

SENATE MEETING AGENDA

Tuesday, May 3, 2011

4:30 p.m. Light dinner will be served.
5:00 p.m. Meeting starts (in the Commons – POD-250)

1. Call to Order/Establishment of Quorum
2. Approval of Agenda
3. Announcements
- Pages 1-4 4. Minutes of Previous Meeting
Motion: *That Senate approve the minutes of the April 5, 2011 meeting*
- Page 5 5. Matters Arising from the Minutes
 5.1 Clarification on Bylaws
6. Correspondence
7. Reports:
 - Pages 6-9 7.1 Report of the President
 - 7.1.1 President's update
 - Pages 10-15 7.1.2 Achievement Report
 - Page 16 7.1.3 Updated Report - Honorary Doctorates
 - 7.1.4 Presentation - Ryerson Builds Website (Julia Hanigsberg)
<http://www.ryerson.ca/ryersonbuilds/>
 - 7.1.5 Student Survey reports (Paul Stenton):
 - Graduating Student Survey 2009 -
www.ryerson.ca/senate/agenda/2011/CUSC_2009_highlights_report.pdf
 - First-Year Student Survey 2010 -
www.ryerson.ca/senate/agenda/2011/CUSC_2010_Highlights_Report.pdf
 - 7.1.6 Academic Plan Update -
www.ryerson.ca/senate/agenda/2011/Academic_Plan_Update_Report.pdf
 - Page 17 7.2 Report of the Secretary
 #W2011-3 of the Secretary of Senate

- Pages 18-97
- 7.3 Committee Reports
- 7.3.1 Report #W2011-4 of the Academic Governance and Policy Committee:
- 7.3.1.1 **Motion #1:** That Senate approve The Institutional Quality Assurance Process, consisting 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*; and Policy 127 - *Curriculum Modifications: Graduate and Undergraduate Program*
- 7.3.1.2 **Motion #2:** *That Senate approve the amendment of Policy 145, Undergraduate Course Management Policy as presented in this report, effective Fall, 2011*
- 7.3.1.3 **Motion #3:** *That Senate approve the amendment of Policy 61, Student Code of Non-Academic Conduct, as presented in this report, effective Fall 2011*
- 7.3.1.4 **Motion #4:** *That Senate approve the move of the School of Health Services Management from the Faculty of Community Services to the Ted Rogers School of Management, effective July 1, 2011*
- Pages 98-100
- 7.3.2 Report #W2011-1 of the Nominating Committee
Motion: *That Senate approve the members of the various Committee*
- Pages 101-114
- 7.3.3 Report #W2011-1 of the Learning and Teaching Committee
- Pages 115-116
- 7.3.4 COU Colleague report - See Appendix at:
www.ryerson.ca/senate/agenda/2011/Appendix_COUAcademic_Colleague_Issues.pdf
- Pages 117-177
- 7.3.5 Report #W2011-3 of the Academic Standards Committee
- 7.3.5.1 **Motion #1:** *That Senate approve the periodic program review of the Bachelor of Architectural Science degree program*
- 7.3.5.2 **Motion #2:** *That Senate approve the periodic program review of the Bachelor of Social Work degree program*
- 7.3.5.3 **Motion #3:** *That Senate approve the review of the Advanced Certificate in International Business from the Chang School of Continuing Education*
- 7.3.5.4 **Motion #4:** *That Senate approve the restructuring of the Certificate in Public Relations from the Chang School of Continuing Education*

7.3.5.5 **Motion #5:** *That Senate approve the restructuring of the Certificate in Graphic Communications from the Chang School of Continuing Education*

7.3.5.6 **Motion #6:** *That Senate approve the proposal for the Bachelor of Arts in History degree program*

7.3.5.7 **Motion #7:** *That Senate approve the proposal for the Minor in History*

7.3.5.8 **Motion #8:** *That Senate approve the proposal for the Bachelor of Arts in Environment and Urban Sustainability Degree program*

Pages 178-208

7.3.6 Report #W2011-1 of the Yeates School of Graduate Studies

7.3.6.1 Complex program changes in:

- Master of Business Administration;
- Management of Technology and Innovation (MMSc); and
- Management of Technology and Innovation (MBA)

7.3.6.2 **Motion:** *That Senate approve the amendments to Policy #142 – Policy and Procedures for Admissions and Studies (Masters and PhD Programs)*

8. Old Business

9. New Business as Circulated

10. Members' Business

Page 209

10.1 Student Provincial Election Participation

Motion #1: *That Senate support finding ways to ensure that student voters are able to participate in the provincial election on Thursday, October 6, 2011, including but not limited to encouraging faculty to not schedule tests, in class presentations or assignments on Election Day.*

Motion #2: *That the Vice-Provost Academic work with students and faculty to determine what reasonable accommodations can be made to allow students to vote.*

10.2 Presentation – Assignment Calculator (Andrew West)
see: <http://news.library.ryerson.ca/assignment-calculator/>

11. Consent Agenda

Page 210

11.1 Discontinuation of Certificates – Chang School

12. Adjournment

MINUTES OF SENATE MEETING

Tuesday, April 5, 2011

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Ex-Officio:	Faculty:		Students:
K. Alnwick	H. Alighanbari	M. Panitch	S. Ahmed
C. Cassidy	R. Banerjee	K. Raahemifar	L. de Montbrun
G. R. Chang	M. Braun	A. Rauhala	A. Hyder
C. Evans	D. Chant	A. Saloojee	D. Jaiswal
G. Fearon	D. Checkland	N. Thomlinson	A. McAllister
D. Foster	R. Church	J. Turtle	L. Salvador
U. George	M. Dionne	N. Walton	C. Sule
J. Hanigsberg	L. Fang	K. Webb	T. Whitfield
G. Hauck	A. Ferworn	A. Wellington	R. Zanussi
J. Isbister	A. Furman	J. Zboralski	
A. Kahan	F. Gunn	Z. C. Zhuang	
M. Lachemi	M. Kolios		
H. Lane Vetere	L. Lavallée		
M. Lefebvre	V. Lem		
S. Levy	J. Leshchyshyn		
M. Lovewell	A. Mitchell		
A. Shepard	C. Mooers		
P. Stenton	G. Mothersill		
SENATE ASSOCIATES:			ALUMNI:
M. Lee Blickstead			P. Nichols
P. Monkhouse			A. Rasoul
F. Tang			
REGRETS:		ABSENT:	
D. Baxter		A. Anderson	
A. Hunter		Y. Chevtchouk	
K. Jones		K. El Sayed	
M. Munawar		J. Girardo	
R. Ravindran		I. Omar	
D. Sydor			
A. West			

- Pre-Senate Presentation: Institute of Public Administration of Canada (IPAC) and Deloitte Public Sector Leadership Award

The following guests attended with regard to this presentation.

Robert Taylor, CEO, IPAC

Brian McKenna, Deloitte

Louise Upton, Deloitte

Todd Guglielmin, Director, Business Development, Deloitte

Jennifer Neepin, Chair of the Board, First Nations Technical Institute (FNTI)

Debra Brant, Acting Dean, FNTI

Doreen Guimont, Program Coordinator, FNTI

1. Call to Order/Establishment of Quorum
2. Approval of Agenda - **agenda approved.**
3. Announcements - None
4. Minutes of Previous Meeting
Motion: *That Senate approve the minutes of the March 1, 2011 meeting*
K. Alnwick moved, L. Fang seconded

Motion approved.
5. Matters Arising from the Minutes - None
6. Correspondence - None
7. Reports:
 - 7.1 Report of the President
 - 7.1.1 President's update
The President announced an open house on April 6, 2011 to unveil the architectural model for the new Student Learning Centre, to be opened in 2014.
 - 7.1.2 Achievement Report
 - 7.1.3 Progress Indicators and Related Statistics – Paul Stenton (see: <http://www.ryerson.ca/senate/agenda/2011/progress-indicators-Apr-1-11-final.pdf>)
 - 7.2 Report of the Secretary
 - 7.2.1 Senate Election Results – 2011-2012
The Secretary also reported that there may be a special meeting of Senate called for Tuesday, June 7, 2011.
 - 7.3 Committee Reports
 - 7.3.1 Report #W2011-3 of the Academic Governance and Policy Committee:

D. Checkland moved all motions

Motion #1: *That Senate approve the amendment of section 3.7 of its Bylaws with respect to filling Senate vacancies during a term.*

M. Dionne seconded

Motion approved with amendment.

Motion #2: *That Senate approve the amendment of section 6.2.2 of its Bylaw with respect to the composition of the Academic Governance and Policy Committee.*

M. Dionne seconded

It was noted that some of the wording in the original bylaw should be retained. This will be corrected and re-circulated.

Motion approved.

Motion #3: *That Yanna Chevtchouk be nominated to fill a student vacancy on the Academic Governance and Policy Committee.*

T Whitfield seconded

Motion approved.

7.3.2 Report #W2011-2 of the Academic Standards Committee

G. Fearon moved all motions

Motion #1: *That Senate approve the Certificate in Disaster and Emergency Management*

F. Gunn seconded

The admission requirements in the report are incorrect and will be amended.

Motion approved.

Motion #2: *That Senate approve the Certificate in Advancing the AODA: Principles and Practices of Accessibility*

M. Braun seconded.

Motion approved.

Motion #3: *That Senate approve the Certificate in Community Engagement, Leadership and Development.*

M. Braun seconded

Motion approved.

- 8.** Old Business
 - 8.1 Follow-up Report on Interdisciplinarity discussion questions – A. Shepard
- 9.** New Business as Circulated - None
- 10.** Members' Business - None
- 11.** Consent Agenda - None
- 12.** Adjournment – meeting was adjourned at 6:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane R Schulman, PhD
Secretary of Senate

Clarification on Bylaw Amendment

Approved April 5, 2011

The following is the text of the Senate Bylaws amendment of section 3.7, approved at the April 5, 2011 meeting of Senate:

3.7 Filling vacancies between general elections:

- 3.7.1** Senate vacancies will be filled provided there are at least two Senate meetings remaining in a Senator's term when the vacancy occurs.
- 3.7.2** If a Senate vacancy occurs in the Chair/Director, Library or Union constituencies between general elections, the Chief Electoral Officer will ask the affected group to conduct a by-election.
- 3.7.3** If a Senate vacancy occurs in any other constituency between general elections, the Nominating Committee will nominate a replacement from the affected group.
 - 3.7.3.1** Nominations beyond those brought forward by the Nominating Committee may be made from the floor of Senate, provided the person nominated is eligible and consents to the nomination. A person who is not present may only be nominated if that person has given prior permission to the Secretary of Senate.
 - 3.7.3.2** If there is more than one nomination, the replacement member will be elected by Senate from among the nominees, with all Senators eligible to vote.
- 3.7.4** The Chief Electoral Officer shall inform Senate of the results of all Senate elections, including an accounting of votes cast.
- 3.7.5** If a vacancy occurs in any committee membership, the Chair of the affected committee shall forward the name of a nominee replacement member to the AGPC, which shall inform Senate. Senate shall approve or reject the candidate.

Ryerson University
President's Update to Senate
May 3rd, 2011



Everyone Makes a Mark

Thank you - With the 2010-11 academic session coming to a close, I extend sincere thanks to members of Senate for your continuing commitment to Ryerson quality and progress at the leading edge of distinction and tremendous spirit. It is an honour to serve the university together.

Student Learning Centre – On April 6th, we had a series of events associated with the public announcement of the Student Learning Centre design, beginning with a news conference and including a community open house and campus celebration. Prior to the announcement, we met with some key partners to ensure information was known in advance by colleagues at the City of Toronto, Government of Ontario, and Downtown Yonge BIA, among others. I am pleased to recognize, with appreciation and thanks, the work of Ryerson Marketing & Communications in the effective and well-organized strategic roll-out to several different audiences (the Toronto Star, Ryerson student press, senior university colleagues, the Ryerson community at large, and the public news conference). The announcement attracted significant attention across the GTA and Canada, and was almost uniformly very well received by everyone. We continue to work with the City on zoning issues, and we are also continuing to develop a retail plan for the site.

Ontario Budget – On March 29th I attended the reading of the Ontario Budget Speech, and have written to the community in *Ryerson Today* commending government for continuing to place a priority on postsecondary education. The provisions in the 2011-12 provincial budget have come in as expected, with support for the creation of 60,000 additional student spaces for colleges and universities by 2015-16, while maintaining the level of per student funding. Overall, the good news is that government continues to demonstrate confidence in postsecondary education as an investment in the future, and this is a message that allows further strategic advocacy.

SOPHe Anniversary – The 50th anniversary of the founding of the School of Occupational and Public Health (SOPHe) was celebrated on March 26th with students, faculty, alumni and friends from the early days. As shared by longtime Ryerson colleague and twice director of the program, Professor Tim Sly, Ryerson was the site of the original public health school in Canada, still remains the only one in Ontario, and has produced most of Canada's public health officers in the past half-century, with an estimated 3,000 to 4,000 graduates since inception in the early '60s.

University of the West Indies (UWI) Gala – On March 26th, Ryerson University was honoured to receive a Chancellor's Award at the [2nd Annual University of the West Indies \(UWI\) Toronto Benefit Gala](#) for its collaboration in advancing education through joint programs with the UWI. The patron of the event is Chancellor G. Raymond Chang, and proceeds from the sold-out event will benefit students through the UWI Scholarship Fund and the UWI Haitian Initiative.

Faculty Teaching Awards Dinner – I was very pleased to host the annual dinner celebrating the recipients of our teaching awards on March 24th. It is thanks to our exceptional faculty that we are not only able, but confidently poised, to continue setting a new standard of distinction and leadership by actively exploring academic models that include interdisciplinary, experiential, innovative and entrepreneurial learning and scholarship.

Board of Governors Elections – I am pleased to share with Senate the results of the Board elections for 2011-12: faculty members Rena Mendelson and Kaamran Raahemifar, staff member

Branka Halilovic, and students Osman Hamid, Tracy Leparulo and Liana Salvador. Elections for alumni Board members will take place from June 20th to July 4th, 2011.

25-Year Club – On May 10th, 2011 we will honour long-service Ryerson faculty and staff whose contributions have played a significant part in the development of the university over a period of remarkable progress and change. I look forward to this event with enjoyment every year, as we induct new members and welcome 25-Year Club members from the past. It is a superb opportunity to share the stories, the history and the spirit that make Ryerson great.

Faculty of Science – The preliminary report of the Faculty of Science Feasibility Committee chaired by Dean Emeritus Maurice Yeates was presented at a town hall on April 14th, as part of the consultation to consider the major initiative coming out of the White Paper on academic structures. Community input and comment are greatly appreciated, and will be shared with the Provost by the Committee.

India-Ryerson – The university is making considerable progress on significant collaboration with Anna University in Chennai, India. The primary development is focusing on programs and facilities around the work of the Centre for Urban Energy, given a shared urban context and matching strengths in research and academic interests. Both the Provost and the Dean of Engineering, Architecture and Science have visited India, and a joint international workshop on these issues was very successful.

Centre for Urban Energy – On March 30th *the Minister of Natural Resources, the Hon. Linda Jeffrey* toured the CUE, noting our shared priorities in urban energy, the strength of partnerships with Hydro One, Toronto Hydro and Ontario Power Authority, our focus on commercialization, and the importance of experiential training being provided to Ryerson through participation in CUE activities. The CUE has awarded \$100,000 to twenty undergraduate and graduate students for research projects, thanks to the investment of CUE partners. It is anticipated that the new CUE facilities on Dalhousie Street will be ready by the end of April, with an official opening planned for next September.

Aboriginal Education Council – A successful proposal to the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities has led to the establishment of a new support fund by the Aboriginal Education Council. Opportunities will be provided for First Nations, Metis and Inuit students and faculty to submit proposals for support from the fund, which will disburse \$60,000 in funding this Spring, with an additional \$60,000 being made available in the Fall. The goals of the fund include: supporting undergraduate students in the development of academic and career skills; helping graduate students with the transition to graduate school; and advancing faculty research on Aboriginal issues and developing Aboriginal curriculum for Ryerson.

Appreciation and Thanks – Ian Hamilton, Assistant Vice President, Campus Planning and Facilities, retired from Ryerson on April 15, 2011 after more than a decade of making a significant contribution to the growth of the university. Joining Ryerson in April 1998, Ian provided leadership during the largest campus expansion in Ryerson's history, including projects such as the George Vari Engineering and Computing Centre, the Ted Rogers School of Management, and Heaslip House, among others. I am especially grateful to Ian for his initiative in making the campus greener, more beautiful, and more sustainable, changes that have attracted so much positive comment and improved community morale and pride.

Ryerson Gallery and Research Centre – The first major exhibition presented by the Ryerson Gallery and Research Centre opened at the Royal Ontario Museum on April 9th as part of the Scotiabank Contact Photography Festival. “*Edward Burtynsky: Oil*” provides the immediately

recognized perspective of one of the most renowned contemporary photographers in the world – and a Ryerson graduate and 2007 honorary doctorate recipient.

Gould Street – On April 13th, the end of the academic year and a very successful year of events on Gould Street were marked with a street celebration featuring games, pizza and prizes. Students were invited to talk about why they want to see Gould Street permanently closed, as part of the creation of a "Close Gould Street" promotional video. The closure of Gould Street continues to contribute to our campus environmental strategy, the unfolding of the Master Plan, and our role as city-builders, and I am very proud to applaud the sustained advocacy by the Ryerson Students' Union, all of our students and the members of our community.

'Green Campus' – The university is striving to increase its role in promoting sustainability and environmental awareness. Ryerson participated in Earth Hour by turning off non-essential campus lights between 8:30 and 9:30 p.m. on March 26th, and took part in the City of Toronto 20-Minute Makeover on April 15th to join the annual clean-up and 'help make Ryerson shine!'

Congratulations –

- On April 9th, honorary graduate Dr. David Suzuki received the prestigious Sakura Award for his contributions to the promotion of Japanese, and Japanese Canadian, culture and heritage.
- Dr. Usha George has been reappointed Dean of the Faculty of Community Services for a second five-year term beginning July 1, 2011.
- The YWCA Women of Distinction this year include **Vivian Del Valle (BSW '06, Jenny Green Social Justice Award) as the 2011 YWCA Woman of Distinction for Community Support,** and Joan Lesmond (Continuing Education Community Services Instructor '98-'07) as **the YWCA 2011 Woman of Distinction for Health Leadership.**
- On April 7th, the Digital Media Zone marked its first anniversary, counting 113 innovators and 49 active projects, 187 jobs, expansion into a second space, more than 200 visitors, extensive media coverage, and growing demand among its many achievements.
- On April 18th, two Ryerson researchers were the recipients of ORION Awards: DMZ Associate Director Dr. Hossein Rahnema received the inaugural Innovation Award, a new category reflecting commercialization potential and innovation outcome, for his project *Context Aware Computing Solutions in Intelligent Transport Systems*; and Dr. Richard Grunberg (Radio and Television Arts) received the Learning Award for his project on *Building the Global Campus Network*, a CNN-style network for universities creating an opportunity for collaborative international student newscasting using high-speed internet connections with full HD content rather than costly satellite technology.
- Wendy Cukier, Associate Dean, Academic, Ted Rogers School of Management, is the recipient of a SSHRC Community-University Research Alliances (CURA) grant, one of only nine recently-announced funded proposals across Canada.
- Grants from the Ontario Media Development Corporation (OMDC) Entertainment and Creative Cluster Partnerships Fund include two projects involving Ryerson faculty – Charles Davis, Edward S. Rogers Chair on Media Management will lead a project on methodologies for new product development; and Richard Lachman, Radio and Television Arts, is a researcher on Tiff.nexus, a project focused on next generation story-telling.

- Peggy Shannon, Chair, Ryerson Theatre School, has been awarded a 3-year SSHRC Partnership Development Grant designed to involve students and new scholars in knowledge mobilization and collaborative innovation.
- Justin Oh, 2nd-year Architecture, received an Honourable Mention in the 2011 eVolo Skyscraper competition, the only Canadian to receive this honour out of 715 submissions from 95 countries in the annual contest for students, architects, engineers and designers.
- In the international 2011 Extreme Redesign competition, Ryerson students Dov Feinmesser and Aaron Hendershott won 1st Place in the Art & Architecture category for their ingenious multi-functional “Flip 'n Slip” child’s chair; and David Di Giuseppe and Arash Nourae were awarded 3rd Place in the College Engineering category for their “Desk2go” laptop design.
- The Ryerson Women’s Hockey team joins the OUA women’s hockey league next year, after a phenomenal final year as the ‘Stingers’ in which they won all of their games, ending their regular season with an undefeated record. The team went on to win the Golden Blades Women’s Hockey League Championship, and the Ontario Women’s Hockey Association bronze medal. Our newest Ryerson Rams will welcome Lisa Jordan as head coach, one of the most successful coaches in Canada with a sterling national and international record.
- This year’s Ryerson Rams Varsity season was notable for leadership beyond sports. Our athletes are raising the bar in dedication to their academic studies, and as proactive and compassionate contributors to the community through charitable activities, and student-led initiatives and events. This kind of spirit and balance, celebrated at the annual Athletic Banquet on April 15th, continues to increase recognition and respect for Ryerson on and off campus, while building Ryerson as a competitive force in Ontario University Athletics (OUA). Thanks and appreciation are extended to every member of the coaching staff, Director of Athletics Dr. Ivan Joseph, and Vice Provost Students Dr. Heather Lane-Vetere.

Government and Institutional Relations – In addition to meetings associated with the Student Learning Centre announcement, the following events have taken place over the last few weeks.

March 18, 2011: I met Graham Fraser, Commissioner of Official Languages, on campus speaking to students about the role of universities in training public sector leaders

March 31, 2011: I was invited by the Centre for Higher Education Research and Development (CHERD) to make a presentation to presidents and senior administrators from new universities in Alberta and British Columbia

April 13, 2011: DMZ hosted a visit from Yuri Navarro, Policy Advisor, Ministry of Economic Development and Trade

April 15, 2011: I attended the Canadian Club Lunch addressed by Premier Dalton McGuinty

Year-End Events: This time of year features annual showcases in many programs and Schools, events which are very effective in advancing the unique strength of Ryerson. It is a privilege to congratulate students in all disciplines, as well as their professors, and every member of the staff and community whose participation and support contribute so much to student success.

RYERSON ACHIEVEMENT REPORT

A sampling of achievements and appearances in the media by members of the Ryerson Community for the May 2011 meeting of Senate.

Events

The announcement of the spectacular design of the Student Learning Centre received wide media coverage locally, nationally and internationally. **President Levy** was quoted in many stories. Media outlets that covered the announcement include the Toronto Star, Globe and Mail, National Post, CBC.ca, Torontoist, blogTO, Now, UrbanToronto.ca, Condo.ca, Daily Commercial News, Treehugger.com, academica.ca, Yonge Street, Azure, Canadian Architect, World Interior Design Network, Aftenposten Norway, Epoch Times, Investorpoint.com, CBLT-TV, Global News, CP-24, CBC Radio One: Metro Morning and Here & Now, 680 News, Arch Daily, Pini Web (Portugal), e-architect.co.uk, Designboom, Full Comment, inhabit.com, The Norway Post, World Architecture News, Archinect.com, News and Views from Norway, A|N blog, hg.hu (Hungary) Arco (Brazil).

Minister John Milloy, Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities joined Minister of Finance Dwight Duncan at his pre-budget news conference which was held at Ryerson for the second year running. **President Levy** spoke at the news conference which was covered by the Toronto Star.

Chancellor G. Raymond Chang, patron of the **University of the West Indies(UWI) gala** was quoted in feature stories on the event in the Jamaica Gleaner, SKNVibes.com, Extra Chicago, Boomonline.com. **President Levy** was presented with an award which recognized Ryerson's contribution to the advancement of Caribbean people through its joint programs with UWI.

The opening of Burtynsky: Oil, the first major exhibition of the Ryerson Gallery and Research Centre by alumnus and acclaimed photographer Edward Burtynsky was featured in the Toronto Star, the Globe and Mail, National Post, CBLT-TV and ArtDaily.org.

MEDIA APPEARANCES

President Levy was quoted in the National Post in a story on the new master plan that is being developed for Yonge Street.

President Levy commented on the federal government's 2011 budget and its commitment of continued support and new investments in research on Yahoo Finance (Canada). The story was also posted on Press Trust (India) and Alpha Trade Finance. He was quoted on CJOH-TV and in the Northumberland View.

Usha George, Dean, Faculty of Community Services, was interviewed on OMNI News on the Canadian government's restructuring of the refugee program.

Ken Jones, Dean, Ted Rogers School of Management was quoted in the Globe and Mail in a story on business school accreditation.

The DMZ continues to be in the news:

- A Globe and Mail story on the Global Entrepreneurship Congress in Shanghai cited the DMZ as a hotbed of innovation paving the way for other universities and colleges to follow suit.
- A brain-controlled prosthetic arm invented by Biomedical Engineering students **Thiago Caires** and **Michael Prywata**, has received broad national and international coverage on the Discovery Channel, Global National News, CITY-TV, CHCH-TV, CKND-TV, RCI: Tam-Tam Canada and The Link, CJBC-AM, CHFD-TV, CITV-TV, CICT-TV, Gizmag, Robaid.com, Orthotec.com, InnovationsReport.com, ZeitNews.com, DemenciaDigital.com, Linecom.com, LongWoods.com, WareGround.com, PhysOrg.com, LabManager.com, Jihn.com, BioPortfolio UK, New Zealand Herald, Popmech.ru (Russia), Innovations Report (Germany), Engadget, MedGadget, MeD India, Zee News India, and DailyIndia.com.
- **Hossein Rahnama**, Associate Director, was interviewed in ItBusiness.ca about the new app that controls billboards from your phone.
- **Valerie Fox**, Director, was interviewed on What'sYourTech.ca about the DMZ's success at the end of its first year.
- Canadian Reviewer carried a salute from the **DMZ** to the City of Toronto, which was confirmed as the high-tech capital of Canada.
- Mediacaster reported that the DMZ will be an exhibitor and will showcase a number of unique industry-related research projects at the National Association of Broadcasters trade show in Las Vegas.

Winston Isaac, Health Services Management, was quoted in the Toronto Sun, Edmonton Sun. Canoe.ca, BioPortfolio.com, CBC Radio One: Here & Now, and 24 Hours on the rise of prostate cancer in the black population.

Alison Matthews David, Fashion, was quoted in the Toronto Star about the need for high security around the design of Kate Middleton's wedding dress and the impact of technology and social media in spreading news.

Neil Thomlinson, Politics and Public Administration, commented on the federal election on blogTO.

Nicole Neverson, Sociology, commented on the Lingerie Football League in the Toronto Star.

Myer Siemiatycki, Politics and Public Administration, was interviewed on Global News and CFJC-TV on the federal election debate. He was quoted in the Globe and Mail about the federal election and lessons from the Ford election success and in the Globe and Mail and Chinese News on election financing and Mayor Ford. He spoke to the Toronto Star about the federal election and the GTA and discussed the federal election on CTV News.

Marisa Modeski, Admissions/Recruitment, was quoted in 24 Hours Toronto on high school students researching universities and programs.

Reed Hilton-Eddy, Learning Success Centre, was quoted in 24 Hours Toronto on how to deal with exam stress.

Gregory Taylor, post doctoral research and spectrum expert, was interviewed in the Ottawa Business Journal about white space spectrum regulation.

Grace-Edward Galabuzi, Politics and Public Administration, commented on a recent report by the Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives and the Wellesley Institute in the Toronto Star, Calgary Herald, Edmonton Journal, The Gazette, Canada.com., Alaska Highway News, Vancouver Sun, Canoe.ca, and the Toronto Sun. He discussed the report with **Winnie Ng**, CAW Sam Gindin Chair, on OMNI News and with **Rodney Diverlus**, Ryerson Students' Union, on CFMT-TV. He was also quoted in the Toronto Star in a story on the proposed Africentric high school at Oakwood Collegiate and was interviewed on CBC Radio One: Metro Morning, Toronto Sun, CFRB-AM, CFMJ-AM, and CTV News Channel.

FinanzNachrichten.de, Finanzen.net, Earth Times, Quoteline, ITNewsOnline and Optical Keyhole, reported that Ryerson students **Dov Feinmesser** and **Aaron Hendershott** were first place winners in the Art and Architecture category and **David Di Giuseppe** and **Arash Nourae** were third place winners in the Engineering category of the Extreme Redesign 3D Printing Challenge.

A book review by **Randy Boyagoda**, English, of *Montecore* by Jonas Hassen Khemiri was published in the Globe and Mail. He discussed the federal election debate on Global British Columbia, CFR-AM, C-FAX 1070, NewsTalk 980, AM770, 680 News, CKNW-AM, AM900, CFNO, Max 104.9, CHSJ-FM, CKBW-FM, CJLS, 560 CFOS, CHQT-AM, CJWL-FM, XM Satellite Radio.

The National Post, Leader Post, Winnipeg Free Press, Calgary Herald, Nanaimo Daily News and the North Shore News quoted **Greg Elmer**, Globemedia Research Chair in Creative Use of Technology, on the impact of digitization of political discourse. Global National News, CICT-TV, CKMI-TV, and CFMD-TV included a discussion with him on the role that technology and social media plays in the current tragedy in Japan.

Winnie Ng, CAW Sam Gindin Chair, was quoted in the Toronto Star, Toronto Sun, 24 Hours Toronto, Torontoist, PR-USA.net, iStock Analyst, Melodika.net, on the rally in downtown Toronto against privatization and cuts to municipal public services. She was interviewed on CFRB-AM.

Wayne McPhail, Journalism, reviewed tablet computers in the Hamilton Spectator.

Eric Kam, Economics, was interviewed on Global News Winnipeg on election promises.

Ryerson student **Natalie Leger's** good fortune at receiving two tickets to a Beach Boys concert from John Stamos was covered in the Toronto Star, CTV Canada AM, ET Canada, the Australian Herald, Media Bistro, FishBowl LA, CFRB-AM, and CFTR-AM.

Gabor Forgacs, Ted Rogers School of Hospitality and Tourism Management was quoted about travelling in Mexico by CTV News, Metro New York, the Waterloo Record, MSN Canada News, Newstalk Radio CJAD, CP 24, and The Canadian Press.

Andrew Furman, Interior Design was quoted by the Canadian Press, the Hamilton Spectator and thespec.ca in a story on the BIXI bike program.

Olivier Courteaux, History, discussed civil war and American history on TFO-TV.

Judy Rebick, Politics and Public Administration, discussed the federal election and majority government on CBC Radio One: The Current.

Daniel Rubenson, Politics and Public Administration, discussed the election debate on CBC Radio One: Metro Morning and The Early Shift (Windsor) and low voter turnout on Global News and CBCS-FM.

Kathryn Underwood's, Early Childhood Education, recent study on early learning programs in Ontario was featured in a story on PhysOrg.com.

The Toronto Star included a profile of Ryerson student, Lyndsay Macdonald, Early Childhood Education, along with the other members of the Toronto Star Youth Panel, made up of some of Canada's most accomplished young leaders, who will pose daily questions to the federal candidates.

