ONTARIO UNIVERSITIES
COUNCIL on QUALITY ASSURANCE

SUMMARY OF AUDITORS' REPORT ON THE SCOPE OF RYERSON UNIVERSITY'S RESPONSE TO THE QUALITY ASSURANCE AUDIT

SEPTEMBER 2018

REPORT CONTENTS:

1. **SUMMARY:** SUMMARY OF THE AUDITORS' REPORT ON THE INSTITUTIONAL ONE-YEAR FOLLOW-UP RESPONSE TO THE QUALITY ASSURANCE AUDIT OF RYERSON UNIVERSITY

2. **APPENDIX 1:** RYERSON UNIVERSITY'S ONE-YEAR FOLLOW-UP RESPONSE TO THE QUALITY COUNCIL AUDIT

Audit Team's Report on Ryerson University's
One-Year Response to Its Quality Assurance Audit

SUMMARY

The Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance undertook an Audit of Quality Assurance at Ryerson University in 2016. As with all such audits, the purpose was to assess the extent to which Ryerson University is in compliance with its own Institutional Quality Assurance Processes (IQAP) and to affirm that institutional practices are consistent with the Quality Assurance Framework that governs all Ontario Universities.

The 2016 Audit Report of Ryerson University contained ten recommendations and fourteen suggestions. Under the Quality Assurance Framework, universities must satisfy audit recommendations, as they identify institutional practices that are not compliant with the university's IQAP. Suggestions are made by the audit team in the spirit of encouraging reflection on how practice might be improved, and thus compliance is not mandatory.

The Quality Assurance Framework requires that each institution submit a one-year follow-up response to the Quality Council. Ryerson University submitted its One-year Response and supporting documents on June 21, 2017.

In July 2017, the Ryerson University Audit team convened to consider the institution's One-year Response and sought clarification regarding the University's response to Recommendations 6 and 8. In July 2018, the Ryerson University Audit team convened to consider the University's clarification of those two recommendations. Auditors have concluded that Ryerson University's One-year Response satisfactorily addresses the Audit Report's ten recommendations.

> **Recommendation 1** (Ryerson University must ensure that the data package provided to academic units undergoing cyclical program review is current and complete as per the requirements of Policy 126 Section I.B.1.)
>
> **Recommendation 2** (Ryerson University must ensure that self-studies for Cyclical Program Reviews, Letters of Intent and Program Proposals for new programs, and the documentation supporting major modifications are complete and that all steps pertaining to their approval are followed and documented as per Policy 126, 112, and 127, as appropriate.)
>
> **Recommendation 3** (Ryerson University must adhere to all procedures outlined in its IQAP (Policies 126 and 112) pertaining to the Peer Review Team (PRT), especially those concerning a) composition of and communication with members of the PRT; b) arm's-length status of the PRT; c) selection of and role of the internal reviewer where one is used; d) materials provided to the PRT; e) details of the PRT site visit, and f) distribution and approval pathway of the PRT report.)

Recommendation 4 (Ryerson University must document the presentation of relevant material to the Board of Governors.)

Recommendation 5 (Ryerson University must amend its IQAP to make it clear who is responsible for inviting the Peer Review Team and providing them with the necessary documentation prior to their site visit, and clarify who may contact potential external reviewers to seek their willingness and availability to serve as reviewers.)

Recommendation 6 (Ryerson University must ensure that there is a Final Assessment Report, Implementation Plan, and Executive Summary for each Cyclical Program Review and that they are posted on the website and sent to the Quality Council.)

Recommendation 7 (Ryerson University must document all relevant steps pertaining to the follow-up report and progress on the development plan as outlined in its IQAP, Policy 126 Section VII.)

Recommendation 8 (Ryerson University must revise its IQAP to include an expanded description of the expedited approval process in accordance with the Quality Assurance Framework.)

Recommendation 9 (Ryerson University must revise its IQAP to include the full definition of a new program as outlined in the Quality Assurance Framework in order to better differentiate new programs from major modifications.)

Recommendation 10 (Ryerson University must revise its IQAP to ensure alignment across its various policies with respect to processes, procedures, and responsibilities.)

