of

the PPR of undergraduate degree programs.

#### **5.6. Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS**

- 5.6.1. Has authority for PPRs of all graduate programs.
- 5.6.2. Is responsible for the graduate PPR schedule, for informing graduate programs in written format of their forthcoming review, and for providing an orientation to PPR.
- 5.6.3. Is responsible for advising and monitoring throughout the PPR process.
- 5.6.4. Responds to the PRT Report as well as to the Program Response and the Faculty Dean's Response to the PRT Report for graduate programs.
- 5.6.5. Ensures that there is a FAR, Implementation Plan, and Executive Summary for each graduate PPR.
- 5.6.6. Submits graduate program FARs, including recommendations, to Senate for assessment and approval.
- 5.6.7. Forwards mandated Follow-up Reports to YSGSC for its information, assessment, and report to Senate, then forwards to Senate for information.
- 5.6.8. Develops a manual that details the process and supports the preparation of the PPR of graduate degree programs.

#### **5.7. Faculty Dean or Dean of Record<sup>1 2</sup>**

- 5.7.1. Reviews the undergraduate PPR self study and appendices prior to submission to Department/School/Program/Faculty Council(s) and endorses the self study and appendices following Council endorsement.
- 5.7.2. Appoints Peer Review Teams (PRT) for undergraduate programs.
- 5.7.3. Provides consultation to the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS regarding the appointment of PRTs for graduate programs.
- 5.7.4. Responds to the PRT Report as well as to the Program Response to the PRT Report for undergraduate and graduate programs.
- 5.7.5. For undergraduate programs, reviews mandated Follow-up Reports to ensure progress with the recommendations from ASC and ensures that the implementation plan is effectively accomplished in a timely manner. If it is believed that there has not been sufficient progress, an additional update and

---

<sup>1</sup> The Dean of Record for interdisciplinary graduate programs that cross faculty lines is the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS (Policy 45).

<sup>2</sup> See Ryerson Senate Policy 110 for definition.

course of action by a specified date may be required.

- 5.7.6. For graduate programs, reviews mandated Follow-up Reports to ensure that the implementation plan is effectively accomplished in a timely manner. If it is believed that there has not been sufficient progress, an additional update and course of action by a specified date may be required.

## **5.8. Chair/Director**

### **5.8.1. Undergraduate Chair/Director of Department/School**

- 5.8.1.1. Oversees the preparation of the undergraduate program self study and appendices within the appropriate timelines.
- 5.8.1.2. Actively engages faculty, staff and students in the periodic program review process.
- 5.8.1.3. Presents a completed PPR self study and appendices to the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record for initial review prior to presentation to Department/School/Program and/or Faculty Councils, as appropriate.
- 5.8.1.4. Prepares a response to the PRT Report.
- 5.8.1.5. Prepares the mandated PPR Follow-up Report for submission to the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record, and the Vice Provost Academic by the specified date, normally within one year of Senate approval of the program review.
- 5.8.1.6. Administers the implementation plan to ensure that it is effectively accomplished in a timely manner.

### **5.8.2. Graduate Program Director**

- 5.8.2.1. Oversees the preparation of the graduate program self study and appendices within the appropriate timelines.
- 5.8.2.2. Actively engages Chairs/Directors, faculty, staff and students in the periodic program review process.
- 5.8.2.3. Presents a completed PPR self study and appendices to the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record for graduate programs for initial review prior to presentation to Program Council.
- 5.8.2.4. Prepares a response to the PRT Report.
- 5.8.2.5. Prepares the mandated PPR Follow-up Report for submission to the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record, and the Vice Provost and Dean YSGS by the specified date, normally within one year of Senate

approval of the review.

5.8.2.6. Administers the implementation plan to ensure that it is effectively accomplished in a timely manner.

**5.9. Department/School/Program and Faculty Council (where applicable)**

5.9.1. Endorses the undergraduate or graduate self study and appendices prior to submission to the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record.

**6. REVIEW OF IQAP POLICY AND PROCEDURES**

6.1. The review of Ryerson's IQAP policies will follow the procedures set out in Ryerson University's IQAP Policy 110.

## **POLICY 126: PERIODIC PROGRAM REVIEW FOR GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS PROCEDURES**

This document outlines the sequential stages of the PPR including the self study report, the peer review and report, responses to the PRT Report, assessments, endorsements, and approvals of undergraduate and graduate PPRs and implementation of recommendations.

### **1. THE SELF STUDY REPORT**

The self study has descriptive, explanatory, evaluative and formative functions. It provides an opportunity for programs to assess academic quality and societal need. It is essential that the self-study is reflective, self-critical and analytical, and that it actively involve both faculty and students in the process. The Vice Provost Academic and the YSGS Associate Dean, Programs, as appropriate, will advise programs throughout the review process on matters of content and format and to ensure that policy requirements are met.

#### **1.1. Objectives (Quality Council requirements have been italicized)**

- 1.1.1. *Program requirements and learning outcomes are consistent with the University's mission and academic plan;*
- 1.1.2. *Program requirements and learning outcomes are clear, appropriate and align with the institution's statement of the undergraduate and/or graduate Degree Level Expectations; and*
- 1.1.3. *Program addresses societal need.*

#### **1.2. Admission requirements**

- 1.2.1. *Admission requirements are appropriately aligned with the learning outcomes established for completion of the program.*

#### **1.3. Curriculum**

- 1.3.1. *The curriculum reflects the current state of the discipline or area of study;*
- 1.3.2. *Evidence of any significant innovation or creativity in the content and/or*

*delivery of the program, including experiential learning opportunities; and*

*1.3.3. Mode(s) of delivery to meet the program's identified learning outcomes are appropriate and effective.*

#### **1.4. Teaching and assessment**

*1.4.1. Appropriateness and effectiveness of the methods for assessing student achievement of the defined program learning outcomes and degree level expectations;*

*1.4.2. Appropriateness and effectiveness of the means of assessment, especially in the students' final year of the program, in clearly demonstrating achievement of the program learning outcomes and the institution's statement of Degree Level Expectations; and*

*1.4.3. Grading, academic continuance, and graduation requirements, if variant from Ryerson's graduate or undergraduate policies.*

#### **1.5. Resources**

*1.5.1. Appropriateness and effectiveness of the academic unit's use of existing human, physical and financial resources in delivering its program(s); and*

*1.5.2. The appropriateness and effectiveness of academic services (e.g. library, co-op, technology, etc.) to support the program(s) being reviewed.*

#### **1.6. Quality indicators**

*1.6.1. **Faculty:** qualifications, scholarly, research and creative (SRC) record; class sizes; percentage of classes taught by permanent or non-permanent (contractual) faculty; numbers, assignments and qualifications of part-time or temporary faculty;*

*1.6.2. **Students:** applications and registrations; attrition rates; time-to-completion; final-year academic achievement; academic awards; student in-course reports on teaching; and*

*1.6.3. **Graduates:** rates of graduation, employment six months and two years after graduation, post-graduate study, "skills match" and alumni reports on program quality when available and when permitted by the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (FIPPA).*

#### **1.7. Quality enhancement**

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

## **1.8. Additional graduate program criteria**

*1.8.1. Evidence that students' time-to-completion is both monitored and managed in relation to the program's defined length and program requirements;*

*1.8.2. Quality and availability of graduate supervision; and*

*1.8.3. Definition and application of indicators that provide evidence of faculty, student and program quality, for example:*

*1.8.3.1. Faculty: funding, honours and awards, and commitment to student mentoring;*

*1.8.3.2. Students: grade-level for admission, scholarly output, success rates in provincial and national scholarships, competitions, awards and commitment to professional and transferable skills;*