The announcement of **Lisa Jordan**, Athletics, as the new head coach of the women's hockey team was covered by CBC.ca, The Chronicle Herald, Calgary Herald, Canada East, American Herald, Canadian Press, The Record (Sherbrooke), The Daily Gleaner (Fredericton), The Daily News (Truro), CBH-FM, CJNI-FM, CIEZ-FM, CKEC-FM, CIGO-FM, CBHT-TV, and ATV-TV.

CTV Newsnet interviewed **Charles Falzon**, Radio and Television Arts, on the limit on the number of questions journalists can ask the Prime Minister each day.

Candice Monson, Psychology, was interviewed by CFYK-TV, CBXT-TV, CBMT-TV, CBOT-TV, CBAT-TV, and CHEK6-TV on post traumatic stress suffered by members of the Armed Forces.

Ryerson student **Tanya Costa**, Ryerson Portuguese Students Association, was interviewed about the provincial budget on CFMT-TV.

The Gauntlet reported that **Ryerson Nursing students** organized their first Trans-Action for Community Health Forum to promote increased inclusion and awareness of transgendered people at the university.

Tyler Forkes, Alumni Relations, was quoted in the National Post in a story on the importance of networking and alumni networks.

The Globe and Mail published a book review by **Irene Gammel**, Modern Literature and Cultural Research Centre, of "The Letters of Rosa Luxemburg".

David Amborski, Urban and Regional Planning, was quoted in a story in the National Post on the debate on density. His research study on construction and housing development in Ontario was featured in the International Business Times. He spoke to Posted Toronto on financing the new transit plan.

The Nanaimo Daily News and the Leader Post reported that Ryerson was one of 80 university teams competing in the NASA international moon buggy race in Alabama.

Groundbreaking research on children of military parents by researchers from Canadian universities including Ryerson was widely covered by The Canadian Press, Winnipeg Free Press, Metro Montreal, The Leader-Post Regina, Prince George Citizen, MSN Canada

News, Canada East, New Brunswick Telegraph-Journal, Vancouver Sun, and Montreal Gazette.

Suanne Kelman, Journalism, commented in the Toronto Star on the public's right to know details about Jack Layton's health. She was quoted in the Globe and Mail in a story on a potential coalition government in the Canadian Press, Metro Toronto, and in the Waterloo Region Record on the creation of Bell Media.

The Globe and Mail profiled men's basketball coach **Roy Rana**, Athletics. The Toronto Sun reported that he is the coach for Nike Hoop Summit's Canadian team.

Ian Watson, Theatre, was profiled in the Ottawa Citizen, Calgary Herald and the Windsor Star.

Peter Monkhouse, The G. Raymond Chang School of Continuing Education is quoted in a Toronto Star story on Ryerson alumnus **Nathan Vella** who is collaborating with the industry advocacy group Interactive Ontario to create a new program that offers business training to the gaming and digital media development community.

Patrice Dutil, Politics and Administration was interviewed about the federal election on CHAN-TV, Global News, and CKND-TV. He commented on the provincial budget on TFO-TV and CBON-FM and on the federal budget and potential election to Global News and CFJC-TV7. He was interviewed on Global News and CJBC-AM on Prime Minister Harper's appeal to opposition parties to support the budget.

John Shields, Politics and Administration, was interviewed on CHAN-TV on immigration in B.C. and its impact on everything from housing to culture and collective values.

Duncan MacLellan, Politics and Public Administration, was interviewed on Global News and CFAX-AM about the federal election. He also was interviewed on CBC Radio One: Here & Now on the federal budget and by Global News election platforms.

The Wall Street Journal profiled Ryerson alumnus **Steve Fernandez**, Radio and Television Arts.

Kim Snow, Child and Youth Care, was quoted in the Toronto Sun on escort agencies and the abuse of young girls.

What's Your Tech.ca and the National Post reported on the [Battle of the Apps](#) competition sponsored by Toronto-based mobile software developer D1 Mobile Inc. in partnership with **StartMeUp Ryerson**, and the City of Toronto.

The Beacon Herald covered a fundraising walk organized by Ryerson student **Shauna Tedder** as a project for a course she is taking on sustainable tourism.

Nursing student, **Shantae Johns**, President of the United Black Students at Ryerson Union and recipient of the Mattie Hayes award, **Shauna Bookal**, Athletics, recipient of the Marie Marguerite Rose Award and **Althea Prince**, The G. Raymond Chang School of Continuing Education, recipient of the Kay Livingstone award were profiled in a story on the Viola Desmond Day celebration at Ryerson in the Jamaica Observer and on the Jamaica Information Service.

Martin Antony, Psychology, was quoted extensively in a story in University Affairs on academia and perfectionism.

The Hamilton Spectator quoted **Wendy Cukier**, Ted Rogers School of Management, in a story on guns and gang crime in Hamilton. She discussed the world of “Mad Men” and the role of women at work on CBC Radio One: Here & Now and the changing rules of teacher/student interaction on social media on OMNI News.

Radio and Television Arts students **Scott Fisher and Jacob Morris**, creators of The Avenue, an online reality-based series, were profiled in the Globe and Mail.

Fiona Yeudall, Centre for Studies in Food Security, critiqued the food movement in Globe and Mail.

The Toronto Star quoted **Robert Ott**, Fashion, in a story on Toronto's fashion and apparel industry. He was interviewed about Fashion Week on CBLT-TV, CHEK6-TV, CFTK-TV, CBOT-TV, and CBUT-TV.

Christina Halliday, Student Learning Support, was quoted in an article in Toronto Star, Mississauga News and parentcentral.ca on new note sharing online services and cheating.

Mid North Mirror reported on the launch of the Ontario Human Rights Commission's new policy on preventing sexual and gender-based harassment in partnership with the Ryerson Students' Union, Ryerson University and the CAW Sam Gindin Chair in Social Justice and Democracy.

Ivor Shapiro, Journalism, was quoted on cbc.ca and interviewed on CFWH-AM on the legal battle between Yukon News and CBC over news sources. He commented on social media and the real time coverage of court trials in the Edmonton Journal, Vancouver Sun and Regina Leader-Post.

Frances Gunn, Ted Rogers School of Retail Management, student **Christie Oreskovich** Ted Rogers School of Hospitality and Tourism Management and alumna **Claudia Labal**, Ted Rogers School of Business Management, were quoted in a Globe and Mail article on graduate employment and the advantages of niche business programs.

Embassy Magazine quoted **Tariq Amin-Khan**, Politics and Public Administration in a story on **why ethnic vote-getting is counterproductive to cultural integration**.

Perry Schneiderman, Theatre, was interviewed on Radio Canada Premiere Chaine: Le Monde Sur Le Mathieu” on the historical relevance of "Les Fridolinades", a production he is remounting at La Nouvelle Scene in Ottawa.

Tuesday, March 1, 2011 – Senate meeting

Revised Monday, April 25, 2011 for distribution to Senate members

7.1 Report of the President

7.13 Announcement of Honorary Doctorates

I am pleased to share the list of honorary doctorate recipients for 2011, and to extend thanks to everyone involved in preparing the nominations, and to the Awards and Ceremonials Committee for its work. It has been a pleasure to connect with the nominees, who have responded with enthusiasm and pride in accepting the honour. We are waiting for confirmations from one Spring (TRSM) and one fall (FEAS) recipient.

Spring 2011

Faculty of Communication & Design

Des McAnuff - FCAD - Internationally recognized Canadian director, producer, and playwright; Doctor of Letters.

Faculty of Community Services

Charles Coffey - Community leader and former Executive Vice President, Government Affairs and Business Development for RBC Financial Group; Doctor of Laws.

Joanne Dallaire - Joanne's ancestry is Omushkego, Swampy Cree, from Attawapiskat Ontario. Her spirit name is Shadow Hawk Woman and she is from the Wolf Clan. She is a traditional healer and a pipe carrier; Doctor of Laws.

Phil Fontaine - Past National Chief of the Assembly of First Nations; Doctor of Laws.

Faculty of Engineering, Architecture and Science

Laura Formusa - President and Chief Executive Officer, Hydro One Inc.; Doctor of Laws.

The G. Raymond Chang School of Continuing Education

Ursula Franklin - Professor emeritus, physicist, pacifist, feminist, human rights activist, educator; Doctor of Laws.

Ted Rogers School of Management

Robert W. Metzger – Justice Metzger sits in the Supreme Court of British Columbia; 1963 Ryerson Business Administration graduate.

Fall 2011

Faculty of Arts / Faculty of Communication & Design

Michael MacMillan - Current Chair and Co-Founder, The Samara Project; Former Executive Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Alliance Atlantis Communications Incorporated; Doctor of Laws.

Faculty of Community Services

Ruth daCosta - Executive Director Covenant House, Toronto; Doctor of Laws.

Faculty of Engineering, Architecture and Science

Julie Payette – Canadian astronaut and Professional engineer; Doctor of Engineering.

**Report #W2011-3 of the Secretary of Senate
May 3, 2011**

Election Results

Vice Chair of Senate 2011-12

David Checkland was acclaimed as Vice Chair of Senate for 2011-12. He will also serve as Vice Chair of the Senate Priorities Committee.

Senate Priorities Committee 2011-13

The following were acclaimed as members of the Senate Priorities Committee. Members will serve for two years, provided they retain their position on Senate.

Marta Braun, Faculty
Michelle Dionne, Faculty
Ken Jones, Dean
Madeleine Lefebvre, Chief Librarian
Dave Mason, Faculty
Andrew McAllister, Undergraduate Student
Golam Morshed, Graduate Student
Nancy Walton, Faculty

Respectfully submitted,

Diane R Schulman, PhD
Secretary of Senate

Report #W2011-4 of the Academic Governance and Policy Committee May 3, 2011

1. Approval of the Institutional Quality Assurance Process

On November 2, 2010, Senate approved four policies that constitute its Quality Assurance Process, as mandated by the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (Quality Council) in its Quality Assurance Framework (QAF) guidelines. These policies were submitted to the Quality Council for its approval as follows:

- November 8, 2010 – Senate approved IQAP forwarded to QC
- December 14, 2010 – first response received from QC.
- January 10, 2011 – IQAP resubmitted to QC
- February 14, 2011 – second response received from QC
- March 17, 2011 – second resubmission to QC
- April 6, 2011 – Conditional approval of IQAP from QC

The changes from the originally approved policies are not major. Attached are the four policies which constitute Ryerson's Institutional Quality Assurance Process as approved by the Quality Council. Once approved by Senate this IQAP process will become effective Fall, 2011. The changes from the originally approved policies are not major. The policies as approved on November 2, 2010 can be viewed at <http://www.ryerson.ca/senate/policies/IQAP-policies.pdf>.

Please refer to the full set of policies for approval attached to this report.

Changes to Policy 110

- Section E: Additional duty of the Vice Provost Academic -Monitoring of new programs, once initiated, in conjunction with the Vice Provost, University Planning;
- Section F: Additional duties of Dean of YSGS –
 - Monitoring of new programs, once initiated, in conjunction with the Vice Provost, University Planning;
 - Responding to the Report of the Program Review Team in a periodic program review of a graduate program;
- Section G: Additional Duties of the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record: Responding to the reports of Peer Review Teams for undergraduate and graduate programs;

Changes to Policy 112

- Scope: Changed “specialization” to “streams or options”.
- Addition of Definition of a New Program: A new program has substantially different program requirements and substantially different learning outcomes from those of any existing approved programs offered by the institution.
- Section D: Additional duty of the Vice Provost Academic -Monitoring of new programs, once initiated, in conjunction with the Vice Provost, University Planning;
- Added Section III: IMPLEMENTATION: If a new program does not begin within thirty-six months of its approval to commence, its approval will lapse.
- Appendix I – Deleted from the Expectations section: *The following degree level expectations adopted from OCAV's Guidelines define a threshold framework for the expression of the intellectual and creative development of students. Under these Guidelines a*

- Procedures Section 4.3 – Mandate of the PRT – added to section 4.3.a - including acknowledgement of any innovative aspects of the proposed program;
- Procedures Section 4.4 – Response to the PRT Report: Addition of - A written response to the PRT report must be provided by the designated Faculty Dean for undergraduate program proposals and the Dean of YSGS for graduate program proposals.

Changes to Policy 126

- Section III: Program review cycle changed “approximately eight years” to “eight years”.
- Appendix I – Deleted from the Expectations section: The following degree level expectations adopted from OCAV’s Guidelines define a threshold framework for the expression of the intellectual and creative development of students. Under these Guidelines a
- Procedures: Addition of Section II: PROTOCOL FOR JOINT PROGRAMS: For programs offered jointly with another university the following should be followed:
 - A. Feedback on the reviewers’ report should be solicited from the partner institution(s), including relevant Deans.
 - B. Preparation of a single Final Assessment Report and Implementation Plan should have input from the partner institution(s), be part of the appropriate governance approval of all partner institution(s), and posted on each institutions website.
 - C. Partner institutions should agree on an appropriate monitoring process for the Implementation Plan.
 - D. The Final Assessment Plan and Implementation Plan should be submitted to the Quality Council by all partners.
- Procedures: Addition to section IV Peer Review Response
 - A.1.b - Composition and Procedure - This includes programs taught in collaboration with colleges or institutions outside of Ontario. In a joint program with other Ontario universities, unless one internal reviewer is agreed upon by all participating institutions, one internal reviewer will be appointed from each participating institution.
 - A.2 – added - All members of the Review Committee will be at arm’s length from the program under review. The external and institutional reviewers will be active and respected in their field, and normally associate or full professors with program management experience
 - B.2.c - distinguishing between those that the program can itself take and those that would require external action, where possible.
 - D.1 – amended to read: The PRT will be provided with:
 - access to program administrators staff, and faculty (including representatives from joint or collaborative Ontario institutions), administrators of related departments and librarians, and students (including representatives from joint or collaborative Ontario institutions), as appropriate;
 - 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
 - F - Response to the PRT Report: A written response to the PRT report must be provided by the designated Faculty Dean for undergraduate program proposals and the Dean of YSGS for graduate program proposals. The Dean will provide a response to each of the following:
 1. The plans and recommendations proposed in the self-study report;

2. The recommendations of the PRT.
3. The program's response to the PRT report.

The Dean will also describe:

1. Any changes in organization, policy or governance required to meet the recommendations.
 2. The resources that would be provided to support the implementation of selected recommendations.
 3. A proposed timeline for the implementation of any of those recommendations.
- Procedures section VI: "report" replaced with "Final Assessment Report".

Changes to Policy 127

- **Definitions: Major Modifications:** 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 or institutional collaboration). Examples of major modifications are provided in Appendix A of this policy.

APPENDIX A EXAMPLES OF MAJOR MODIFICATIONS

Requirements that differ significantly from those existing at the time of the previous cyclical program review

- The merger of two or more programs
- New bridging options for college diploma graduates
- Significant change in the laboratory time of an undergraduate program
- The introduction or deletion of an undergraduate thesis or capstone project
- The introduction or deletion of a work experience, co-op option, internship or practicum, or portfolio
- At the master's level, the introduction or deletion of a research project, research essay or thesis, course-only, co-op, internship or practicum option
- 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
- Major changes to courses comprising a significant proportion of the program.

Significant changes to the learning outcomes

- Changes to program content, other than those listed in a) above, that affect the learning outcomes, but do not meet the threshold for a 'new program'

Significant changes to the faculty engaged in delivering the program and/or to the essential resources such as when there have been changes to the existing mode(s) of delivery (e.g. online delivery or inter-institutional collaboration)

- Changes to the faculty delivering the program: e.g. a large proportion of the faculty retires; new hires alter the areas of research and teaching interests

- 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
 - Change to full- or part-time program options, or vice versa
 - Changes to the essential resources, where these changes impair the delivery of the approved program
- **III. AUTHORITY** - Vice Provost Academic: Where necessary, the Vice Provost Academic has final authority to determine if a modification is considered major or minor.
- **Motion 1: That Senate approve The Institutional Quality Assurance Process, consisting 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*; and Policy 127 - *Curriculum Modifications: Graduate and Undergraduate Programs*.**

2. Amendment of Policy 145 – Undergraduate Course Management Policy

There has been some discussion of the policy concerning the provision of make-up tests, assignments and exams. The existing policy is considered by some to be unclear, and the provision of make-ups, particularly when a scheduled make-up has been missed, has sometimes been problematic. While it is recognized that there are legitimate reasons for missing work, the provision of make-ups needs to be reasonable.

The issue of the posting of grades was also reviewed, and language was changed to reflect better ensure student privacy. The AGPC proposes that this section be further amended for Fall 2013 to require that all student grades be posted only using the Course Management System.

The AGPC established a sub-committee, consisting of Lynn Lavallée, Jurij Leschyshyn, Kaamran Raahemifar, Liana Salvador, Diane Schulman, and John Turtle, to review the policy. The AGPC makes the following recommendations with respect to changes to Section 2.2 of Policy 145: Undergraduate Course Management Policy. (See <http://www.ryerson.ca/senate/policies/pol145.pdf> for the complete policy.)

The proposed changes to section 2.2 of the policy are summarized in the table below, followed by both the current and proposed wording. Note that the numbering of the current and proposed wording on the same topic does not necessarily correspond.

CURRENT		PROPOSED	
		2.2.6	Addition of compliance with academic Accommodation of Students with Disabilities policy
		2.2.7.1	Addition of a set of guiding principles for provisions of make-ups.
2.2.6	Should a student miss a mid-term test or equivalent (e.g. studio or presentation), with appropriate documentation, a make-up will be scheduled as soon as possible in the same semester. Make-ups should cover the same material as the original assessment but need not be of an identical format. Only if it is not possible to schedule such a make-up may the weight of the missed work be placed on the final exam, or another single assessment. This may not cause that exam or assessment to be worth more than 70% of the student's final grade.	2.2.7.2	<p>“Determination of whether a make-up of a mid-term, assignment or other assessment during the semester should be given</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Should a student miss a mid-term test or equivalent (e.g. studio or presentation), with appropriate documentation, normally a make-up will be scheduled as soon as possible in the same semester, and, where possible, before the last date to drop the course. - Where a missed mid-term, assignment or other assessment is one of only two assessments in a course (e.g. there is one mid-term and a final), or when the assessment is worth more than 30% of the final course grade, the provision of a make-up is required.

		<p>- Where a missed mid-term, assignment or other assessment is part of a number of assessments given throughout the term, and when it can be shown that the objective of the missed work is assessed in some other way, then the instructor and student may agree, in writing, to distribute the weight of the missed work to the final exam or other assessment or group of assessments. The redistribution of the weight of missed work may not cause the final exam or any single assessment to be worth more than 70% of the student's final grade. Where there is no agreement, the student may consult the Chair or Director for assistance.</p> <p>- Where it is not possible to schedule the missed work or mid-term because, for example, it was presented in a group, it requires that a lab studio or other set-up be recreated; the weight may be distributed to the final exam or other assessment or group of assessments. In this case, the redistribution of the weight of missed work should normally not cause the final exam or any single assessment to be worth more than 70% of the student's final grade. If it will, an alternate assignment should be considered on a case by case basis.</p>
<p>2.2.6</p>	<p>If a student misses a scheduled make-up test or exam, the grade may be distributed over other course assessments even if that makes the grade on the final exam worth more than 70% of the final grade in the course.</p>	<p>2.2.9</p> <p>Missing a make-up 2.2.9.1 Provision of a second make-up: On a case by case basis, a second make-up may be scheduled at the discretion of the instructor. The student may be required to provide a detailed rationale supported by appropriate documentation for consideration.</p> <p>2.2.9.2 Mid-term test, assignment or assessment during the semester: - If a student misses a scheduled make-up of a mid-term, assignment or other assessment for verifiable reasons, the</p>

			<p>grade may be distributed over other course assessments even if that makes the grade on the final exam worth more than 70% of the final grade in the course.</p> <p>- If a student misses a scheduled mid-term make-up test or assignment, without a verifiable reason, a grade of “0” may be assigned.</p> <p>2.2.9.3 Final Exam: Except where there are verifiable reasons, and the student and instructor have agreed to a rescheduled make-up exam, students who miss a scheduled make-up of a final exam will receive a “0” for that exam.</p>
2.2.9	While it is preferable to post grades electronically on the Course Management System, grades on assignments, tests and exams, including final exams which are posted in hard copy must be posted by numerically sorted student identification number after at least the first two digits have been removed.”	2.2.11	While it is preferable to post grades electronically on the Course Management System, grades on assignments, tests and exams, including final exams, if posted in hard copy, must be posted by numerically sorted student identification number after at least the first four digits have been removed.

Policy 145 – Current wording

- 2.2.6 Should a student miss a mid-term test or equivalent (e.g. studio or presentation), with appropriate documentation, a make-up will be scheduled as soon as possible in the same semester. Make-ups should cover the same material as the original assessment but need not be of an identical format. Only if it is not possible to schedule such a make-up may the weight of the missed work be placed on the final exam, or another single assessment. This may not cause that exam or assessment to be worth more than 70% of the student’s final grade. If a student misses a scheduled make-up test or exam, the grade may be distributed over other course assessments even if that makes the grade on the final exam worth more than 70% of the final grade in the course.
- 2.2.7 Students who miss a final exam for a verifiable reason and who cannot be given a make-up exam prior to the submission of final course grades, must be given a grade of INC (as outlined in the *Grading Promotion and Academic Standing Policy*) and a make-up exam (normally within 2 weeks of the beginning of the next semester) that carries the same weight and measures the same knowledge, must be scheduled.

- 2.2.8 Final exams are not returned, but are retained for a period of one year after the end of the semester. Departments and Schools must develop procedures to ensure that the disposal of examination papers respects the privacy of the students' work.
- 2.2.9 While it is preferable to post grades electronically on the Course Management System, grades on assignments, tests and exams, including final exams which are posted in hard copy must be posted by numerically sorted student identification number after at least the first two digits have been removed. Instructors must inform students in all course management documentation of the method to be used in the posting of grades. Students who wish not to have their grades posted in hard copy must inform the instructor in writing prior to the due date of the first assignment.
- 2.2.10 All grades, on assignments or tests must be posted or made available to students through the return of their work. Grades on final exams must be posted. However, as there may be other consideration in the determination of final grades, students will receive their official final grade in the course only from the Registrar. Final official course grades may not be posted or disclosed anywhere by an instructor.
- 2.2.11 It is the responsibility of the Department or School to develop systems or determine procedures for the confidential return of graded course work. It is the instructor's responsibility to ensure that these procedures are followed.

Policy 145 – Proposed wording (and renumbering of section)

- 2.2.6 Student assessments should comply with the provisions of Senate Policy 159, *Academic Accommodation of Students with Disabilities*.
- 2.2.7 **Make-up mid-term tests, assignments and other assessments during the semester:**
- 2.2.7.1 **Guiding principles**
- Students receive grades that they earn by demonstrating their knowledge of the course material.
 - Assessments are structured such that students' knowledge can be demonstrated incrementally and they are given feedback to facilitate improvement where needed.
 - Different types of courses (e.g. lectures, labs, studios) have different types and number of assessments, ranging from a number of smaller assessments spread over the semester to a single mid-term test and a final exam.
 - Make-ups should cover the same material as the original assessment but need not be of an identical format.
- 2.2.7.2 **Determination of whether a make-up of a mid-term, assignment or other assessment during the semester should be given**
- Should a student miss a mid-term test or equivalent (e.g. studio or presentation), with appropriate documentation, normally a make-up will be scheduled as soon as possible in the same semester, and, where possible, before the last date to drop the course.
 - Where a missed mid-term, assignment or other assessment is one of only two assessments in a course (e.g. there is one mid-term and a final), or when the assessment is worth more than 30% of the final course grade, the provision of a make-up is required.
 - Where a missed mid-term, assignment or other assessment is part of a number of assessments given throughout the term, and when it can be shown that the

objective of the missed work is assessed in some other way, then the instructor and student may agree, in writing, to distribute the weight of the missed work to the final exam, or other assessment or group of assessments. The redistribution of the weight of missed work may not cause the final exam or any single assessment to be worth more than 70% of the student's final grade. Where there is no agreement, the student may consult the Chair or Director for assistance.

- Where it is not possible to schedule the missed work or mid-term because, for example, it was presented in a group, it requires that a lab studio or other set-up be recreated; the weight may be distributed to the final exam or other assessment or group of assessments. In this case, the redistribution of the weight of missed work should normally not cause the final exam or any single assessment to be worth more than 70% of the student's final grade. If it will, an alternate assignment should be considered on a case by case basis.

2.2.8 **Make-up of final exams:** Students who miss a final exam for a verifiable reason and who cannot be given a make-up exam prior to the submission of final course grades, must be given a grade of INC (as outlined in the *Grading Promotion and Academic Standing Policy*) and a make-up exam (normally within 2 weeks of the beginning of the next semester) that carries the same weight and measures the same knowledge, must be scheduled.

2.2.9 **Missing a make-up**

2.2.9.1 **Provision of a second make-up:** On a case by case basis, a second make-up may be scheduled at the discretion of the instructor. The student may be required to provide a detailed rationale supported by appropriate documentation for consideration.

2.2.9.2 **Mid-term test, assignment or assessment during the semester:**

- If a student misses a scheduled make-up of a mid-term, assignment or other assessment for verifiable reasons, the grade may be distributed over other course assessments even if that makes the grade on the final exam worth more than 70% of the final grade in the course.
- If a student misses a scheduled mid-term make-up test or assignment, without a verifiable reason, a grade of "0" may be assigned.

2.2.9.3 **Final Exam:** Except where there are verifiable reasons, and the student and instructor have agreed to a rescheduled make-up exam, students who miss a scheduled make-up of a final exam will receive a "0" for that exam.

2.2.10 Final exams are not returned, but are retained for a period of one year after the end of the semester. Departments and Schools must develop procedures to ensure that the disposal of examination papers respects the privacy of the students' work.

2.2.11 While it is preferable to post grades electronically on the Course Management System, grades on assignments, tests and exams, including final exams, if posted in hard copy, must be posted by numerically sorted student identification number after at least the first four digits have been removed. Instructors must inform students in all course management documentation of the method to be used in the posting of grades. Students who wish not to have their grades posted in hard copy must inform the instructor in writing prior to the due date of the first assignment.

2.2.12 All grades, on assignments or tests must be posted or made available to students through the return of their work. Grades on final exams must be posted. However, as there may be other consideration in the determination of final grades, students will receive their official final grade in the course only from the Registrar. Final official course grades may not be posted or disclosed anywhere by an instructor.

2.2.13 It is the responsibility of the Department or School to develop systems or determine procedures for the confidential return of graded course work. It is the instructor's responsibility to ensure that these procedures are followed.

Motion 2: That Senate approve the amendment of Policy 145, *Undergraduate Course Management Policy* as presented in this report, effective Fall, 2011.

3. Amendment of Policy 61 – Student Code of Non-Academic Conduct

In accordance with the requirement for the Student Code of Non-Academic Conduct to be reviewed in 2011, the AGPC established an *ad hoc* committee to complete that review.

In addition to reviewing the policy, the committee completed the annual review of procedures in keeping with the policy revisions.

Composition of the committee

Ryerson community members who participated on the committee are:

Staff: Diane Schulman, Senate (Chair); Cathy Faye, School of Graduate Studies; Ann Whiteside, DHPS; Imre Juurlink, Security; Jen Gonzales, Housing; Mickey Cirak, Student Conduct Officer

Students: Manpreet Chana, Student member-at-large; Rodney Diverlus, RSU; Emily Shelton, CESAR; Liana Salvador, RSU

Faculty: Karen Spalding, Nursing; Tariq Amin-Khan, Faculty

The consultation also included Julia Hanigsberg, Heather Lane-Vetere, Tony Conte and Nora Farrell.

In general, the current Code and the process have been working well and have been successful in addressing student conduct concerns brought to the Student Conduct Office. Changes reflect areas where some clarification was needed, and the requirements of the Occupational Health and Safety Act.

A summary of changes and the revised policy, in its entirety, are attached to this report. The current policy can be found at <http://www.ryerson.ca/senate/policies/pol61.pdf>.

Reflecting changes in the Occupational Health and Safety Act

In June, 2010, Bill 168: A bill to amend the Occupational Health and Safety Act, came into effect. Under the amendment, employers are required to develop programs and policies which explicitly address incidents of workplace violence, harassment that could lead to workplace violence, or domestic abuse that could spill into the workplace as a workplace hazard. Any related policies which may also address violence in the workplace, should refer back to these protocols. In consultation with the Bill 168 working group, the committee added language of "workplace" and a section to the Code to meet this requirement.

New sections

The committee added the following:

- a section to the Code and Procedures addressing the process for dealing with students who do not comply with remedies imposed by the Student Code Office;
- a section clarifying appeals of interim measures;
- an elaboration on the informal resolution options outlined in the Procedures section of the Code; and

- a section on the ability to act on a complaint, regardless of whether or not the complaint is received in writing.

Motion 3: That Senate approve the amendment of Policy 61, *Student Code of Non-Academic Conduct*, as presented in this report, effective Fall 2011.

4. Movement of the School of Health Services Management from the Faculty of Community Services to the Ted Rogers School of Management

The Provost's Academic Restructuring Commission (PASC) report *Academic Restructuring at Ryerson University: White Paper*¹ states that the Commission "endorses transferring Health Services Management from FCS to TRSM to support a new health services management program". In response, the Provost and the Deans of the Faculty of Community Services (FCS) and the Ted Rogers School of Management (TRSM) struck a committee to more fully explore this option. This committee consisted of: Aziz Guergachi, Faculty, Information Technology Management; Winston Isaac, Director, School of Health Services Management; Jim Tiessen, Director, MBA Program, Ted Rogers School of Management; Janice Waddell, Associate Dean, Faculty of Community Services. The broad directive from the Provost and the Deans to the committee was to consider Ryerson's current and potential position in the health care management field.

The healthcare sector comprises 10% of Canada's economy and, given technology and demographic trends, it will continue to grow and employ appropriately educated and trained clinicians, staff and managers. As fiscally-stressed governments try to control spending while demand continues to expand, management will become even more important as efficiencies are sought and tough decisions get made.

More than 15 years ago, Ryerson moved into the healthcare management field by introducing part-time degree completion programs in Health Services Management and Health Information Management. The Committee compared Ryerson's programs to comparator programs at other institutions, as well as the current employer demand in the field. The committee report concluded, that given the changes in health care provision and management and the need to provide a curriculum that supports a wide range of specializations, the movement of the School of Health Services Management from the Faculty of Community Services to the Ted Rogers School of Management was ideal. This proposal was presented to faculty and students in the School at meetings on April 6 and 7, 2011, as well as to the Chairs and Directors in both Faculties (Directors in FCS on April 5, 2011 and Chairs in TRSM on March 29, 2011). All have agreed that the move is for the best.

