

TORONTO METROPOLITAN UNIVERSITY

POLICY OF SENATE

DEVELOPMENT OF NEW GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

Policy Number:	112
Previous Approval Dates:	February 7, 1995 (original policy), May 9, 2002; March 1, 2005; May 6, 2008; May 3, 2011; November 4, 2014; March 6, 2018; June 11, 2019
Current Policy Approval Date:	May 3, 2022
Next Policy Review Date:	May 2027 <i>(or sooner at the request of the Provost and Vice President Academic or Senate)</i>
Responsible Committee or Office:	Provost and Vice-President Academic

New program development is part of the Toronto Metropolitan University (the University) 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

Together, the policies that constitute the IQAP serve to promote a culture of continuous improvement, striving to achieve the highest possible standards of academic quality.

1. PURPOSE

This policy governs the creation of new programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels that require Quality Council approval. Expedited Approvals (when appropriate) are included under Policy 112.

2. SCOPE

This policy includes all undergraduate and graduate programs, both full and part-time, type 2 and type 3 graduate diplomas, offered solely by Toronto Metropolitan University (the University) or in partnership with any other post-secondary institutions.

3. DEFINITIONS

A New Program is defined as any degree credential, degree program, or graduate diploma program, currently approved by Senate, which has not been previously approved for the

University by the Quality Council, its predecessors, or any intra-institutional approval processes that previously applied. A change of name, only, does not constitute a new program; nor does the addition of a new program of specialization where another with the same designation already exists (e.g., a new honours program where a major with the same designation already exists). A new program has substantially different program objectives, program requirements and program-level 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 University units, or from collaborative structures involving other post-secondary institutions.

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

3.2. Refer to 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. Toronto Metropolitan 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 University 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, including a brief commentary on the qualifications of external reviewers, 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 and monitoring 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. When an on-site visit is not appropriate, authorizes external review of new undergraduate program proposals to be conducted by virtual site visit or an equivalent method and provides a clear justification for the decision to use these alternatives.

5.6.4. Submits new undergraduate program proposals to the Academic Standards Committee (ASC).

- 5.6.5. Submits to Senate undergraduate new program proposal briefs and ASC's recommendations for approval.
- 5.6.6. In collaboration with the relevant offices, supports new undergraduate program development, implementation and monitoring.
- 5.6.7. Posts an Executive Summary of new undergraduate and graduate programs on the University's Curriculum Quality Assurance website with links to the Senate website and the Provost and Vice-President Academic's website.
- 5.6.8. 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. When an on-site visit is not appropriate, authorizes external review of eligible new master's program proposals to be conducted by virtual site visit or an equivalent method, and provides a clear justification for the decision to use these alternatives.
- 5.7.5. Submits new graduate program proposals to the PPC and the YSGS Council.
- 5.7.6. Submits to Senate graduate new program proposal briefs and the YSGS Council's recommendations for approval regarding new graduate programs.
- 5.7.7. In collaboration with the relevant offices, supports new graduate program development, implementation and monitoring.
- 5.7.8. 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.
- 5.7.9. Develops a manual that details the process and supports the preparation of new graduate program proposals.

5.8. Faculty Dean or Dean of Record¹

- 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.
- 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 the University's Board of Governors. After that time, the new program's approval will lapse.

7. MONITORING

No later than the end of the fourth academic year after a new program has commenced, an interim report from the academic unit will be filed with the Office of the Vice Provost

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

Academic (for undergraduate programs) or the Office of the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS (for graduate programs) for submission to Senate. The report will carefully evaluate the program's success in realizing its objectives, requirements and outcomes, as originally proposed and approved; summarizing student registrations compared to projections; student retention; the status of issues raised in the implementation plan; any changes that have occurred in the interim; any challenges faced by the program together with how these challenges are being addressed; and, a response to any note(s) issued from the Quality Council's Appraisal Committee at the time of the program's approval. The interim monitoring report and its outcomes will be incorporated into the program's first periodic program review.

8. REVIEW OF IQAP POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

The review of Toronto Metropolitan University's IQAP policies will follow the procedures set out in 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.