*1.8.3.3. Program: evidence of a program structure and faculty research that will ensure the intellectual quality of the student experience; and*

*1.8.3.4. Sufficient graduate level courses that students will be able to meet the requirement that two-thirds of their course requirements be met through courses at this level.*

## **1.9. Recommendations and Implementation Plan**

*1.9.1. Identify and prioritize program recommendations, including priorities for implementation, who will be responsible for acting on those recommendations, and timelines for acting on and monitoring the implementation of those recommendations.*

## **1.10. Executive Summary**

*1.10.1. An executive summary suitable for posting on the university website.*

## **1.11. Appendices**

*1.11.1. Appendix I: Data, and reports supporting the self study, as outlined in PPR Manuals*

*1.11.2. Appendix II: Concerns and recommendations raised in previous reviews: document and address*

*1.11.3. Appendix III: Faculty Curriculum Vitae*

*1.11.4. Appendix IV: Courses Outlines*

1.11.5. Appendix V: Documentation of Approvals and Related Communications<sup>3</sup>

Detailed guidelines for the Self-Study and Appendices are in PPR Manuals, provided by the Office of the Vice Provost Academic and the Yeates School of Graduate Studies.

## **2. PROTOCOL FOR CONCURRENT UNDERGRADUATE AND GRADUATE PERIODIC PROGRAM REVIEWS**

- 2.1. Where there are concurrent undergraduate and graduate PPRs, separate self studies and appendices are required.
- 2.2. External peer reviews of both undergraduate and graduate programs may be coordinated if the Department/School chooses to do so; however, separate PRT Reports are required.

## **3. PROTOCOL FOR JOINT PROGRAMS**

- 3.1. The self study clearly explains how input was received from faculty, staff and students at each partner institution. There will be a single self study.
- 3.2. Selection of the reviewers involves participation by each partner institution.
  - 3.2.1. Where applicable, selection of the internal reviewer requires joint input;
  - 3.2.2. The selection of the peer reviewer could include one internal to represent all partners; and
  - 3.2.3. The selection could give preference to an internal reviewer who is from another joint program, preferably with the same partner institution.
- 3.3. The site visit involves all partner institutions and preferably at all sites.
  - 3.3.1. Reviewers consult faculty, staff and students at each partner institution, preferably in person.
- 3.4. Feedback on the reviewers' report is solicited from participating units at each partner institution, including the Deans or Dean of Record.
- 3.5. Preparation of a FAR requires input from each partner.

---

<sup>3</sup> Reviews, endorsements, approvals and related communications must be documented and retained at every stage of the PPR process. The documentation (1.11.5. Appendix V) accompanies the complete PPR that is submitted to the ASC or YSGS Council (Section 9.0).

- 3.5.1. There is one FAR that is subject to the appropriate governance processes at each partner institution;
- 3.5.2. The FAR is posted on the university website of each partner;
- 3.5.3. Partner institutions agree on an appropriate monitoring process for the Implementation Plan section of the FAR; and
- 3.5.4. The FAR should be submitted to the Quality Council by all partners.

#### **4. PROTOCOL FOR INTERDISCIPLINARY AND MULTIDISCIPLINARY PROGRAMS**

- 4.1. For multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary programs the Faculty Dean of Record will oversee the periodic program review.
- 4.2. The self study clearly explains how input was received from faculty, staff and students of the program. There will be a single self study and site visit.

#### **5. PROTOCOL FOR ACCREDITED PROGRAMS**

- 5.1. PPRs may be coordinated with any professional accreditation review, if feasible, and accreditation review information can be used to supplement the PPR; however, a self study and appendices, separate from an accreditation review, are required.
- 5.2. In the case of accredited programs, at their discretion, the Vice Provost Academic or the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS, as applicable, may require a separate Peer Review Team when the accrediting body's assessment does not fully cover all the areas required by the University's PPR process. The Peer Review Team Report must be a separate document from the Accreditation PRT Report.

#### **6. REVIEWS AND ENDORSEMENTS PRIOR TO SUBMISSION TO AN EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW TEAM**

##### **6.1. Department/School/Program Council; Faculty Council**

- 6.1.1. Following the review of the self study and appendices by the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record, the Department/School/Program Council and Faculty Council, as appropriate, will review and endorse the self study and appendices. A record will be kept of the date(s) of the relevant Council

meeting(s), along with any qualifications or limitations placed by the Council(s) on the endorsement.

## **6.2. Program Advisory Council (for Undergraduate Programs)**

6.2.1. Following endorsement by the Department/School/Program/Faculty Council(s), as appropriate, the self-study and appendices, along with any qualifications or limitations, will be sent to the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record for presentation to the Program Advisory Council (PAC) for its review and comments. A record will be kept of the date(s), minutes, and members attending the meeting(s). A response to the comments of the PAC may be included in the Peer Review Team (PRT) Report (see Section 7.6) and/or the responses to the PRT Report (see Section 8).

## **6.3. Faculty Dean or Dean of Record**

6.3.1. The Faculty Dean or Dean of Record will review the undergraduate self study and appendices for completeness and to determine if there are any issues prior to a review and endorsement by the Department/School/Program/Faculty Council.

6.3.2. Following endorsement of the self study and appendices by the Department/School/ Program Council and Faculty Council, as appropriate, and a review by the PAC (for undergraduate programs), the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record will endorse the self study and appendices for preliminary submission to the Vice Provost Academic for undergraduate PPRs, or to the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS for graduate PPRs.

## **6.4. Vice Provost Academic**

6.4.1. The Vice Provost Academic will review the undergraduate self study and appendices for completeness and to determine if there are any issues prior to submission to a Peer Review Team.

## **6.5. YSGS Programs and Planning Committee (PPC)**

6.5.1. The YSGS PPC will review the graduate self study and appendices for completeness and to determine if there are any issues prior to submission to a Peer Review Team.

# **7. PEER REVIEW**

As soon as possible after the self study and appendices have been reviewed for completeness by the Vice Provost Academic, for undergraduate programs, or the YSGS PPC, for graduate programs, it will undergo review by a Peer Review Team (PRT), as described below.

## 7.1. SELECTION OF PEER REVIEW TEAM (PRT) MEMBERS

- 7.1.1. PRTs are required for program reviews for undergraduate and graduate degree programs, and graduate diploma programs.
- 7.1.2. All members of the PRT will be at arm's length<sup>4</sup> from the program under review.
- 7.1.3. The external and internal reviewers will be active and respected in their field, and normally associate or full professors with program management experience.
- 7.1.4. If graduate and undergraduate program reviews are done concurrently, the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record, and the Vice Provost Academic and the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS must decide if combined or separate Peer Review Teams are required. Separate PRT Reports from the Peer Review Team(s) are required.

### 7.1.5. Undergraduate

The PRT for undergraduate program reviews will consist of:

- 7.1.5.1. One external reviewer qualified by discipline and experience to review the program(s); and
- 7.1.5.2. 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 program under review. Internal reviewers will provide external reviewers with an institutional perspective on related policies and processes.
- 7.1.5.3. The PRT composition is the same for programs taught in collaboration with colleges or institutions outside of Ontario. In a joint program with other Ontario universities, unless one internal reviewer is agreed upon by all participating institutions, if applicable, one internal reviewer will be appointed from each participating institution.

### 7.1.6. Graduate

The PRT for graduate program reviews will consist of:

- 7.1.6.1. Two external reviewers qualified by discipline and experience to review the program(s); and
- 7.1.6.2. One further external reviewer, or an internal reviewer from a related discipline (or interdisciplinary group) within the university.