¹ Provost's Academic Structure Commission, 2010, *Academic Restructuring at Ryerson University: White Paper*, (Jan. 29), p. 26 Available

http://www.ryerson.ca/provost/planning/planning_initiatives/academic_structure/white_paper_academicstructure_jan2010.pdf.

Based on this consultation, Usha George, Dean, Faculty of Community Services, and Ken Jones, Dean, Ted Rogers School of Management, have requested that a motion be brought to Senate by the Academic Governance and Policy Committee to seek approval for the movement of the School of Health Services Management to the Ted Rogers School of Management. The program curriculum would remain unchanged for students currently enrolled, and program and curriculum development, first at the undergraduate and then at the graduate level, would follow over the next few years. Physical movement of the School would occur as soon as possible.

Motion 4: That Senate approve the move of the School of Health Services Management from the Faculty of Community Services to the Ted Rogers School of Management, effective July 1, 2011.

Respectfully submitted,

Alan Shepard, Chair

For the Committee: Keith Alnwick, Alexandra Anderson, Rupa Banerjee, Yanna Chevtchouk, Chris Evans, Heather Lane Vetere, Lynn Lavallée, Jurij Leshchyshyn, Mark Lovewell, Peter Monkhouse, Mariam Munawar, Melanie Panitch, Liana Salvador, Diane Schulman, John Turtle

RYERSON UNIVERSITY
POLICY OF SENATE

INSTITUTIONAL QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESS

Policy Number:	110
Current Policy Approval Date:	May 3, 2011
Policy Review Date:	May 2013 (<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

Ryerson University, in its commitment to quality education, and in compliance with the Quality Assessment Framework established by the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (Quality Council), has developed this overarching policy on Quality Assurance and three subsidiary policies which establish policies and procedures for the three pillars of quality: new program development and approval; the periodic review of existing programs; and the modification of existing curricula and programs.

The subsidiary policies are as follows:

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

I. SCOPE: This Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP) governs all graduate and undergraduate programs, both full and part-time, offered solely by Ryerson or in partnership with any other post-secondary institution.

II. AUTHORITY & RESPONSIBILITY:

A. Senate

1. Final internal authority for the approval of all new graduate and undergraduate programs;
2. Final authority for the approval of all graduate and undergraduate periodic program reviews; and
3. Final authority for the approval of all major modifications to curriculum/programs.

B. Academic Standards Committee: Recommendations to Senate for undergraduate programs with respect to implementation of new programs, periodic program reviews and major curriculum modifications.

C. Yeates School of Graduate Studies Council: Recommendations to Senate for graduate programs with respect to implementation of new programs, periodic program reviews and major curriculum modifications.

D. Provost and Vice President Academic

1. Overall responsibility for the IQAP policies and procedures;
2. Approval for the development of new program proposals based on Letters of Intent;
3. Final approval of commencement, implementation and budget of new programs;
4. Approval of any budget allocations to support program review outcomes;
5. Responsibility for reporting to the Board of Governors on new program proposals and the outcomes of program reviews; and
6. Responsibility for reporting to the Quality Council, which may be delegated to the Vice Provost Academic.

E. Vice Provost, Academic

1. Receiving undergraduate new program Letters of Intent and submitting them to the Provost;
2. Submitting full undergraduate new program proposals to the Academic Standards Committee;
3. Monitoring of new programs, once initiated, in conjunction with the Vice Provost, University Planning;
4. Forwarding follow-up reports on Periodic Program Reviews to the Academic Standards Committee;
5. Determining if an undergraduate program/curriculum modification is major or minor, where necessary;
6. Resolution of disputes between Deans or between a Dean and a Department/School/Faculty Council with respect to curriculum modification;
7. Establishing the Periodic Program Review schedule;
8. Reporting to the Quality Council, in consultation with the Provost;
9. Responsibility for the local implementation of Ryerson's Quality Council Audit Process; and
10. The posting of Periodic Program Review executive summaries on the Ryerson website.

F. Dean, Yeates School of Graduate Studies

1. Acceptance and submission of new graduate program Letters of Intent to the Provost;
2. Determining if a graduate program/curriculum modification is major or minor, where necessary;
3. Approval of major and minor modifications to graduate programs;
4. Submission of new program proposals, curriculum modifications and graduate program reviews to Senate, as chair of the Yeates School of Graduate Studies Council;
5. Responding to the Report of the Program Review Team in a periodic program review of a graduate program;
6. Forwarding follow-up reports on Graduate Periodic Program Reviews to the YSGSC;
7. Monitoring of new programs, once initiated, in conjunction with the Vice Provost, University Planning; and
8. Appointing Peer Review Teams for graduate programs in consultation with the program Dean.

G. Faculty Deans (or Dean of Record for Interdisciplinary Programs)

1. Approval of major and minor modifications to graduate and undergraduate programs;
2. Resolution of disputes between a Department/School Council and Chair/ Director with respect to curriculum modification;

3. Submission of Letters of Intent for undergraduate programs to the Vice Provost Academic;
4. Appointing Peer Review Teams for graduate programs in consultation with the Dean of the Yeates School of Graduate Studies.
5. Responding to the reports of Peer Review Teams for undergraduate and graduate programs;
6. Submission of Letters of Intent for graduate programs and new graduate program proposals to the Dean of the Yeates School of Graduate Studies; and
7. Submission of new undergraduate program proposals to the Academic Standards Committee.

H. Department/School or Faculty Councils (where applicable)

1. Approval of Letters of Intent, new undergraduate program proposals, major and minor modifications, and recommending these to the appropriate Deans;
2. Approval of major modifications to curriculum/programs; and
3. Approval of periodic program reviews to be forwarded to Dean.

I. Yeates School of Graduate Studies Council: Approval of new graduate program proposals and periodic program reviews for forwarding to Senate.

J. Department/School Chairs/Directors: Presentation of periodic program review follow-up report to Faculty Dean or Dean of Record and Dean of Graduate Studies for graduate programs, and Provost.

K. Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (Quality Council):

1. The Quality Council has ultimate authority to approve the university's IQAP and any subsequent revisions.
2. The Quality Council audit the university's periodic program review process on an eight year cycle.
3. The university will annually submit a report to the Quality Council on major program modifications approved through the university's internal process, and summarizing outcomes of periodic program reviews.

III. Selection of Peer Review Team (PRT) members

A. Peer Review Teams (PRT) are required for periodic program review and new program proposals for both graduate and undergraduate programs.

B. The PRT will consist of:

1. two faculty from the relevant discipline(s), field(s) or profession from another university, including universities outside Ontario, where appropriate, who are at arms length from the program school/department; plus
2. for a program review, one additional reviewer, either from within the university but from outside the discipline (or interdisciplinary group) engaged in the program, or external to the university.
3. The membership of the undergraduate PRT will be determined and appointed by the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record for Interdisciplinary Programs, based on written information provided by the program. The membership of the graduate PRT will be determined by the Dean of YSGS in consultation with the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record. Information from the program will include names and brief biographies of

four or more faculty external to Ryerson and two or more faculty internal to Ryerson. If graduate and undergraduate reviews are done simultaneously, the Faculty Dean, or Dean of Record, and Dean of YSGS must decide if a combined PRT or separate PRTs are required.

4. The Faculty Dean or Dean of Record for undergraduate programs, and the Dean of 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.

IV. ESTABLISHING AND REVIEWING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

- A.** The three policies that address the development of new programs, periodic review of programs and modifications of curriculum are approved by Senate in compliance with this overall IQAP policy.
- B.** Any revision of this policy or the associated policies requires Senate and the Quality Council approval.
- C.** Procedures associated with each of the policies are reviewed as needed to ensure that they remain current and that they are effective.
- D.** A Handbook for Periodic Program Review and New Program Development, giving further detail on the review process, will be developed by the Academic Standards Committee for undergraduate programs and the Yeates School of Graduate Studies Council for graduate programs.

RYERSON UNIVERSITY
POLICY OF SENATE

DEVELOPMENT OF NEW GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

Policy Number²:	112
Previous Approval Dates for Policy 112	May 6, 2008, March 1, 2005, May 9, 2002 February 7, 1995 (original policy)
Previous Approval Dates for Policy 127	January 2002 (Reformatted), October 2000 October 1996
Current Policy Approval Date	May 3, 2011
Policy Review Date	May 2013 (<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

POLICY STATEMENT

I. SCOPE

This policy governs the creation of new degrees, degree programs or programs of specialization at the undergraduate and graduate level, including those offered jointly with other post-secondary institutions. It does not include change of program name only, nor the inclusion of a new streams or options within an existing program.

Definitions:

- A. New program:** A new program has substantially different program requirements and substantially different learning outcomes from those of any existing approved programs offered by the institution.
- B. Degree program:** The complete set and sequence of courses, combination of courses and/or other units of study, research and practice prescribed by the University for the Fulfillment of a degree. Degrees are granted for meeting the established requirements at a specified standard of performance consistent with the university's Degree Level Expectations (DLEs). (See APPENDIX I and II).

II. AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY

- A. Senate:** Final internal authority for the academic approval of all Ryerson University programs rests with the Senate.
- B. Academic Standards Committee (ASC) and Yeates School of Graduate Studies Council (YSGS Council):** As committees of Senate, these committees will review final proposals for new undergraduate and graduate programs, respectively, and will bring recommendations to Senate with respect to their approval.

² This policy combines Policies on new undergraduate programs (Policy 112) and graduate programs (Previously Policy 127) in keeping with COU guidelines developed in 2010.

C. Provost and Vice President Academic

1. approval of the development of program proposals, based on Letters of Intent (LOI); and
2. final approval of implementation and budget of new programs.

D. Vice Provost, Academic

1. accepting undergraduate LOIs and full program proposals for submission to the Provost;
2. submitting full undergraduate program proposals to the Academic Standards Committee for review and approval; and
3. monitoring of new programs, once initiated, in conjunction with the Vice Provost, University Planning.

E. Deans

1. Faculty Deans, or Deans of Record for Interdisciplinary Programs, have the authority for the submission of:
 - a. new undergraduate program LOIs to the Vice Provost Academic for submission to the Provost;
 - b. new undergraduate program proposals to the Vice Provost Academic for submission to the Provost;
 - c. new graduate program LOIs to the Dean of the Yeates School of Graduate Studies for submission to the Provost; and
 - d. new graduate program proposals to the Dean of the Yeates School of Graduate Studies for submission to the Provost.
2. Dean of the Yeates School of Graduate Studies has the authority for the submission to the Provost of:
 - a. new graduate program LOIs; and
 - b. new graduate program proposals.

F. YSGS Programs and Planning Committee: Reviews and approves graduate program proposals and recommends to YSGS Council.

G. Department/School and Faculty Councils (where applicable): The approval of Councils is required for an LOI or new program proposal to proceed to the Dean for submission to the Vice Provost Academic.

H. Ontario University Council on Quality Assurance:

1. The Quality Council has the authority to approve or decline new program proposals.
2. The Provost, through the Vice Provost, Academic, has the responsibility to report to the Quality Council about the approval process for all new programs.

I. Board of Governors: Authority for the financial approval of all new programs rests with the Board of Governors.

J. Disputes: If there is a disagreement within a Department/School, or between Departments/Schools with respect to the development of a new program, the relevant Dean(s) shall decide how to proceed. Should there be a disagreement between Deans or between a Dean and a Department/School or Faculty Council, the Provost shall decide how to proceed.

III. IMPLEMENTATION: If a new program does not begin within thirty-six months of its approval to commence, its approval will lapse.

IV. PROCEDURES: The Provost shall establish the procedures related to this policy, and review those procedures as necessary. The procedures associated with this policy shall include all of the steps necessary for the approval of undergraduate and graduate programs.

APPENDIX I: DEGREE LEVEL EXPECTATIONS FOR UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

	UNDERGRADUATE DEGREE
EXPECTATIONS	<i>All undergraduate degree programs at Ryerson will be expected to demonstrate that at the completion of the program students would have acquired the following set of skills.</i>
1. Depth and Breadth of Knowledge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. A developed knowledge and critical understanding of the key concepts, methodologies, current advances, theoretical approaches and assumptions in a discipline overall, as well as in a specialized area of a discipline; b. A developed understanding of many of the major fields in a discipline, including, where appropriate, from an interdisciplinary perspective, and how the fields may intersect with fields in related disciplines; c. A developed ability to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Gather, review, evaluate and interpret information; and ii. Compare the merits of alternate hypotheses or creative options, relevant to one or more of the major fields in a discipline; d. A developed, detailed knowledge of and experience in research in an area of the discipline; e. Developed critical thinking and analytical skills inside and outside the discipline; f. The ability to apply learning from one or more areas outside the discipline.
2. Knowledge of Methodologies	<p>An understanding of methods of enquiry or creative activity, or both, in their primary area of study that enables the student to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Evaluate the appropriateness of different approaches to solving problems using well established ideas and techniques; b. Devise and sustain arguments or solve problems using these methods; and describe and comment upon particular aspects of current research or equivalent advanced scholarship.
3. Application of Knowledge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The ability to review, present and critically evaluate qualitative and quantitative information to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Develop lines of argument; ii. Make sound judgments in accordance with the major theories, concepts and methods of the subject(s) of study; iii. Apply underlying concepts, principles, and techniques of analysis, both within and outside the discipline; iv. Where appropriate use this knowledge in the creative process; and

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. The ability to use a range of established techniques to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Initiate and undertake critical evaluation of arguments, assumptions, abstract concepts and information; ii. Propose solutions; iii. Frame appropriate questions for the purpose of solving a problem; iv. Solve a problem or create a new work; and c. The ability to make critical use of scholarly reviews and primary sources.
4. Communication Skills	The ability to communicate information, arguments, and analyses accurately and reliably, orally and in writing to a range of audiences.
5. Awareness of Limits of Knowledge	An understanding of the limits to their own knowledge and ability, and an appreciation of the uncertainty, ambiguity and limits to knowledge and how this might influence analyses and interpretations.
6. Autonomy and Professional Capacity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Qualities and transferable skills necessary for further study, employment, community involvement and other activities requiring: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The exercise of initiative, personal responsibility and accountability in both personal and group contexts; ii. Working effectively with others; iii. Decision-making in complex contexts; b. The ability to manage their own learning in changing circumstances, both within and outside the discipline and to select an appropriate program of further study; and c. Behaviour consistent with academic integrity and social responsibility.

APPENDIX II: DEGREE LEVEL EXPECTATIONS FOR GRADUATE PROGRAMS

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

DOCTORAL DEGREE	
EXPECTATIONS	<i>This degree extends the skills associated with the Master's degree and is awarded to students who have demonstrated:</i>
1. Depth and Breadth of Knowledge	A thorough understanding of a substantial body of knowledge that is at the forefront of their academic discipline or area of professional practice.
2. Research and Scholarship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The ability to conceptualize, design, and implement research for the generation of new knowledge, applications, or understanding at the forefront of the discipline, and to adjust the research design or methodology in the light of unforeseen problems; b. The ability to make informed judgments on complex issues in specialist fields, sometimes requiring new methods; and c. The ability to produce original research, or other advanced scholarship, of a quality to satisfy peer review, and to merit publication.
3. Level of Application of Knowledge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The capacity to undertake pure and/or applied research at an advanced level; and b. Contribute to the development of academic or professional skills, techniques, tools, practices, ideas, theories, approaches, and/or materials.
4. Professional Capacity/Autonomy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The qualities and transferable skills necessary for employment requiring the exercise of personal responsibility and largely autonomous initiative in complex situations; b. The intellectual independence to be academically and professionally engaged and current; c. The ethical behaviour consistent with academic integrity and the use of appropriate guidelines and procedures for responsible conduct of research; and d. The ability to evaluate the broader implications of applying knowledge to particular contexts.
5. Level of Communication Skills	The ability to communicate complex and/or ambiguous ideas, issues and conclusions clearly and effectively.
6. Awareness of Limits of Knowledge	An appreciation of the limitations of one's own work and discipline, of the complexity of knowledge, and of the potential contributions of other interpretations, methods, and disciplines.

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

PROCEDURES

The stages of the developmental and approval process are:

1. GENERATION OF A PRELIMINARY PROPOSAL

1.1 Initiation of the Process

Preliminary proposals for new degree programs will be developed by faculty groups ("originating units") that are comprised of faculty from a single school or department, from several schools and/or departments within a Faculty, from schools and departments from different Faculties, or from collaborative structures involving other post-secondary institutions.

1.2 Authorization to Proceed

The authorization of the Provost and Vice President Academic³ is required before a full program proposal is developed.

The first step in obtaining this authorization is a *Letter of Intent (LOI)* to be prepared by the originating unit. When the unit has received approval from the relevant Faculty Dean(s), the LOI will be transmitted to the Vice Provost for undergraduate programs or to the Dean of YSGS for graduate programs.

This letter will include:

- a. a brief statement of the consistency of the program with Ryerson's mission and academic plan, the Faculty plan and the Department/School plan;
- b. a brief description of the proposed program including its purpose, anticipated student clientele, and curriculum;
- c. a preliminary statement of existing and/or emerging societal need and the basis on which this has been determined;
- d. a preliminary projection of faculty and other resource requirements, developed in consultation with the University Planning Office;
- e. 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 approval of the LOI;
- f. the proposed schedule for program implementation;
- g. an executive summary; and
- h. for graduate programs, a statement of whether the program is a professional program and/or a full cost recovery program;
- i. for graduate programs, letters of support and commitment from the relevant Faculty Dean(s).

³ Hereafter referred to as Provost.

The executive summary will be posted by the Provost and, along with the complete LOI, will be available for inspection by any interested member of the Ryerson community. A period of one month is set aside for comment on the proposal.

The Provost will respond to the letter of intent after the expiry of the one-month community response period. If the development of a proposal is authorized, an academic unit will be formally designated to assume responsibility for it and a Faculty Dean 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 formal proposal. In the case of undergraduate inter-Faculty proposals the Provost shall decide which Faculty Dean shall be given primary responsibility.

Authorization to proceed signifies that the University supports the development of a formal program proposal, but it does not commit the University or the Faculty to final endorsement.

2. DEVELOPMENT OF THE FORMAL PROPOSAL

2.1 Proposal Content

A proposal must include:

2.1.2 Basic information

- a. Name of the program and the proposed degree designation(s), identification of the designated academic unit, and the names of the principal faculty members involved in its development.
- b. Statement of the program goals, clearly identifying the rationale for offering this new program as it relates to societal need, Ryerson's mission and academic plan and the academic plans of the Faculty and the Department/School.
- c. Overview of the curriculum, major disciplines/options of the program, and mode of delivery.
- d. A presentation of the program curriculum in a clear tabular format as it would appear in the calendar, specifying the courses, their modes of delivery and scheduled hours per week, for each term of the program.
- e. Discussion of the overlap between, and/or integration of, the program with other existing or planned programs at Ryerson.
- f. Copy of the Provost's authorization to proceed and a summary of major departures from the Letter of Intent.
- g. **New Program Advisory Committee (for undergraduate programs only):** Once authorization to proceed has been given, a New Program Advisory Committee² will be constituted. This Committee will consist of at least 5 members. The designated academic unit will provide the relevant Dean(s) with a list of suggested members and brief biographical sketches. The suggested members may be drawn, as appropriate, from business, industry, labour, agencies, government, and other universities. As the proposal is developed, the role of the committee is to provide advice on:
 - i. program objectives;
 - ii. proposed courses and curriculum structure;
 - iii. equipment and other required support (where relevant);

- iv. likely employment patterns for graduates; and
- v. any other aspects of the proposed program related to its objectives, structure, and societal relevance.

In general, the committee's advice will be sought periodically during the development of the proposal. Its working relationship with the designated academic unit should be iterative.

2.1.3 Program details

a. Objectives

- i. Consistency of the program with the institution's mission and academic plans.
- ii. Clarity and appropriateness of the program's requirements and associated learning outcomes in addressing the institution's own undergraduate or graduate Degree Level Expectations.
- iii. Appropriateness of degree nomenclature.

b. Admission requirements

- i. A statement of the admission requirements and the appropriateness of the program's admission requirements for the learning outcomes established for completion of the program.
- ii. 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.

c. Structure

- i. Appropriateness of the program's structure and regulations to meet specified program learning outcomes and degree level expectations.
- ii. For graduate programs, a clear rationale for program length that ensures that the program requirements can be reasonably completed within the proposed time period.

d. Program content

- i. Ways in which the curriculum addresses the current state of the discipline or area of study.
- ii. An analysis of the program's curriculum content in terms of professional licensing/accreditation requirements, if any.
- iii. Identification of any unique curriculum or program innovations or creative components.
- iv. For research-focused graduate programs, clear indication of the nature and suitability of the major research requirements for degree completion.
- v. Evidence that each graduate program requires students to take a minimum of two-thirds of the course requirements from among graduate level courses.

e. Mode of delivery

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

f. Assessment of teaching and learning

- i. Appropriateness of the proposed methods for the assessment of student achievement of the intended program learning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations.
- ii. Completeness of plans for documenting and demonstrating the level of performance of students, consistent with the institution's statement of its Degree Level Expectations (see Appendix).
- iii. Promotion and graduation requirements, if variant from Ryerson's graduate or undergraduate policies on grading, promotion and academic standing.

- g. **Resources (Developed in consultation with the University Planning Office where appropriate.)**
 - i. **For all programs**
 - a. Adequacy of the administrative unit's planned utilization of existing human, physical and financial resources, and any current institutional commitment to supplement those resources, to support the program.
 - b. Participation of a sufficient number and quality of faculty who are competent to teach and/or supervise in the program.
 - c. Report by the university library on existing and proposed collections and services to support the program goals and learning objectives.
 - d. Evidence that there are adequate resources to sustain quality graduate and undergraduate research activities, including information technology and laboratory access.
 - ii. **Resources for graduate programs only**
 - a. Evidence that faculty have the recent research or professional/clinical expertise needed to sustain the program, promote innovation and foster an appropriate intellectual climate.
 - b. Where appropriate to the program, evidence that financial assistance for students will be sufficient to ensure adequate quality and numbers of students.
 - c. Evidence of how supervisory loads will be distributed, and the qualifications and appointment status of faculty who will provide instruction and supervision.
 - iii. **Resources for undergraduate programs only:** Evidence of and planning for adequate numbers and quality of:
 - a. faculty and staff to achieve the goals of the program or of plans and the commitment to provide the necessary resources in step with the implementation of the program;
 - b. planned/anticipated class sizes;
 - c. provision of supervision of experiential learning opportunities (if required); and
 - d. the role of adjunct and part-time faculty.
- h. **Quality and other indicators**
 - i. Definition and use of indicators that provide evidence of quality of the faculty (e.g., qualifications, research, innovation and scholarly record; appropriateness of collective faculty expertise to contribute substantively to the proposed program).
 - ii. Evidence of a program structure and faculty research that will ensure the intellectual quality of the student experience.

2.1.4 Appendices - The following information, relevant to the above, should be included as appendices to the proposal.

- a. Calendar-type course descriptions of each of the proposed courses, accompanied by course level outcomes, and articulating the relationship of these outcomes to program expectations.
- b. A synopsis of each undergraduate professional and required professionally-related course, identifying the major topics of study, potential text(s), methods of evaluation and related computer, laboratory, or studio experience.
- c. Curriculum Vitae of the faculty members, formatted as per the RFA Collective Agreement in a single volume, who will be involved in the development/delivery of the proposed program.

2.1.5 Institutional appropriateness, societal need, and student demand

- a. Assessment of institutional appropriateness. This assessment should refer to the university's

mission and to relevant areas of strength within the university and the designated academic unit. These would include teaching, SRC activity, and others as appropriate.

- b. Description of the existing and/or emerging societal need(s) that will be met by the program's graduates, and any relevant trends in the anticipated societal need, including:
 - i. anticipated student demand for the program, supported with as much evidence as possible;
 - ii. evidence that graduates of the program are and will be needed in appropriate sectors based on such things as: letters from potential employers and, where applicable, professional organizations and /or associations, who have reviewed the proposed curriculum and/or a formal survey of potential students; and/or
 - iii. statistics related to the number of Ontario students leaving the province to study in the same field elsewhere in Canada or abroad, and the comments of relevant student groups.
- c. Indication of any innovative and distinctive aspects of the proposed program, and a comparison with the most similar programs in Ontario. If there are significant similarities between the proposed program and existing programs, a case for duplication should be made.
- d. Examination of potential collaboration/cooperation with other Institutions offering similar or complementary programs, and the rationale for whether such joint arrangements may or may not be beneficial. The outcome of any consultations with other institutions offering similar programs regarding the possibility of cooperation, sharing of resources, facilities and faculty should be indicated.

2.1.6 *Data developed in consultation with the University Planning Office (UPO) and, for Graduate Program, the Yeates School of Graduate Studies*

- a. Projected enrolment levels for at least the first five years of the operation of the new program, leading to the intended steady-state enrolment levels and the year in which such steady-state will be reached.
- b. The facilities, specialized equipment, and other physical resources that will be required to offer the proposed program.
- c. Estimated number of faculty members (total and additional, in FTEs) and support staff that will be required to deliver the program at the steady-state conditions.
- d. Estimated annual operating and capital funds required to deliver the proposed program.
- e. Space (including work/study space for graduate students), computing and library support that will be required.
- f. For Graduate programs, funding for graduate students.
- g. Tuition proposal for graduate programs.
- h. For PhD programs based on an already existing related Masters program, flow-through cohort data on publication, employment and student funding.

A preliminary assessment of financial viability will be carried out as soon as possible after the required information is gathered. The proposal will not be submitted for Decanal approval prior to this preliminary assessment.

- 2.1.7 Preliminary External Review** – If a graduate program so desires, it may engage an external consultant to review the written documents, normally prior to department/school council approval. The consultant will be selected in consultation with the Dean and the Dean of YSGS, and may not be a member of the subsequent Peer Review Team.

3. PROCESS FOR PROGRAM APPROVAL

3.1 Departmental/School Approval

The formal proposal for an undergraduate or graduate program will be presented to the relevant Departmental/School Council(s) for review and approval. Where such a Council does not exist the designated Faculty Dean shall establish an appropriate committee consisting of members of related department/school councils.

A record will be kept of the date(s) of the relevant Council meeting(s), along with any qualifications or limitations placed on approval by the Council(s). This information must be forwarded to the designated Faculty Dean.

3.2 Decanal Approval

After the undergraduate program proposal has been approved by the Department/School(s) it will be forwarded to the Faculty Dean(s) for approval. Once the undergraduate program proposal is approved, the Faculty Dean will submit the proposal to the Vice Provost, Academic. The Vice Provost, Academic, will submit the proposal to the ASC for review and approval. Inter-Faculty programs will require the approval of the Deans of all involved Faculties.

After the graduate program proposal has been approved by the School/Department Council(s), it will be forwarded to the Faculty Dean. Once the graduate program is approved, the Faculty Dean will provide a letter of support and the program proposal to the Yeates School of Graduate Studies for review by the Program and Planning Committee of the Yeates School of Graduate Studies Council.

4. PEER REVIEW AND SITE VISIT

As soon as possible after a proposal has been approved by the Dean(s), it will undergo review by a peer review team as described below.

4.1 Requirements

The undergraduate peer review team will be appointed by the designated Faculty Dean based on written information provided by the originating unit. This information will include the names and brief biographies of four faculty external to Ryerson.

The graduate peer review team will be appointed by the Dean of YSGS in consultation with the Faculty Dean. The originating unit will provide a list of names and brief biographies of four or more faculty external to Ryerson.

4.2 Composition and Selection of the Peer Review Team (PRT)

- a. The PRT will consist of two faculty from the relevant discipline(s), field(s) or profession from another university, including universities outside Ontario where appropriate, who are at arms length from the program school/department

- b. The membership of the undergraduate PRT will be determined and appointed by the Dean based on written information provided by the program. The membership of the graduate PRT will be determined by the Dean of YSGS in consultation with the faculty Dean. Information from the program will include names and brief biographies of four or more faculty external to Ryerson and three or more faculty internal to Ryerson.
- c. The Faculty Dean, or Dean of Record for undergraduate programs and the Dean of YSGS, in consultation with the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record for graduate programs, will ask one of the external reviewers to serve as Chair.
- d. There will be a site visit, structured to include the opportunity for the PRT to meet with appropriate faculty, staff and students.

4.3 The Mandate of the Peer Review Team

The general mandate of the Peer Review Team is to evaluate and report in writing on the academic quality of the proposed program and the capacity of the designated academic unit to deliver it in an appropriate manner. The report of the PRT will address:

- a. the currency, rigour, and coherence of the proposed curriculum, including acknowledgement of any innovative aspects of the proposed program;
- b. the appropriateness of the program's goals and learning objectives;
- c. the ability of the proposed curriculum to meet the program's goals and learning objectives;
- d. the proposed number of faculty;
- e. the academic expertise of the faculty in relation to the program's goals and objectives;
- f. the proposed levels of support staff and infrastructure (e.g. space, facilities, technology, library) for the proposed program, within the unit and (to the extent relevant) the university;
- g. for graduate programs, the proposed levels of funding for graduate students;
- h. for graduate programs, the relevance of the proposed fields of the program;
- i. the proposed admissions criteria; and,
- j. any recommendations for improvement and/or modification to the program.

4.3 Provided to the Peer Review Team Before the Site Visit

The Peer Review Team will be provided with a Letter of Invitation, a site visit agenda and their mandate, along with the formal proposal and all documentation pertinent to its approval to this point. This communication will remind the PRT of the confidentiality of the documents presented.

4.4 Provided to the Peer Review Team During the Site Visit

- a. The PRT will be provided with:
 - 1. access to program administrators, staff, and faculty, administrators of related departments and librarians and students as appropriate; and
 - 2. any additional information that may be needed to support a thorough review.

- b. At the close of the site visit for an undergraduate program, the PRT will hold a debriefing involving the designated Faculty Dean, Vice Provost, Academic, and/or the Provost and any others who may be invited. For a graduate program, the Dean of YSGS will also attend.

4.6 After the Site Visit

Within four weeks of the completion of the site visit, the undergraduate PRT will submit its written report to the designated Faculty Dean and the Provost. The graduate PRT will submit its written report to the Faculty Dean and the Dean of YSGS, also within four weeks of the visit. For undergraduate programs, the designated Faculty Dean will circulate this report to the designated academic unit. For graduate programs, the Dean of YSGS will circulate this report to the designated academic unit and the designated Faculty Dean.

4.4 Response to the PRT Report

Within four weeks of receipt of the PRT report, the designated academic unit will submit its response for undergraduate program proposals to the designated Faculty Dean and for graduate program proposals to the Dean of YSGS. The response will take the form of a statement that identifies any corrections or clarifications, indicates how the PRT recommendations are being accommodated or, if they are not to be accommodated, reasons for this. Alternatively, if the PRT report is strongly favourable, the designated academic unit may respond by resubmitting its proposal incorporating any modifications.

A written response to the PRT report must be provided by the designated Faculty Dean for undergraduate program proposals and the Dean of YSGS for graduate program proposals.

If the proposal is revised following, or as a result of, the PRT review, the original proposal and the revised proposal must be resubmitted to the designated Faculty Dean/Dean of YSGS.