Templates for Undergraduate and Graduate Letters of Intent and New Program Proposals are provided in the new Program Proposal Guidelines documents found on the University's Curriculum Development website:

(<https://www.ryerson.ca/curriculumquality/curriculum-development/>)

Proposed new programs that fall under the Expedited Approval Process include new graduate diploma programs, and new standalone degree programs arising from a long-standing field in a master's or doctoral program that has undergone at least two Periodic Program Reviews and has at least two graduating cohorts. These proposed new programs follow all of the Policy 112 procedures outlined below, with the exception of Section 4 (Peer Review) and Section 5 (Responses to the Peer Review Team Report).

A Field² 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 (LOI). The LOI is developed by an originating designated academic unit.

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

- I. i) Faculty Dean or Dean of Record;
- II. ii) Vice-Provost Academic or the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS as appropriate;
- III. iii) University Planning Office; and
- IV. iv) Registrar's Office.

1.1. LETTER OF INTENT CONTENT

The LOI must include all the following information. If the Provost and Vice-President Academic subsequently authorizes the development of a new program proposal, the LOI is incorporated into the full new program proposal.

² Refer to Senate Policy 110 for definition

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.

Program Details (*Quality Council requirements have been italicized*)**1.1.3. Program Objectives**

- 1.1.3.1. *A clear set of program objectives;*
- 1.1.3.2. *Appropriateness of degree nomenclature given the program's objectives; and*
- 1.1.3.3. *Consistency of the program objectives with the University's mission and academic plan.*

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. Program Requirements

- 1.1.5.1. Presentation of the program curriculum in a clear table format;
- 1.1.5.2. *Appropriateness of the program's structure and the requirements to meet its objectives and program-level learning outcomes;*
- 1.1.5.3. *Appropriateness of the program's structure, requirements, and program-level learning outcomes in meeting the institution's undergraduate or graduate Degree Level Expectations;*
- 1.1.5.4. Discussion of how an EDI/anti-racism lens has been applied in the development of the program;
- 1.1.5.5. *Appropriateness of the proposed mode(s) of delivery to facilitate students' successful completion of the program-level learning outcomes;*

- 1.1.5.6. *For graduate programs, a clear rationale for program length that ensures that students can complete the program-level learning outcomes and requirements within the proposed time;*

1.1.6. Admission Requirements

- 1.1.6.1. *A statement of the admission requirements and the appropriateness of the program's admission requirements given the program objectives and the program-level learning outcomes; and*
- 1.1.6.2. *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.*

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

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

- 1.1.7.1. *Participation of a sufficient number and quality of core faculty who are competent to teach and/or supervise in and achieve the goals of the program and foster the appropriate academic environment;*
- 1.1.7.2. *Adequacy of the administrative units' planned utilization of existing human, physical and financial resources, including implications for the impact on other existing programs at the university and any current institutional commitment to support the program;*
- 1.1.7.3. *For graduate programs: a statement of whether the program is a professional program and/or a full cost recovery program.*

1.1.8. Appendices

- 1.1.8.1. *Appendix I: Template course outlines of each of the proposed core courses including those taught by Schools/Departments other than the Program Department. For the LOI stage, the course outlines will include, at a minimum, calendar ready course descriptions for each of the core courses in the proposed curriculum. Once the LOI proceeds to the full proposal stage, course outlines must be fully developed to include course descriptions, course learning outcomes, major topics of study, teaching methods, assessment methods, and potential readings.*
- 1.1.8.2. *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.*

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

1.1.8.4. Appendix IV: An executive summary.

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

The following documentation must be included in the full new program proposal, as part of Appendix VII (see Section 2.1.7.3 below)

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 University community.

1.2.6. If the Letter of Intent 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 month³.

1.2.7. Review of the Letter of Intent by any interested member of the University 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

³ 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.

the Faculty to final endorsement.

2. NEW PROGRAM PROPOSAL

2.1. Full New Program Proposal

2.1.1. Letter of Intent

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

2.1.2. Program Requirements

2.1.2.1. *Ways in which the curriculum addresses the current state of the discipline or area of study;*

2.1.2.2. An analysis of the program's curriculum content in terms of professional licensing/accreditation requirements, if any;

2.1.2.3. *Identification of any unique curriculum or program innovations, creative components, experiential learning components, or other significant high impact practices;*

2.1.2.4. *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*

2.1.2.5. *Evidence that each graduate program requires students to take a minimum of two-thirds of the course requirements from among graduate level courses.*

2.1.3. Assessment of teaching and learning

2.1.3.1. *Appropriateness of the proposed methods for assessing student achievement of the program-level learning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations;*