Ryerson University is to be commended for its careful consideration of the recommendations and suggestions, as reflected in the institution's One-year Response. The University clearly takes quality assurance seriously. The Response is thorough and effective in documenting the measures taken to address the recommendations and in cross-referencing new processes with the revised IQAP. The revisions outlined in the One-year Response further strengthen an already thorough and effective set of quality assurance procedures.

RYERSON UNIVERSITY
Response to Recommendations and Suggestions
in the Quality Council Audit Report (June 2016)
and
Supplementary Responses to Recommendation 6 and Recommendation 8

A. RECOMMENDATIONS

R1: Ensure that the data package provided to academic units undergoing cyclical program review is current and complete as per the requirements of Policy 126 Section I.11.1.
IQAP[1] Revisions:
n/a
Response:
Progress Indicators and Related Statistics are revised annually by Ryerson's University Planning Office (UPO). In some cases, the data is not updated in the interactive data tables at the same time as the Progress Indicators and Related Statistics Report is published; therefore, programs are now being instructed to refer to both the interactive tables and the report to ensure the most current information is being used in their program review. Any data that is not available in the report or online is provided by the UPO upon request. Additionally, there are now two checkpoints to ensure that the data in the PPR is as current as possible: (1) when the self study and appendices are reviewed by the Vice Provost Academic (VPA)/Yeates School of Graduate Studies (YSGS) office, the program is notified to update data, if necessary; and (2) when the self study and appendices are reviewed by the Academic Standards Committee (undergraduate) or the Programs and Planning Committee (graduate), the program is notified if data need updating and the Program Review does not go forward to Senate for approval until the revisions are made.

R2: Ensure that self-studies for Cyclical Program Reviews, Letters of Intent and Program Proposals for new programs, and the documentation supporting major modifications are complete and that all steps pertaining to their approval are followed and documented as per Policy 126, 112 and 127, as appropriate.
IQAP Revisions:
Policy 110 - 3.4, 3.5, 3.7; Policy 112 - Procedures Introduction, and 2.2.6; Policy 126 - 5.5.4, 6.5.1 and Procedures Section 6; Policy 127 – 3.1
Response:
A number of revisions have been made to Policies 126, 112, and 127 (as appropriate) to ensure that all steps pertaining to completeness of the submissions and the approval processes are followed. Policy 110 now includes a definition of a new field and Policy 112 references new fields in its procedures section. Graduate diplomas are more clearly defined (Policy 110) and processes and approvals are referenced in Policy 112. Policy 126 has been revised to clarify the procedure for initial approval of the self study and appendices prior to the site visit. (In the

---

[1] Ryerson's IQAP consists of:
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

previous version of Policy 126, for undergraduate programs, it was stated that the ASC reviewed the PPR prior to and after the peer review site visit. In actual fact, the PPR was reviewed by the VPA's office prior to the site visit.)

Better clarity of the approval/endorsement requirements, based on the revisions to the IQAP, will be included in the revised undergraduate PPR Manual and a process and approval/endorsement template will be included in the manual. The current YSGS Manuals for New Program and Cyclical Program Review have a clearly outlined process map that articulates approval processes and documentation, and, in the case of new graduate programs, includes all the stages in the development of a new program proposal. Policy 112 also better reflects the need for proper documentation.

Policy 127 clearly outlines procedures for major modifications, the required approvals, forms and documentation that are required. The Vice Provost Academic or the Vice-Provost and Dean YSGS will make the determination of whether curricular changes are minor or major based on Policy 127. All major curriculum modifications are now reviewed by the VPA's Office or the Office of the Dean and Vice Provost YSGS when submitted, and a checklist is sent to the program indicating any items that are missing or incomplete. Policy 110 and Policy127 have been revised to indicate that major modifications are a subset of the broader Expedited Approvals section of the Quality Assurance Framework.

A document management system (UG and G) has been established to track and archive documents, approvals, and timelines.