If the designated Faculty Dean(s) or the Dean of YSGS believes that this revised proposal differs substantially from the appended formal proposal s/he is required to return it to the Department/School Council(s) for further endorsement before providing decanal endorsement.

Undergraduate Programs

The entire proposal, with revisions, including the PRT review and response and the Faculty Dean's approval, is submitted to the Vice Provost, Academic. The Vice Provost, Academic, will submit the proposal to ASC.

Graduate Programs

The entire proposal, with revisions, including the PRT review and response and the designated Faculty Dean's approval, is submitted to the Yeates School of Graduate Studies, for submission to the PPC. PPC will make one of the following recommendations:

- a. That the program be sent to the YSGS Council with or without qualification; or
- b. That the program proposal be returned to the designated academic unit for further revision.

Upon approval by the PPC, the Dean of YSGS will submit the entire proposal, with revisions, including the PRT review and response, along with the designated Faculty Dean's approval, to the YSGS Council.

5. ACADEMIC STANDARDS COMMITTEE AND YEATES SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES REVIEW

The ASC or the YSGS Council will review the proposal for academic quality and societal need and make one of the following recommendations:

- a. That the program be approved, with or without qualification;
- b. That the program proposal be returned to the originating unit for further revision; or
- c. That the program not be approved.

6. SENATE APPROVAL - The Chair of the Academic Standards Committee or the Dean of YSGS (as Chair of the YSGS Council), will submit a report to Senate. Senate approval is the culmination of the internal academic approval process.

7. QUALITY COUNCIL APPROVAL - Once approved by Senate, the Proposal Brief, together with all required reports and documents, as outlined in the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance Framework, will be submitted to the Quality Council for approval as per the required process. Following submission to the Quality Council, the university may announce its intention to offer the program if it is clearly indicated that QC approval is pending and no offers of admission will be made until that approval is received.

8. REPORT TO THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS - The Provost is responsible for presentation of the program to the Board for approval of financial viability.

9. PROVOST - Final implementation of the program is the responsibility of the Provost.

10. PERIODIC PROGRAM REVIEW - All new programs will be reviewed no more than eight years after implementation and in accordance with Senate Policy 126: Periodic Program Review of Graduate and Undergraduate Programs.

RYERSON UNIVERSITY
POLICY OF SENATE

PERIODIC PROGRAM REVIEW OF GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

Policy Number	126
Current Policy Approval Date	May 3, 2011
Policy Review Date	May 2013 (<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

POLICY STATEMENT

I. SCOPE

This policy governs the periodic review of all existing undergraduate and graduate programs, including those offered jointly with other post-secondary institutions.

Programs offered jointly with other post-secondary institutions will be subject to the periodic program review policies of all the institutions. These programs are included in the schedule of program reviews which will be published annually.

II. AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY

- A. Senate:** Final authority for the approval of periodic program review of all Ryerson programs rests with the Senate.
- B. Academic Standards Committee (ASC) and Yeates School of Graduate Studies Council (YSGSC):** As committees of Senate, ASC and YSGSC will assess periodic program reviews on Senate's behalf and bring recommendations to Senate with respect to their approval.

Where departments/schools choose to combine an undergraduate and graduate program review, the ASC and YSGSC will coordinate their reports to Senate.

ASC and YSGSC shall publish Periodic Program Review Manuals describing and supporting the review process, including:

- Guidance on the conduct of rigorous, objective and searching self-studies and the potential benefits of such studies;
- The responsibilities for the collection, aggregation and distribution of institutional data and outcome measures required of self studies; and
- The Periodic Program Review schedule.

C. Deans

1. The Faculty Dean, or Dean of Record for an Interdisciplinary program, has the authority to submit undergraduate periodic program reviews to the ASC and graduate periodic program reviews to the Yeates School of Graduate Studies.

2. The Dean of the Yeates School of Graduate Studies, as chair of the YSGSC, has the authority for submission of the graduate periodic program reviews to Senate.

D. YSGS Programs and Planning Committee: Assesses graduate periodic program reviews and makes recommendations to YSGSC.

E. Department/School/Program Councils: Approval of these Councils is required before the periodic program review is submitted to the Faculty Dean. Multidisciplinary and Interdisciplinary Programs shall be reviewed as distinct programs and must establish an administrative entity that will be responsible for both curriculum and program review.

F. Department/School Chairs/Directors and Graduate Program Directors: The Chair/Director/Graduate Program Director is responsible for the presentation of the required follow-up report to the Dean and Provost by the specified date, normally within one year of the review.

G. Vice Provost, Academic: The Vice Provost, Academic shall forward required follow-up reports to the ASC for its information, review, and report to Senate. If it is believed that there has not been sufficient progress in addressing any issues raised by the Program Review, an additional update and course of action by a specified date may be required.

The Vice Provost, Academic will establish the schedule for periodic program reviews.

The Vice Provost, Academic will be responsible for the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (Quality Council) periodic audit process.

Following action by the Senate, the Provost will present a report that summarizes the outcomes of the Program Review to the Board of Governors for its information.

III. PURPOSE

Periodic program reviews serve primarily to help ensure that programs achieve and maintain the highest possible standards of academic quality and continue to satisfy societal need. They also serve to satisfy public accountability expectations through a review process that is transparent and consequential. The process is endorsed by the Council of Ontario Universities (COU) and monitored by the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (Quality Council). Academic programs at Ryerson are also aligned with the statement of undergraduate and graduate degree-level expectations adopted by the COU. These degree-level expectations can be found in Appendix I and II of this policy.

The process is to be applied to all programs on a cycle of eight years. Where there are related undergraduate and graduate programs, reviews of both programs may be combined if the department/school wishes to do so. Program reviews will be coordinated with any professional accreditation review. An accreditation review can be used to satisfy the program review requirement to the extent that it meets that requirement. The program must submit a supplementary report containing additional information required by the program review process, if any.

IV. PROCEDURES

- The Provost shall establish the procedures related to this policy, and review those procedures as necessary.
- The procedures associated with this policy shall include all of the steps necessary for the preparation of an undergraduate or graduate program review.

- For undergraduate programs, the Academic Standards Committee will develop a manual that gives details of the process and supports the preparation of the review. The Yeates School of Graduate Studies Council will prepare a manual for graduate programs.

APPENDIX I: DEGREE LEVEL EXPECTATIONS FOR UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

	UNDERGRADUATE DEGREE
EXPECTATIONS	<i>All undergraduate degree programs at Ryerson will be expected to demonstrate that at the completion of the program students would have acquired the following set of skills.</i>
1. Depth and Breadth of Knowledge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. A developed knowledge and critical understanding of the key concepts, methodologies, current advances, theoretical approaches and assumptions in a discipline overall, as well as in a specialized area of a discipline; b. A developed understanding of many of the major fields in a discipline, including, where appropriate, from an interdisciplinary perspective, and how the fields may intersect with fields in related disciplines; c. A developed ability to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Gather, review, evaluate and interpret information; and ii. Compare the merits of alternate hypotheses or creative options, relevant to one or more of the major fields in a discipline; d. A developed, detailed knowledge of and experience in research in an area of the discipline; e. Developed critical thinking and analytical skills inside and outside the discipline; f. The ability to apply learning from one or more areas outside the discipline.
2. Knowledge of Methodologies	<p>An understanding of methods of enquiry or creative activity, or both, in their primary area of study that enables the student to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Evaluate the appropriateness of different approaches to solving problems using well established ideas and techniques; b. Devise and sustain arguments or solve problems using these methods; and describe and comment upon particular aspects of current research or equivalent advanced scholarship.
3. Application of Knowledge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The ability to review, present and critically evaluate qualitative and quantitative information to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Develop lines of argument; ii. Make sound judgments in accordance with the major theories, concepts and methods of the subject(s) of study; iii. Apply underlying concepts, principles, and

	<p>techniques of analysis, both within and outside the discipline;</p> <p>iv. Where appropriate use this knowledge in the creative process; and</p> <p>b. The ability to use a range of established techniques to:</p> <p>i. Initiate and undertake critical evaluation of arguments, assumptions, abstract concepts and information;</p> <p>ii. Propose solutions;</p> <p>iii. Frame appropriate questions for the purpose of solving a problem;</p> <p>iv. Solve a problem or create a new work; and</p> <p>c. The ability to make critical use of scholarly reviews and primary sources.</p>
<p>4. Communication Skills</p>	<p>The ability to communicate information, arguments, and analyses accurately and reliably, orally and in writing to a range of audiences.</p>
<p>5. Awareness of Limits of Knowledge</p>	<p>An understanding of the limits to their own knowledge and ability, and an appreciation of the uncertainty, ambiguity and limits to knowledge and how this might influence analyses and interpretations.</p>
<p>6. Autonomy and Professional Capacity</p>	<p>a. Qualities and transferable skills necessary for further study, employment, community involvement and other activities requiring:</p> <p>i. The exercise of initiative, personal responsibility and accountability in both personal and group contexts;</p> <p>ii. Working effectively with others;</p> <p>iii. Decision-making in complex contexts;</p> <p>b. The ability to manage their own learning in changing circumstances, both within and outside the discipline and to select an appropriate program of further study; and</p> <p>c. Behaviour consistent with academic integrity and social responsibility.</p>

APPENDIX II: DEGREE LEVEL EXPECTATIONS FOR GRADUATE PROGRAMS

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

DOCTORAL DEGREE	
EXPECTATIONS	<i>This degree extends the skills associated with the Master's degree and is awarded to students who have demonstrated:</i>
1. Depth and Breadth of Knowledge	A thorough understanding of a substantial body of knowledge that is at the forefront of their academic discipline or area of professional practice.
2. Research and Scholarship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The ability to conceptualize, design, and implement research for the generation of new knowledge, applications, or understanding at the forefront of the discipline, and to adjust the research design or methodology in the light of unforeseen problems; b. The ability to make informed judgments on complex issues in specialist fields, sometimes requiring new methods; and c. The ability to produce original research, or other advanced scholarship, of a quality to satisfy peer review, and to merit publication.
3. Level of Application of Knowledge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The capacity to undertake pure and/or applied research at an advanced level; and b. Contribute to the development of academic or professional skills, techniques, tools, practices, ideas, theories, approaches, and/or materials.
4. Professional Capacity/Autonomy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The qualities and transferable skills necessary for employment requiring the exercise of personal responsibility and largely autonomous initiative in complex situations; b. The intellectual independence to be academically and professionally engaged and current; c. The ethical behaviour consistent with academic integrity and the use of appropriate guidelines and procedures for responsible conduct of research; and d. The ability to evaluate the broader implications of applying knowledge to particular contexts.
5. Level of Communication Skills	The ability to communicate complex and/or ambiguous ideas, issues and conclusions clearly and effectively.
6. Awareness of Limits of Knowledge	An appreciation of the limitations of one's own work and discipline, of the complexity of knowledge, and of the potential contributions of other interpretations, methods, and disciplines.

POLICY 126: PERIODIC PROGRAM REVIEW OF GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

PROCEDURES

I. THE SELF-STUDY REPORT

The self-study has descriptive, explanatory, evaluative and formative functions. It provides an opportunity for programs to assess academic quality and societal need. It is essential that the self-study is reflective, self-critical and analytical, and that it actively involve both faculty and students in the process. The self-study consists of two parts: a narrative that addresses key areas, and appendices that include the data and information that form the basis for the narrative.⁴

- A. **NARRATIVE** – The narrative must provide a reflective, self-critical and analytical review of the program based on data and surveys, and must be the result of active involvement of faculty and students. The narrative must include, but is not limited to:
1. **Program History:** a brief history of the program's development; and
 2. **Program Outcomes:** a statement of the goals, learning objectives and program expectations and their consistency with the University's mission and academic plan, the Faculty academic plan, the school/department academic plan and the undergraduate and graduate Degree-Level Expectations found in Appendix I and II of the policy.
 3. **Development Since Previous Program Review** – a report on how the program has met the goals and objectives of the developmental plan submitted in the previous Program Review and how it has addressed the Senate recommendations on that Program Review.
 4. **Societal Need**⁵
 - a. a description of current and anticipated societal need; and
 - b. an assessment of existing and anticipated student demand.
 5. **Admission Criteria**
 - a. a statement of admission requirements and an analysis showing they are appropriately aligned with the learning outcomes of the program; and
 - b. for graduate programs, the grade level for admission
 6. **Academic Quality**
 - a. description of the program curriculum and structure, including the relationship of the curriculum and individual courses to the Degree Level Expectations, program goals and learning objectives;
 - b. a description of how the curriculum reflects the current state of the discipline or area of study;
 - c. a description, where appropriate, of how the curriculum addresses issues of diversity and inclusion;
 - d. evidence of any significant innovation or creativity in the content and/or delivery of the program relative to other such programs;
 - e. an analysis and evaluation of the appropriateness and effectiveness of the mode of delivery (including, where applicable, distance or on-line delivery) to meet the program's learning objectives;
 - f. the appropriateness and effectiveness of the methods of assessing student achievement of the defined learning outcomes and degree learning expectations, particularly in students' final year of study;
 - g. an analysis and evaluation of the level of achievement of students, consistent with the defined learning outcomes and degree learning expectations;

⁴ The ASC and YSGSC will advise programs throughout the review process on matters of content and format and to ensure that policy requirements are met.

⁵ Elements of employer surveys/focus groups may be relevant in this section.

- h. for graduate programs, evidence of a program structure and faculty research that will ensure the intellectual quality of the student experience;
- i. for graduate programs, 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. a statement of any variations from Ryerson's GPA policy and an analysis and evaluation of the appropriateness of these variations;
- k. a summary and evaluation of any partnership or collaborative agreements with other institutions.
- l. a summary and evaluation of any experiential learning opportunities.
- m. a summary and evaluation of library resources;
- n. a summary and analysis of the results of student surveys/focus groups and graduate surveys, including the quality of support to students and general student satisfaction with the program.

7. Academic Quality Indicator Analysis (Data to be included in Appendices). A summary and analysis of the following areas:

a. Faculty:

- faculty qualification and SRC record;
- class size
- percentage of classes taught by full and part-time faculty;
- numbers, assignment and qualifications of part-time faculty;
- for graduate programs:
 - the quality and availability of graduate supervision
 - faculty funding, honours and awards
 - faculty commitment to student mentoring

b. Students

- Number of applications and registrations;
- Attrition rates;
- Time-to-completion (for graduate programs), including evidence that that students' time-to-completion is both monitored and managed in relation to the program's defined length and program requirements;
- GPAs on graduation
- Graduation rates
- Faculty Course Survey results
- Academic awards and for graduate students, success rates in provincial and national scholarships and competitions
- For graduate students, scholarly output and commitment to professional and transferable skills.
- For graduate students, the level of funding.

c. Graduates

- Employment six months and two years after graduation
- Post-graduation study
- Alumni reports
- Results of employer surveys/focus groups (for graduate programs, where appropriate)

8. Resources: An analysis and evaluation of the appropriateness and effectiveness of the use of existing human, physical and financial resources, (e.g. laboratory, studio and computer facilities and space, respecting Ryerson's autonomy to determine priorities for funding, space, and faculty allocation) to support the program.

9. Strengths, Weaknesses and Opportunities - a self-critical analysis of the strengths, weaknesses and opportunities of the program, addressing:

- a. academic quality based on the elements in sections 5-7 above;

- b. opportunities for program improvement and enhancement; and
- c. the ability of the program to meet its goals and Degree Level Expectations.

10. Developmental Plan - a 3-5 year developmental plan including:

- a. priorities for implementation of the recommendations;
- b. relationship of the priorities to the university, faculty and department/school/program academic plan; and
- c. timeline for implementation.

11. An Executive Summary suitable for posting on the university website.

B. APPENDICES

1. Appendix I: All data and survey information on which the narrative is based⁶, including but not limited to:
 - a. Program specific Degree Level Expectations;
 - b. Admissions requirements, admissions data, and information on student demand;
 - c. Student satisfaction survey (and/or focus group comments where appropriate);
 - d. Faculty Course Survey results as compared to the faculty and university;
 - e. Comments from service departments (for undergraduate programs);
 - f. Faculty data (faculty members listed by field, courses taught, full/part-time, class size, and, for graduate programs, funding, supervisory privileges etc.);
 - g. Data on enrolment in all program courses (required and elective);
 - h. Retention and graduation data (cohort data for graduate programs);
 - i. Student funding for graduate programs;
 - j. Recent graduate survey;
 - k. Employer survey (and/or focus group comments where appropriate);
 - l. Employment and publication data for graduate programs (where appropriate);
 - m. Library resources report;
 - n. Additional relevant data.
2. Appendix II: Faculty Curriculum Vitae
 - a. For Undergraduate programs
 - all faculty members in the program school or department; and
 - all other faculty who have recently taught required courses to program students.
 - b. For Graduate programs
 - all faculty members in the program school or department; and
 - all adjunct faculty.
3. Appendix III: Courses
 - a. List of courses offered (including mode of delivery, faculty member responsible, etc.)
 - b. Course outlines for all courses offered by the program.
4. Appendix IV: Documentation of Advisory Council comments (for undergraduate programs), Department/School/Program Council Approvals, and approval by the Dean(s).

Detailed guidelines for the above are contained in a Program Review Manual.

- II. PROTOCOL FOR JOINT PROGRAMS:** For programs offered jointly with another university the following should be followed:
- A. Feedback on the reviewers' report should be solicited from the partner institution(s), including

⁶ Relevant statistical information is available from the University Planning Office.

relevant Deans.

- B. Preparation of a single Final Assessment Report and Implementation Plan should have input from the partner institution(s), be part of the appropriate governance approval of all partner institution(s), and posted on each institutions website.
- C. Partner institutions should agree on an appropriate monitoring process for the Implementation Plan.
- D. The Final Assessment Plan and Implementation Plan should be submitted to the Quality Council by all partners.

III. REVIEWS AND APPROVALS AT THE PROGRAM AND DECANAL LEVELS

A. Department/School/Program Council

The Chair/Director of the program will forward the full self-study report to the Faculty Dean⁷ and, for graduate programs, the Dean of YSGS who will review it and either refer it back to the program for further development or for presentation to the Department/School/Program Council (or other appropriate administrative entity in the case of multi-disciplinary or inter-disciplinary programs) for its review and approval. A record will be kept of the date(s) of the relevant Council meeting(s), along with any qualifications or limitations placed by the Council on the approval.

B. Program Advisory Council (for Undergraduate programs)

Following approval by the Department/School/Program Council, the self-study report, along with any Department/School/Program Council qualifications or limitations, will be sent to the Faculty Dean for presentation to the Program Advisory Council (PAC) for its review and comments. A record will be kept of the date(s) of the meeting(s) and members attending the meeting(s).

C. Dean of the Faculty

The Dean will approve the program review for preliminary submission to either the Academic Standards Committee or the Yeates School of Graduate Studies.

D. Assessment Prior to Submission to an External Peer Review Team

1. Undergraduate Program reviews: The ASC will review the program review to determine if there are any issues prior to submission to a Peer Review Team.
2. Graduate Program Reviews: The Programs and Planning Committee of the YSGS Council will review the program review to determine if there are any issues prior to submission to a Peer Review team.

IV. PEER REVIEW AND RESPONSE

The program must undergo an external evaluation by a Peer Review Team (PRT). Members of the PRT will be given information on the University and its mission, a complete copy of the self-study report and a copy of the PRT Mandate.

A. Composition and Procedure⁸

1. The PRT will consist of:
 - a. two faculty from the relevant discipline(s), field(s) or profession from another university, including universities outside Ontario, where appropriate, who are at arms length from the program school/department; and

⁷ For multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary programs, a Dean will be designated to serve as the Faculty Dean.

⁸ The Peer Review procedures are outlined in the *Peer Review Team Guide* found in the Program Review Manual.

- b. one additional reviewer, either from within the university but from outside the discipline (or interdisciplinary group) engaged in the program, or external to the university. This includes programs taught in collaboration with colleges or institutions outside of Ontario. In a joint program with other Ontario universities, unless one internal reviewer is agreed upon by all participating institutions, one internal reviewer will be appointed from each participating institution.
2. The membership of the undergraduate PRT will be determined and appointed by the Dean based on written information provided by the program. The membership of the graduate PRT will be determined by the Dean of YSGS in consultation with the faculty Dean. All members of the PRT will be at arm's length from the program under review. Information from the program will include names and brief biographies of four or more faculty external to Ryerson and two or more faculty internal to Ryerson. The external and institutional reviewers will be active and respected in their field, and normally associate or full professors with program management experience. If graduate and undergraduate reviews are done simultaneously, the Faculty Dean and Dean of YSGS must decide if a combined PRT or separate PRTs are required.
3. The Faculty Dean or Dean of Record for undergraduate programs, and the Dean of 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. There will be a site visit, structured to include the opportunity for PRT discussion with students, faculty and staff.
5. In the case of accredited programs, at his or her discretion, the Vice Provost, Academic may require a separate Peer Review when the accrediting body's assessment does not fully cover all of the areas required by the University's program review process or may require an Addendum to the materials presented to an accreditation board associated with the academic discipline under review.

B. The Peer Review Team Mandate

1. The general mandate of the PRT is to evaluate the academic quality of the program and the capacity of the School or Department to deliver it in an appropriate manner. More specifically, the Peer Review will address:
 - a. the appropriateness of the program's goals and learning objectives and the consistency of the program's curriculum with these goals and objectives;
 - b. the currency, rigour, and coherence of the program's curriculum;
 - c. the appropriateness of the mode of delivery and methods used for the evaluation of student progress;
 - d. the appropriateness of the program's admissions requirements to the program goals and learning objectives;
 - e. the appropriateness and effectiveness of the use of existing human, physical and financial resources, (e.g. laboratory, studio and computer facilities and space, respecting Ryerson's autonomy to determine priorities for funding, space, and faculty allocation) to support the program;
 - f. the quality of support to students and general student satisfaction with the program;
 - g. the degree to which the scholarly, research and creative activity in the offering unit provides support for the program goals and learning objectives;
 - h. for graduate programs, the level of funding for graduate students; and
 - i. for graduate programs, the relevance of any fields within the program.
2. The PRT should, at the end of its report, specifically comment on:
 - a. the program's strengths, weaknesses and opportunities;
 - b. the program's developmental plan; and
 - c. recommendations for actions to improve the quality of the program, if any, distinguishing between those that the program can itself take and those that would require external action, where possible.

C. Provided to the Peer Review Team Before the Site Visit

The Peer Review Team will be provided with a Letter of Invitation, a site visit agenda and their mandate, along with the formal proposal and all relevant documentation. For This communication will remind the PRT of the confidentiality of the documents presented.

D. Provided to the Peer Review Team During the Site Visit

3. The PRT will be provided with:
 - o 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;
 - o coordination of site visits to Ontario institutions offering joint programs (excluding college collaborative programs), where appropriate; and
 - o any additional information that may be needed to support a thorough review.
4. At the close of the site visit for an undergraduate program, the PRT will hold a debriefing involving the designated Faculty Dean, Vice Provost, Academic, and/or the Provost and any others who may be invited. For a graduate program, the Dean of YSGS will also attend.

E. Peer Review Team Report

1. At the close of the site visit for an undergraduate program, the PRT will hold a debriefing involving the designated Faculty Dean, Vice Provost, Academic, and/or the Provost and any others who may be invited. For graduate programs, the Dean of YSGS is included.
2. The PRT shall submit a written report to the Dean and Vice Provost, Academic within four weeks of its site visit.
3. A copy of the PRT report will be forwarded to the Chair/Director.

F. Response to the PRT Report

Within four weeks, the program will submit a written response to the PRT report for undergraduate program proposals to the Faculty Dean and for graduate program proposals to the Dean of YSGS. The written response may include any of the following: corrections or clarifications of items raised in the PRT report; a revised developmental plan with an explanation of how the revisions reflect the recommendations or respond to the weaknesses or deficiencies identified in the report; and/or an explanation of why recommendations of the PRT will not be acted upon.

A written response to the PRT report must be provided by the designated Faculty Dean for undergraduate program proposals and the Dean of YSGS for graduate program proposals. The Dean will provide a response to each of the following:

4. The plans and recommendations proposed in the self-study report;
5. The recommendations of the PRT.
6. The program's response to the PRT report.

The Dean will also describe:

4. Any changes in organization, policy or governance required to meet the recommendations.
5. The resources that would be provided to support the implementation of selected recommendations.
6. A proposed timeline for the implementation of any of those recommendations.

If the self appraisal report or the developmental plan is revised following, or as a result of, the PRT review, the original and the revised documents must be resubmitted to the Faculty Dean/Dean of YSGS.

If the Faculty Dean(s) or the Dean of YSGS believes that this document differs substantially from the original s/he is required to return it to the Department/School Council(s) for further endorsement before providing decanal endorsement.

Undergraduate Programs

The entire report, with revisions, including the PRT review and response and the Faculty Dean's approval, is submitted to the Vice Provost, Academic. The Vice Provost, Academic, will submit the proposal to ASC.

Graduate Programs

The entire report, with revisions, including the PRT review and response and the Faculty Dean's approval, is submitted to the Yeates School of Graduate Studies, for submission to the PPC. PPC will make one the following recommendations:

- a. That the report be sent to the YSGS Council with or without qualification;
- b. That the report be returned to the program for further revision.

Upon approval by the PPC, the Dean of YSGS will submit the entire report, with revisions, including the PRT review and response, along with the Faculty Dean's approval, to the YSGS Council.

V. ACADEMIC STANDARDS COMMITTEE OR YEATES SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES REVIEW

The ASC or the YSGS Council will review the report and make one of the following recommendations:

- a. Approval of the review as submitted, with or without recommendations for further action.
- b. Conditional approval of the review, with conditions specified.
- c. Referral of the review to the Dean for further action in response to specified weaknesses and/or deficiencies.
- d. Rejection of the review as submitted.

If there is a concurrent review of an undergraduate and a graduate program, the chairs of the ASC and YSGSC will consult to provide a joint report to Senate.

VI. SENATE APPROVAL

The Chair of the ASC and/or YSGS Council, will submit a Final Assessment Report to Senate that summarizes the findings and conclusions of the review of the program, including the program's strengths and weaknesses, and outlining the actions to be taken on the recommendations arising from the review.

Senate is charged with final academic approval of the Program Review. Senate shall publish the Executive Summary, Final Assessment Report and the associated Implementation Plan, and the action of Senate for each Periodic Program Review on the Senate website following Senate action. Copies will be provided to the Quality Council and the Board of Governors, for their information. Complete documentation, respecting the provisions of FIPPA, will be made available through the Senate office.

VII. FOLLOW-UP REPORT AND IMPLEMENTATION

If the report includes a recommendation for approval of the program review, it will include a date for a required follow-up report to be submitted to the Dean and Provost on the progress of the developmental plan and any recommendations or conditions attached to the approval. The initial follow-up report is normally due by June 30 of the academic year following Senate's resolution. The Provost may require additional follow-up reports.

If the report is referred to the Dean, a date will be specified for the completion of a revised report. If the revised report is not filed by that date, the program review will be rejected.

The Chair/Director and Dean are responsible for requesting any additional resources identified in the report through the annual academic planning process. The relevant Dean(s) is responsible for providing identified resources, and Provost is responsible for final approval of requests for extraordinary funding. Requests should normally be addressed, with a decision to either fund or not fund, within 2 budget years of the Senate approval.

The follow-up report to Senate will include an indication of the resources that have been provided.

VIII. QUALITY COUNCIL

The Provost will annually report outcomes of all Periodic Program Reviews to the Quality Council as per the required process.

IX. REPORT TO THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS

The Provost is responsible for presentation of the Final Assessment Report to the Board for its information.

RYERSON UNIVERSITY
POLICY OF SENATE

CURRICULUM MODIFICATIONS: GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

Policy Number:	127
Approval Date:	May 3, 2011
Policy Review Date	May 2013 (<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

POLICY STATEMENT

I. SCOPE

This policy governs changes to existing minors, undergraduate and graduate programs, including those offered jointly with other post-secondary institutions, recognizing that the university must be responsive to professional developments and advances in disciplinary knowledge. This applies to all programs, whether offered in full, in part, or in partnership with any other postsecondary institution.

II. DEFINITIONS

Major Modifications: 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 or institutional collaboration).

Examples of major modifications are provided in Appendix A of this policy.

Minor Modifications: Changes which are not considered major modifications, such as: changes in course description, title or requisites; alteration to the number of course hours; repositioning of a course in a curriculum; adding or deleting a required course; changes in course weight; change in mode of a single course delivery; reconfiguration or minor changes to courses in a Minor; change in admission policy; variation in policy for grading, promotion, graduation or academic standing; or change in program name and/or degree designation.

III. AUTHORITY

Vice Provost Academic: Where necessary, the Vice Provost Academic has final authority to determine if a modification is considered major or minor.

Major Modifications: Major Modifications must first be approved by Department/School Councils, Chairs/Directors and Deans (including Dean of the Yeates School of Graduate Studies for graduate programs), and then submitted to either the Academic Standards Committee (ASC) or the Yeates School of Graduate Studies Council (YYSGS) for its review and recommendation to Senate

with respect to approval. For the addition of a new field to an existing graduate program, Expedited Approval of the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance is required.

Proposals must also include a statement on any additional resources that will be required (e.g. faculty, space, technology) and the Degree Level Expectations⁹ which will be affected, if any. Reference must be included to any related changes that had occurred since the last program review.

Minor Modifications: Minor Modifications require Department/School Council, Chair/Director and Decanal approval (including the Dean of Graduate Studies for graduate programs). Consultation with other affected departments/schools/programs, including the Chang School of Continuing Education and the library, where relevant, is required. A statement of any changes in resource requirements is also required.

Information with appropriate sign-offs is forwarded for implementation as per Procedures, and changes are sent to Senate for information.

Senate: Senate has the ultimate authority to approve Major Modifications to curriculum, and may discuss and act upon any Minor Modification brought for information.

Disputes: If there is a disagreement within a department/school/program, or between departments/schools/programs with respect to any curriculum modification, the relevant Dean(s) shall decide how to proceed. Should there be a disagreement between Deans or between a Dean and a Department/School/Program or Faculty Council, the Vice Provost Academic shall decide how to proceed.

IV. PROCEDURES

Procedures related to this policy will be developed and reviewed annually by the Chairs of the ASC, YYS GS and delegates from the Registrar's Office and the Yeates School of Graduate Studies. These procedures will incorporate the process for undergraduate and graduate calendar changes.

⁹ Degree Level Expectations for graduate and undergraduate programs have been established by the Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents (OCAV). A list of the DLEs can be found appended to Senate Policies 112 and 127. Programs establish their program outcomes based on these.

APPENDIX A EXAMPLES OF MAJOR MODIFICATIONS

Requirements that differ significantly from those existing at the time of the previous cyclical program review

- The merger of two or more programs
- New bridging options for college diploma graduates
- Significant change in the laboratory time of an undergraduate program
- The introduction or deletion of an undergraduate thesis or capstone project
- The introduction or deletion of a work experience, co-op option, internship or practicum, or portfolio
- At the master's level, the introduction or deletion of a research project, research essay or thesis, course-only, co-op, internship or practicum option
- 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
- Major changes to courses comprising a significant proportion of the program.