---

<sup>4</sup> See Appendix A for information on arm's length selection of PRT members.

Internal reviewers are not members of the program under review. Internal reviewers will provide external reviewers with an institutional perspective on related policies and processes.

- 7.1.6.3. The PRT composition is the same for programs taught in collaboration with colleges or institutions outside of Ontario. In a joint program with other Ontario universities, unless one internal reviewer is agreed upon by all participating institutions, if applicable, one internal reviewer will be appointed from each participating institution.

#### **7.1.7. Concurrent Reviews**

The PRT for the concurrent review of an undergraduate and graduate program will consist of at least:

- 7.1.7.1. Two external reviewers qualified by discipline and experience to review the programs; and
- 7.1.7.2. 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 program under review. Internal reviewers will provide external reviewers with an institutional perspective on related policies and processes.

### **7.2. APPOINTMENT OF PEER REVIEW TEAM (PRT) MEMBERS**

#### **7.2.1. Undergraduate**

- 7.2.1.1. The membership of the undergraduate PRT will be determined and appointed by the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record based on written information provided by the program.
- 7.2.1.2. The program will provide the Faculty Dean or 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).
- 7.2.1.3. Initial communications to the reviewers, such as interest, availability, and invitation to serve on a PRT, will come only from the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record.
- 7.2.1.4. The Faculty Dean or Dean of Record will invite one of the external reviewers to act as Chair of the PRT.

#### **7.2.2. Graduate**

- 7.2.2.1. The membership of the graduate PRT will be determined by the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS in consultation with the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record and the program.

7.2.2.2. The program will provide the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS with names and brief biographies of four or more faculty external to Ryerson and two or more faculty internal to Ryerson (if applicable).

7.2.2.3. Initial communications to the reviewers, such as interest, availability, and invitation to serve on a PRT, will come only from the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS.

7.2.2.4. The Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS, in consultation with the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record for graduate programs, will invite one of the external reviewers to act as Chair of the PRT.

### **7.3. THE MANDATE OF THE PEER REVIEW TEAM (PRT)**

The general mandate of the PRT is to evaluate the academic quality of the program and the capacity of the School or Department to deliver it in an appropriate manner. The report of the PRT will address all of the following:

7.3.1. the clarity of the program's learning outcomes and their consistency with the institution's mission and academic plans, and alignment of the program's learning outcomes with the institution's degree level expectations;

7.3.2. the alignment of the program's learning outcomes with admission requirements;

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

7.3.4. the appropriateness and effectiveness of methods used to assess achievement of the program's learning outcomes and learning objectives;

7.3.5. the appropriateness and effectiveness of the academic unit's use of human, physical and financial resources and support services;

7.3.6. quality indicators relating to students, graduates and faculty;

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

7.3.8. initiatives taken to enhance the quality of the program and the associated learning and teaching environment.

7.3.9. **The PRT should, at the end of its report, specifically comment on:**

7.3.9.1. the program's strengths, weaknesses and opportunities;

7.3.9.2. the program's recommendations and implementation plan; and

- 7.3.9.3. the PRT's further recommendations for actions to improve the quality of the program, if any, distinguishing between those that the program can itself take and those that would require external action, where possible.

#### **7.4. INFORMATION PROVIDED TO THE PEER REVIEW TEAM BEFORE THE SITE VISIT**

##### **7.4.1. Undergraduate**

- 7.4.1.1. The PRT will be provided with a Letter of Invitation from the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record, the PRT's mandate, and information on the University and its mission and mandate. The program will provide to the PRT a site visit agenda along with the self study with all appendices. This communication will remind the PRT of the confidentiality of the documents presented.

##### **7.4.2. Graduate**

- 7.4.2.1. The PRT will be provided with a Letter of Invitation from the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS. The graduate program will provide their mandate and information on the University and its mission, a site visit agenda, and the self study with all appendices. This communication will remind the PRT of the confidentiality of the documents presented.

#### **7.5. THE PEER REVIEW TEAM (PRT) SITE VISIT**

- 7.5.1. The PRT will be provided with:

- 7.5.1.1. 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.

- 7.5.1.2. Coordination of site visits to Ontario institutions offering joint programs (excluding college collaborative programs), where appropriate; and any additional information that may be needed to support a thorough review.

##### **7.5.2. Undergraduate**

- 7.5.2.1. At the opening of the site visit the Vice Provost Academic will review the PRT mandate, the format for the PRT Report, and the timeline for completion of the PRT report.

- 7.5.2.2. 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 or Dean of Record, and any others who may be invited by the Faculty Dean or PRT.

### **7.5.3. Graduate**

7.5.3.1. At the opening of the site visit the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS will review the PRT mandate, the format for the PRT Report, and the timeline for completion of the PRT report.

7.5.3.2. At the close of the site visit, the PRT will hold a debriefing involving the Provost and Vice-President Academic, the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS, the Faculty Dean, and any others who may be invited by the Faculty Dean or PRT.

### **7.5.4. Concurrent**

7.5.4.1. At the opening of the site visit the Vice Provost Academic and the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS will review the PRT mandate, the format for the PRT Reports, and the timeline for completion of the PRT Reports.

7.5.4.2. 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 Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS, the Faculty Dean and any others who may be invited by the Faculty Dean or the PRT.

## **7.6. PEER REVIEW TEAM (PRT) REPORT**

### **7.6.1. Undergraduate**

7.6.1.1. Within four weeks of the completion of the site visit, the PRT for an undergraduate program will submit its written report to the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record and the Vice Provost Academic. The Faculty Dean or Dean of Record will forward this report to the Chair/Director of the program.

### **7.6.2. Graduate**

7.6.2.1. Within four weeks of the completion of the site visit, the PRT for a graduate program will submit its written report to the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS. The Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS will forward this report to the Chair/Director of the program and to the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record.

## **8. RESPONSES TO THE PEER REVIEW TEAM (PRT) REPORT**

### **8.1. PROGRAM RESPONSE**

#### **8.1.1. Undergraduate**

8.1.1.1. Within four weeks of receipt of the PRT Report, the program will submit a written response to the PRT Report to the Faculty Dean or Dean or Record. The written response may include any of the following:

- Comments, corrections and/or clarifications of items raised in the PRT Report;
- A revised implementation plan with an explanation of how the revisions reflect the further PRT recommendations and/or respond to the weaknesses or deficiencies identified in the PRT Report; and
- An explanation of why recommendations of the PRT will not be acted upon.

#### **8.1.2. Graduate**

8.1.2.1. Within four weeks of receipt of the PRT Report, the program will submit a written response to the PRT Report to the Vice Provost and Dean, YSGS and to the Faculty Dean. The written response may include any of the following:

- Comments, corrections and/or clarifications of items raised in the PRT Report;
- A revised implementation plan with an explanation of how the revisions reflect the further PRT recommendations and/or respond to the weaknesses or deficiencies identified in the PRT Report; and
- An explanation of why recommendations of the PRT will not be acted upon.

### **8.2. FACULTY DEAN'S OR DEAN OF RECORD'S RESPONSE**

8.2.1. For undergraduate and graduate programs, within four weeks a written response must be provided by the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record. The response will address:

- The recommendations proposed in the self-study report;
- Further recommendations of the PRT;

- The Program Response to the PRT Report;
- Any changes in organization, policy or governance required to meet the recommendations;
- The resources that would be provided to support the implementation of selected recommendations; and
- A proposed timeline for the implementation of any of those recommendations.