R3: Adhere to all procedures outlined in its IQAP (Policies 126 and 112) pertaining to the Peer Review Team (PRT), especially those concerning a) composition of and communication with members of the PRT; b) arm's-length status of the PRT; c) selection of and role of the internal reviewer where one is used; d) materials provided to the PRT; e) details of the PRT site visit, and f) distribution and approval pathway of the PRT report.
IQAP Revisions:
Policy 112 –Procedures sections 4.1, 4.2, 4.4, 4.6,5, Appendix A; Policy 126 – Procedures sections 7.1 – 7.6, 8, Appendix A
Response:
Policy 112 and Policy 126 have been revised to make clearer the composition of peer review teams and the roles of the Dean or Dean of Record and the program when communicating with potential reviewers/reviewers and, as well, the parties that are responsible for providing information/materials to the PRT. Template letters for the Dean's invitation to peer reviewers will be provided to programs and will include information on arm's length status along with a requirement for agreement by reviewers of their arm's length position. Policy 112 and Policy 126 now state that the Vice Provost Academic or the Vice-Provost and Dean YSGS, where appropriate, will review the Mandate, the format for the PRT Report, and the timeline for completion of the report with the Peer Review Team at the beginning of the site visit. The role of an internal reviewer has been revised in Policy 112 and Policy 126.

Currently, the undergraduate Peer Review Manual Part II, the YSGS Program Review Manual (Part II - Site Visit) for programs includes an extensive explanation of arm's length to assist

Deans or Deans of Record and programs. The undergraduate New Program Manual contains the same information. This arm's length requirement is also discussed and emphasized during the initial meeting between the program undergoing review and the Vice Provost Academic or the YSGS Associate Dean.

Materials provided to the PRT and the distribution and approval pathways of the PRT report have been revised in Policy 112 and Policy 126. The revised manuals will detail the documentation that is required at every stage of the peer review team site visit and will include a site visit agenda template, which will require that attendees at the site visit be listed, and a PRT report template.

Document management, from requirements to archiving, has been revised and will be reflected in the PPR and New Program manuals. The documentation archiving system will also act as a pathway and checkpoint for endorsements and approvals.

R4: Document the presentation of relevant material to the Board of Governors.
IQAP Revisions:
n/a
Response:
On an annual basis all undergraduate and graduate new program proposals, and the Final Assessment Report and Executive Summary from all undergraduate and graduate program reviews that have been approved by Senate are submitted to the Provost from the Office of the Vice Provost Academic for inclusion on the Board of Governors' agenda. Going forward, a copy of the Board's agenda will be archived within the document management system for the appropriate program reviews and new programs.

R5: Amend its IQAP to make it clear who is responsible for inviting the Peer Review Team and providing them with the necessary documentation prior to their site visit, and clarify who may contact potential external reviewers to seek their willingness and availability to serve as reviewers.
IQAP Revisions:
Policy 112 - Procedures section 4.2; Policy 126 – Procedures 7.2
Response:
As identified in the response to Recommendation 3, Policy 112 and Policy 126 have been revised to clearly establish proper procedures for the selection and communication with peer reviewers. The revised manuals to accompany the policies will reflect best practices.

R6: Ensure that there is a Final Assessment Report, Implementation Plan, and Executive Summary for each Cyclical Program Review and that they are posted on the website and sent to the Quality Council.
IQAP Revisions:
Policy 126 – 5.3.2, 5.5.5, 5.5.6, Procedures 13
Response:
Policy 126 has been revised to indicate that "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 Final Assessment Report, and the action of Senate for each

undergraduate and graduate periodic program review on the Curriculum Quality Assurance website with links to the Senate website and the Provost's website." Current practices within the offices of VPA and YSGS include the tracking of program reviews to ensure that all programs listed on the undergraduate and graduate PPR schedules are completed within an appropriate timeframe. As per Quality Council requirements, Final Assessment Reports/Implementation Plans which have been approved by Senate are submitted through the Provost's office to the Quality Council on an annual basis.

RYERSON UNIVERSITY'S SUPPLEMENTARY RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION 6 (date: January 2018; revised July 2018)
Revisions have been made to Policy 126 that explicitly state the responsibility of the Provost and Vice-President Academic, the Vice Provost Academic, and the Vice-Provost and Dean of the Yeates School of Graduate Studies for ensuring that FARs are always prepared and submitted to the Quality Council. Senate will now be receiving Final Assessment Reports for review and approval. The following sections of the IQAP have been revised (in bold):

1. Provost and Vice-President Academic
Policy 126, Section 5.3.2 Internal Authority and Responsibility – Provost and Vice-President Academic, has been revised to read:
> **5.3.2.   Submits Final Assessment Reports, including Implementation Plans and Executive Summaries, for all undergraduate and graduate PPRs to Quality Council annually, as per Quality Council's required process.**
> (Note: PPR refers to periodic program review)