Significant changes to the learning outcomes

- Changes to program content, other than those listed in a) above, that affect the learning outcomes, but do not meet the threshold for a 'new program'

Significant changes to the faculty engaged in delivering the program and/or to the essential resources such as when there have been changes to the existing mode(s) of delivery (e.g. online delivery or inter-institutional collaboration)

- Changes to the faculty delivering the program: e.g. a large proportion of the faculty retires; new hires alter the areas of research and teaching interests
- 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
- Change to full- or part-time program options, or vice versa
- Changes to the essential resources, where these changes impair the delivery of the approved program

PROCEDURES FOR SUBMISSION OF UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM MODIFICATIONS AND CALENDAR CHANGES

Forms, time lines and complete submission instructions can be found at
www.ryerson.ca/calendar/edit.

Please note that handwritten submissions will not be accepted.

MINOR MODIFICATIONS

CATEGORY 1 MODIFICATIONS

Description: Category 1 Modifications typically include:

- course description, title, and requisite changes; and/or
- minor alterations in course hours with a cumulative change of two hours or less for a single-term course, or four hours or less for a multi-term course.

Consultation:Undergraduate Publications as needed

Required approvals:Teaching Department/School.

Form to be completed:Course Change Form – Active Courses (UCCF–A)

Where to Submit:Undergraduate Publications, POD 362.

Submission Deadline:**First Friday after October Senate meeting (See time line)**

CATEGORY 2 MODIFICATIONS

Description: Category 2 Modifications include:

- course repositioning, additions, deletions;
- significant 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;
- mode of delivery and course weight variations; and/or
- minor changes to existing Minors (i.e., deleting one course and adding another; re-configuration of required and elective courses).

Required Consultation:

Undergraduate Publications must be consulted early in the process to ensure that possible issues regarding the affect of the change on students in each year of the program and out-of-phase students are considered.

Required approvals:

- Department/School Council of the Teaching Department/School;
- Dean of the Teaching Department/School; and
- Department/School Council(s) and the Dean(s) of the affected Program Department(s)/School(s).

Forms to be completed:

- **Course Change Form – Active (UCCF–A) for changes to active courses and/or**
- **Course Change Form – New (UCCF–N) for the introduction of a new course**
- **Approvals and Consultations Form (UAAC) – 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.
 - **Chang School courses affected;** if any, consultation with the relevant Chang School Program Director, School Council and Dean are required.
 - **Deleting a course identified as “Required” in another program’s curriculum;** if any, that program’s Chair/Director, Departmental/School Council and Dean must approve the deletion.
 - **Deleting an elective course in another program’s curriculum;** if any, there must be consultation with that program.
 - **Minor** – if a change affects a Minor, the programs which are affected by the change must be notified.

- **Course Change Summary Form (UCCS)**
 - Summarizes all significant course changes for the 2011/12 academic year.
 - **Every course listed in a UCCS form must have a corresponding UAAC form.**

Where to Submit: Undergraduate Publications, POD-362

Submission Deadline: **First Friday after October Senate meeting(See time line)**

Last possible submission date to implement following year: **Second week of October (See time line)**

CATEGORY 3 MODIFICATIONS

Description: Category 3 Modifications include:

- change in admission requirements or variation in policy on grading, promotion, graduation, or academic standing;
- new Minors and substantial changes to existing Minors; and/or
- changes to program name and/or degree designation with applicable implementation date with provisions for retroactivity.

Required Consultations:

Consultation with Undergraduate Publications and with the Chair of the Academic Standards Committee (ASC) is required early in the development process, and should continue as needed during proposal development.

Required approvals:

- Department/School Council of the Teaching Department/School;
- Dean of the Teaching Department/School;
- Department/School Council(s) and the Dean(s) of the affected Program Department(s)/School(s); and
- Senate. ASC evaluates the proposal and submits its recommendation to Senate.

Forms and Documents to be completed:

- **Course Change Form – Active (UCCF–A) and/or**
- **Course Change Form – New (UCCF-A)**
 - Although the complex change may not yet be approved, these forms must be completed and submitted to Undergraduate Publications by the deadline date.
- **Approvals and Consultations Form (UAAC) – All of the following which apply must be indicated on the form. If additional space is needed for approvals, additional forms may be used.**
 - **Chang School courses affected;** if any, consultation with the relevant Chang School Program Director, School Council and Dean are required.
 - **Deleting a course required in another program’s curriculum;** if any, that program’s Chair/Director, Departmental/School Council and Dean must approve the deletion.
 - **Deleting an elective course in another program’s curriculum;** if any, there must be consultation with that program.
 - **Minor** – if a change affects a Minor the programs which are affected by the change must be notified.
- **Proposed curricular structure in Calendar format (UCAL):** Proposed curricular structure in Calendar format, submit by the deadline date to Undergraduate Publications.
- **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.
 - **New Minors and changes to existing Minors:** Include a rationale for the Minor and its curriculum. Cumulative academic development should be demonstrated and academic/learning objectives should be articulated.
 - **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; and **provisions for retroactivity.**

Category 3: Where to Submit and Submission Deadlines

Submit to	Documents	Final Deadline
Office of Vice Provost, Academic	- Twenty hard copies and an electronic copy of the proposal - A copy of the completed UAAC Form - At least one week prior to consideration by the ASC.	Last week of June
Undergraduate Publications	UCCF-A/N, UAAC and UCAL forms	First Friday after October Senate meeting

Due to their large workload, ASC cannot guarantee that curriculum and program changes submitted after the June deadline will be discussed in time for approval at the following November Senate meeting, but will make every attempt to do so where possible. Changes submitted by the deadline will be given priority. Approval at the November meeting is required for Calendar implementation in the following year.

MAJOR MODIFICATIONS

Description: 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 or institutional collaboration).

Examples of major modifications are provided in Appendix A of policy 127. Please consult the Vice Provost Academic for further clarification

Approvals and Consultations Form (UAAC) – 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.

Proposed curricular structure in Calendar format (UCAL): Proposed curricular structure in Calendar format, submit by the deadline date to Curriculum Advising

Proposal: Include any of the following items which pertain:

1. an introductory summary of the proposed changes and a rationale for them in light of stated program objectives;
2. an indication of those changes which are the result of a previous periodic program review;
3. an indication of what additional resources are required, including space, faculty and staff;
4. a list or table permitting easy comparison of existing and amended programs by semester and year, including course numbers and titles, course hours in lecture, lab or studio, and course designation by program categories (professional, professionally-related and liberal studies);
5. if there are changes to electives, rationale for change and indication of actual availability of electives;
6. calendar format description of new or amended courses;
7. a statement of program balance (among professional, professionally-related, and liberal studies) for existing and amended programs;
8. an indication of how and when changes will be implemented;
9. a summary of implications for external recognition and/or professional accreditation;
10. in the case of extensive changes, a summary of views of the Advisory Council; and
11. the effect upon the program's Degree Level Expectations, if any.

Where to Submit and Submission Deadlines

Submit to	Documents	Final Deadline
Office of Vice Provost, Academic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Twenty hard copies and an electronic copy of the proposal ▪ A copy of the completed UAAC Form ▪ At least one week prior to consideration by the ASC. 	Last week of June
Undergraduate Publications	UCCF-A/N, UAAC and UCAL forms	First Friday after October Senate meeting

Due to their large workload, ASC cannot guarantee that curriculum and program changes submitted after the June deadline will be discussed in time for approval at the following November Senate meeting, but will make every attempt to do so where possible. Changes submitted by the deadline will be given priority. Approval at the November meeting is required for Calendar implementation in the following year.

**Undergraduate Curriculum Modifications: Approvals and Consultations (UAAC)
To be submitted for Category 2, Category 3 and Major Modifications**

SCHOOL/DEPARTMENT INITIATING THE MODIFICATION: _____

List the courses that following approvals, consultations and additional information refers to: i.e. HST 508, HST 405.

1. LIBRARY CONSULTATION

Many types of course/program modifications have implications for Library resources. In such cases, consultation with the subject librarian is to take place before a modification form is submitted. **Yes** **No**

- 1a.** Are there serious deficiencies in current Library resources available to support this change?
- 1b.** If so, how will these be rectified?

Name of subject area librarian _____ Date(s) of consultation _____

2. ADDITIONAL RESOURCES REQUIRED?

2a. Are additional resources (e.g., faculty, space, technology) required to implement and sustain the proposed changes

2b. If yes, specify course(s) requiring the resources.

3. CONTINUING EDUCATION COURSES AFFECTED?

3a. Is there a Chang School Offering?

3b. Are any Chang School courses and/or Certificate programs affected by this change?

.....

3c. If yes, specify course and obtain Chang School approval below:

4. MINORS AFFECTED?

4a. Are any Minors affected by this change?

4b. If yes, specify Minor and course(s) and obtain the approval of the Program that oversees the Minor below:

5. UNDERGRADUATE PUBLICATIONS AND ACADEMIC STANDARDS COMMITTEE CONSULTATION **Yes** **No**

5a. Undergraduate Publications for significant and Category 3 and Major Modifications

.....

5ab Academic Standards Committee for Category 3 and Major Modifications

6. APPROVALS and SIGNATURES

- All Category 2, Category 3 and Major Modifications require the approval of the Teaching Department, their Department/School Council and their Dean. The approval of other Program Departments, their Department/School Council and their Dean may also be required.
- Approval by the Chang School is required only if the proposed changes directly affect Chang School offerings or the changes are initiated by The Chang School.

		Name	Signature	Date
Teaching	Department/School			
	D/S Council Approval			
	Chair/Director			
	Dean			
Program	Department/School			
	D/S Council Approval			
	Chair/Director			
	Dean			
CE	CE Council Approval			
	CE Program Director Approval			
	Dean			

PROCEDURES FOR SUBMISSION OF GRADUATE CURRICULUM MODIFICATIONS AND CALENDAR CHANGES

**Forms, time lines and complete submission instructions can be found at
www.ryerson.ca/graduate/TBA**

Where to submit:

All graduate curriculum and calendar changes must be submitted to the office of the Director of Graduate Academic Administrative Services, YDI 1112.

Submission Deadlines: **First week in October (For Winter term changes)**
 First week of February (For Spring/Summer term changes)
 First week of April (For Fall term changes)

Required Consultation:

The Director of Graduate Academic Administrative Services should be consulted early in the process to ensure that possible issues regarding the affect of the change on current and incoming students are considered.

MINOR MODIFICATIONS

CATEGORY 1 MODIFICATIONS

Description: Category 1 Modifications typically include:

- course description, title, and requisite changes;
- minor alterations in course hours with a cumulative change of two hours or less for a one credit course or four hours or less for a two credit course.

Required approvals:

- Graduate Program

Forms to be completed:

- Graduate course Change form – Active Courses (GCC-A)
- 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 form

CATEGORY 2 MODIFICATIONS

Description: Category 2 Modifications include:

- 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 two or more credit course;
- mode of delivery and course weight variations;

Required approvals:

- Department/School/Program Council;
- Dean of the teaching Department(s)/School(s);
- the Dean of YSGS

Forms to be completed:

- Graduate Course Change form – Active (GCC–A) or - New (GCC–N)
 - for changes to active or the introduction of new courses respectively
- 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.

- 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.

CATEGORY 3 MODIFICATIONS

Description: Category 3 Modifications include:

- change in admission policies or variation in policy on grading, promotion, graduation, or academic standing;
- new Fields and substantial changes to existing Fields;
- changes to program name and/or degree designation with applicable implementation date;

Required approvals:

- Department/School/Program Council;
- Department/School Council(s) and the Dean(s) of affected Program(s)/Department(s)/School(s);
- Dean of YSGS
- Senate, for information.

Forms and Documents to be completed:

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

MAJOR MODIFICATIONS

Description: 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 or institutional collaboration).

Examples of major modifications are provided in Appendix A of policy 127. Please consult the Dean of Graduate Studies, and, if necessary, the Vice Provost Academic for further clarification

:

Required approvals:

- Department/School/Program Council;
- Department/School Council(s) and the Dean(s) of affected by the change(s)
- Graduate Programs and Planning Committee, Graduate Council
- Senate.

Forms and Documents to be completed:

- Proposal: Include any of the following items which pertain:
 12. an introductory summary of the proposed changes and a rationale for them in light of stated program objectives;
 13. a list or table permitting easy comparison of existing and amended programs by semester and year (if appropriate), including course numbers and titles, and course hours in lecture, lab or studio
 14. if there are changes to electives, rationale for change and indication of actual availability of electives;
 15. calendar format description of new or amended courses;
 16. an indication of how and when changes will be implemented, including retroactivity;
 17. a summary of implications for external recognition and/or professional accreditation;
 18. effect upon the program's Degree Level Expectations, if any.

- Proposed curricular structure in Calendar format (GCAL): Proposed curricular structure in Calendar format

- 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.

Graduate Approvals and Consultations (GAC)

To be submitted for Minor Modifications (Categories 2 and 3) and Major Modifications

GRADUATE PROGRAM INITIATING THE MODIFICATION: _____

List the courses that the following approvals, consultations and additional information refers to: i.e. EE8901, CC8620

1. LIBRARY CONSULTATION

Many types of course/program modifications have implications for Library resources. In such cases, consultation with the subject librarian is to take place before a modification form is submitted.

Yes No

1a. Are there serious deficiencies in current Library resources available to support this change?

1b. If so, how will these be rectified?

Name of subject area librarian _____ Date(s) of consultation _____

2. ADDITIONAL RESOURCES REQUIRED?

Yes No

2a. Are additional resources (e.g., faculty, space, technology) required to implement and sustain proposed changes

2b. If yes, specify course(s) requiring the resources.

3. CONSULTATION

Yes No

3a. Director of Graduate Academic Administrative Services

3b Programs and Planning Committee

4. APPROVALS and SIGNATURES

All Minor Category 2, Category 3 and Major Modifications require the approval of the Teaching Dept, their Dept/School Council and their Dean. The approval of other Program Depts, their Dept/School Council and their Dean may also be required.

		Name	Signature	Date
Teaching	Department/School			
	Dept/School Council			
	Chair/Director			
	Dean			
Graduate Program	Program Council			
	Director			
	Graduate Dean			
YSGS	Programs & Planning Committee			
	Graduate Council			
Senate				

GRADUATE PROGRAM INITIATING CHANGE: _____

DATE of SUBMISSION: _____

MINOR MODIFICATIONS – CATEGORY 1				
Course code/ Number	Course Title	Description of Change	Graduate Program(s) affected by the change	Implementation Date

MINOR MODIFICATIONS – CATEGORY 2				
Course code/ Number	Course Title	Description of Change	Graduate Program(s) / School(s) / Department(s)/ affected by and informed of change	Implementation Date

MINOR MODIFICATIONS – CATEGORY 3			
Description of Change		Graduate Program(s) / School(s) / Department(s)/ affected by and informed of change	Implementation Date

MAJOR MODIFICATIONS			
Description of Change		Graduate Program(s) / School(s) / Department(s)/ affected by and informed of change	Implementation Date

STUDENT CODE OF NON-ACADEMIC CONDUCT 2011 REVIEW
SUMMARY OF CHANGES
April 8, 2011

Page 1

POLICY

A. STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES

Ryerson University is a learning, teaching, and work community of students, faculty and staff, committed to providing a civil and safe environment which is respectful of the rights, responsibilities, well-being and dignity of all of its members.

Comment [M1]: Added work community (in line with Bill 168 requirements).

The Student Code of Non-Academic Conduct ("Code") reflects the expectation that students will conduct themselves in a manner consistent with generally accepted standards of behaviour, University regulations and policies, departmental policies, and in compliance with federal, provincial and municipal laws, as well as professional standards and codes of ethics that govern students who are members of some regulated professions.

Comment [M2]: Added departmental policies.

The foundational principles upon which the Code has been built include:

1. Every student enjoys within the University all rights and freedoms recognized by law.
2. The University has an obligation to maintain safe and suitable conditions for learning, teaching and working.
3. Students will conduct themselves in a manner consistent with the educational mission and policies of the University.
4. The University is not concerned with the way students conduct their personal lives and will not institute disciplinary proceedings unless Ryerson's interests are affected, the actions have a negative impact on faculty, staff or other students, the actions damage the learning, teaching and work environment of the University, or the actions impact the peaceful and safe enjoyment of University housing by residents and neighbours.
5. This Code is normally applied on the basis of a written complaint. In exceptional circumstances (e.g., where there is a risk of harm to a community member and/or the University has a legal obligation to act), the University may initiate proceedings based on information received (regardless of whether it is provided in writing at the time of the report).
6. All complaints will be handled and decision-making processes conducted in a manner consistent with the principles of natural justice and administrative fairness.
7. This Code will be applied regardless of the medium used for committing misconduct.
8. When a student's behaviour indicates a risk to others, then an interdisciplinary approach will be employed to assess risk and make recommendations.

Comment [M3]: Added work conditions (in line with Bill 168 requirements).

Comment [M4]: Added work environment.

Comment [M5]: Reworded the section and added "acting based on information received."

This Code applies to non-academic conduct. Academic conduct is governed by the *Student Code of Academic Conduct*, Senate Policy 60.

Page 2

Ryerson students, staff and faculty are responsible for familiarizing themselves with this Code.

Comment [M6]: Added staff and faculty should familiarize themselves with the Code.

B. APPLICATION OF POLICY

2. On Campus

This Code applies to all conduct which takes place on University land and premises either rented or owned or using University owned or run property or equipment including, but not limited to, telephones, computers and computer networks. Conduct of students who live in residences and which takes place in residence is also governed by the Residence Contract and Community Standards.

Comment [M7]: Added a section on students in residence.

3. Off Campus

This Code applies to the conduct of students off campus:

- a. When they have declared publicly that they represent the University;
- b. When they are participating in an organized course activity;
- c. When they are participating in a Ryerson University event that has been identified as such; or
- d. In exceptional circumstances when the potential consequences of the conduct may adversely affect the complainant’s course of learning, teaching or work at the University.

Comment [M8]: Added work environment.

4. Persons Covered by this Code

- a. Currently enrolled students: Special, graduate, undergraduate, exchange, audit and continuing education students enrolled either full-time or part-time in courses, either credit or non-credit, of the University, including collaborative programs and when on placements that are part of their academic program.
- b. Students active in a program but not currently enrolled in classes: students who are active in a program but not currently enrolled in classes including students who have been assigned a “Required to Withdraw” academic standing.
- c. Former Students: if the person was a Student at the time of the alleged violation of the Code.

Comment [M9]: Added collaborative programs.

If any proceedings under this code cannot be initiated or completed because a person against whom a complaint has been filed is no longer a Student as defined in this section, the proceeding may continue if the person becomes a Student again.

Penalties levied under such circumstances shall be noted on the person's record and the person shall not be permitted to register for any course or courses at the University until such time as the penalty imposed has been fulfilled.

Page 3

5. Relationship to Other Policies and Proceedings

b. Civil or Criminal Proceedings

Conduct that constitutes a breach of the Criminal Code or other statute, or that would give rise to a civil claim or action, should ordinarily be dealt with by the appropriate criminal or civil proceedings. In most cases, formal resolution by the University of any allegations which are the subject of a criminal or civil court proceeding will be suspended until the resolution of that proceeding.

In cases in which criminal or civil proceedings have not been taken, or the proceedings would not adequately protect the University's interests, and/or provide adequate safety and risk mitigation measures, the University reserves the right to take action under this Code, including the application of interim measures.

Comment [M10]: Reworded the section.

Comment [M11]: Added that the University may take risk mitigation steps.

c. Meeting requirements under the Occupational Health and Safety Act

Under the Ontario *Occupational Health and Safety Act*, all incidents of workplace violence, harassment that could lead to workplace violence, or domestic violence which may continue in the workplace must be reported and managed in accordance with University policies.

Comment [M12]: New section.

C. OFFENCES PROHIBITED UNDER THIS CODE

The offences described in this Code are not intended to be exhaustive, but to provide reasonable parameters that will guide students in their actions. Violations could consist of a single act, repeated acts or form part of a pattern of behaviour that, taken together, constitutes a violation of the Code.

1. Disruption of Learning, Teaching and Work - Students shall not behave in disruptive ways that obstruct the learning, teaching and work environment.
2. Malicious or Untrue Material –Students shall not distribute malicious materials or materials they know to be untrue about faculty, staff or students.

Comment [M13]: Added "pattern of behaviour." In some cases, a single instance may not be sufficient to proceed with a complaint or actions under the Code; however, over time, if the act is repeated, it may give rise to a complaint and action under this Code.

Comment [m14]: Included "work."

Page 4

3. Threats and Harm to Health and Safety –Students shall not endanger, threaten, harm, or encourage others to endanger, threaten or harm, or act in ways which

would reasonably be perceived to endanger, threaten or harm the physical and mental well-being of community members.

Comment [m15]: Added "reasonable perception of threat and harm."

Comment [m16]: Changed "staff, faculty and students" to "community members."

Page 4

7. Misuse of Library or Computer Resources, Services, Equipment and Networks - Students shall not:

- a. remove, borrow and/or retain books, equipment or other library material from the university libraries or designated areas of the library without proper authorization;
- b. mutilate, deface, intentionally misplace library books or material or in any way deprive others of access to library resources;
- c. abuse any University computer or computer related facility, network or software; alter or remove computer files or software without proper authorization; purposefully misplace or deprive others of access to such computer resources;
- d. use computer equipment on campus, software, networks, accounts, email accounts or computer services owned, leased and/or operated by the University in a manner inconsistent with the University's acceptable Use Guideline; for a malicious purpose; or to download, distribute or send offensive, discriminatory, and/or harassing material.

Comment [M17]: Added "networks" to the list.

9. Identification on Request - Students are required to provide a valid form of identification (such as a Ryerson issued One Card) to representatives of University Security & Emergency Services, exam invigilators, or other University employees where such information is relevant to the legitimate pursuit of their duties.

Comment [m18]: Added "valid form of identification"

Page 5

14. Firearms, Explosives, Weapons – Students shall not use, possess, or distribute firearms, explosives, or other weapons, including replicas of firearms, explosives or other weapons.

Comment [M19]: Added replicas.

18. Failure to Comply – Students shall comply with remedies and penalties outlined in Policy Section D1 and assigned by the Student Conduct Officer as a result of breaching the Code.

Comment [M20]: New section.

Page 6

D. REMEDIES AND PENALTIES

The following penalties may be imposed for a breach of the Code or for failure of a respondent to comply with the remedies and penalties assigned under the Code as result

of the breach. More than one penalty may be imposed concurrently for a single breach and/or failure to comply. When imposing a penalty the full context will be considered including elements, such as but not limited to, the severity of the offence, the harm caused, pattern of behaviour, and whether the student has been found guilty of prior breaches of the Code. The Assessment of Behavioural Risk Team may be consulted in determining appropriate remedies and penalties or the need for supports (e.g. those provided by the Access Centre or the Centre for Student Development and Counselling).

Comment [M21]: Added pattern of behaviour.

Page 6

Penalties imposed by Student Conduct Officer (con't)

1. Penalties imposed by the Student Conduct Officer
 - f. Restriction on communication, accessing premises and/or services —prohibition or limitation on entering University premises or specific parts thereof, restriction on contact with specific person(s), accessing a specific resource or service on campus (e.g., computer networks, RAC, etc).

Comment [M22]: Changed wording from “Loss of Privileges” to “Restriction on communications, accessing premises and/or services.”

Page 8

F. INTERIM MEASURES

2. Urgent or On-going Situations and Risk Personal Safety

- a. If there are reasonable grounds to conclude that a Student’s continued presence on campus poses a risk of harm to the community, the safety of others is endangered, damage to University property is likely to occur, or the continued presence of the Student would be disruptive to the legitimate operations of the University, it may be necessary to remove the Student from the University. In such cases, the Student Conduct Officer may recommend to the Vice Provost, Students that the student be suspended from the University or be restricted from accessing specific areas on campus for up to five (5) working days. A temporary suspension must be reviewed by the Vice Provost, Students within the five (5) working day suspension period, and either revoked or continued.
- b. The Student Conduct Officer may also convene a meeting of the Assessment of Behavioural Risk Team in order to assess risk of harm to the Student or others and determine the best course of action to enhance safety.
- c. In circumstances indicating a risk of self harm to the Student or others, Ryerson Security and Emergency Services may immediately and temporarily remove (“bar”) a student from campus or a specified part of campus pending application of these Interim Measures and other parts of this Code.

Comment [M23]: Changed wording

Comment [m24]: Removed “extreme”; Prior version stated “extreme circumstances.”

Page 9

Interim Measures (Con't)

e. The hearing process outlined in Part F, s. 2(d) applies to Interim Measures only. Appeals for sanctions and remedies issued as a result of breaching the Student

Code of Non-Academic Conduct would follow the process described in Policy Part E.

f. Appeals of a bar issued by Security and Emergency Service pursuant to the provisions of Part F of the Code shall be made to Security and Emergency Services.

Comment [m25]: New sections.

RYERSON UNIVERSITY
POLICY OF SENATE

STUDENT CODE OF NON-ACADEMIC CONDUCT

Policy Number: 61

Last Approval Date: May 6, 2008

Approval Date: May 3, 2011

Presented by: Academic Governance and Policy Committee

Responsible Office: Vice Provost, Students

Implementation Date: Fall, 2011

Review Date: Fall, 2014 or sooner at the request of the Vice Provost, Students

TABLE OF CONTENTS

POLICY	Page
A. STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES	1
B. APPLICATION OF POLICY	2
1. Peaceful Assemblies and Freedom of Expression	2
2. On Campus	2
3. Off Campus	2
4. Persons Covered by this Code	2
5. Relationship to Other Policies and Proceedings	3
a. Code Does Not Supersede Other Policies	
b. Civil or Criminal Proceedings	
c. Meeting requirements under the Occupational Health and Safety Act	
C. OFFENCES PROHIBITED UNDER THIS CODE	3
D. REMEDIES AND PENALTIES	5
1. Penalties imposed by the Student Conduct Officer	6
2. Penalties imposed by the Vice-Provost, Students	6
3. Penalties imposed by the Senate Appeals Committee	7
E. APPEALS AND HEARINGS	7
F. INTERIM MEASURES	8
1. Disruption of Instructional Activities	8
2. Urgent or On-going Situations and Risk Personal Safety	8
G. POWER TO CREATE PROCEDURES UNDER THIS CODE	9
APPENDIX A: DESCRIPTION OF THE ASSESSMENT OF BEHAVIOURAL RISK TEAM (ABRT)	10

STUDENT CODE OF NON-ACADEMIC CONDUCT PROCEDURES
--

A. DEFINITIONS		11
B. GENERAL PROVISIONS		12
B1. Consultation with the Student Conduct Officer		12
B2. Correspondence and notice		12
B3. Representation		12
B4. Confidentiality		12
B5. Records of Complaints		12
B6. Burden and Standard of Proof in Establishing Misconduct		13
B7. No investigation required for a charge of Failure to Comply		13
C. MISCONDUCT COMPLAINTS		13
C1. How to file a complaint under the Code		13
C1.1 Who May Make a Complaint		13
C1.2 Form of Complaint		13
C1.3 Acting based on information received		13
C2. Determining whether the Conduct is covered under the Code		14
C2.1 Conduct not covered by the Code		14
C2.2 Conduct Covered by the Code		14
C3. Determining proper resolution paths for a complaint about conduct that is covered by the Code		14
C3.1 Informal resolution		14
C3.2 Involvement of Other University offices		15
C3.3 Discrimination and Harassment Complaints		15
C3.4 Residence Offence Procedures		15
C3.5 Code violations on campus which may affect Residence		15
C4. Notification and investigation of complaints		16
C4.1 Meeting with Person Making a Complaint		16
C4.2 Notice to Student		16
C4.3 Meeting with Student		16
C4.4 Student Failing to Respond to Student Conduct Officer		17
C4.5 Penalties levied under C 4.4		17
C4.6 Student Conduct Officer's Investigation		17
C5. Communicating the Decision made by the Student Conduct Officer		17
C5.1 Decision by Student Conduct Officer that the Student did not commit an offence		17
C5.2 Decision by Student Conduct Officer that the Student committed an offence		18
C5.3 Additional Details Regarding Penalties for the Student		18

C6. Remedies or Penalties Imposed by the Student Conduct Officer	18
6.1 Failure to Comply	19
C7. Recommendation by Student Conduct Officer to Vice Provost, Students	19
C7.1 Investigation by Vice Provost, Students	19
C8. Decisions made by the Vice Provost, Students	20
C8.1 Decision by Vice Provost that the Student did not commit an offence	20
C8.2 Decision by Vice Provost that the Student committed an offence	20
C8.3 Additional Details Regarding Penalties for the Student	21
C8.4 Remedies or Penalties Imposed by the Vice Provost	21
C9. Recommendation by the Vice Provost of a Penalty that May Only be Imposed by the Senate Appeals Committee	21
D. SENATE HEARINGS REGARDING NON-ACADEMIC DISCIPLINARY WITHDRAWAL OR EXPULSION	22
D1. Non-Academic Disciplinary Withdrawal or Expulsion	22
D2. Hearing to be held before Hearing Panel of Senate Appeals Committee	22
D3. Hearing to be held with notice to Student	22
D4. Parties to the Hearing	22
D5. Open Hearing	22
D6. Student Opportunity to Hear the Charge and Respond	23
D7. Hearing Panel Decisions	23
E. APPEALS	24
E1. Appeals to the Vice Provost Students from Student Conduct Officer Decisions	
E2. Appeals to the Senate Appeals Committee of Decisions Made by the Vice Provost	
F. INTERIM MEASURES	26

POLICY

A. STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES

Ryerson University is a learning, teaching, and work community of students, faculty and staff, committed to providing a civil and safe environment which is respectful of the rights, responsibilities, well-being and dignity of all of its members.

The Student Code of Non-Academic Conduct ("Code") reflects the expectation that students will conduct themselves in a manner consistent with generally accepted standards of behaviour, University regulations and policies, departmental policies, and in compliance with federal, provincial and municipal laws, as well as professional standards and codes of ethics that govern students who are members of some regulated professions.

The Code outlines, in a non-exhaustive manner, actions which the University considers to be non-academic misconduct offences and the range of remedies and/or penalties which may be imposed. The principles underlying this Code are educational and whenever appropriate the University encourages informal resolution of minor incidents. However, when necessary due to unacceptable conduct, penalties will be imposed in the manner described in the 'Procedures' document aligned with this Code to ensure an acceptable standard is maintained.