8.2.1.1. If the self study report or the implementation plan is revised following, or as a result of, the PRT review, the original and the revised documents must be resubmitted through the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record to the Vice-Provost Academic or the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS. If the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record and the Vice-Provost Academic or the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS believe that this document differs substantially from the original, it must be resubmitted to the Department/School/Program Council(s) and Faculty Councils, if appropriate, for further endorsement followed by decanal endorsement.

### **8.3. VICE-PROVOST and DEAN, YSGS'S RESPONSE**

8.3.1. For graduate programs, within four weeks a written response must be provided by the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS. The response will address:

- The recommendations proposed in the self-study report;
- Further recommendations of the PRT;
- The Program Response to the PRT Report;
- The Faculty Dean's Response to the PRT Report;
- Any changes in organization, policy or governance required to meet the recommendations;
- The resources that would be provided to support the implementation of selected recommendations; and
- A proposed timeline for the implementation of any of those recommendations.

8.3.1.1. If the self study report or the implementation plan is revised following, or as a result of, the PRT review, the original and the revised documents must be resubmitted through the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record to the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS. If the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record

and the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS believe that this document differs substantially from the original, it must be resubmitted to the Department/School/Program Council(s) and Faculty Councils, if appropriate, for further endorsement followed by endorsement by the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record and the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS.

## **9. ASSESSMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS BY ASC OR YSGS COUNCIL**

### **9.1. Academic Standards Committee (ASC)**

9.1.1. For undergraduate programs, the PPR, which includes the Self Study Report and Appendices (Section 1), with revisions if required, the PRT Report, the Program Response, and the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record's Response is submitted to the Vice Provost Academic for submission to the ASC for assessment.

9.1.2. The ASC will then make one of the following recommendations:

9.1.2.1. Senate approve the PPR, with a mandated Follow-up Report(s).

9.1.2.2. Senate approve the PPR with conditions, as specified, and with a mandated Follow-up Report(s).

9.1.2.3. The PPR be referred to the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record for further action in response to specified weaknesses and/or deficiencies.

9.1.2.4. The PPR, as submitted, be rejected.

### **9.2. Yeates School of Graduate Studies (YSGS)**

9.2.1. For graduate programs, the PPR, which includes the Self Study Report and Appendices (Section 1), with revisions if required, the PRT Report, the Program Response, the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record's Response, and the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS's Response is submitted to the YSGS Programs and Planning Committee (PPC).

9.2.1.1. The PPC will assess the PPR and make one the following recommendations:

9.2.1.1.1. That the PPR be sent to the YSGS Council with or without qualification;

9.2.1.1.2. That the PPR be returned to the program for further revision.

9.2.2. Upon approval by the YSGS PPC, the YSGS Council will assess the report and make one of the following recommendations:

9.2.2.1. Senate approve the PPR, with a mandated Follow-up Report(s).

9.2.2.2. Senate approve the PPR with conditions, as specified, and with a mandated Follow-up Report(s).

9.2.2.3. The PPR be referred to the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record for further action in response to specified weaknesses and/or deficiencies.

9.2.2.4. The PPR, as submitted, be rejected.

## **10. FINAL ASSESSMENT REPORT (FAR)**

10.1. For undergraduate programs, the Office of the Vice Provost Academic will prepare for Senate a Final Assessment Report (FAR)<sup>5</sup>, which includes the PPR implementation plan, and an executive summary.

10.2. For graduate programs, the Office of the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS will prepare for Senate a FAR, which includes the PPR implementation plan, and an executive summary.

10.3. If there is a concurrent review of an undergraduate and a graduate program, separate FARs will be prepared for Senate.

10.4. The FAR should include all the elements that are required within Quality Council's Quality Assurance Framework.

## **11. SENATE APPROVAL**

11.1. The Vice Provost Academic and/or the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS, as appropriate, will submit a PPR Report to Senate which includes the FAR and the requirements of a mandated Follow-up Report(s).

11.2. Senate has the final academic authority to approve the PPR Report to Senate, which includes the FAR and the mandated Follow-up Report(s).

---

<sup>5</sup> See Ryerson Senate Policy 110 for a definition.

## **12. FOLLOW-UP REPORT**

- 12.1. The PPR Report to Senate will include a date, within one year of Senate approval of the PPR, for a mandated Follow-up Report to be submitted to the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record and the Vice Provost Academic or the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS, as appropriate, on the progress of the implementation plan and any further recommendations. The PPR Report to Senate may also include a date(s) for subsequent Follow-up Reports.
- 12.2. The Chair/Director and Faculty Dean or Dean of Record, and the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS, if applicable, are responsible for requesting any additional resources identified in the PPR through the annual academic planning process. The relevant Faculty Dean or Dean of Record, or the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS, if applicable, is responsible for providing the identified resources, if feasible, and the Provost and Vice-President Academic is responsible for final approval of requests for extraordinary funding. Requests should normally be addressed, with a decision to either fund or not fund, within two budget years of the Senate approval of the PPR.
- 12.3. The Follow-up Report will include an indication of any resources that have been provided at the time of the report.
- 12.4. The Follow-Up Report(s) will be reviewed by the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record and ASC or YSGS Council, as appropriate. If it is believed that there has not been sufficient progress on the implementation plan, an additional update and course of action by a specified date may be required.
- 12.5. The Follow-up Report will be forwarded to Senate as an information item following review by the ASC or YSGS Council, as appropriate.

## **13. DISTRIBUTION REQUIREMENTS**

- 13.1. Under the direction of the Vice Provost Academic and the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS, the Office of the Vice Provost Academic shall publish the Executive Summary, the FAR, and the action of Senate for each approved PPR on Ryerson University's Curriculum Quality Assurance website with links to the Senate website and the Provost and Vice-President Academic's website.
- 13.2. Complete PPR documentation, respecting the provisions of FIPPA, will be made available through the Office of the Vice Provost Academic and Office of the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS.
- 13.3. The Provost and Vice-President Academic will submit annually the FARs of all approved PPRs to the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (Quality Council), as per the required process.

13.4. The Provost and Vice-President Academic is responsible for the presentation of the PPR Executive Summary and its associated implementation plan to the Board of Governors for its information.

## APPENDIX I

### 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 supervisor, advisor or colleague.

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 to be likely, to be predisposed, positively or negatively, about the program.

#### 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 of 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.

**Source: Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (Quality Council)**



**RYERSON UNIVERSITY  
POLICY OF SENATE**

**CURRICULUM MODIFICATIONS: GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE  
PROGRAMS**

<b>Policy Number:</b>	127
<b>Previous Approval Dates:</b>	May 3, 2011; November 4, 2014
<b>Current Policy Approval Date:</b>	March 6, 2018
<b>Next Policy Review Date:</b>	May 2023 (or sooner at the request of the Provost and Vice President Academic or Senate)
<b>Responsible Committee or Office:</b>	Provost and Vice President Academic

---

Curriculum modification of graduate and undergraduate programs is part of Ryerson University's Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP), which includes the following policies:

Policy 110: Institutional Quality Assurance Process

Policy 112: Development of New Graduate and Undergraduate Programs

Policy 126: Periodic Program Review of Graduate and Undergraduate Programs

**Policy 127: Curriculum Modifications: Graduate and Undergraduate Programs**

**1. PURPOSE**

This policy governs changes to existing undergraduate and graduate programs, recognizing that the university must be responsive to developments and advances in disciplinary knowledge.

**2. SCOPE**

This policy governs curriculum modification of undergraduate and graduate programs that have been approved by Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (Quality Council).