2. Vice Provost Academic
Policy 126, Section 5.5.6 and 5.5.7 Internal Authority and Responsibility – Vice Provost Academic, have been added:
> **5.5.6.   Ensures that there is a Final Assessment Report, Implementation Plan, and Executive Summary for each PPR.**
>
> **5.5.7.   Submits an undergraduate program FAR, including recommendations from the Academic Standards Committee (ASC), for review and approval by Senate.**

3. Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS (Yeates School of Graduate Studies)
Policy 126, Section 5.6.4 and 5.6.5 Internal Authority and Responsibility – Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS, have been added:
> **5.6.5.   Ensures that there is a Final Assessment Report, Implementation Plan, and Executive Summary for each PPR.**
>
> **5.6.6.   Submits graduate program FAR, including recommendations, to Senate for review and approval.**

4. Senate

Previously, for undergraduate programs, Ryerson University's Senate received a *brief* of the program review, which, after approval, was transformed into a Final Assessment Report. The revised Policy 126, Procedures Section 10 Final Assessment Report, has been revised to read:

> **10.1.   For undergraduate programs, the Office of the Vice Provost Academic will prepare for Senate a Final Assessment Report (FAR), 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.**

The revised Policy 126, Procedures Section 11 Senate Approval, has been revised to read:

> **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).**

5. Distribution Requirements

Policy 126, Procedures Section 13, clearly states how Final Assessment Reports will be made available on Ryerson University websites, and the requirement of the Provost and Vice-President Academic to submit the FARs of all approved program reviews to the Quality Council.

> **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 the Curriculum Quality Assurance website with links to the Senate website and the Provost's website.**
>
> **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.**

R7: Document all relevant steps pertaining to the follow-up report and progress on the development plan as outlined in its IQAP, Policy 126 Section VII.
IQAP Revisions:
Policy 126 – 5.5.8, 5.6.7, 5.8.1, 5.8.2, Procedures 12
Response:
Policy 126 now states that the follow-up report will be reviewed by the Academic Standards Committee for undergraduate programs and the Programs and Planning Committee of the YSGS Council for graduate programs, then forwarded to Senate as an information item. Programs are

sent a reminder with detailed instruction for the follow-up report six months in advance, with a subsequent email one month prior to the due date. The undergraduate PPR Manual will be updated with relevant steps, and YSGS has incorporated the 1 year follow up requirement in the YSGS Program Review Manual process map. Senate minutes indicating that the follow-up reports have been reviewed are archived within the document management system.

R8: Revise its IQAP to include an expanded description of the expedited approval process in accordance with the Quality Assurance Framework.
IQAP Revisions:
Policy 110 - 3.4; Policy 112 – Procedures introduction and Procedures Section 4; Policy 127 – 3.1
Response:
Policy 110 now has an expanded description of the expedited approval process in the Definitions section. References to expedited approvals are also made in Policies 112 and 127.

> **RYERSON UNIVERSITY'S SUPPLEMENTARY RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION 8 (date: January, 2018; revised July 2018)**
> Revisions have been made to Policy 112 and Policy 127 (in bold) to clarify how expedited approvals apply to graduate Fields, to new graduate diplomas and to Major Modifications to existing programs.
>
> **1. Proposal – Policy 112**
> Policy 112, Procedures (introduction), now more clearly identifies the requirements for a graduate diploma and for a Field within a new graduate program proposal.
>> **Procedures (introduction)**
>> **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[2] can be declared as part of a graduate new program proposal.**
>
> **2. Definitions**
> Policy 127, Definitions 3.1, now includes a statement about expedited approvals for Major Modifications and Fields:
>> **3.1.   Major Modifications:** 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 (e.g., online delivery or inter-institutional collaboration). Examples of Major Modifications are provided in Appendix

---

[2] Refer to Senate Policy 110 for definition

A of this policy. **Expedited approvals by the Quality Council for Major Modifications, including new or substantially modified graduate Fields within an existing program, are only required at the request of the university.**

3. Proposal – Policy 127 (undergraduate)

Policy 127, Procedures Section 2.4 Undergraduate Curriculum Modifications and Calendar Changes, now states clearly the requirements of a Major Modification proposal that is submitted to the Quality Council for an Expedited Approval. A footnote in Policy 127, Section 3.1, refers to Ryerson University Senate Policy 110 for a definition of the Expedited Approval Process.