The foundational principles upon which the Code has been built include:

1. Every student enjoys within the University all rights and freedoms recognized by law.
2. The University has an obligation to maintain safe and suitable conditions for learning, teaching and working.
3. Students will conduct themselves in a manner consistent with the educational mission and policies of the University.
4. The University is not concerned with the way students conduct their personal lives and will not institute disciplinary proceedings unless Ryerson's interests are affected, the actions have a negative impact on faculty, staff or other students, the actions damage the learning, teaching and work environment of the University, or the actions impact the peaceful and safe enjoyment of University housing by residents and neighbours.
5. This Code is normally applied on the basis of a written complaint. In exceptional circumstances (e.g., where there is a risk of harm to a community member and/or the University has a legal obligation to act), the University may initiate proceedings based on information received (regardless of whether it is provided in writing at the time of the report).
6. All complaints will be handled and decision-making processes conducted in a manner consistent with the principles of natural justice and administrative fairness.
7. This Code will be applied regardless of the medium used for committing misconduct.
8. When a student's behaviour indicates a risk to others, then an interdisciplinary approach will be employed to assess risk and make recommendations.

This Code applies to non-academic conduct. Academic conduct is governed by the *Student Code of Academic Conduct*, Senate Policy 60.

Ryerson students, staff and faculty are responsible for familiarizing themselves with this Code.

B. APPLICATION OF POLICY

1. Peaceful Assemblies and Freedom of Expression

Nothing in this Code shall be construed to prohibit peaceful assemblies and demonstrations, lawful picketing, or to inhibit freedom of expression.

2. On Campus

This Code applies to all conduct which takes place on University land and premises either rented or owned or using University owned or run property or equipment including, but not limited to, telephones, computers and computer networks. Conduct of students who live in residences and which takes place in residence is also governed by the Residence Contract and Community Standards.

3. Off Campus

This Code applies to the conduct of students off campus:

- a. When they have declared publicly that they represent the University;
- b. When they are on a course or participating in an organized course activity;
- c. When they are participating in a Ryerson University event that has been identified as such; or
- d. In exceptional circumstances when the potential consequences of the conduct may adversely affect the complainant's course of learning, teaching or work at the University.

4. Persons Covered by this Code

- a. Currently enrolled students: Special, graduate, undergraduate, exchange, audit and continuing education students enrolled either full-time or part-time in courses, either credit or non-credit, of the University, including collaborative programs and when on placements that are part of their academic program.
- b. Students who are active in a program but not currently enrolled in classes including students who have been assigned a "Required to Withdraw" academic standing.
- c. Former Students: if the person was a Student at the time of the alleged violation of the Code.

If any proceedings under this code cannot be initiated or completed because a person against whom a complaint has been filed is no longer a Student as defined in this section, the proceeding may continue if the person becomes a Student again.

Penalties levied under such circumstances shall be noted on the person's record and the person shall not be permitted to register for any course or courses at the University until such time as the penalty imposed has been fulfilled.

5. Relationship to Other Policies and Proceedings

a. Code Does Not Supersede Other Policies

Nothing in this Code shall replace or supersede any complaint, grievance or appeal procedure set out in any collective agreement to which the University is a party, the Student Code of Academic Conduct, or other University policies (e.g. Discrimination and Harassment Prevention Policy, Civility Policy, Ryerson Student Computing Guidelines, Residence Contract and Community Standards, etc.) .

When conduct may violate multiple policies the Conduct Officer will assess whether this Code should apply and how best to proceed to ensure a fair, expeditious and, where possible, streamlined approach.

b. Civil or Criminal Proceedings

Conduct that constitutes a breach of the Criminal Code or other statute, or that would give rise to a civil claim or action, should ordinarily be dealt with by the appropriate criminal or civil proceedings. In most cases, formal resolution by the University of any allegations which are the subject of a criminal or civil court proceeding will be suspended until the resolution of that proceeding.

In cases in which criminal or civil proceedings have not been taken, or the proceedings would not adequately protect the University's interests, and/or provide adequate safety and risk mitigation measures, the University reserves the right to take action under this Code, including the application of interim measures.

c. Meeting requirements under the Occupational Health and Safety Act

Under the Ontario *Occupational Health and Safety Act*, all incidents of workplace violence, harassment that could lead to workplace violence, or domestic violence which may continue in the workplace must be reported and managed in accordance with University policies.

C. OFFENCES PROHIBITED UNDER THIS CODE

The offences described in this Code are not intended to be exhaustive, but to provide reasonable guidance to students. Violations could consist of a single act, repeated acts or form part of a pattern of behaviour that, taken together, constitutes a violation of the Code.

1. Disruption of Learning, Teaching and Work - Students shall not behave in disruptive ways that obstruct the learning, teaching and work environment.
2. Malicious or Untrue Material –Students shall not distribute malicious materials or materials they know to be untrue about faculty, staff or students.
3. Threats and Harm to Health and Safety –Students shall not endanger, threaten, harm, or encourage others to endanger, threaten or harm, or act in ways which would reasonably

be perceived to endanger, threaten or harm the physical and mental well-being of community members.

4. Unauthorized Entry and/or Presence - Students shall not enter, use or let someone else use non-public areas of the University without permission and must leave those premises if asked to do so by authorized University staff.
5. Theft, Damage and Destruction of property - Students shall not steal, damage or destroy property of the University or a faculty, staff or other Student.
6. Misuse of Facilities, Equipment, Materials or Services - Students shall not:
 - a. use any facility, equipment, material or service in a manner which might put another person at risk and without proper authority;
 - b. obtain any University equipment, material or service by fraudulent means or by knowingly providing false information.
7. Misuse of Library or Computer Resources, Services, Equipment and Networks - Students shall not:
 - a. remove, borrow and/or retain books, equipment or other library material from the university libraries or designated areas of the library without proper authorization;
 - b. mutilate, deface, intentionally misplace library books or material or in any way deprive others of access to library resources;
 - c. abuse any University computer or computer related facility, network or software; alter or remove computer files or software without proper authorization; purposefully misplace or deprive others of access to such computer resources;
 - d. use computer equipment on campus, software, networks, accounts, email accounts or computer services owned, leased and/or operated by the University in a manner inconsistent with the University's acceptable Use Guideline; for a malicious purpose; or to download, distribute or send offensive, discriminatory, and/or harassing material.
8. Compliance with Directions from University Employees - Students are required to comply with directions of University employees (including faculty and staff) acting in the legitimate performance of their duties (e.g. regarding exam rules, instructor course management policies, smoking, evacuation, pets).
9. Identification on Request - Students are required to provide a valid form of identification (such as a Ryerson issued One Card) to representatives of University Security & Emergency Services, exam invigilators, or other University employees where such information is relevant to the legitimate pursuit of their duties.
10. Possession, Use or Distribution of False Identification - Students shall not possess, distribute or use false or altered identification.

11. Harassment - Students shall not:

- a. engage in activity that violates the Discrimination and Harassment Prevention Policy based on the grounds specified by the Discrimination and Harassment Prevention Policy (race, ancestry, place of origin, colour, ethnic origin, citizenship, creed, sex, sexual orientation, age, record of offences, marital status, family status, disability);
- b. engage in conduct which, although not based on the grounds specified by the Discrimination and Harassment Prevention Policy, is abusive, demeaning, threatening, or intimidating, or involves the misuse of authority or power.

12. Misconduct Related to the Use of Alcohol/Drugs - Students shall not:

- a. be drunk and disorderly in public;
- b. possess, provide, or consume illegal drugs;
- c. possess or consume alcoholic beverages, except when properly in attendance at a licensed campus pub or event, or as permitted under the Residence Contract;
- d. possess or consume alcohol anywhere on University premises if under the age of nineteen (19) years;
- e. provide alcoholic beverages to any person under the legal drinking age (nineteen (19) in Ontario).

13. Hazing - Students shall not engage in any act which endangers, or could reasonably be seen to endanger the mental or physical health or safety of a student, for the purpose of initiation, admission into, affiliation with, or as a condition for continued membership in, a group or organization.

14. Firearms, Explosives, Weapons – Students shall not use, possess, or distribute firearms, explosives, or other weapons, including replicas of firearms, explosives or other weapons.

15. Unauthorized Use of Dangerous Chemicals – Students shall not use dangerous chemicals unless they have proper authority from the University.

16. False, Frivolous or Malicious Charges - Complainants shall not knowingly bring a false, frivolous or malicious charge under this Code or any other policy of the University.

17. Abuse of the Student Code of Non-Academic Conduct - Students shall not falsify, distort or misrepresent information, or obstruct the application of this Code.

18. Failure to Comply – Students shall comply with remedies and penalties outlined in Policy Section D1 and assigned by the Student Conduct Officer as a result of breaching the Code.

D. REMEDIES AND PENALTIES

The following penalties may be imposed for a breach of the Code or for failure of a respondent to comply with the remedies and penalties assigned under the Code as result of the breach. More

than one penalty may be imposed concurrently for a single breach and/or failure to comply. When imposing a penalty the full context will be considered including elements, such as but not limited to, the severity of the offence, the harm caused, pattern of behaviour, and whether the student has been found guilty of prior breaches of the Code. The Assessment of Behavioural Risk Team may be consulted in determining appropriate remedies and penalties, or the need for supports (e.g. those provided by the Access Centre or the Centre for Student Development and Counselling).

1. Penalties imposed by the Student Conduct Officer

The following penalties may be imposed by the Conduct Officer:

- a. Written reprimand—a notice in writing to the Student that the Student has committed or is committing an offence
- b. Apology—an expression of regret for the offence in a form satisfactory to the Conduct Officer
- c. Letter of Behavioural Expectations—an undertaking (i) not to engage in certain behaviour, and (ii) setting out the consequences if the letter is not followed, and in some cases (iii) that prescribes a range of actions to be taken (e.g. seeking counselling, a psychiatric assessment, registration with the Access Centre, attending services off campus that should help the student).
- d. Community or University service or other activity that allows students to reflect on and learn from their behaviour of its impact
- e. Restitution—compensation for loss, damage or injury in the form of monetary or material replacement
- f. Restriction on communication, accessing premises and/or services—prohibition or limitation on entering University premises or specific parts thereof, restriction on contact with specific person(s), accessing a specific resource or service on campus (e.g., computer networks, RAC, etc).

2. Penalties imposed by the Vice Provost, Students

The following penalties may be imposed by the Vice Provost, Students, on the recommendation of the Student Conduct Officer:

- a. Deregistration from a single course
- b. Non-Academic Disciplinary Suspension (NDS) for a period up to two (2) years.
 - i. The length of the suspension is determined by the Vice Provost, Students and may be recommended by the Student Conduct Officer.
 - ii. The NDS notation shall remain until students graduate, or for eight (8) years, whichever comes first. Students who subsequently graduate from another post-secondary institution may petition the Registrar's Office to have the notation removed. Continuing education students and part-time degree students may petition the Registrar to remove the NDS two years after the period of suspension has been served.

- iii. No courses may be taken at Ryerson, including at The G. Raymond Chang School of Continuing Education during the period of NDS specified by the Vice Provost, Students. Course work taken elsewhere during the period of suspension will not be credited towards GPA calculations, Academic Standing or graduation requirements within the student's program.
- iv. If the NDS is assigned during the semester, students may be permitted to complete some or all of the other courses in which they are enrolled, and the suspension will become effective at the end of the semester.
- v. A student who is assigned an NDS may not be admitted to any program or certificate until the specified period of suspension has been served and any specified conditions have been met.

3. Penalties imposed by the Senate Appeals Committee

The following penalties may only be imposed by the Senate Appeals Committee, on the recommendation of the Vice Provost, Students:

- a. Non-Academic Disciplinary Withdrawal (NDW)—Students who are assigned a NDW for non-academic misconduct shall be withdrawn from the University for a period of at least two (2) years. A NDW shall be permanently noted on a student's academic record and official transcript.
 - i. A student who is assigned a NDW may not apply to the same program but may apply to any other program after serving the specified period of withdrawal and after meeting specific conditions established by the Senate Appeals Committee;
 - ii. No courses may be taken at Ryerson, including at The G. Raymond Chang School of Continuing Education, during the period of NDW. Course work taken elsewhere during this period will not be credited towards GPA calculations, Academic Standing or graduation requirements within any Ryerson program;
 - iii. For continuing education students, NDW will result in the student being prohibited from enrolling in any courses at Ryerson during the specified period, and from enrolling in certificate programs or courses as determined by the Senate Appeals Committee.
- b. Expulsion-- Students who are expelled from the University shall not be allowed to register or enroll in any course or program of the University. Expulsion shall be permanently noted on a student's academic record and official transcript.

E. APPEALS AND HEARINGS

1. Burden and Standard of Proof: The burden of proof is on the University. This means that the University must demonstrate that the offence has occurred and, in the case of an appeal, that the remedy or penalty is reasonable given the nature of the offence. The standard of proof in all decisions shall be a balance of probabilities. This means that it must be shown that it is more likely than not that the student committed the offence.

2. Appeals of the charges brought by, or penalties imposed by, the Conduct Officer under section Policy section D1 are to the Vice Provost, Students. If the Conduct Officer recommends a penalty under Policy section D2, the Vice Provost, Students shall be the decision maker.
3. Appeals of charges brought by, or penalties imposed by the Vice Provost, Students under section D2 are to the Senate Appeals Committee.
4. If the Vice Provost, Students recommends a NDW or Expulsion, the Senate Appeals Committee shall hold a hearing.
5. Decisions of the Senate Appeals Committee are final.
6. Timeliness: Every effort will be made to ensure these proceedings are handled in an expeditious manner. Students may contact the Student Conduct Officer when they are concerned about delays in the process. The Student Conduct Officer may dismiss charges when the University unduly delays the process.

F. INTERIM MEASURES

1. Disruption of Instructional Activities

Disruption of instructional activities, including examinations, may be dealt with by the appropriate instructor as a matter of classroom discipline. The instructor may require the student to leave the area for the remainder of the particular class or examination. Any disruption that results in the removal of a student shall be reported to the Chair, Course Director or Program Director.
2. Urgent or On-going Situations and Risk Personal Safety
 - a. If there are reasonable grounds to conclude that a Student's continued presence on campus poses a risk of harm to the community, the safety of others is endangered, damage to University property is likely to occur, or the continued presence of the Student would be disruptive to the legitimate operations of the University, it may be necessary to remove the Student from the University. In such cases, the Student Conduct Officer may recommend to the Vice Provost, Students that the student be suspended from the University or be restricted from accessing specific areas on campus for up to five (5) working days. A temporary suspension must be reviewed by the Vice Provost, Students within the five (5) working day suspension period, and either revoked or continued.
 - b. The Student Conduct Officer may also convene a meeting of the Assessment of Behavioural Risk Team in order to assess risk of harm to the Student or others and determine the best course of action to enhance safety.
 - c. In circumstances indicating a risk of self harm to the Student or harm to others, Security and Emergency Services may immediately and temporarily remove ("bar") a student from campus or a specified part of campus pending application of these Interim Measures and other parts of this Code.

- d. If the suspension under (a) is continued, the Student may request a hearing by the Senate Appeals Committee, who shall hear and decide on the matter within ten (10) working days. Grounds for appeal are limited to the following:
 - (i) That the Vice Provost, Students had no power under this Code to reach the decision taken
 - (ii) That there was a fundamental procedural error seriously prejudicial to the appellant; or
 - (iii) That the appellant has new evidence to present that could not reasonably have been presented earlier.
- e. The hearing process outlined in s. 5 above applies to Interim Measures only. Appeals for sanctions and remedies issued as a result of the breach of the Student Code of Non-Academic Conduct would follow the process described in Policy Part E.
- f. Appeals of a bar issued by Security and Emergency Service pursuant to the provisions of Part F of the Code shall be made to Security and Emergency Services.

G. POWER TO CREATE PROCEDURES UNDER THIS CODE

Procedures under this Code shall be established by the Vice Provost, Students in keeping with fair process and the principles of natural justice and in consultation with the Student Conduct Officer who shall convene a committee to provide recommendations for this purpose. The committee will include representatives from RSU and CESAR, and faculty among its members. Procedures shall be published annually at the start of each academic year. Published procedures shall be in effect for that academic year.

APPENDIX A: DESCRIPTION OF THE ASSESSMENT OF BEHAVIOURAL RISK TEAM (ABRT)

Purpose of Team

To provide the University with a working group to provide behavioural risk recognition, information gathering, initial risk assessment, critical interventions, and finally, recommendations and referral to the appropriate person or group with long term responsibility for risk mitigation and case management. The team itself is not responsible for long term case management but will refer to the appropriate resource on or off campus.

Team Composition

- Clinical Coordinator, Centre for Student Development and Counselling (Psychologist)
- General Counsel and Secretary of the Board of Governors
- Supervisor, Ryerson Security and Emergency Services
- Manager, Ryerson Security and Emergency Services
- Manager, Access Centre for Students with Disabilities
- Director, Office of the Provost and Vice President Academic
- Director, Ryerson Student Wellness Services (Physician)
- Psychologist, Centre for Student Development and Counselling
- Consulting Psychiatrist, St. Michael's Hospital
- Officer, Discrimination and Harassment Prevention Services
- Housing Manager (if the community member whose behaviour has activated the ABRT lives in residence or if an assessed risk may impact others living in residence)
- Student Conduct Officer

Team Activation

The team is activated by any member of the team when someone from the Ryerson Community either:

- threatens harm against another person or intentionally causes harm to another person;
- threatens harm to themselves, or intentionally causes harm to themselves;
- causes Ryerson community members to believe that the person poses a danger to themselves or any other person.

Activation Timeframe

The team makes every effort to respond to a crisis as soon as possible – usually within one business day or less.

**Report #W2011-1 of the Nominating Committee
Academic Governance and Policy Committee
May 3, 2011**

1. Report of the Nominating Committee - The following are nominated to serve on standing committees of Senate. Faculty terms are two years and student terms are one year. This report includes only those nominated to fill committee vacancies and does not include those who are continuing in a current term.

ACADEMIC GOVERNANCE AND POLICY COMMITTEE				
Name		Faculty	Department	Returning member
Gerd Hauck	Dean	FCAD		
John Turtle	Faculty	Arts		Y
Catherine Schryer	Faculty	FCAD	Professional Communication	
Zhixi Zhuang	Faculty	FCS	Urban & Regional Planning	
Ali Miri	Faculty	FEAS	Computer Science	
Ann-Marie Brinsmead	Program Director	Chang		
Mary Sharpe	Chair	FCS	Midwifery	
Waqas Manzoor	Grad Student	FEAS	Aerospace Engineering	
Election to be held for 2 seats				
Viktoria Ovoian	UG Student	TRSM	Business Management	
Melissa Palermo	UG Student	FCAD	New Media (RSU Representative)	
Liana Salvador	UG Student	FCS	Nursing	

SCHOLARLY RESEARCH AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY COMMITTEE				
Mohamed Lachemi	Dean	FEAS		
Patrizia Albanese	Faculty	Arts	Sociology	
Catherine Schryer	Chair	FCAD	Professional Communication	
Brian Cameron	Librarian			Y
Charles Sule	Grad Student		Envi App Science & Mngmt	Y
Crystal Leverman	UG Student	FCS	Health Service Management	Y
Mariam Rashad	UG Student	FCS	Social Work	Y

ACADEMIC STANDARDS COMMITTEE				
Name		Faculty	Department	Returning member
John Turtle	Faculty	Arts	Psychology	
Jacqui Gingras	Faculty	FCS	Nutrition	Y
Pamela Robinson	Faculty	FCS	Urban and Regional Planning	Y
Ian Baitz	Faculty	FCAD	Graphics Comm. Management	
Noel George	Faculty	FEAS	Chemistry & Biology	Y
Naomi Eichenlaub	Librarian			
Andrew West	Student	Arts	Politics	Y
Jennifer Cartwright	Student	TRSM	Business Management	Y

AWARDS & CEREMONIALS COMMITTEE				
Andrew Hunter	Director	Arts	Arts & Contemporary Studies	
Randy Boyagoda	Faculty	Arts	English	
Carlyle Farrell	Faculty	TRSM	Business Management (GMS)	
Robert Ott	Chair	FCAD	Fashion	Y
Usha George	Dean,	FCS		Y
Sri Krishnan	Associate Dean	FEAS		
Martha Lee-Blickstead	Program Director	Chang School		
Maricruz Rodriguez	UG Student		Criminal Justice	Y
Amanda Alaica	Grad Student		Civil Engineering	Y

SENATE APPEALS COMMITTEE				
Tara Burke	Faculty	Arts	Psychology	
John Caruana	Faculty	Arts	Philosophy	
Asher Alkoby	Faculty	TRSM	Business Management	
Dave Valliere	Faculty	TRSM	Business Management	Y
Lucia Dell'Agnese	Faculty	FCAD	Fashion	Y
Gregory Levy	Faculty	FCAD	Professional Communication	Y
Roma Chumak-Horbatsch	Faculty	FCS	Early Childhood Education	
Linda Cooper	Faculty	FCS	Nursing	Y
Sue Bishop	Faculty	FCS	Nursing	
Don Rose	Faculty	FCS (Chang)	Nursing	
Jurij Leshchyshyn	Faculty	FEAS	Architecture	
Jaclyn Dell'Unto	UG Student	Arts	Psychology	
Darlene Ferreira	UG Student	Arts	Public Admin & Governance	
Olivia Ong	UG Student	Arts	Arts & Contemporary Studies	
Michelle Opasinis	UG Student	Arts	Public Admin & Governance	
Fairuz Shickh	UG Student	Arts	Psychology	
Tom Tang	UG Student	Arts	Economics	
Andrew West	UG Student	Arts	Politics	
Yekaterina Ni	UG Student	TRSM	Business Management	
Aisha Nofal	UG Student	TRSM	Business Management	Y
Nancy Sandu	UG Student	TRSM	Business Management	
Shone Thomas	UG Student	TRSM	Business Tech Management	
Rachel Velsher	UG Student	TRSM	Business Management	
Leema Budhu	UG Student	FCS	Occupational & Public Health	
Josephine Cusumano	UG Student	FCS	Urban and Regional Planning	Y
Bhavna Sahajpal	UG Student	FEAS	Medical Physics	Y
Nika Zolfaghari	UG Student	FEAS	Biomedical Engineering	Y
Serena Gasparitsch	CE Student	Chang		
Kateryna Aksenchuk	Grad Student	FCS	Nursing	Y
Mariam Munawar	Grad Student	TRSM	Business	Y
Charles Sule	Grad Student		Environ Science & Man.	

SENATE LEARNING AND TEACHING COMMITTEE				
Monica de Vries	UG Student	Arts	Public Administration	Y
Rebecca Zanussi	UG Student	FCAD	Journalism	
Neda Hamzavi	UG Student	FCS	Nursing	
Eli Vandersluis	UG Student	FEAS	Mechanical Engineering	
Rachel Velsher	UG Student	TRSM	Business Management	
Golam Morshed	Grad Student		Mechanical Engineering	
Ugochukwe Asagwara	CE	Chang		

Ryerson University

**Report #W2011-1 of the
Senate Learning and Teaching Committee**

May 3, 2011

Report of the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee

Table of Contents

Introduction	3
Senate Learning and Teaching Sub-Committee Reports	4
Academic Integrity Sub-Committee	4
Experiential Learning Model Sub-Committee	5
Inclusive Learning Environment Sub-Committee	6
Information Literacy Sub-Committee	7
Writing Language and Proficiency Sub-Committee.....	9
Effective Use of Technology Sub-Committee.....	10
Identified Discussion Issues and Future Actions	11

Introduction

The goal of the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee (SLT) is the promotion of an effective educational environment by identifying, prioritizing, and acting upon issues from across the University. Much of the committee work is conducted within sub-committees comprised of a cross-section of the Ryerson community, and through the sharing of outcomes with the larger SLT group.

This document provides a report of sub-committee activities for the academic year 2010-2011. In addition, the SLT Committee has identified pressing issues to be addressed.

Members of the Senate Learning and Teaching committee 2010 – 2011:

Chris Evans, Vice Provost, Academic (Chair)

Heather Lane Vetere - Vice Provost, Students

Maureen Reed – Interim Director, Learning & Teaching Office (non-voting)

Diane Schulman - Secretary of Senate (non-voting)

Appointees of the Vice Provost, Academic

Donna Bell – Academic Integrity Officer

Katherine Penny – Director, Experiential Learning Office

Rona Abramovitch – Advisor on Outreach and Access

Anne Johnson – Faculty, Chemistry and Biology

Appointees of the Vice Provost, Students

Christina Halliday - Director, Student Learning Support

Gretchen Bingham - Coordinator, Learning Success Centre

Boza Tasic - Coordinator, Math Assistance Centre

John Hannah - Assistant Director, Student Learning Support

Learning & Teaching Office

Restiani Andriati, Digital Media Projects Office

Paola Borin, Curriculum Development Consultant

John Paul Foxe, Educational Developer

Dalia Hanna, Program Coordinator

Linda Kowal, The G. Raymond Chang School of Continuing Education

Michelle Schwartz, Online Resources Developer

Gosha Zywno, Faculty Associate, UTDP

Faculty Representation

Alan Sears - Arts, Sociology (Teaching Chair)

Marsha Barber - Communication & Design, Journalism (Teaching Chair)

Elaine Frankel - Community Services, Early Childhood Education (Teaching Chair)

Frankie Stewart - Engineering, Mechanical Engineering (Teaching Chair)

Tatyana Antimirova - Architecture & Science, Physics (Teaching Chair)

Ken Grant - Ted Rogers School of Management, ITM (Teaching Chair)

Don Kinder - Librarian, Library (Teaching Chair)

Students

Monica de Vries - Arts, Public Administration

Nicholas Michelis - Communication & Design, Image Arts

Lina Kiskunas - Community Services, Nursing

Yeganeh Ghezavati - Engineering, Architecture & Science, Industrial Engineering

Toby Whitfield - Ted Rogers School of Management, Business Management

Dianne Lam - Graduate Studies

Deborah Baxter - Continuing Education

1.0 Senate Learning and Teaching Sub-Committee Reports

Preamble

At the September meeting, the Chair requested all sub-committees to submit their action plans for the 2010/2011 academic year. These action plans included their goals and potential deliverables. Each month, sub-committees reported on their progress. They submitted reports on their outcomes in early April. What follows is a summary of these reports.

Academic Integrity Sub-Committee

Committee members 2010-2011

Donna Bell	(Chair) Academic Integrity Office
Diane Schulman	Secretary of Senate
John Paul Foxe	Learning & Teaching Office
Anne Johnson	Faculty member, FEAS
Restiani Andriati	Digital Media Projects Office
Don Kinder	Library
Linda Kowal	The G. Raymond Change School of Continuing Education

Background

The Academic Integrity Sub-Committee was formed in 2004. This committee addresses issues of concern to faculty surrounding student academic conduct and methods to reduce misconduct. In addition, this committee focuses on creating resources for faculty to assist with the reduction of academic misconduct on campus.

Goals 2010-2011

1. Create a Faculty Resource Guide which will include new best practices for assignment development, writing, and managing online courses, as well as a section of resources to assist faculty.
2. Further develop and enhance the graduate section of the Academic Integrity website.
3. Develop a guide for TA/GAs around academic integrity (education/grading/invigilation/policies)
4. Create a new section on the Academic Integrity website dealing with the concepts of editing and proofreading.

Outcomes

1. Created a faculty resource guide on assignment development.
2. Developed and enhanced content for the graduate section of the Academic Integrity website
3. Developed a guide for TA/GAs. To be released in web format, summer 2011.
4. Developed the content for a new section of the Academic Integrity website regarding editing and proofreading. To be released in web format, summer 2011.
5. Created a training program for appeals panel members on making fair and equitable decisions.

Future Directions

1. Develop a guide for international students to assist in their understanding of academic integrity.
2. Examine the balancing of collaboration and assessment (i.e. academic integrity guidelines in groups).
3. Look at the role of study groups and peer evaluation from an academic integrity perspective.

Experiential Learning Model Sub-Committee

Committee Members 2010-2011

Gretchen Bingham	Learning Success Centre
Paola Borin	Learning and Teaching Office
Elaine Frankel	Faculty of Community Services
Andrew McWilliams	Faculty of Engineering, Architecture & Science
Gillian Mothersill	Faculty of Communication & Design
Katherine Penny (Chair)	Experiential Learning Office

Background

Experiential learning allows the needs and preferences of individuals to be met by providing learner-centred, accessible, purposeful learning. Building knowledge through a process of discovery provides opportunities for progression in social and scholarly development. The Experiential Learning Committee's mandate is to model and disseminate best practices in experiential learning across the university.

In 2009-2010 the sub-committee created a comprehensive *experiential learning model*. When creating the model, consideration was given to how application, analysis, evaluation and creativity in experiential learning allows for transformational intellectual growth. A great deal of attention was paid to building an interactive model that would maximize effective learning. It was designed specifically with Ryerson University's teaching and learning community in mind.

The committee took a creative and holistic approach in designing the model, resulting in Kolb's experiential learning cycle becoming one of four "lenses" of the model. Kolb includes the cycle of learning as a central principle in his experiential learning theory, typically expressed as the four-stage cycle of learning, in which immediate or concrete experiences provide a basis for observations and reflections. These observations and reflections are assimilated and distilled into abstract concepts producing new implications for action which can be actively tested, in turn creating new experiences. Key descriptive words, each well-defined, opened the door to a broader perspective of experiential learning in the Ryerson model, incorporating three other "lenses": curriculum, climate and community.

The model was fine-tuned following a presentation to the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee in January 2010. It was accepted through a peer-review process for presentation at the STLHE 2010 conference in June 2010 and was very well received.

Goals for 2010-2011

1. Make the experiential learning model available on the EL website. The 3-D model, which was developed by a Graphic Design Management student, will eventually be converted into an interactive and adaptable web-based format.
2. Continue to enhance the EL model by adding links/information to the key words in the "lenses," providing more in-depth information and resources.
3. Introduce the model across the university. Workshops sharing best practices and demonstrating how to utilize the model as a teaching tool will be developed and presented by the committee to faculty and staff.
4. Produce an online information link to assist faculty/staff as they develop and shape experiential learning activities, including how to incorporate EL in their course outlines and learning plans.
5. Expand the committee membership.
6. Create a video podcast as an effective means of delivering the model across the university and bring it to the SLT Committee for feedback. The outcome will be a useful and interactive resource for faculty and staff.

Outcomes

1. The model was made available on the experiential learning website (www.ryerson.ca/experiential/) and to the Ryerson Teaching Chairs
2. Produced an online link, available on the experiential learning website, to assist faculty and staff to further understand how the lenses of the model are defined and how they support experiential learning activities within the curriculum
3. Began the process of developing the video.

Future Directions

1. Improve the 3D model image for better clarity when viewing.
2. Release the video.
3. Promote the video as an interactive tool for use by Deans, Directors/Chairs, Teaching Chairs and Managers.
4. Continue to attract users to resources listed on the website through an experiential learning flyer, through Teachnet and during ongoing activities of the Experiential Learning Office throughout the Ryerson community.