### 3. DEFINITIONS

**3.1. Major Modifications<sup>1</sup>:** Substantial program changes, including the following: requirements that differ significantly from those existing at the time of the previous periodic program review; significant changes to learning outcomes; or significant changes to the faculty engaged in delivering the program and/or to the essential resources, such as where there have been changes in mode(s) of delivery. Examples of Major Modifications are provided in Appendix A of this policy. Expedited approvals<sup>2</sup> by the Quality Council for Major Modifications and new or substantially modified graduate Fields within an existing program are only required at the request of the university.

**3.2. Minor Modifications:** Program changes that are not substantial including, but not limited to:

3.2.1. Category 1 Minor Modifications – e.g. changes in course description, title or requisites; alteration to the number of course hours.

3.2.2. Category 2 Minor Modifications – e.g. repositioning of a course in a curriculum; adding or deleting a required course; changes in course weight; change in mode of a single course delivery; reconfiguration or minor changes to courses in a Minor.

3.2.3. Category 3 Minor Modifications – e.g. change in admission policy; variation in policy for grading, graduation or academic standing; change in program name and/or degree designation; minor changes to existing graduate Fields.

**3.3.** Refer to Ryerson Senate Policy 110 for definitions related to this policy.

**3.4.** Refer to Ryerson Senate Policy 110 for Degree Level Expectations for Undergraduate and Graduate Programs.

### 4. EXTERNAL AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY

#### 4.1. Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (Quality Council)

4.1.1. The Quality Council receives a summary of the University's Major Modifications to curriculum on an annual basis.

4.1.2. The Quality Council audits the University's Major Modification process on an eight-year cycle and determines whether the University has acted in compliance with the provisions of its IQAP.

---

<sup>1</sup> All Senate approved Major Modifications are reported to the Quality Council annually and are subject to a possible audit.

<sup>2</sup> Refer to Ryerson University Senate Policy 110 for definition

## 5. INTERNAL AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY

### 5.1. Senate

- 5.1.1. Has the final authority to approve Major Modifications to undergraduate and graduate programs.
- 5.1.2. Has the final authority to approve Category 3 Minor Modifications to undergraduate programs.
- 5.1.3. Has the final authority to approve, as a consent item, Category 2 Minor Modifications to undergraduate programs.
- 5.1.4. Receives for information Category 3 Minor Modifications to graduate programs.
- 5.1.5. Has final internal authority for the approval of all new and revised academic policies.

### 5.2. Standing Committees and Governance Council of Senate

- 5.2.1. **Academic Standards Committee (ASC):** A Standing Committee of Senate that assesses and provides recommendations to Senate for approval of Category 3 Minor Modifications and Major Modifications to undergraduate programs; and assesses Category 2 Minor Modifications, as required, and recommends to Senate, for information.
- 5.2.2. **Yeates School of Graduate Studies Council (YSGS Council):** A Governance Council of Senate that assesses and makes recommendations to YSGS Council on Major Modifications and Category 3 Minor Modifications to graduate programs.
  - 5.2.2.1. **YSGS Programs and Planning Committee (PPC):** Assesses and makes recommendations to YSGS Council on Major Modifications and Category 3 Minor Modifications to graduate programs.

### 5.3. Provost and Vice President Academic

- 5.3.1. Has overall responsibility for this policy and its procedures and review.
- 5.3.2. Reports outcomes of all undergraduate and graduate Major Modifications to Quality Council on an annual basis.

### 5.4. Deputy Provost and Vice Provost University Planning

- 5.4.1. Analyzes program costing for Major Modifications and other Minor Modifications to programs, as required.

### 5.5. Vice Provost Academic

- 5.5.1. Has final authority, where necessary, to determine if a modification to an

undergraduate program is considered major or minor.

- 5.5.2. Advises undergraduate programs on curriculum modifications.
- 5.5.3. Has the authority to submit Category 2 Minor Modifications for undergraduate programs to the Academic Standards Committee (ASC) for assessment and recommendation to Senate.
- 5.5.4. Submits Category 3 Minor Modifications and Major Modification proposals for undergraduate programs to the Academic Standards Committee (ASC) for assessment and recommendation to Senate.
- 5.5.5. Submits to Senate the ASC's recommendations regarding Category 2 Minor Modifications, Category 3 Minor Modifications and Major Modifications.
- 5.5.6. Submits, on an annual basis, Senate-approved undergraduate and graduate Major Modifications to the Provost and Vice President Academic for a report to the Quality Council.
- 5.5.7. Resolves disputes between Faculty Deans/Dean of Record or between a Faculty Dean/Dean of Record and a Department/School/Program or Faculty Council with respect to curriculum modifications, as required.

#### **5.6. Vice-Provost and Dean, Yeates School of Graduate Studies (YSGS)**

- 5.6.1. Has final authority, where necessary, to determine if a modification to a graduate program is considered major or minor.
- 5.6.2. Advises graduate programs on curriculum modifications.
- 5.6.3. Approves Category 2 Minor Modifications.
- 5.6.4. Submits Category 3 Minor Modifications and Major Modification proposals to the YSGS Council, for assessment and recommendation to Senate.
- 5.6.5. Submits to Senate, for information, the YSGS Council's recommendations regarding Category 3 Minor Modifications.
- 5.6.6. Submits to Senate the YSGS Council's recommendations regarding Major Modifications.
- 5.6.7. Resolves disputes between Faculty Deans/Dean of Record or between a Faculty Dean/Dean of Record and a Department/School/Program or Faculty Council with respect to curriculum modifications, as required.

#### **5.7. Faculty Dean or Dean of Record**

- 5.7.1. Endorses Category 2 and Category 3 Minor Modifications and Major Modifications to undergraduate programs.

5.7.2. Endorses Category 2 and Category 3 Minor Modifications and Major Modifications to graduate programs, in consultation with the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS.

5.7.3. Resolves disputes between a Department/School/Program Council and Faculty Council, if applicable, and Chair/ Director with respect to curriculum modifications, as required.

#### **5.8. Chair/Director of Department/School (or designated academic unit)**

5.8.1. Oversees preparation of Minor and Major Modifications.

5.8.2. Submits to Department/School/Program and Faculty Council (where applicable) Minor and Major Modifications.

5.8.3. Submits Minor and Major Modifications, as required, to the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record.

#### **5.9. Department/School/Program and Faculty Council (where applicable)**

5.9.1. For undergraduate programs, approves Category 1 Minor Modifications, unless the Department/School/Program Council has designated another approval process.

5.9.2. For undergraduate programs, endorses Category 2 and Category 3 Minor Modifications and Major Modifications and recommends these to the appropriate Faculty Dean or Dean of Record.

5.9.3. For graduate programs, endorses all Minor Modifications and Major Modifications and recommends these to the appropriate Faculty Dean or Dean of Record, as appropriate.

### **6. REVIEW OF POLICY AND PROCEDURES**

6.1. The review of Ryerson University's IQAP policies will follow the procedures set out in Ryerson Senate Policy 110.

6.2. Procedures related to this policy will be developed and reviewed annually by the Vice Provost Academic, the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS, and the Registrar's Office. These procedures will incorporate the process for undergraduate and graduate calendar changes.

## **POLICY 127: CURRICULUM MODIFICATIONS FOR GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS**

### **PROCEDURES: UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS**

This document outlines the procedures for **Minor Modifications** (Categories 1, 2 and 3) and **Major Modifications** to undergraduate degree programs.

Category 3 Minor Modifications and Major Modifications require proposals that are assessed by the Academic Standards Committee (ASC). The proposals must be submitted to the Vice Provost Academic by **the last Friday in June**. Due to the large workload, ASC cannot guarantee that curriculum modification proposals submitted after the June deadline will be reviewed in time for ASC's recommendations to be forwarded to Senate for consideration at the November Senate meeting. ASC will give priority to proposals submitted by the June deadline. To implement new or revised curriculum for the subsequent fall semester, the proposal must be approved at or before the November Senate meeting.