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 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 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 (professional, professionally-related, 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 professional, professionally-related, 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) appropriateness of degree nomenclature.
c)   appropriateness of the program's admission requirements for the learning outcomes established for completion of the program;
d) sufficient explanation of alternative requirements, if any, for admission into a 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;
e) ways in which the curriculum modification addresses the current state of the discipline or area of study;
f) identification of any unique curriculum or program innovations or creative components;
g) appropriateness of the proposed mode(s) of delivery to meet the intended program learning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations;
h) appropriateness of the proposed methods for the assessment of student achievement of the intended program learning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations;
i) completeness of plans for documenting and demonstrating the level of performance of students, consistent with the institution's statement of its Degree Level Expectations;
j) 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;

k) 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;

l) evidence that there are adequate resources to sustain the quality of scholarship produced by undergraduate students including library support, information technology support, and laboratory access;

m) evidence that faculty have the recent research or professional/clinical expertise needed to sustain the program, promote innovation and foster an appropriate intellectual climate;

n) where appropriate to the program, evidence that financial assistance for students will be sufficient to ensure adequate quality and numbers of students;

o) evidence of how supervisory loads will be distributed, and the qualifications and appointment status of faculty who will provide instruction and supervision, if appropriate;

p) evidence of and planning for adequate numbers and quality of: (a) faculty and staff to achieve the goals of the program; or (b) of plans and the commitment to provide the necessary resources in step with the implementation of the program; (c) planned/anticipated class sizes; (d) provision of supervision of experiential learning opportunities (if required); and (e) the role of adjunct and part-time faculty;

q) definition and use of indicators that provide evidence of quality of the faculty (e.g., qualifications, research, innovation and scholarly record; appropriateness of collective faculty expertise to contribute substantively to the proposed curriculum modification); and

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

4. Proposal (graduate)

Policy 127, Procedures Section 2.3 Graduate Curriculum Modifications and Calendar Changes, now states clearly the requirements of a Major Modification proposal that is submitted to the Quality Council for an Expedited Approval. A footnote in Policy 127, Section 3.1, refers to Ryerson University Senate Policy 110 for definitions of a Field and the Expedited Approval Process.

All Major Modifications require preparation of a proposal as per Section 2.3.1 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 2.3.2).

The process for Major Modifications undergoing Expedited Approval consists of the preparation of the proposal as outlined in Sections 2.3.1 and 2.3.2. The Expedited Approval process does not require an External Peer Review (see Policy 112 Section 4.0).

2.3.1. PROPOSAL (mandatory)

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) appropriateness of degree nomenclature;
c)   appropriateness of the program's admission requirements for the learning outcomes established for completion of the program;
d) sufficient explanation of alternative requirements, if any, for admission into a graduate or second-entry program, such as minimum grade point average, additional languages or portfolios, along with how the program recognizes prior work or learning experience;
e) for graduate programs, a clear rationale for program length that ensures that the program requirements can be reasonably completed within the proposed time period;
f) ways in which the curriculum modification addresses the current state of the discipline or area of study;
g)   identification of any unique curriculum or program innovations or creative components;

h) for research-focused graduate programs, clear indication of the nature and suitability of the major research requirements for degree completion, if applicable;

i) evidence that each graduate student in the program is required to take a minimum of two-thirds of the course requirements from among graduate level courses;

j) appropriateness of the proposed mode(s) of delivery to meet the intended program learning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations;

k) appropriateness of the proposed methods for the assessment of student achievement of the intended program learning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations;

l) completeness of plans for documenting and demonstrating the level of performance of students, consistent with the institution's statement of its Degree Level Expectations;

m) 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;

n) 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;

o) 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;

p) evidence that faculty have the recent research or professional/clinical expertise needed to sustain the program, promote innovation and foster an appropriate intellectual climate;

q) where appropriate to the program, evidence that financial assistance for students will be sufficient to ensure adequate quality and numbers of students;

r) evidence of how supervisory loads will be distributed, and the qualifications and appointment status of faculty who will provide instruction and supervision, if appropriate;

s) evidence of and planning for adequate numbers and quality of: (a) faculty and staff to achieve the goals of the program; or (b) of plans and the commitment to provide the necessary resources in step with the implementation of the program; (c) planned/anticipated class sizes; (d) provision of supervision of experiential learning opportunities (if required); and (e) the role of adjunct and part-time faculty;

t) definition and use of indicators that provide evidence of quality of the faculty (e.g., qualifications, research, innovation and scholarly record; appropriateness of collective faculty expertise to contribute substantively to the proposed curriculum modification); and