Inclusive Learning Environment**Committee Members 2010-2011**

Gretchen Bingham (Chair)	Learning Success Coordinator
Rona Abramovitch	Access and Outreach
Dalia Hanna	Learning and Teaching Office
Heather Willis	Accessibility Coordinator
Stephanie Marinich-Lee	Access Centre
Jeff Perera	Learning Success Centre Student Rep
Rodney Diverlus,	VP. Equity RSU
Gilary Massa	RSU Equity events organizer
Elaine Frankel	ECE, Teaching Chair FCS

Katherine Turner ISTC

Background

The sub-committee started meeting in 2007 to explore ways in which the Ryerson community could better respond to learning with an inclusive lens. The initial question posed was: *What is inclusive education and how do we create inclusive learning environments?*

Through a series of discussions with sub-committee members and faculty, it was decided that a simulation experience would be developed in collaboration with the Interpersonal Skills Teaching Centre (ISTC). Over a period of two years, the sub-committee worked with Katherine Turner from the ISTC, collected stories, developed scenarios and had rich discussions around the issues of inclusive education at Ryerson.

The purpose of the resulting simulation is to increase awareness of inclusivity in the classroom based on real stories and critical incidents contributed by students, staff and faculty.

A pilot of the simulation was presented in February, 2009 to members of the Senate Learning & Teaching Committee, with the intent of using the feedback from participants to further refine the simulation. Since that time, the simulation has been delivered and revised several times.

Goals for 2010 – 2011

1. To extend the conversation about diversity and inclusive education:
 - a. Increase working committee participation to include students and additional faculty.
 - b. Increase the community's experience with issues related to diversity and equity through participation in simulations and rich debrief (i.e., a detailed, interactive discussion involving the simulation participants, the actors and a facilitator. The purpose is to tease out themes and issues and to consider appropriate responses and actions.).
 - c. Double the participation of faculty members in simulations held during the 2010/2011 academic year.
2. To deepen the conversations and insights from participation and exposure:
 - a. To address issues of diversity and inclusiveness particular to specific faculties.
 - b. Appropriately resource the development of 2-3 additional simulations.
3. To attempt to evaluate the longer-term impact of the simulations (i.e. beyond the immediate feedback).
4. Engage with the LTO in bringing a diversity, inclusion and equity lens to activities such as workshops, publications, etc., where appropriate and possible.

Outcomes

1. Updated inclusivity simulations that brought in new content around homophobia, Aboriginal issues, and disabilities.
2. Increased RFA membership on the committee.
3. Increased student membership on the committee.
4. Highlighted disability by including a new simulation.
5. Presented simulation two times: New Faculty Orientation January 6, 2011 (Number of attendees: 60) and Inclusive Classroom workshop, March 16, 2011 (Number of attendees: 35). In 2009/2010, the session attracted 35 faculty.

6. Increased discussion around faculty concerns.

Future Directions

1. Create online tools that highlight inclusivity issues.
2. Meet with the Teaching Chairs and students to get feedback and new ideas; use this information to develop a plan for the future of the simulations.
3. Develop a simulation on mental health.
4. Work with the LTO to promote modeling of inclusivity.

Information Literacy

Committee Members 2010-2011

Don Kinder (Chair)	Library
Maureen Reed	Interim Director LTO, Faculty
Michelle Schwartz	Learning and Teaching Office
John Paul Foxe	Learning and Teaching Office
Restiani Andriati	DMP
Donna Bell	Academic Integrity Office
Diane Granfield	Library

Note: Members of the Library's Learning and Teaching Committee were involved in certain initiatives.

Background

The Association of Colleges and Research Libraries/ACRL (2006) defines an information literate individual as one who is "able to recognize when information is needed and has the ability to locate, evaluate and use effectively the needed information and to use it ethically and legally." It is widely recognized that information competencies are key factors in student success and in lifelong learning, and the *Information Literacy Competency Standards* developed by the ACRL have been adopted by numerous postsecondary libraries internationally.

The mandate of this sub-committee is to create a culture of information literacy at Ryerson. By identifying instructors who are already embedding information literacy skills into programs and courses, the sub-committee aims to create an inventory of best practices. This information will then be used to develop programs and tools that will empower instructors to incorporate information competencies into their courses, both by working collaboratively with librarians and by drawing on the expertise of their peers.

Goals for 2010-2011

1. Survey faculty and learning success staff about their opinions and experiences of integrating information literacy skills into undergraduate and graduate programs/courses.
2. Complete data analysis of survey results to identify current practices/gaps.

3. Identify potential partners willing to assist faculty in integrating information literacy practices/skills into their curriculum.
4. Conduct an updated literature review of best practices on embedding information literacy into course/assignment content.
5. Produce a report about the current and best practices recommended by literature and faculty.
6. Create a tool box of resources for best practices for use by faculty (i.e. innovative technology tools, resource experts).
7. Create a workshop to be delivered to the Library Learning and Teaching Committee to disseminate information literacy best practices to the Faculty Teaching Chairs Committees.
8. Create a workshop for faculty (through LTO programming) on creating assignments that develop information literacy skills, foster academic integrity and optimize student engagement in learning.

Outcomes

1. Completed and analyzed a survey of faculty regarding the integration of information literacy into courses.
2. Began working with a research skills tool called *Re-search*, a learning object that allows librarians and faculty to collaborate in creating course-specific modules that foster information literacy skills. Through examples, exercises and quizzes student learn how to develop effective research questions, identify and evaluate sources, build effective search strategies and correctly cite sources. Currently working with nursing faculty in developing modules for students in distance education courses. Expansion to all faculties is planned for fall 2011.
3. Developed and delivered an information literacy workshop for teaching assistants and graduate assistants—the point of the workshop was to assist TA/GAs in helping undergraduates with these skills.
4. Created an information literacy workshop for faculty to be presented at the May Faculty Conference.
5. Created and gave a workshop for faculty on scholarly publishing, impact factors and the Digital Commons. Over 35 faculty members attended.
6. Assisted in the assessment design workshop provided by the Library.

Future Directions

1. Compile a list of faculty who are willing to volunteer to assist other faculty members with integrating information literacy into their courses.
2. Have faculty pilot the *Re-search* project in their courses.
3. Create an electronic tutorial to help faculty with information literacy in assignment design (perhaps online).

Writing & English Language Proficiency Working Group

Committee Members 2010-2011

Christina Halliday (Chair)	Student Learning Support
John Hannah	Student Learning Support
Marju Toomsalu	English Department

Lu Ann Lafrenz	Faculty Member, Fashion
Anne Johnson FEAS	Faculty Member, FEAS
Beth Swart	Faculty Member, FCS
Donna Bell	Academic Integrity Office
Don Kinder	Library

Background

The Writing & English Language Proficiency Working Group is responsible for identifying student academic writing and English language skill development needs and, in response to those identified needs, making recommendations regarding faculty and teaching assistant development, program development across campus, and academic policies. Where concerns are relevant to specific faculties, units, or other campus initiatives, the Chair of the sub-committee will liaise as appropriate.

Goals for 2010-2011

1. Formulate and forward recommendations related to student academic writing and English language skill development which respond to institutional priorities and the Ryerson University Strategic Plan.
2. Formulate and forward recommendations with respect to academic policies that impact student development in the acquisition of writing and English language skills.
3. Develop programming, teaching approaches, and faculty development recommendations that address the diversity of students at Ryerson University *and* their particular academic writing and English language skill development needs.
4. Develop and recommend adjustments to campus academic support and student service units that enhance student development in academic writing and English language skills.

Outcomes

1. Completed the university audit for EAL.
2. Evaluated current resources for EAL and student writing.
3. Evaluated the EAL student population skill level for first year entrance.
4. Examined documentation indicating writing skill level of first year entrance.
5. Examined admissions data for characteristics of EAL population.

Future Directions

1. Expected completion date of Draft Plan: May 2011.
2. Create a faculty resource to support EAL students in the classroom.

Effective Use of Technology

Committee Members 2010-2011

Restiani Andriati	(Chair) DMP, CCS
Tetyana Antimirova	Teaching Chair, FEAS
Deb Baxter	Student, Chang School
Sally Wilson	Library
Dalia Hanna	Learning and Teaching Office
Graham McCarthy	Library
Michelle Schwartz	Learning and Teaching Office
Stephanie Goetz	DMP

Goals for 2010-2011

1. Introduce Social Media and Web 2.0 tools to faculty and instructors; show how these tools can be used to enhance students' learning and debunk the notion that these tools are scary and cannot be used for teaching. This will be done by:
 - Running a series of workshops and lunch & learn seminars on Social Media and Web 2.0 tools. There will be different levels of workshops and seminars to accommodate the various comfort level of instructors in using technology, e.g.
 - Introduction – What is this tool?
 - How to use it in class (how-to, hands-on).
 - New ways to use the tool and where to go from here (discussions).
 - Providing documentation and tutorials for Social Media and Web 2.0 tools.
 - Holding workshops, with sessions on Twitter, Flickr, etc.; posting recordings of the sessions online along with documents on how to get started.
 - Creating an introductory level workshop series, followed by in-depth sessions on using technology in the classroom. This will be accomplished through collaboration amongst the DMP, LTO, Library, and the Edge Lab
2. Promoting resources available to Ryerson community by:
 - Highlighting and inter-connecting resources and websites from the DMP, LTO and the Library.
 - Communicating these resources to faculty through the Teaching Chairs. The resources may include generic tips and tricks for various tools / technologies and how to use them pedagogically.

Outcomes

1. Created a blog for resources available at <http://web20.blog.ryerson.ca/>
2. Created and ran workshops for faculty who wish to learn Web 2.0 tools.
3. Held two discussion forums on Web 2.0 and Social Media.
4. Created a workshop to pilot at the May Faculty Conference on how to use social media tools in class, where:
 - a. Participants use hands-on examples.
 - b. Participants experience and access different types of social media tools.

Future Directions

1. Use content from other sub- committees to demonstrate the use of technology.
2. Investigate ways to increase faculty awareness of the DMP.
3. Continue to interact with the LTO.
4. Continue the conversation around Web 2.0 and ways to use it in classes.

5. Create guidelines for instructors in using Web 2.0, such as opt-out and privacy considerations, and course and assignment goals alignment.
6. Equip instructors who wish to integrate social media into their courses by providing workshops and consultations.

2.0 Identified Discussion Issues and Future Actions

Preamble

At each Senate Learning and Teaching Committee meeting time was devoted to discuss issues of importance in the Ryerson community. Of the topics discussed, three in particular generated a great deal of interest. These topics are listed below along with a brief discussion summary. In addition, members suggested future actions for the SLT to address these issues.

Discussion Topics

Topic 1: Management of Large Classes

Summary

Faculty and students reported disruptive behaviour in large classes. The greatest concerns were expressed about very large first-year classes. SLT members believe that students' anonymity and frustration with large classes contribute to the disruptions. Members suggested remedies including setting out behaviour rules on the first day of class, and increasing engagement through technology. Some members suggest that the issue should be studied in more detail.

Topic 2: Inclusivity for all Students

Summary

Inclusivity needs to be infused and embedded in everything we do, but it is sometimes difficult for faculty to know how to be inclusive or recognize when they are not. Members discussed how to get faculty to be more inclusive. Members noted faculty are not trying to be exclusive, but may not recognize when they are not inclusive and may be offended when this is pointed out to them. Regarding students with disabilities, most faculty want to assist students with disabilities but sometimes do not understand their obligations or how to accommodate. In addition, some may erroneously believe that students with some forms of disability are not suited to university and these misconceptions lead to difficulties. Members suggested that the faculty may be uninformed about disabilities and accommodations. Some faculty may see accommodation as onerous, even though this isn't always the case. Faculty are also often unaware of the supports and resources for accommodation that already exist at Ryerson. Members suggested increased education for faculty from Discrimination and Harassment Prevention Services and the Access Center, as well as more LTO resources addressing the topic. In addition, members believed that more training about inclusivity and universal design of courses is desirable.

Topic 3: Effective Assessment and Assignment Design

Summary

Members suggested that effective assessment and assignment design intersects with many of the other topics considered by the SLT. At least three sub-committees have worked on, or plan to work on, issues that relate to effective design (Academic Integrity, Information Literacy, and Writing and Language Proficiency). These groups suggest that there is a lack of appropriate resources for faculty on assessment design. In addition, assessments are not always inclusive of all students; members believe that there is a lack of understanding of universal design for assignments.

Future Directions

Members believe that there are several ways to address each of the topics above. Based on these discussions the following actions were taken or are planned:

1. **Classroom Management:** The LTO developed and provided resources online, including a well-read electronic newsletter promoting these resources. In addition, the LTO encouraged discussion around this topic at several workshops and at New Faculty Orientation, and met with the Student Conduct Officer to develop some planned resources. The LTO plans to increase resources for faculty to address the many different types of issues surrounding classroom management during the next academic year.
2. **Inclusivity Issues:** The LTO is increasing online resources, has conducted several workshops on inclusivity (simulations) and is working to model inclusivity. The LTO will reach out to other university centres for assistance in creating better tools for faculty that promote inclusivity in teaching (e.g. student services, discrimination and harassment, etc.). SLT members suggest a special project on universal design in the upcoming year that includes a workshop or panel discussion and the development of resources for faculty.
3. **Effective Assessment and Assignment Design:** Given that three subcommittees have plans around assessment and assignment design, members suggest that these groups liaise to share information and support one another. From this liaison, a project for the upcoming year could be developed with the intent of creating a report to Senate about current and successful practices in assessment and assignment design.

Respectfully Submitted,



Chris Evans, Vice Provost Academic
Chair of the Committee

REPORT TO SENATE

By COU Academic Colleague Alex Wellington
Winter 2011

COU WEBSITE: <http://www.cou.on.ca/>

MISSION: “Working to improve the quality and accessibility of higher education in Ontario”

FOCUS: Publicly-funded universities in Ontario

According to its website, “COU works with and on behalf of its members to meet public policy expectations of greater accountability, financial self-reliance, diversity of educational opportunity, and responsiveness to educational and marketplace needs, while supporting institutions' traditional rights of autonomy and self-regulation.”

COMMITTEES: Executive Committee
Government and Community Relations
Relationships with Other Post-Secondary Institutions
Ontario Universities Application Centre (OUAC) Advisory Board
Budget and Audit Committee

NOTE: Sheldon Levy has been the Chair of COU for 2009 to 2010, and for 2010 to 2011. During the meetings of Council on April 7 and April 8, COU President Bonnie Patterson and Vice-Chair Alastair Summerlee praised Sheldon for his exemplary leadership of COU, and his exceptionally acute strategic vision.

MEETINGS: The Academic Colleagues meet twice each term in the Academic Year together, and once each term with the Executive Heads in the full Council. Selected Staff from the Council of Ontario Universities are in attendance at these meetings.

Role of the Academic Colleagues includes membership on the COU Committees and preparation of Discussion Papers/ Working Papers to be provided to the full Council

Discussion Papers/ Working Papers found online on COU Website:
<<http://www.cou.on.ca/Issues-Resources/Student-Resources/Publications/Papers-by-Academic-Colleagues.aspx>>

Leslie Sanders, “Teaching Stream Positions: Some Implications” (April 2011)

NOTE: This report will be available through the COU website soon; in the meantime copies are available, electronically, upon request, from Alex Wellington

Sylvie Albert, “Student Retention: A Moving Target” (July 2010)

<http://www.cou.on.ca/Issues-Resources/Student-Resources/Publications/Papers-by-Academic-Colleagues/PDFs/AC-Discussion-Paper-Student-Retention---July-2010_.aspx>

Marilyn Rose, "The Academic Accommodation of Graduate Students With Disabilities"
(October 2009)

<<http://www.cou.on.ca/Issues-Resources/Student-Resources/Publications/Papers-by-Academic-Colleagues/PDFs/AC-Working-Paper---Accommodating-Graduate-Students.aspx>>

Philippe Constantineau, "The Ontario Transfer Credit System: A Situation Report" (July 2009)

John Logan, "Learning Disabilities: A Guide for Faculty at Ontario Universities" (January 2009):

<<http://www.cou.on.ca/content/objects/ACWorkingPaper-LearningDisabilitiesGuide.pdf>>

James Neufeld and James Dianda, "Academic Dishonesty: A Survey of Policies and Procedures at Ontario Universities" (2005-2006):

<<http://www.cou.on.ca/content/objects/AC%20Working%20Paper%20Series.pdf>>

SELECTIVE SAMPLE of TOPICS discussed by Academic Colleagues at meetings:

Evaluations

Online Education, including Collaborative Degrees

Role of Research in Undergraduate Education

Commercialization of Research

UPDATES: On the COU website are posted regular updates, titled "Council Highlights"

REPORT OF ACADEMIC STANDARDS COMMITTEE

Report #W2011–3; May 2011

In this report the Academic Standards Committee (ASC) brings to Senate its evaluation and recommendation on a number of items.

Section A presents periodic program reviews of the following programs:

- the *Bachelor of Architectural Science* degree program;
- the *Bachelor of Social Work* degree program.

Section B presents items from the Chang School of Continuing Education, including:

- the review of the *Advanced Certificate in International Business*;
- the restructuring of the *Certificate in Public Relations*;
- the restructuring of the *Certificate in Graphic Communications*.

Section C presents proposals from the Faculty of Arts, including:

- the *Bachelor of Arts in History* degree program;
- the *Minor in History*;
- the *Bachelor of Arts in Environment and Urban Sustainability* degree program;

A. Periodic Program Reviews

A1. Architectural Science

1. PREAMBLE

The timing of this Periodic Program Review reflects a significant juncture due to substantial changes in the Bachelor of Architectural Science (B.Arch.Sc) program. In particular, full accreditation status was awarded to the department for the Master of Architecture program as of January 1st, 2010 by the Canadian Architecture Certification Board (CACB). This means the B.Arch.Sc program is a pre-professional degree leading to admissibility to the M.Arch. degree. Revisions to the curriculum and other developments implemented to facilitate the accreditation have created an environment to prepare students for the profession of architecture. In light of the Department's mission of sustainability, technology, and professional preparation, the undergraduate program is dependent upon the integration of three optional areas of specialty: Architectural Design, Building Science, and Project Management.

2. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The goal of this integrated lecture- and studio-based undergraduate program is, to quote from the Department's mission statement, "to educate students for a wide range of professional roles in the

design, construction and management of the built environment". The mission and goals of the Department are aligned with both Ryerson's academic plan (*Shaping our Future*) and that of the Faculty of Engineering, Architecture and Science.

The program emphasizes studies in design theory, technology, and management. The long-standing reputation of the program rests in part on this unique emphasis of the curriculum. The first three years of the program provide students with a common foundation. Program options are designated in students' final year. The common curriculum concentrates on the principles of the physical and social sciences and humanities, as well as engineering and building technology and the application of this knowledge to the solution of a wide range of architectural and environmental problems. In the final year, students are required to take a concentration of studies in one of the three program options (Architecture, Building Science and Project Management), with courses from the other options or departments related to the built environment as professional electives. Students continue to apply theory learned in the lecture courses to workshop projects which simulate real-life problems in design, construction management, and building science.

The history of architecture education at Ryerson dates to the institution's 1948 founding, with the School of Architectural Draughting offering one of Ryerson's first programs- a career-oriented two year diploma training for architectural assistants. In 1951 the Department of Architectural Technology was established, introducing a three year diploma. In 1973 a four year degree program, the Bachelor of Technology (Architectural Science), was launched. Ryerson's expansion in the current period culminated with the achievement of full university status in 1993 with an emphasis on research and the introduction of graduate studies programs. Developments during the 1990s and 2000s led to the current, B.Arch.Sc. degree program.

The Department has a staff of 27 tenure-stream/tenured (RFA) faculty complemented by approximately 15 part-time (CUPE) faculty instructors. The annual first-year intake target was about 160 students for a number of years. However, with increasing demands on faculty time due to new graduate programming and space limitations in the design studios, the first-year enrollment target was reduced to 114 in 2009/2010. The total enrollment in all years in all variations of the program was approximately 570 in the years prior to the target readjustment.

3. THE CURRICULUM

The curriculum consists of three common years followed by a final year of specialization. The final year offers three different options: Architecture, Building Science and Project Management. The curriculum is structured around four themes: introduction and context, preparation (tools and elements), integration and concentration/specialization/transition. The first semester provides students with an introduction and sets the context for their education in architectural science. Semesters two, three and four prepare students for advanced studies through an exploration of the necessary tools and elements. Semesters six and seven provide a comprehensive integration of the multiple components of an undergraduate education in architectural science. In the final two semesters, students select from one of the three options available and undertake intensive work in their chosen specialization.

In terms of comparator programs, Ryerson's B.Arch.Sc closely resembles other CACB-accredited programs in Ontario in terms of structure, learning objectives and overall curriculum.

The Architecture degree curriculum reflects Ryerson's tripartite structure. It provides a balance amongst professional, professionally-related and liberal studies over the degree period. In the professional (core) courses, students are provided with a balance of theory and opportunities to apply their knowledge in order to become competent professionals. Professionally related courses utilize interdisciplinary studies which are complimentary to the professional courses, which provide material which helps to form a general context for the study of architecture, and which contribute to the solution of a wide range of architectural and environmental problems.

Three Options:

Architecture- The Architecture option offers a technical base with a focus on architectural design principles. Through lectures, seminars, and hands-on studio workshops, students learn program planning, design, presentation techniques, and contract documentation.

Building Science- The Building Science option offers a more detailed technical base of studies including the selection and design of building construction assemblies, the evaluation of their suitability and performance, and construction and technical drawings.

Project Management- The Project Management option examines the managerial and economic aspects of construction projects, including the planning, organization, management, supervision and control of the process.

Modes of Delivery:

Courses in the architectural science program include studios, lecture courses, laboratories and seminars. Lecture courses are three hours and convey knowledge and information to a large group (~ 112 students). They are usually evaluated through examinations and projects related directly to accumulation of information. Studios (9 hours per week, 3 credits) involve application of information and are taught in small groups (12-14 students). Projects in the studio require analysis and design solutions that are best taught through small groups under the direction of a faculty member. Seminars (professional electives) are usually one-credit courses and meet three hours per week. The format is smaller groups (approximately 40 students) where analysis and discussion are foundations. The professional electives are not required courses and can be chosen from a list of possible offerings. The topics of these courses are usually in a faculty member's area of expertise and focused on a specific area of the curriculum, thus these courses provide more in-depth understanding of the topic.

Studio courses involve students undertaking architectural design projects structured to address particular issues and concepts. Imbedded in these projects are specific research and analysis assignments such as site and program analysis, precedent studies and, in third year studio, financial and economic implications of projects. Assignments are generally evaluated on their breadth and depth of research and analysis as these pertain to the design project.

Studio courses are also a venue for experiential learning, an important hallmark of Ryerson's mission to provide career-relevant education. The studio-based curriculum, with its public presentation and evaluation of student work, regularly involves members of the industry taking part in juries and on review panels. Students thus experience 'real world' exposure to critical and professional review of their work while at the same time having the opportunity to exercise and hone their professional and presentation skills and techniques.

Admission Requirements:

Applicants require completion of the O.S.S.D. with six Grade 12 U/M courses, including Grade 12 U courses in: English, Physics (SPH4U) and Mathematics (one of Advanced Functions (MHF4U) or Calculus and Vectors (MCV4U)) with a minimum of 60 percent or higher in each of these courses. ENG4U/EAE4U is the preferred English. Applicants may be required to attend an on-campus information session, to submit a collection of their work, to complete an Admissions Writing and Sketching Exercise and to forward other relevant documentation in support of their application (i.e., a portfolio). These criteria will be used in the selection process. Advanced Functions and Introductory Calculus (MCB4U) will be accepted in place of Advanced Functions (MHF4U) where presented and where applicable. Geometry and Discrete Mathematics (MGA4U) will be accepted in place of Calculus and Vectors (MCV4U) where presented and where applicable. Subject to competition, candidates may be required to present averages/grades above the minimum.

CACB Criteria and OCAV Learning Objectives (UDLEs):

As part of its self-study analysis, the program has tried to describe the way in which its courses support the OCAV Learning Outcomes (UDLEs) and how the OCAV UDLEs cross-refer to the CACB criteria. For example, under the broad UDLE "Knowledge of Methodologies" it is noted that all "architectural studios in the curriculum require students to gain understanding of methods of enquiry and especially creative activity, by nature of their pedagogy. The projects in design studio are inherently about solving problems. Students are given programs, or situations, that they need to design solutions to the clients' needs or contextual issues (ASC 201 [Design Studio I], 301 [Design Studio II], 401 [Design Studio III], 520 [Integration Studio I] and 620 [Integration Studio II])."

Appendix F in the PPR documentation presents the learning objectives of the CACB which have been adopted by Architecture as program learning objectives. The Appendix F chart maps these 37 learning objectives to the OCAV UDLEs. The mapping confirms that the CACB objectives do map to all the OCAV UDLEs to some extent. That is, the program curriculum, by complying to the CACB learning objectives, also supports the OCAV UDLEs to some extent.

4. THE PROGRAM REVIEW

The review provides comprehensive information about the program and the Department, including student data, student and graduate surveys and a comparator review. As required by Senate policy 126 it provides a statement of the consistency of the goals, learning objectives and program expectations with various academic plans and the OCAV degree level expectations (See comments in the ASC

Evaluation section, however). The Peer Review Team¹ (PRT) report and the Department's response to it provide further insight into the program.

Assessment of Strengths and Weaknesses:

The assessment of program strengths and weaknesses, based on the Self-Study Report and the observations and comments made by the PRT is as follows:

Strengths:

Curriculum- The program's goals and learning objectives are appropriate and the program is strong. The thematic areas embedded in the curriculum are highly appropriate. The new, accredited curriculum provides a balance between breadth of preparation in the first three years, and specialist knowledge in the three areas of Architecture, Building Science and Project Management in year 4. The range of curriculum items building professional skills and attitudes is a positive feature as are the experiential learning opportunities.

High-Quality Applicants/Students- The program attracts a large pool of high-quality applicants. The retention rates in the program are very high (> 85% following three years of study), attesting to the quality of students admitted and their commitment to the program. Graduation rates have also been rising over time.

Preparation of Graduates- Graduates are well prepared to enter the workforce in a wide variety of positions. The employment rate for 2005 graduates was 100% after 2 years. Another measure of success is the admission of Ryerson University undergraduates to graduate programs. In recent years, Ryerson University Architectural Science graduates have been admitted to professional graduate programs in architecture at Dalhousie University, The University of Toronto, McGill University, Cornell University, Yale University, and Columbia University, to mention a few institutions. About 50% of all program graduates pursue some form of additional education beyond the Ryerson undergraduate degree.

Student Satisfaction- Students feel a high level of satisfaction with the program. For example, nearly 85% of graduating students indicated they were satisfied or very satisfied with the overall quality of their education (NSSE 2006).

Student Culture- There is an extraordinarily strong student culture in the program. With three major student societies – the Architecture Course Union (ACU), the Project Management Institute (PMI), and the only Canadian chapter of the AIAS – as well as a fourth, a fledgling chapter of CASA, students are continually active with charettes, road trips, conferences, symposia, and parties.

Human Resources- The full-time faculty are dedicated, highly committed professionals.

¹ Members of the PRT were Profs. Sharon Matthews (Consultant to the Boston Architectural Center, former Director of the National Architectural Accreditation Board (USA) and former Chair of the architecture program at Norwich University) and David Caro (Chair of PRT, Dept of Architecture, McGill University).

Governance- The collegial program governance is presented as a strength in the Self-Study Report. The program governance provides scope for a high level of student participation in governance and curriculum development.

Weaknesses: The Self-Study Report flags a number of issues as summarized here. In many cases, these have been fully or partially addressed by the change in curriculum structure from the old model to the model adopted for accreditation.

1) Curricular and Program Issues:

Curricular Gaps and Overlaps- The old, pre-accreditation curriculum suffered from a large number of gaps and overlaps. This situation is seen largely as the result of curricular drift caused by a lack of coordinated oversight. The redesign of curriculum to facilitate accreditation addressed these issues for the most part. Plans have also put in place for an administrative structure which allows for improved curricular oversight to avoid future drift.

Integration of IT Technology- Computer technology is not integrated into the current program in any systematic way. The department has initiated a planned response to this which is in the implementation phase.

Student Workload/Too Many Assignments- The Department has addressed the issue of excess workload in the revised program curriculum by developing a coherent course of study in each semester. Core courses are reduced from five (six or seven, if split courses are counted separately) to four per semester.

Overcrowding in Classrooms and Studios- The reduction of the Y1 target from ~ 160 to 112 has helped reduce this problem.

Insufficient Studio Contact Hours- Studios in the old curriculum were scheduled for six hours per week, while studios in most architecture programs are scheduled for nine, twelve, or sixteen hours per week. The quality issues of this situation were compounded by high student-to-faculty ratios in studio under the old curriculum. The revised curriculum has increased studio contact hour to 9 h/week, a ceiling set by the RFA collective agreement. The student-to-faculty ratio is also to be lowered to 14:1. These changes have significant financial implications as noted below.

Divergence of the Three Options- Under the old curriculum, these became quite separate areas of study with little conceptually or culturally in common. The accredited curriculum has addressed this by building the three optional specialization areas on a common curricular foundation.

Student Demand for Co-op and Study Abroad Options- The creation of more comprehensive and stable study-abroad programs is a priority of the department and a faculty member has been given responsibility for developing programs. The department has also added a goal to offer a practicum in the program as part of its academic plan.

2) Resource Issues

New Faculty- The department was somewhat understaffed. Fifteen new tenure-stream faculty have been hired since 2002 to prepare the program to transition to accreditation.

Faculty Workload- Analysis carried out by faculty members using a number of indicators, including number of courses taught, number of hours taught, number of students, and coordination duties suggest that the teaching workload for Ryerson faculty members is 20-25% higher than is typical in architecture programs in Ontario. This extra teaching workload impacts negatively on the ability of faculty members to conduct SRC activities or carry out administrative duties. Revisions to the undergraduate program curriculum will reduce faculty workload, on average, by approx. 15%.

Administrative Staff- The department requires administrative/technical support of various kinds. Additional staff positions are desirable. A complete plan for Departmental staffing is being developed, and is expected to be implemented incrementally by 2010/2011.

Financial Resources- As noted above, changes in the curriculum have increased financial pressures in some ways.

Library- The architecture collection in the University Library suffered from significant gaps for a number of years. Acquisitions have increased markedly in the last few years, however, and significant acquisitions are planned in conjunction with the opening of the M. Arch. program. These will support the undergraduate program as well.

The Architecture Building- The Architecture Building, which dates from the late 1970s, suffers from a number of limitations including: deferred maintenance (e.g., to HVAC); limited studio space; infrastructure to accommodate computing, IT and audio visual; lack of space for faculty SRC activities; a dedicated gallery space; a student lounge; and improved security systems.

3) Cultural Issues

Program Visibility within Ryerson- The program believes it has experienced a period of isolation. However, it seems confident that as Ryerson's profile rises, the place of Architecture in the institution will be more central. Faculty members are working towards this goal by being advocates for the built environment: by raising their research profiles, by promoting and developing lecture series, by holding final thesis reviews in the Engineering building.