2.1.3.2. *Appropriateness of the plans to monitor and assess:*

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

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

2.1.4. Resources (developed in consultation with the University Planning Office and the University Library)

- 2.1.4.1 Planned/anticipated class sizes;
- 2.1.4.2 Planned number of faculty and staff;
- 2.1.4.3 Report by the University library on existing and proposed collections and services to support the program's learning outcomes;
- 2.1.4.4 *Discussion of the role and approximate percentage of adjunct and part-time faculty/limited term appointments used in the delivery of the program and the associated plans to ensure the sustainability of the program and quality of the student experience.*
- 2.1.4.5 *Supervision of experiential learning opportunities (if required);*
- 2.1.4.6 *Evidence that there are adequate resources to sustain the quality of scholarship, research, and creative activities produced by students, including library support, information technology support, and laboratory access;*
- 2.1.4.7 *Evidence of plans and additional institutional resource commitments, if necessary, to support the program in step with its ongoing implementation;*

Resources for graduate programs only

- 2.1.4.8 *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;*
- 2.1.4.9 *Where appropriate to the program, evidence that financial assistance for students will be sufficient to ensure adequate quality and numbers of students; and*
- 2.1.4.10 *Evidence of how supervisory loads will be distributed, in light of qualifications and appointment status of the faculty.*

2.1.5. Quality and other indicators

- 2.1.5.1 *Evidence of the quality of the faculty (e.g., qualifications, funding, honours, awards, research, innovation, creative, and scholarly record; appropriateness of collective faculty expertise to contribute substantively to the proposed program and commitment to student mentoring); and*
- 2.1.5.2 *Any other evidence that the program and faculty will ensure the intellectual quality of the student experience.*

2.1.6. Fields in a graduate program (optional - if a graduate program wishes to have a Quality Council endorsed field)

2.1.6.1. A list of Fields, if applicable, in the proposed Master's program; and/or

2.1.6.2. A list of the Fields, if applicable, in the proposed PhD program.

2.1.7. Appendices (in addition to Appendices I-IV, as described in Section 1.1.8 above)

2.1.7.1. 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.

2.1.7.2. Appendix VI: Copy of the Provost and Vice-President Academic's authorization to proceed.

2.1.7.3. Appendix VII: Documentation of approvals and related communications⁴.

2.1.8. Preliminary External Review for Graduate Programs

2.1.8.1. 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 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

⁴ 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.

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.

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 length⁵ from the program under review. The Dean of Record or Vice-Provost and Dean YSGS, as appropriate, is responsible for verifying members of the PRT meet this criterion.
- 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, including an appreciation of pedagogy and learning outcomes.
- 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

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

and Dean, YSGS may authorize a combined PRT, if appropriate. However, 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. Two external reviewers; and
- 4.1.4.2. The option of one further internal reviewer from within the university, but from outside the discipline (or interdisciplinary group). Internal reviewers are not members of the designated academic unit under review. Internal reviewers will provide external reviewers with an institutional perspective on related policies and processes.
- 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, 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 review, virtual site visit or an equivalent method if the external reviewers are satisfied that the off-site option is acceptable. The Provost (or designate) will also provide a clear justification for the decision to use these alternatives.

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; and
- 4.1.5.2. One further external reviewer, or an internal reviewer from within the university, but from outside the discipline (or interdisciplinary group). Internal reviewers are not members of the designated academic unit under review. Internal reviewers will provide external reviewers with an institutional perspective on related policies and processes.
- 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, if applicable, one internal reviewer will be appointed from each participating institution.
- 4.1.5.4. External review of new doctoral program proposals must be conducted on-site.
- 4.1.5.5. Certain new master's programs (e.g., professional master's programs, fully online, etc.) may be conducted by desk review, virtual site visit or an equivalent method if both the Provost (or designate) and external reviewers are satisfied that the off-site option is acceptable. An on-site visit is required

for all other proposed master's programs.