> u) **evidence of a program structure and faculty research that will ensure the intellectual quality of the student experience.**

R9: Revise its IQAP to include the full definition of a new program as outlined in the Quality Assurance Framework in order to better differentiate new programs from major modifications.
  IQAP Revisions:
  Policy 110 - 3.10; Policy 112 – preamble; Policy 127 – Appendix A (footnote)
  Response:
  The full definition of a new program is now in Policy 110 in the Definitions section and is referenced in Policy 112 and Policy 127.

R10: Revise its IQAP to ensure alignment across its various policies with respect to processes, procedures, and responsibilities.
  IQAP Revisions:
  Policies 110, 112, 126, 127
  Response:
  In Policies 110 (Section 5.5.3), 112 (Section 5.10), and 126 (Section 5.9) reference has been made to Graduate Program Councils. References to Dean(s) of Record are now consistent across all policies. Procedures for Peer Review Teams are now consistent across Policy 112 and Policy 126. "Authority and Responsibility" sections have been revised in all policies.

B. SUGGESTIONS

S1: Consider implementing additional mechanisms to engage students in the preparation of self-study reports in the Cyclical Program Review process, with a view to better fulfilling the requirement of active involvement noted in Policy 126 Section I.
IQAP Revisions:
n/a
Response:
Currently, students can be involved in the PPR process through: student surveys, in-class participation SWOT analysis, School/Departmental Council, program curriculum committees, and as representatives on the Academic Standards Committee and Senate. Going forward, it will be suggested that programs include a student on the PPR team in order to ensure that the student perspective is not overlooked.

S2: Document discussion and approvals that result in a revised timeline that includes significant departures from a timeline specified in the IQAP.
IQAP Revisions:
n/a
Response:
If there is any variation from the expected timeline for the PPR, all relevant documentation will be retained and archived. Programs will be informed at the program review orientation that failure to

complete the PPR within the expected timeline could result, for example, in measures such as curriculum modifications being delayed.

S3: Include a comprehensive definition of arm's-length relationship in its IQAP; it may also be helpful to have it included in the template given to academic units preparing for a Cyclical Program Review or to those starting the new- program proposal process.
IQAP Revisions:
Policy 112 – Procedures 4.1.1, and Appendix A; Policy 126 – Procedures 7.1.2, and Appendix A
Response:
A full description of arm's length selection of peer reviewers is now in the appendices of Policy 112 (new programs) and Policy 126 (Periodic Program Reviews), and references to arm's length are within the policies in appropriate sections. It is also contained in the PPR and New Program Manuals and is available within the learning management system that provides resources for PPRs and new program development.

S4: Consider adding to its IQAP a requirement to document the source and date of initial notification to academic units regarding upcoming Cyclical Program Reviews, including a list of the materials provided to academic units at that initial stage.
IQAP Revisions:
Policy 126 - 5.5.2, 5.6.2
Response:
Policy 126 now indicates that the VPA/Vice Provost and Dean YSGS informs programs in written format of their forthcoming review, (which is archived in the document management system) and provides an orientation to periodic program review. Current orientation practices include an extensive overview of the PPR process, history, policies, expectations, and resources.

S5: Include on its Cyclical Program Review (CPR) schedule the year of the last review of each program in order to ensure that the 8-year requirement is met. Care must also be taken to update the CPR schedule to capture program name changes.
IQAP Revisions:
n/a
Response:
The schedule that was provided to the auditors and posted on the Senate website was a condensed version for ease of reading. The full schedule for undergraduate and graduate programs has now replaced the condensed version on the Curriculum Quality Assurance website and in the program review and new program sections of Ryerson's learning management system.