All Minor and Major Modifications require the submission of forms to Undergraduate Calendar Publications by the **first Monday of October**. Undergraduate Calendar Publications will accept Minor and Major Modifications starting May 1<sup>st</sup>.

**Required forms and submission guidelines can be found at:**  
<https://www.ryerson.ca/undergradpublications/forms/>

## **1. MINOR MODIFICATIONS**

### **1.1. CATEGORY 1 MINOR MODIFICATIONS**

1.1.1. **Description:** Category 1 Minor Modifications include:

- revisions to course description, title, and requisites; and
- minor changes to course hours that entail an overall change of two hours or less for a single-semester course, or four hours or less for a two-semester course.

1.1.2. **Consultation:** Undergraduate Calendar Publications, as needed

1.1.3. **Required approvals:** Department/School/Program/Faculty Council(s) of Teaching Department/School, as appropriate (or the approver, such as Chair/Director, designated by the Department/School/Program Council of Teaching Department/School)

## 1.2. CATEGORY 2 MINOR MODIFICATIONS

### 1.2.1. **Description:** Category 2 Minor Modifications include:

- routine changes to curriculum including course repositioning, additions, deletions;
- considerable changes in course hours with a cumulative change of three hours or more for a single-term course or five hours or more for a multi-term course;
- a change to the mode of delivery of a course;
- course weight variations; and
- small changes to existing Minors (for example, deleting one course and adding another; rearrangement of required and elective courses).

Consideration must be given to the effect of the change on students in each year of the program, including Majors, Double Majors, Concentrations, Co-op, Direct Entry, advanced standing and out-of-phase students.

### 1.2.2. **Consultations:** Consultations should start as early in the process as possible and should include:

- Vice Provost Academic, for clarification of category of curriculum modification (e.g. Category 2 or Category 3)
- Curriculum Management: Curriculum Advising and Undergraduate Calendar Publications
- Chair/ Director and the Faculty Dean of the Departments/Schools affected by the curriculum modification
- Library, if course/program changes have implications for Library resources
- University Planning Office if additional resources (e.g., faculty, space, and/or technology) are needed as a result of the implementation of the proposed course and/or curriculum change
- Chang School Program Director, School Council, and Faculty Dean, if Chang School courses are deleted or certificates are affected

### 1.2.3. **Required Endorsements and Approvals:**

- Department/School/Program/Faculty Council(s) of the Program Department(s)/Schools(s), for endorsement;
- Faculty Dean of Program Department(s)/School(s), for endorsement;

- Department/School/Program/Faculty Council(s) of Teaching Department/School, where applicable, for endorsement;
- Faculty Dean of Teaching Department/School, where applicable, for endorsement; and
- Senate, for approval as a consent agenda item.

### 1.3. CATEGORY 3 MINOR MODIFICATIONS<sup>3</sup>

#### 1.3.1. **Description:** Category 3 Minor Modifications include:

- change in program admission requirements;
- program-specific variations on grading, graduation, and/or Academic Standing;
- small changes to the total number of courses needed for graduation in a program (less than 5%);
- new Minors and substantial changes to existing Minors;
- new Concentrations and substantial changes to existing Concentrations;
- new Optional Specialization or substantial changes to existing Optional Specialization;
- changes to existing Co-op curriculum and/or schedule (note that introducing or deleting a Co-op is a Major Modification);
- deletion of a **required** course or courses in a program's curriculum provided by another Teaching Department/School, only in cases where the Teaching Department/School Council and/or the Faculty Dean of the Teaching Department/School disputes the course deletion; and
- changes to program name and/or degree designation, including Honours designation.

#### 1.3.2. **Consultations:** Consultations should start as early in the process as possible. Consultations will continue, as needed, throughout the proposal development.

- Vice Provost Academic
- Registrar or Assistant Registrar, Curriculum Management
- Registrar and Director, Admissions

---

<sup>3</sup> Although the ASC may not yet have reviewed the curriculum changes, course change forms must be completed and filed with Undergraduate Calendar Publications by the deadline date (first Monday of October).

- Undergraduate Calendar Publications Editor
- University Planning Office, if additional resources (e.g., faculty, space, and/or technology) may be needed as a result of the implementation of the proposed course and/or curriculum change
- Library, if course/program changes have implications for Library resources
- Department/Schools affected by the proposed changes and their Faculty Deans
- Chang School Program Director, School Council, and Faculty Dean, if Chang School courses or certificates are affected

**1.3.3. Required Endorsements and Approvals:**

- Department/School/Program/Faculty Council(s) of the Program Department(s)/School(s), for endorsement;
- Faculty Dean of Program Department(s)/School(s), for endorsement;
- Department/School/Program/Faculty Council(s) of Teaching Department/School, where applicable, for endorsement;
- Faculty Dean of Teaching Department/School, where applicable, for endorsement;
- Academic Standards Committee (ASC), for assessment and recommendation to Senate; and
- Senate, for approval.

**1.3.4. REQUIRED PROPOSAL:** Consideration must be given to the effect of the change on students in each year of the program, including Majors, Double Majors, Concentrations, Co-op, Direct Entry, advanced standing and out-of-phase students. The proposal should contain the following information, as appropriate:

- the existing and the proposed curriculum modification, showing the revisions
- the rationale for the curriculum modification, including information on comparator programs (where relevant)
- changes to pre-requisites, if relevant
- program learning outcomes
- the effect of the proposed change on the program learning outcomes, enrolment targets, retention, and academic standing
- the implementation date and implementation plan, and provisions for retroactivity

For changes to program name and/or degree designation include an explanation of why the proposed credential is more appropriate; provide credential used by comparator programs; provide a comparison to the admissions requirements and curriculum of programs using the proposed credential; demonstrate that the proposed credential is recognized by industry or relevant professions; where relevant, include feedback from alumni and current program students. Provide an implementation plan.

For an Honours designation, refer to guidelines provided by the Office of the Vice Provost Academic.

## 2. MAJOR MODIFICATIONS

**2.1. Description:** Major Modifications to existing programs include substantial changes in program requirements from those that existed at the time of the previous periodic program review; significant changes to program learning outcomes; and a significant change to the faculty engaged in delivering the program and/or to the essential resources, such as when there is a change in the mode(s) of delivery (e.g. online delivery).

Examples of Major Modifications are provided in Appendix A of Ryerson Senate Policy 127. Please consult the Vice Provost Academic for further clarification.

**IMPORTANT:** Major Modifications are normally an outcome of a periodic program review. Therefore, Major Modification proposals should be submitted within four (4) years of Senate approval of a periodic program review. Consultation with the Vice Provost Academic must take place prior to commencing work on a Major Modification proposal if more than four years have elapsed since the last Senate approved periodic program review.

### 2.2. Consultations

Consultations with the following individuals and/or groups should start as early in the process as possible and continue, as needed, throughout the proposal development:

- Vice Provost Academic
- Curriculum Development Consultant
- Registrar, Assistant Registrar, Curriculum Management
- Director, Admissions
- Undergraduate Calendar Publications Editor
- University Planning Office, if additional resources (e.g., faculty, space, and/or

technology) may be needed as a result of the implementation of the proposed course and/or curriculum change

- Department/Schools affected by the proposed changes and their Faculty Deans
- Chang School Program Director, School Council, and Faculty Dean, if Chang School courses or certificates are affected

### **2.3. Required Endorsements and Approvals**

- Department/School/Program/Faculty Council(s) of the Program Department(s)/Schools(s), for endorsement;
- Faculty Dean of the Program Department(s)/School(s), for endorsement;
- Department/School/Program/Faculty Council(s) of Teaching Department/School, where applicable, for endorsement;
- Faculty Dean of Teaching Department/School, where applicable, for endorsement;
- ASC evaluates the proposal and submits its recommendation to Senate;
- Senate, for approval; and
- Quality Council, in the case of an Expedited Approval of a Major Modification.