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 the University and two or more faculty internal to the University (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 the University and two or more faculty internal to the University (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 evaluate the new proposed program, and make explicit recommendations on any essential or otherwise desirable modifications to the proposed program. The evaluation will be based against the following criteria (Note: PRT members will be provided with a template for guidance in completing their report):

- 4.3.1. Consistency of the program with the institution's mission and academic plans, clarity of its objectives, and appropriateness of the degree nomenclature, given the program's objectives;
- 4.3.2. Appropriateness of the program's structure and requirements to meet specified objectives, program learning outcomes and degree level expectations, as well as address the current state of the discipline or area of study.
- 4.3.3. For graduate programs, a rationale for program length to ensure program-level learning outcomes and requirements can be reasonably completed within the proposed time period, a minimum of two-thirds of the course requirements are graduate-level courses, and for research focused programs, the appropriateness of the major research requirements for degree completion;
- 4.3.4. Appropriateness and effectiveness of proposed modes of delivery and methods to assess student achievement of the program-level learning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations, as well as the appropriateness of the plans to monitor and assess: i) The overall quality of the program; ii) Whether the program is achieving in practice its proposed objectives; iii) Whether its students are achieving the program-level learning outcomes; and iv) How the resulting information will be documented and subsequently used to inform continuous program improvement;
- 4.3.5. Appropriateness of the program's admission requirements for the program objectives and learning outcomes established for completion of the program, and sufficient explanation of any alternative admission requirements, such as recognition of prior work or learning experience;
- 4.3.6. Given the program's planned class sizes and cohorts as well as its program-level learning outcomes, adequacy of the number and quality of core faculty; appropriateness of the role of adjunct/sessional faculty; sustainability of the program and quality of the student experience; incorporation of EDI into the program, as well as any unique curriculum or program innovations and provision of supervision for experiential learning, if applicable; appropriateness of the administrative unit's planned use of existing human, physical and financial resources; and evidence of adequate resources to sustain quality scholarship, student research and creative activities, and laboratory access;
- 4.3.7. For graduate programs, given the planned class sizes and cohorts as well as the program-level learning outcomes, evidence of recent faculty research (scholarly, research and creative) or professional/clinical expertise needed to sustain the program, promote innovation and foster an appropriate intellectual climate; evidence of sufficient student financial assistance to ensure adequate quality and numbers of students; and evidence of how supervisory loads will be distributed to provide qualified faculty instruction and supervision;
- 4.3.8. Indicators of faculty quality and any other evidence that the program and faculty will ensure the intellectual quality of the student experience.

- 4.3.9. Acknowledge any clearly innovative aspects of the proposed program together with recommendations on any essential or otherwise desirable modifications to it.
- 4.3.10. Any additional assessment of the New Program Proposal as a whole or related issues, as appropriate.

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. Once confirmed, the Dean of Record for undergraduate programs or the Vice-Provost and Dean YSGS for graduate programs will provide to the PRT a site visit agenda along with the new program proposal, including all appendices and 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 as outlined in the template guidelines, 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 as outlined in the template guidelines, 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 of 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

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

Once approved by Senate, the new program proposal, together with all required reports and documents, including a brief commentary on the qualifications of external reviewers, as outlined in the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance Framework, will be submitted to the Quality Council for appraisal and approval as per the process outlined in the Quality Assurance Framework⁶. In the event that the university disagrees with the Appraisal Committee's recommendation, the University can opt to appeal as per the procedures under 2.7.2 of the Quality Assurance Framework.

9. PRESENTATION TO THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS

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

10. PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENT OF NEW PROGRAMS

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

11. PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

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

12. MONITORING

No later than the end of the fourth academic year after a new program has commenced, an interim report from the academic unit will be filed with the Office of the Vice Provost Academic (for undergraduate programs) or the Office of the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS (for graduate programs) for submission to Senate. The report will carefully evaluate the

⁶ The Quality Council outlines its appraisal process in sections 2.6 and 2.8 of the QAF document.

program's success in realizing its objectives, requirements and outcomes, as originally proposed and approved; summarizing student registrations compared to projections; student retention; the status of issues raised in the implementation plan; any changes that have occurred in the interim; any challenges faced by the program together with how these challenges are being addressed; and, a response to any note(s) issued from the Quality Council's Appraisal Committee at the time of the program's approval. The interim monitoring report and its outcomes will be incorporated into the program's first periodic program review.

13. PERIODIC PROGRAM REVIEW

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

APPENDIX A

Choosing Arm's Length Reviewers

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

Arm's length does not mean that the reviewer must never have met or even heard of a single member of the program. It does mean that reviewers should not be chosen who are likely, or perceived 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
- A recent doctoral supervisor (within the past seven years) of one or more members of the program

ADDITIONAL ADVICE FOR CHOOSING EXTERNAL REVIEWERS

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

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