S6: Consider including in its IQAP a more explicit and clear pathway for the development and approval of interdisciplinary programs.
IQAP Revisions:
Policy 126 – Procedures 4
Response:
A section on Protocol for Interdisciplinary and Multidisciplinary Program Reviews has been in included in Policy 126. Policy 112 (new programs) refers to interdisciplinary programs, as appropriate.

S7: Consider revising its IQAP, Policy 112 Section 4, to make the pathway for the Peer Review Team report and responses to the report, including the role of the Dean(s) of Record, explicit and clear.
IQAP Revisions:
Policy 112 – Procedures 4.6, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3
Response:
This has been revised in Policy 112.

S8: Consider revising the "Procedures" portion of Policy 112 to include a reference regarding the shared responsibility for new program monitoring as well as a more detailed description of what the monitoring process entails.
IQAP Revisions:
Policy 110 - 5.5.2, 5.6.1, 5.7.1, 5.8.2; Policy 112 – 4.9.3, 5.5.2, 5.6.5, 5.7.6, 5.8.3
Response:
Policy 110 and Policy 112 have been revised to indicate shared responsibility and collaboration for new program development and implementation between the Vice Provost Academic, the Vice Provost and Dean YSGS, the Deputy Provost and Vice Provost University Planning, and the Dean (Dean of Record)

S9: Consider establishing a central document management system to house all documents and correspondence associated with the procedures and approval pathways outlined in its IQAP.
IQAP Revisions:
Response:
As a preliminary solution to document management, a system has been developed in Google Drive that will house all appropriate documents and correspondence. The system will be monitored and refined as needed by the offices of the Vice Provost Academic and the Dean and Vice Provost YSGS.

S10: Consider including in its IQAP the name of the University Committee that is responsible for making changes to the IQAP.
IQAP Revisions:
Policy 110 - 6.1
Response:
Policy 110 has been revised to include the Academic Governance and Policy Committee (AGPC).

S11: Consider renaming Section 4.4 of Policy 112 and Section IV.D of Policy 126 from the current "Provided to the Peer Review Team during the Site Visit" to "The Peer Review Team Site Visit."
IQAP Revisions:
Policy 112 – Procedures 4.5; Policy 126 – Procedures 7.5
Response:
This has been revised in Policy 112 and Policy 126.

S12: Consider expanding the current description of the process and responsibilities for the review of joint programs in its IQAP if additional joint programs are created.

IQAP Revisions:
Policy 126 - Procedures 3
Response:
The protocol for the periodic review of joint programs has been revised in Policy 126.

S13: Review the sections of its IQAP that deal with the composition and responsibilities of the Peer Review Team to ensure clarity regarding the requirement and responsibilities of an internal reviewer.
IQAP Revisions:
Policy 112 – Procedures 4.1.4.2, 4.1.5.2; Policy 126 - Procedures 7.1.5.2, 7.1.6.2
Response:
Revisions have been made in Policy 112 and Policy 126 to clarify the selection and role of an internal reviewer.

S14: Consider adding to the list of 'Quick Links' on the Provost's homepage a direct link to the Curriculum Quality Assurance page to make it easier to find the Executive Summaries and Final Assessment Reports.
IQAP Revisions:
n/a
Response:
A direct link on the Provost's homepage will be requested. Currently, the Senate website provides a direct link.

June 25, 2018

RYERSON UNIVERSITY
POLICY OF SENATE

CURRICULUM MODIFICATIONS: GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

Policy Number:	127
Previous Approval Dates:	May 3, 2011; November 4, 2014
Current Policy Approval Date:	March 6, 2018
Next Policy Review Date:	May 2022 *(or sooner at the request of the Provost and Vice President Academic or Senate)*
Responsible Committee or Office:	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[1]: 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[2] 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;

---

[1] All Senate approved Major Modifications are reported to the Quality Council annually and are subject to a possible audit.
[2] Refer to Ryerson University Senate Policy 110 for definition

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. <u>EXTERNAL AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY</u>

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.

5. <u>INTERNAL AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY</u>

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 <u>proposals</u> 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 1st.

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[3]
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
- 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

---

[3] 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).

- 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)/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;
- 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. <u>MAJOR MODIFICATIONS</u>

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.