### **2.4. Proposal**

All Major Modifications require preparation of a proposal as per Section 2.4.1 below. The University, at its discretion, may request that the Quality Council review a Major Modification proposal, which normally falls under the Expedited Approval Process and, thus, would require completion of a Supplemental Proposal (Section 2.4.2).

The process for Major Modifications undergoing Expedited Approval consists of the preparation of the proposal as outlined in Sections 2.4.1 and 2.4.2. The Expedited Approval process does not require an External Peer Review (see Policy 112 Section 4.0).

The Major Modification proposal must indicate the implementation date, the implementation plan, and provisions for retroactivity. Consideration must be given to the effect of the change on students in each year of the program, including Optional Specializations, Majors, Double Majors, Concentrations, Co-op, Direct Entry, advanced standing and out-of-phase students.

#### **2.4.1 Proposal (mandatory)**

Include all the following in the proposal:

1. a summary of the proposed changes and the rationale in light of your stated program learning outcomes;
2. the effect on the Undergraduate Degree Level Expectations (UDLEs) and program learning outcomes, illustrated through an analysis of curricular mapping;
3. an indication of those changes that are the result of a previous periodic program review;
4. a list of the added resources that are needed, including space, faculty and staff;
5. a table permitting easy comparison of the existing curriculum with the curriculum of the proposed amended program by year and term, including course numbers and titles, course hours in lecture, lab or studio, and course designation by program categories (core, open electives and liberal studies);
6. a rationale if there are changes to electives, with comments on the actual availability of electives;
7. a description of each new or amended course, in calendar format
8. a statement of program balance (among core, open electives, and liberal studies) for existing and amended programs;
9. a statement of how and when changes will be implemented, and the strategy for communicating the changes to students;
10. a summary of the implications for external recognition and/or professional accreditation;
11. a summary, in the case of extensive changes, of views of the Program Advisory Council;
12. a list of any other programs affected by the changes; and
13. a brief executive summary.

#### **2.4.2 Supplemental Proposal**

**If the University chooses to submit a request for an Expedited Approval by the Quality Council (optional) for a Major Modification, the proposal must contain all the information in Section 2.4.1 as well as the following:**

- a) consistency of the curriculum modification with the institution's mission and academic plans;
- b) ways in which the curriculum modification addresses the current state of the discipline or area of study;

- c) identification of any unique curriculum or program innovations or creative components;
- d) for research-focused graduate programs, clear indication of the nature and suitability of the major research requirements for degree completion, if applicable;
- e) appropriateness of the proposed mode(s) of delivery to meet the intended program learning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations;
- f) appropriateness of the proposed methods for the assessment of student achievement of the intended program learning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations;
- g) completeness of plans for documenting and demonstrating the level of performance of students, consistent with the institution's statement of its Degree Level Expectations;
- h) 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 curriculum modification;
- i) participation of a sufficient number and quality of faculty who are competent to teach and/or supervise in the program when the curriculum modification is implemented;
- j) evidence that faculty have the recent research or professional/clinical expertise needed to sustain the program, promote innovation and foster an appropriate intellectual climate;
- k) evidence of how supervisory loads will be distributed, and the qualifications and appointment status of faculty who will provide instruction and supervision, if appropriate.

## **POLICY 127: CURRICULUM MODIFICATIONS FOR GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS GRADUATE PROCEDURES**

Forms, time lines and complete submission instructions can be found at  
<http://www.ryerson.ca/graduate/faculty-staff/>

### **Where to submit:**

Graduate curriculum and calendar changes with all signatures must be submitted to the office of the Associate Dean, Programs, YSGS.

**Submission Deadline: February 1**

### **Required Consultation:**

The Associate Dean, Programs, YSGS, should be consulted early in the process to ensure that possible issues regarding the effect of the change on current and incoming students are considered.

## **1. MINOR MODIFICATIONS**

### **1.1. CATEGORY 1 MINOR MODIFICATIONS**

**1.1.1. Description:** Category 1 Minor Modifications typically include:

- revisions to course description, title, and requisites;
- minor changes to course hours with a cumulative change of two hours or less for a one credit course or four hours or less for a multi-credit course.

### **1.1.2. Required Approvals**

- Graduate Program Council, for approval.

### **1.1.3. Required Forms**

- Graduate course Change form – Active Courses (GCC-A)
- Graduate Course Change Summary form (GCCS)
  - Summarizes all course changes for the upcoming academic year

- Every course listed in a GCCS form must have a corresponding GCC form

## **1.2. CATEGORY 2 MINOR MODIFICATIONS**

### **1.2.1. Description:** Category 2 Minor Modifications include:

- routine changes to curriculum including course repositioning, additions, deletions;
- significant changes in course hours with a cumulative change of three hours or more for a one-credit course or five hours or more for a multi-credit course;
- a change to the mode of delivery of a course; and
- course weight variations.

### **1.2.2. Required Endorsements and Approvals**

- Graduate Program Council, for endorsement;
- Faculty Dean of the Teaching Department(s)/School(s), for endorsement; and
- Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS, for approval.

### **1.2.3. Forms**

#### **1.2.3.1. Graduate Course Change form – Active (GCC–A) or - New (GCC–N)**

- for changes to active or the introduction of new courses respectively

#### **1.2.3.2. Graduate Approvals and Consultations form (GAC) – All of the following which apply must be indicated on the form. If additional space is needed for approvals, additional forms may be used.**

- Subject Librarian: regarding library resource needs/changes.
- Additional resources needed (i.e. faculty, space, technology) as a result of the implementation of the proposed course and/or curriculum changes. If additional resources are needed, the form will be forwarded to the University Planning Office for review.
- Deleting an elective course in another program's curriculum: there must be consultation with that program.

#### **1.2.3.3. Graduate Course Change Summary form (GCCS)**

- Summarizes all course changes for the upcoming academic year

- Every course listed in a GCCS form must have a corresponding GCC-A or -N form

### **1.3. CATEGORY 3 MINOR MODIFICATIONS**

#### **1.3.1. Description:** Category 3 Minor Modifications include:

- change in program admission requirements;
- program-specific variations on grading, promotion, graduation, and/or academic standing;
- minor changes to existing Fields; and
- changes to program name and/or degree designation with applicable implementation date.

#### **1.3.2. Required Endorsements and Approvals**

- Graduate Program Council, for endorsement;
- Department/School Council(s), for endorsement;
- Faculty Dean of affected Program(s)/Department(s)/School(s), for endorsement;
- Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS, for approval; and
- Senate, for information.

#### **1.3.3. Forms and Documents**

##### **1.3.3.1. Proposal**

- Changes in admission, promotion, grading, graduation, or academic standing policy:
  - Include copies of both the existing and the proposed policy, identifying the changes, and the rationale for them.
- Minor changes to existing Fields:
  - Include a list of current Fields (if applicable) with an outline of requirements.
- Changes to program name and/or degree designation:
  - Include an explanation of why the current designation is inappropriate and why the proposed designation is preferable;

designations used by comparator programs; comparison to the admissions requirements and curriculum of programs using the proposed designation; confirmation of recognition of the proposed designation by industry and/or relevant professions; where relevant, views of alumni and current program students.

- Provisions for retroactivity.

1.3.3.2. Proposed curricular structure in Calendar format (GCAL): Proposed curricular structure in Calendar format

1.3.3.3. Graduate Course Change form – Active (GCC–A) or - New (GCC–N)

- for changes to active or the introduction of new courses respectively

Although the change is not yet approved, these forms must be completed and submitted by the deadline date.

1.3.3.4. Graduate Approvals and Consultations form (GAC) – All of the following which apply must be indicated on the form. If additional space is needed for approvals, additional forms may be used.

- Subject Librarian: regarding library resource needs/changes.
- Additional resources needed (i.e. faculty, space, technology) as a result of the implementation of the proposed course and/or curriculum changes. If additional resources are needed, the form will be forwarded to the University Planning Office for review.
- Deleting an elective course in another program's curriculum: there must be consultation with that program.

1.3.3.5. Graduate Course Change Summary form (GCCS)

- Summarizes all course changes for the term submitted.
- Every course listed in a GCCS form must have a corresponding GCC-A or -N form.

## 2. MAJOR MODIFICATIONS

**2.1. Description:** Major Modifications to existing programs include substantial changes in program requirements from those which existed at the time of the previous periodic program review, significant changes to program learning outcomes, or a significant change to the faculty engaged in delivering the program and/or to the essential resources, such as when there is a change in mode(s) of delivery (e.g. online

delivery).

Examples of Major Modifications are provided in Appendix A of Ryerson Senate Policy 127. Please consult the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS, and, if necessary, the Vice Provost Academic for further clarification.

## **2.2. Required Endorsements and Approvals**

- Graduate Program Council, for endorsement;
- Department/School Council(s) and the Faculty Dean of affected by the change(s), for endorsement;
- YSGS Programs and Planning Committee, for endorsement;
- YSGS Council evaluates the proposal and submits its recommendation to Senate;
- Senate, for approval; and
- Quality Council, in the case of an Expedited Approval of a Major Modification.

## **2.3. Documentation**

All Major Modifications require preparation of a proposal as per Section 2.4.1 below. The University, at its discretion, may request that the Quality Council review a Major Modification proposal, which normally falls under the Expedited Approval process and, thus, would require completion of a Supplemental Proposal (Section 2.4.2).

The process for Major Modifications undergoing Expedited Approval consists of the preparation of the proposal as outlined in Sections 2.4.1 and 2.4.2. The Expedited Approval process does not require an External Peer Review (see Policy 112 Section 4.0).

### **2.3.1. Proposal (mandatory)**

Include all of the following in the proposal:

1. a summary of the proposed changes and the rationale in light of your stated program learning outcomes;
2. the effect on the Graduate Degree Level Expectations (GDLEs) and program learning outcomes, illustrated through an analysis of curricular mapping;
3. an indication of those changes that are the result of a previous periodic program review;
4. a list of the added resources that are needed, including space, faculty and staff;

5. a table permitting easy comparison of the existing curriculum with the curriculum of the proposed amended program;
6. a rationale if there are changes to electives, with comments on the actual availability of electives;
7. a description of each new or amended course, in calendar format ;
8. a statement of how and when changes will be implemented, and the strategy for communicating the changes to students;
9. a summary of the implications for external recognition and/or professional accreditation;
10. a summary, in the case of extensive changes, of views of the Graduate Program Council;
11. a list of any other programs affected by the changes; and
12. a brief executive summary.

### **2.3.2. SUPPLEMENTAL PROPOSAL**

If the University chooses to submit a request for an Expedited Approval by the Quality Council (optional) for a Major Modification including the creation, deletion or re-naming of a Field, the proposal must contain all the information in Section 2.3.1 in addition to the following:

- a) consistency of the curriculum modification with the institution's mission and academic plans;
- b) ways in which the curriculum modification addresses the current state of the discipline or area of study;
- c) identification of any unique curriculum or program innovations or creative components;
- d) for research-focused graduate programs, clear indication of the nature and suitability of the major research requirements for degree completion, if applicable;
- e) appropriateness of the proposed mode(s) of delivery to meet the intended program learning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations;
- f) appropriateness of the proposed methods for the assessment of student achievement of the intended program learning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations;
- g) completeness of plans for documenting and demonstrating the level

of performance of students, consistent with the institution's statement of its Degree Level Expectations;

- h) 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 curriculum modification;
- i) participation of a sufficient number and quality of faculty who are competent to teach and/or supervise in the program when the curriculum modification is implemented;
- j) evidence that there are adequate resources to sustain the quality of scholarship produced by graduate students' scholarship and research activities, including library support, information technology support, and laboratory access;
- k) evidence that faculty have the recent research or professional/clinical expertise needed to sustain the program, promote innovation and foster an appropriate intellectual climate;
- l) evidence of how supervisory loads will be distributed, and the qualifications and appointment status of faculty who will provide instruction and supervision, if appropriate;
- m) 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 curriculum modification); and
- n) evidence of a program structure and faculty research that will ensure the intellectual quality of the student experience.

**2.4.** Proposed curricular structure in Calendar format (GCAL): Proposed curricular structure in Calendar format.

**2.5.** Graduate Approvals and Consultations form (GAC) – All of the following which apply must be indicated on the form. If additional space is needed for approvals, additional forms may be used.

- Subject Librarian: regarding library resource needs/changes.
- Additional resources needed (i.e. faculty, space, technology) as a result of the implementation of the proposed course and/or curriculum changes. If additional resources are needed, the form will be forwarded to the University Planning Office for review.

## **APPENDIX A**

### **MAJOR MODIFICATIONS**

#### **Undergraduate and Graduate**

Major Modifications typically include one or more of the following program changes:

- a) Requirements for the program that differ significantly from those existing at the time of the previous cyclical program review.
- b) Significant changes to the learning outcomes;
- c) Significant changes to the faculty engaged in delivering the program and to the essential physical resources as may occur, for example, where there have been changes to the existing modes of delivery.

#### **EXAMPLES OF MAJOR MODIFICATIONS**

- Significant change in the laboratory time of a program
- The introduction or deletion of a research paper, thesis or capstone project
- The introduction or deletion of work experience, co-op, internship, or practicum, or portfolio
- Considerable changes to courses comprising a significant proportion of the program
- Significant change in the total number of courses required for graduation in a program
- Change to the name of the School or Department
- The creation of a double major based on existing degree programs
- Significant changes to the program learning outcomes
- Changes to program content, other than those listed above, that affect the learning outcomes, but do not meet the threshold for a 'new program'<sup>4</sup>
- The introduction, deletion, or change to a full- or part-time program options
- The merger of two or more programs
- Significant changes to the faculty engaged in delivering the program and to the essential resources such as when there have been changes to the existing modes of delivery (for example, a new institutional collaboration or a move to online, blended or hybrid learning).

---

<sup>4</sup> Refer to Ryerson University Senate Policy 110 for definition.

- Considerable curriculum changes due to changes to the faculty delivering the program: for example a large proportion of the faculty retires; or the expertise of new hires changes the focus of research and teaching interests
- Changes to the essential resources, where these changes impair the delivery of the approved program
- New bridging options for college diploma graduates
- The establishment of an existing degree program at another institution or location
- The offering of an existing program substantially online where it had previously been offered in face-to-face mode, or vice versa
- The creation, deletion or re-naming of a field in a graduate program
- Any change to the requirements for graduate program candidacy examinations, field studies or residence requirements