<u>IMPORTANT</u>: 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. <u>Consultations</u>

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) appropriateness of degree nomenclature;
c) appropriateness of the program's admission requirements for the learning outcomes established for completion of the program;
d) sufficient explanation of alternative requirements, if any, for admission into a 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;
e) ways in which the curriculum modification addresses the current state of the discipline or area of study;
f) identification of any unique curriculum or program innovations or creative components;
g) appropriateness of the proposed mode(s) of delivery to meet the intended program learning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations;
h) appropriateness of the proposed methods for the assessment of student achievement of the intended program learning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations;
i) completeness of plans for documenting and demonstrating the level of performance of students, consistent with the institution's statement of its Degree Level Expectations;
j) 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;
k) 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;
l) evidence that there are adequate resources to sustain the quality of scholarship produced by undergraduate students including library support, information technology support, and laboratory access;
m) evidence that faculty have the recent research or professional/clinical expertise needed to sustain the program, promote innovation and foster an appropriate intellectual climate;
n) where appropriate to the program, evidence that financial assistance for students will be sufficient to ensure adequate quality and numbers of students;
o) evidence of how supervisory loads will be distributed, and the qualifications and appointment status of faculty who will provide instruction and supervision, if appropriate;

p) evidence of and planning for adequate numbers and quality of: (a) faculty and staff to achieve the goals of the program; or (b) of plans and the commitment to provide the necessary resources in step with the implementation of the program; (c) planned/anticipated class sizes; (d) provision of supervision of experiential learning opportunities (if required); and (e) the role of adjunct and part-time faculty;

q) definition and use of indicators that provide evidence of quality of the faculty (e.g., qualifications, research, innovation and scholarly record; appropriateness of collective faculty expertise to contribute substantively to the proposed curriculum modification); and

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

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)
  - o Summarizes all course changes for the upcoming academic year
  - o 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 2.43.1 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 2.43.2).

The process for Major Modifications undergoing Expedited Approval consists of the preparation of the proposal as outlined in Sections 2.43.1 and 2.43.2. 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) appropriateness of degree nomenclature;
c) appropriateness of the program's admission requirements for the learning outcomes established for completion of the program;
d) sufficient explanation of alternative requirements, if any, for admission into a graduate or second-entry program, such as minimum grade point average, additional languages or portfolios, along with how the program recognizes prior work or learning experience;
e) for graduate programs, a clear rationale for program length that ensures that the program requirements can be reasonably completed within the proposed time period;
f) ways in which the curriculum modification addresses the current state of the discipline or area of study;
g) identification of any unique curriculum or program innovations or creative components;
h) for research-focused graduate programs, clear indication of the nature and suitability of the major research requirements for degree completion, if applicable;
i) evidence that each graduate student in the program is required to take a minimum of two-thirds of the course requirements from among graduate level courses;
j) appropriateness of the proposed mode(s) of delivery to meet the intended program learning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations;
k) appropriateness of the proposed methods for the assessment of student achievement of the intended program learning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations;
l) completeness of plans for documenting and demonstrating the level of performance of students, consistent with the institution's statement of its Degree Level Expectations;
m) 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;
n) 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;
o) 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;

p) evidence that faculty have the recent research or professional/clinical expertise needed to sustain the program, promote innovation and foster an appropriate intellectual climate;

q) where appropriate to the program, evidence that financial assistance for students will be sufficient to ensure adequate quality and numbers of students;

r) evidence of how supervisory loads will be distributed, and the qualifications and appointment status of faculty who will provide instruction and supervision, if appropriate;

s) evidence of and planning for adequate numbers and quality of: (a) faculty and staff to achieve the goals of the program; or (b) of plans and the commitment to provide the necessary resources in step with the implementation of the program; (c) planned/anticipated class sizes; (d) provision of supervision of experiential learning opportunities (if required); and (e) the role of adjunct and part-time faculty;

t) definition and use of indicators that provide evidence of quality of the faculty (e.g., qualifications, research, innovation and scholarly record; appropriateness of collective faculty expertise to contribute substantively to the proposed curriculum modification); and

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

> 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

<u>Undergraduate and Graduate</u>

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[4]'
- 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).
- 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

---

[4] Refer to Ryerson University Senate Policy 110 for definition.