Program Visibility in the Communities- The Department is intent on rapidly raising its profile within the architectural community, the academic community and the broader Toronto community. Accreditation will go some way to achieving this visibility, as will the Department's aggressive plans for projection of the departmental image.

SRC Activity- SRC activity has increased markedly in recent years. There are still challenges. These include: the need for a clear policy on SRC activities; the need for established research programs for new faculty members to enter, and for SRC mentorship opportunities; the need to improve facilities to

support SRC; the need for a more modest teaching workload. There has also been a dearth of qualified research students in the Department. This should be alleviated to some extent by the new graduate programs.

Building a Cohesive Faculty- The Department has gone through extraordinary rapid change in the last five years, and it should not be surprising that stresses have appeared among the faculty cohort. A major goal of the next few years will be that of forging a cohesive faculty cohort – finding areas of agreement, forming SRC alliances, coordinating teaching and administrative roles.

5. THE PEER REVIEW TEAM REPORT

The Peer Review Team (PRT) report notes similar strengths and weaknesses as those raised by the Self-Study document.

Strengths noted include: the Department is a stimulating and collegial home for faculty, staff and students; high-quality administrative leadership in the Department; a high level of optimism and shared sense of purpose; the new curriculum which the PRT deems to be “effective and highly marketable”; the general nature of the Architecture Building which is well designed for formal, informal and even improvisational use of space, the workshop and IT facilities which are described as “state-of-the-art resources for teaching and research.

Weaknesses noted also echo many raised in the Self-Study. These include: overly high teaching workloads, a problem which may be exacerbated by the proposed changes in the studio courses; too few staff in the workshop and limited IT support; the space limits (i.e., overcrowding) and outdated infrastructure elements (i.e., HVAC) of the Architecture Building; inappropriate office space for adjunct faculty; the impact of heavy student workload on their ability to enrich their education with courses from outside the Department/Faculty.

The PRT report focuses on the following points as deserving special attention:

Examples of Best Practice that Deserve Special Mention:

Among the many programs and sectors of activity identified as strengths or opportunities, the PRT proposes that the following be recognized as examples of Best Practice:

- i) The exhibition in the hallways of the research and creative work of the teaching and technical staff – a simple but highly effective way of celebrating an area of activity that is an essential component of the Department’s mission
- ii) The management of the workshop and IT facilities as professional state-of-the-art resources for teaching and research, despite heavy workloads and inadequately serviced space
- iii) The high level of meaningful participation by students in Departmental governance and curriculum development – convincing evidence of a healthy and collaborative environment for teaching, learning and research.

Recommendations on Concerns Related to the Program that should be Addressed as Priorities:

The PRT recommends that the following issues and areas of activity be addressed as priorities for resolution by the Department with the support of the University:

- i) faculty teaching load. This is deemed to be too high compared to other departments at the University, although the PRT also comments that such workloads are not unusual for architecture programs.
- ii) consideration of verbal and writing skills, research skills, use of precedents, ethics and professional judgment, architects' leadership roles, national and regional traditions, and critical thinking in the ongoing reform of the curriculum
- iii) additional staff support in the IT and workshop operations
- iv) improved HVAC services in the IT lab, workshop and design studios
- v) continued upgrading of the building envelope
- vi) studio furniture, studio lighting and systems for the hanging and electronic display of work
- vii) creation of an exhibition gallery

Of these, items i, iii, iv, v and vi are identified as **areas that require immediate consideration** by the University.

The Team also recommends that the Department pursue its plans for the development of post-professional research programs at the Master and, possibly, PhD levels. The PRT believes that the timing will never be better, given the momentum created by the recent accreditation review and the emphasis in the new curriculum on research as an essential element of learning at every level.

6. DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND RESPONSE TO PRT REPORT

The development plan of the Department of Architectural Science consists of several key components which support eight objectives. The following summary groups development plans, and progress made, around those eight objectives. Additional points have been added where relevant.

1) CACB Accreditation. Although the goal was to have accreditation complete by January 2012, it was in fact granted in January 2010.

Curriculum: This process has had a significant effect on creating additional coherence in the curriculum. Even so, the Department is cognizant of the need for additional improvement in some areas of the curriculum. They are working toward resolving these deficiencies by conducting meetings with faculty focus groups to address specific issues. Strategies to increase students' critical thinking, research and writing skills by strengthening these areas in the curriculum are being explored and discussed in faculty focus groups. Faculty members have already started to add essays to the Contemporary Ideas, Technologies and Precedents courses, are considering a writing course, and reviewing the Professional Practice sequence.

Faculty Workload: The department agrees with the PRT's statement that faculty teaching loads are too high in comparison to other departments in the University, although they are not unusual for architecture programs. The Department also agrees that overall heavy workloads grow out of the balance between teaching and SRC activities. This issue has been raised with the Dean and he has provided his commitment to assist SRC activities in the department. The department (and its SRC committee) is currently exploring proposals to accomplish this. Furthermore, a Teaching Standards committee has been formed to evaluate faculty members' teaching loads in the department and this committee will consider the assignment of GA/TA hours to courses in the programs, supervision of graduate students, and compensation for the revision of courses.

Student Workload: The Department recognizes as legitimate student, faculty and PRT concerns about excess workload in courses. The department has held two retreats since September 2010 to specifically discuss workload in the courses in the undergraduate program. While the way forward is still not entirely clear, the discussions have suggested opportunities to coordinate assessments in studio with those in related courses, and to rearrange the sequence of courses in the curriculum to better coordinate these courses horizontally and vertically.

2) Establish a graduate program in Construction Project Management, to admit first cohort of students in the Fall Semester 2010. The proposed program is currently anticipated to launch its first intake in Fall 2011.

3) Resources to meet the needs of high quality programs in the Department; physical resources, Human Resources, Awards and Scholarships, improvement in the quality and size of student engagement space within the Architecture Building, and to explore cross/multi/inter-disciplinary teaching and research collaboration with programs in urbanism, geography, sustainability, land use and environment. Target date: 2013.

This item specifically addresses several concerns raised in the Self-Study as well as by the PRT. Progress has been made in some areas.

Human Resources: Funding for adjunct faculty, key contributors to the program's success in the view of the PRT, has been increased by nearly 58% compared to 2008/2009. Two faculty hires in Architecture and one in building Science have taken place and an additional IT staff member hired. Two additional faculty hires are being finalized at this moment. The Department is in discussion with the Dean about a new IT technical support position to be shared with physics.

Space: Building renovations have gotten underway to provide better use of space for a new Building Science Lab, a new Fabrication Lab and additional critique space. The reduction of the first-year target also removes some of the space pressure on studios. Student engagement space has also been improved within the department with the reconfiguration of the resource center into a more interactive engagement space with new journal subscriptions, new furniture, new books and duplicating equipment. Ryerson's administration has also committed to the purchase of studio furniture for the first and second year studios.

Awards: Five new student awards have been introduced. Additional scholarship funds have also been accessed.

Physical resources: Equipment. Two new laser cutters for the workshop, and a \$250K wind tunnel were donated for research; 40 new computers were purchased for the CAD lab as well as three new 'ceiling mounted' projectors for the studios.

Physical resources: Building. The Department agrees with the comments from the PRT concerning the need for building upgrades of various kinds. Decisions to make a full building renovation are outside the authority of the Department. However, the Department will engage in an analysis, together with Ryerson's Campus Planning and Facilities, of the building's needs to begin planning these upgrades. Further, the department has raised \$150,000 toward matching the University's commitment of \$250,000 for the renovation of a space in the building for an exhibition gallery. The need to plan for an exhibition gallery is supported by the Self-Study analysis and the comments of the PRT.

4) PhD Program by 2013. Preliminary meetings have taken place and a person identified to spearhead the development of the proposal.

5) Advance and disseminate knowledge through scholarship, research and graduate teaching of national and international standing in the Department (Architectural Design, Building Science and Project Management). Target date: 2013. There has been a notable increase in NSERC awards (up 120% in 2009/2010 compared to 2008/2009) and acceptance of papers at conferences.

6) Expand the knowledge and practice of more effective and innovative pedagogy for the graduate and undergraduate programs. Target date: 2013.

Initiatives have included inviting internationally recognized practitioners as "Architects in Residence" and providing international study/work experience opportunities for students. This program review is part of the development plan to address issues of innovative pedagogy. The full UDLEs analysis will facilitate the program adopting further effective pedagogy.

7) Initiate a program to open opportunities for industry and University collaboration for student research projects. Target date: 2012. No work has started on this item yet.

8) Establish a positive and distinguishable identity that reflects the Department's unique qualities and mission – and one that establishes a distinctive reputation. Target date: 2013. A number of outreach initiatives have been launched to support this. These include: participation in the Carrot City exhibition; participation in the Venice Biennale; and an enhanced lecture series. It is anticipated that these and similar reputation-enhancing activities will continue in the future.

ASC Evaluation

The ASC assessment of the periodic program review of the *Bachelor of Architectural Science* and its recommendations are as follows:

The analysis of learning outcomes presented in the PPR (section 3, above) does not clarify how individual courses support program-level learning objectives (i.e., the CACB learning objectives) and how these, in turn address the OCAV UDLEs in terms of level of mastery (introductory, reinforcing or proficiency). This last point is vital to confirm coherence in the curriculum from the course level upwards (also noted above). To the extent that the documentation is descriptive rather than fully analytical, the ASC concludes that the full UDLEs analysis mandated by Policy 126 has been initiated but not completed. **ASC recommends that a full UDLEs analysis of the program be completed and presented in a follow-up report.**

The PRT report flags areas where the curriculum does not fully support the CACB learning objectives (verbal and writing skills; research skills; critical thinking skills; use of precedents; national and regional traditions; architects' leadership roles; ethics and professional judgment). In the estimation of the ASC these curricular elements would also not fully support the OCAV UDLEs for the program. The program's response to the PRT recommendation (i.e., to continue to revise the curriculum to address these limitations) indicates that steps are being taken to strengthen the curriculum on these points. **ASC recommends that the progress in rectifying these weaknesses be presented in a follow-up report.**

The ASC noted that the liberal studies courses open to students in the B.Arch.Sci. in semester 1 are all English literature courses (choose 1 of 4). **ASC recommends that the program re-consider this narrow focus on literature, especially in light of student comments that the curriculum is rather constrained.**

The ASC took note of student comments about the constrained nature of the curriculum. ASC also notes that architecture students have a very limited range of professionally-related courses and have a somewhat internalized curriculum. **ASC recommends that the program review these aspects of its curriculum with the view to introduce the level of flexibility desired by students while continuing to meet the needs of accreditation.** The program may find that the UDLEs analysis will be beneficial in helping to address these issues of curriculum flexibility.

ASC notes that at the time of the PPR Self-Study the fourth-year specializations in Architectural Design, Building Science and Project Management were not yet being taught. **The ASC recommends that the Department monitor the courses in the fourth-year specializations and how these contribute to program coherence in follow-up report.** Again, the UDLEs process will inform and support this analysis.

Finally, ASC applauds the diligent efforts being made by program faculty to address concerns about excess student workload. The curriculum retreats being held, with their emphasis on trying to rationalize assignment work, represent a valid and productive strategy. ASC believes that the UDLEs analysis will again inform and facilitate this rationalization of student workload. **ASC recommends the program continue to refine its curriculum to address excess student workload.**

Follow-up Report

In keeping with usual procedure, a follow-up report which addresses the recommendations stated in the ASC Evaluation Section is to be submitted to the Dean of the Faculty of Engineering, Architecture and Science and the Provost and Vice President Academic by the end of June, 2012.

Recommendation

Having satisfied itself of the merit of this proposal, ASC recommends:

That Senate approve the Periodic Program Review of the Bachelor of Architectural Science degree program.

A2. Social Work

1. PREAMBLE

The School of Social Work resides in the Faculty of Community Services at Ryerson University. The School offers a four-year Bachelor of Social Work (BSW) degree. The Ryerson BSW is now the largest undergraduate BSW program in Canada. In 2010, the program received a full seven-year re-accreditation by the Canadian Association for Social Work Education (CASWE).

Building on a history of social work education, the BSW prepares students to be critically aware and reflective citizens and for entry into professional social work practice and the pursuit of further higher education. The School's curriculum reflects the diverse historical backgrounds, and continued strivings of Indigenous peoples globally with an emphasis on Aboriginal peoples in Canada, as well as people of diverse racial, gender, sexuality, ability and class identities.

The School of Social Work contributes in many important ways to advancing the overall mission of the University. It has shared in the major academic expansions experienced by the University as a whole, including enhanced emphasis on scholarly, research and creative activities as well as initiation of graduate studies.

2. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The School of Social Work offers two distinct degrees: Bachelor of Social Work (BSW) and Master of Social Work (MSW). Both degrees reflect the mission statement of the School with its focus on anti-oppression and working with marginalized populations.

Three Undergraduate Program Options:

The BSW is offered through three programs variants to facilitate access of three potential student groups.

The Four-Year BSW: The four-year BSW program is geared towards recent high school graduates and mature students who have completed a high school diploma but have no post-secondary education.

The Advanced Standing BSW Program Option: The advanced standing direct entry program (two-year program) aims to facilitate access of students who already possess relevant post-secondary education and experience in the social service field. The advanced standing version of the program contains content similar or equivalent to the four year program offered to students with no previous degrees and

has access to the same School resources (e.g. student supports, field placements, etc.). Both versions of the program ensure an appropriate balance between theoretical studies and practical experiences.

The FNTI Advanced Standing BSW Program Option: A variation on the advanced standing version is the program offered in collaboration with the First Nations Technology Institute (FNTI). The FNTI collaborative program is an initiative that fosters access for Aboriginal students. Program delivery for the BSW is presented at an off-campus location in Southern Ontario, provided by the FNTI. FNTI recruits applicants, and after they have successfully completed Ryerson pre-requisite courses, Ryerson admits the applicants to the Advanced Standing Social Work Program. Ryerson applies the same standards for admissions as for on-campus students (see below).

In the fall of 2008, the School of Social Work celebrated its 44th Anniversary. The program has grown from a two-year certificate for 25 students to a four-year baccalaureate degree with over 700 full-time and 100 part-time students. Since Fall 2007, the School has also offered an MSW degree. Since its first accreditation in 1982, and re-accreditations in 1989, 1996, and 2003, the BSW curriculum had been modified to meet changing societal needs, to accommodate advances in social theory and practice. This process has continued with the re-accreditation in 2010.

Currently, the School is comprised of 19 tenure or tenure-stream (RFA) faculty members. This complement is supported by approximately 9 part-time instructors (CUPE, based on FTEs). The annual first-year student intake target is about 190 for the four-year program and about 60 for the advanced standing program. Approximately 2/3 of the four-year program admits are direct from high school and the remainder are either mature students or individuals who have a previous degree. In recent years the total enrollment has been approximately 700 full-time and 100 part-time students.

3. THE CURRICULUM

The curriculum in the BSW program (four year and advanced standing) is based on Ryerson's tripartite curriculum structure and includes Professional (Social Work courses), and a "general education" component that includes Professionally-Related Studies (Sociology, Psychology, Politics, Economics, Philosophy, History, Geography, Justice Studies), and Liberal Studies.

Professional Content: The professional (i.e., social work) component is composed of a coherent core curriculum with a pre-established sequence of courses. This professional core aims to induce functional competencies by presenting the knowledge and developing the skills characteristic of current practice in the career field. At the School, the specific objectives of the professional education component are to provide students with the skills, knowledge and values necessary to become competent generalist social work practitioners.

"General Education" Content: The general education component aims to enhance students' analytic ability and academic proficiency through exposure to subject matter and disciplines that support the core discipline and/or focus on a breadth of knowledge. The general education component of the BSW includes 6 one-semester Liberal Studies courses and 12 Professionally-Related one-semester courses. The general education component accounts for 45% of the overall curriculum. Students in the Advanced

Standing program take a reduced number of Liberal Study courses as they are admitted into the third year of the program with transfer credits and must have three Liberal Study courses prior to admission.

Practica/Field Placements: Field education is a significant component of the BSW degree, comprising over 900 hours and providing students with the opportunity to engage in direct social work practice. Students are expected to engage in direct responsibilities in a variety of real practice situations and settings.

Field Coordinators facilitate appropriate matches between students and placement settings. The matching process endeavours to provide a great deal of choice for students as well as flexibility should they change their placement preference at any point in the process.

In recognition of diverse student needs and backgrounds in the Social Work programs (FNTI, four year program, Advanced Standing), multiple approaches are relied upon in terms of the structure of field placement. These include:

Concurrent Fall/Winter placements are the most common structure. Field placement occurs concurrently with the field practice course throughout the fall and winter terms of any given academic year. All Third Year students are normally in their Field Practicum Tuesday and Thursday of each week throughout the full school year, for a total of 364 practicum hours. All full-time Fourth Year students are normally in their Field Practicum Wednesday, Thursday and Friday of each week throughout the full academic year for a total of 546 practicum hours.

Block placements normally occur in the Spring/Summer session, after practice class (SWP 31 or SWP 50) has been completed. Block practica are designed for fully employed Advanced Standing students who are not enrolled in the full-time day program, and who are taking a leave from their employment in order to complete the practicum. This is a concentrated Field Practicum for four or five days per week or between 28 and 35 practicum hours per week.

International placements are a type of “block” placement. The opportunity to undertake an international placement is offered to predominantly third year students in the spring/summer, with a few fourth year students choosing to do this thus delaying their graduation from the program.

Work study placements can be block placements or go through Fall/Winter terms. These placements allow Advanced Standing students the option to undertake a placement in their current workplace setting.

The FNTI Collaborative Program: The curriculum for the program adheres to the same standards, course objectives and assignments as apply to the courses offered through the on-campus advanced standing program. Some modifications related to curriculum delivery reflect the Aboriginal student’s life and practice experience and indigenous ways of knowing. Courses are offered in an intensive format, meeting everyday for a week, two or three times per semester, spread out over the period of the program.

Students in the FNTI program are provided with the opportunity to complete a portfolio assignment in lieu of their Third Year placement in recognition of their advanced standing in the BSW and their years of practice experience in the social service field.

Student Achievement: Student achievement is evaluated through course assignments and field placement evaluations. Students are required to pass all required courses according to the minimum passing requirements set by Ryerson University for all students completing undergraduate degrees. Furthermore, students are expected to pass both field placements (graded as “pass/fail”) in order to graduate from the program. Students may challenge their Third Year placement. Those who do so are expected to pass the required Third Year Practice Seminar (SWP 31) with a minimum grade of C+.

Transfer and Challenge Credits: In an effort to promote access to a diverse range of students and to facilitate the entry of students with various forms of background experience, the School adheres to Ryerson’s transfer credit policy. This permits students to transfer a maximum of 50% of their credits from a previous university degree (usually Liberal Studies or Professionally-Related courses, but could include some social work courses such as Introduction to Social Work). The School also provides students with the opportunity to “challenge”, or to gain up to 9 credits—the equivalent of three half year courses—from the list of professional courses (SWP 900 series courses). Based on previous relevant work experience, students submit an application to challenge these credits to the Associate Director of the Undergraduate Program.

Admission Requirements:

For the Four-Year Program: Admission to the four-year BSW following graduation from Ontario Grade 12 or equivalent requires: O.S.S.D. with six Grade 12 U/M courses including Grade 12 U English. ENG4U/EAE4U is the preferred English. A minimum grade of 70% or higher is required in the 12 U English course. The average GPA of students admitted has been approximately 73% and higher. There are also non-academic admission criteria: resume, reference letters, and an applicant profile.

For the Advanced Standing Program: Admission to the two-year advanced standing BSW following graduation from university or community college is based on the following requirements:

Admission to Advanced Standing is to third year of the program in the Fall term only and is available on a part-time study basis. The number of students admitted is limited by space availability. Consideration for admission to Advanced Standing (in third year) will be given to students who have the following qualifications; (A) and (C) or (B) and (C): (A) Holders of a baccalaureate degree in the humanities or social sciences from a Canadian university (or equivalent) who have at least two years of accumulated employment in the social service field. OR (B) Holders of a Social Service or Human Services Counselor diploma from a Canadian Community College (or equivalent), who have at least a ‘B’ level average, plus completion of three, one-term, university liberal studies courses, one lower level and two upper level, NOT first year/first level (lower level) Psychology, Politics or Sociology, with at least a ‘C’ level grade in each course. AND (C) Completion of a prerequisite course, CVSW 15A/B Foundations of Social Work II with at least a ‘B’ level grade. Liberal studies and employment prerequisites must be successfully completed prior to taking CVSW 15A/B. Admission to CVSW 15A/B is limited by space availability.

Applicants will be pre-selected to take this course by Undergraduate Admissions and Recruitment in conjunction with the School of Social Work. Applicants will be selected based on post-secondary academic performance and/or employment in the social service field. Students approved to this program are not eligible to receive further transfer or challenge credits.

OCAV Learning Objectives (UDLEs):

The PPR documentation does not explicitly address the OCAV UDLEs. However, the analysis of core courses and a number of electives (Self-Study Volume 1 section 2.5.4, pg 114-121 and Appendix B) does touch on the ways in which courses support accreditation standards. The accreditation standards are reminiscent of statements of program-level outcomes. For example, Standard 5.10.10 is the “Ability to undertake systematic inquiry and critical evaluation related to social work knowledge and practice”. Therefore, section 2.5.4 lays the basis for a full UDLEs analysis.

4. THE PROGRAM REVIEW

The self-study review provides comprehensive information about the program and the School, including student data, student and graduate surveys and a comparator review. As required by Senate policy 126 it provides a statement of the consistency of the School’s goals and mission with those of the Faculty of Community Services (pg. 23-24 Self-Study Vol. 1) and the academic plan of the University (Vol. 1 Addendum, pg. 10).

The review does not explicitly address the relationship between the program’s learning expectations and the OCAV degree level expectations. See the comments in Section 3, above, however.

As part of the re-accreditation process for the BSW, a CASWE peer-review team visited the School (November 2009). This Peer Review Team² (PRT) filed its report in early 2010. The report of the site visit team report provides further insight into the program.

It has been the practice at Ryerson to provide accredited programs which have a PRT visit as part of accreditation with latitude around whether a second PRT visit will be required for PPR. The decision is made on the basis of how recently the accreditation PRT has taken place and the degree of correspondence between the mandate of the accreditation PRT and that of the Ryerson PRT. In the case of the Social Work program, there is substantial overlap in the mandates. Further, the accreditation PRT visit took place in late 2009 and the initial submission of the Ryerson PPR materials to the Vice Provost Academic took place in the summer of 2010. For these reasons the Social Work program was not required to host a second PRT visit.

Assessment of Strengths and Weaknesses:

The assessment of program strengths and weaknesses, based on the Self-Study Report and the observations and comments made by the PRT is presented below. An interesting observation by the PRT

² Members of the PRT were Drs. Richard Vedan (UBC, PRT Chair) and Constance Barlow (University of Calgary).

is that individual program features were viewed both as challenges and opportunities by key stakeholders (e.g., community agency representatives, faculty staff, students, senior administrators) on a number of occasions.

Strengths: As a general comment, the BSW program enjoys the high regard of students, graduates, agency representatives, community members and the University administration. Stakeholders remarked on the School's strong sense of community and the significant and multi-faceted role it plays in the broader community. It is seen as a leader in addressing social issues and providing a (societally) relevant curriculum.

Curriculum- The program's curriculum is strong and highly appropriate. The curriculum strikes an appropriate balance amongst breadth and depth of theoretical knowledge and the necessary experiential learning opportunities required to produce competent social work practitioners.

The BSW curriculum is rooted in an anti-oppression theoretical framework. Students, graduates and community members commented that the anti-oppression framework is of value. In fact, many students and graduates indicated this perspective attracted them to the program.

The range of programmatic variants helps ensure that a diverse group of students can access the BSW curriculum. This is a positive feature that aligns well with the culture of the School, the Faculty and Ryerson University. The FNTI curriculum represents a culturally relevant body of knowledge which adheres to the same standards as the on-campus program.

Quality Applicants/Students- Average GPA upon admission to the four-year program is 73% or better. Ryerson University statistics on retention rates indicate that 88.2% of social work full-time students are retained in the program after the first year of study (no comparable data is available for Advanced Standing program). This figure is slightly better than the Ryerson average of 85.1%. Graduation rates for full-time social work students are also better than the Ryerson average: 74.2% compared to 67.6%.

Preparation of Graduates- Feedback from field placements indicates that social work students are viewed as exceeding expectations in terms of their field performance. Employer survey data (Addendum. 11 survey responses from 31 sent. This represents 13% of agencies which hired Ryerson graduates over the past 5 years). Although the response rate was low, the respondents expressed a high level of satisfaction with Ryerson graduates. Eighty-two percent found them to be well prepared or highly prepared for social work practice.

Student Satisfaction- The PPR data (e.g., NSSE) indicates a high level of student satisfaction with the program. In the most recent NSSE survey (2008), 75% of Y1 full-time social work students evaluated their entire experience as good to excellent. Tellingly, this rose to 86% of Y4 students.

Student Culture- There is a robust student culture within the School. The School has focused its efforts on providing students with the necessary supports to develop a sense of community at the School and to enhance participation in decision-making and interaction among students in all programs. Student voice at the School is expressed through regular structures and forums such as the Social Work Student

Union, the Social Work Anti-Oppression Coalition and town hall meetings, as well as through ad-hoc events, as needed, such as workshops or social events.

Human Resources-

Tenure/Tenure-Stream Faculty: The RFA faculty complement has increased over time. The faculty view the School and University as an exciting workplace which offers a range of opportunities. There has been a marked increase in research funding, editorship, publication and other markers of research success. Faculty are also active in delivering the MSW program.

CUPE Instructors: CUPE instructors play a key role in undergraduate program delivery, both in practicum and classroom settings. They are highly-experienced clinicians and accomplished scholars.

Staff: The School has three administrative support staff in addition to four professional support staff who are in the field office. A key position is that of Student Affairs Coordinator. This position is responsible for administrative work related to admissions, recruitment, and course loading. It also fields all types of student enquiries for all programs offered at the School.

Financial Resources- The base budget has increased as the total program enrolment has increased.

Governance- The School accords importance to participation in decision-making by all key stakeholders. The faculty and student body are very diverse and attention has been paid to the inclusion of traditionally marginalized groups such as women and racialized students and faculty members. Committees exist to encourage participation and involvement.

The FNTI and Ryerson faculty and staff have an ongoing and effective working relationship and are addressing challenges with this program variant to the degree that available resources permit.

Weaknesses: The Self-Study and PRT reports flag a number of issues as summarized below. Some of these have already been addressed in curriculum changes made in Fall 2010 while others are subjects of the School's development plan.

1) Curricular Redundancy/Minors/Limitations of Theoretical Framework- Both student focus groups and the PRT highlighted concerns with redundant material in the curriculum. For example, foundation courses were deemed to include excessive material that was also presented in later courses. Curriculum revisions approved by Ryerson's Senate in Fall 2010 have largely addressed this concern.

Students and faculty also noted concerns about excessive student workload in Y2. In the second year of the curriculum, student course load was 6 in each semester. This has also been rectified by curriculum revisions implemented in Fall 2010.

Students expressed an interest in taking a minor in Disability Studies along with currently available minors in Psychology, Political Science and Sociology. Recent curricular modifications in the Y2 curriculum facilitate the Disability Studies minor.

While students were attracted to the anti-oppression framework of the curriculum, and graduates said they value it, they also commented that they believe it does not fully prepare them for practice. They felt this emphasis became somewhat redundant by the final year and students expressed an interest in exposure to additional theories and more opportunities for “hands-on” interpersonal skills development in the classroom.

2) Resource Issues

Faculty Numbers The department is somewhat understaffed. As the MSW has been launched, tenure/tenure-stream faculty have devoted more of their teaching time to the graduate program. The undergraduate program has been increasingly carried by part-time instructors. While the part-time instructors are highly qualified, there are concerns that this can lead to a loss of institutional memory. It is also conceivable that a student could graduate from the program without ever having been taught by a full-time faculty member.

Faculty hires are on the books, but have yet to happen. The undergraduate program has grown and an MSW program has been added, but the growth in faculty numbers has not kept pace.

Administrative Staff- There is a sense that the School also lacks sufficient staff resources. In particular, the demands on the Student Affairs Coordinator seem excessive. There are concerns that if the incumbent were to leave, a replacement would never provide the same level of commitment.

Space- A lack of space in general is an ongoing issue for the School. Available space is sub-standard in some cases (e.g., offices in proximity to busy corridors). Assigned classrooms are often old with ineffective designs.

Increased Student Numbers in Placements: Increasing student numbers have created a situation where faculty field consults have risen from 20 to 30 per year. The decision has been made to visit placement settings on an “as needed” basis. This is a concern for program quality. The PRT recommends the impact of this change be monitored.

The PRT recommended an increase in both faculty (tenure/tenure-stream) and staff resources. It also recommended additional infrastructure resources.

3) FNTI- Although the FNTI-Ryerson arrangements are generally positive, there are challenges. These include constraints on FNTI due to Ryerson’s governance structures, funding issues, and issues related to a lack of understanding of the meaning of indigenous knowledge. Furthermore, it is difficult to engage FNTI students with on-campus students.

4) SRC Activity- SRC activity has increased markedly in recent years. There are still challenges. In particular, how to balance the demands of SRC with teaching and service responsibilities is an ongoing concern.

5) Equity Admission- While the admission practices of the School seem to be successful at creating a diverse student body, faculty feel that this happens to a large extent by accident. There is no formal

policy for equity admissions to ensure diversity. The PRT recommended an explicit equity admissions policy as well as a School policy on disability admissions.

5. DEVELOPMENTAL PLAN AND RESPONSE TO PRT RECOMMENDATIONS

The School's developmental plan is structured around the articulation of nine objectives. These are aligned with the academic plans of the Faculty of Community Services and of the University. The objectives and the initiatives which flow from them are summarized here.

Objective 1: *Advance praxis of anti-oppression and anti-colonialism in the undergraduate and graduate curriculum.* Initiatives include: review the curriculum currency, rigor, and integration of social work theory, with a particular emphasis on anti-oppression and Indigenous-focused content; establish "Brown-Bag" lunches for sharing courses, teaching strategies, assignments, etc.; develop a *Graduate Conference* so that graduate students and faculty have a space to share their research with undergraduate students and the Ryerson community.

Objective 2: *Strengthen programs that serve diverse student learners.* Initiatives include: Develop a stand-alone advanced standing program; Explore the feasibility of increasing the size of our advanced standing program relative to the 4 year program; Continue efforts to hire tenure track RFA from diverse communities; Explore alternative methods of delivering classes, such as on-line courses, weekend courses, other scheduling options, etc.; Assess how effectively the program is addressing issues of access, curriculum and organizational structures that affect whether students enter and succeed in the programs and strive to make any identified adjustments, particularly for students from marginalized communities.

Objective 3: *Enhance strategies of academic student support.* Initiatives include: Explore alternative delivery formats to address students' different learning needs; Develop a strategy to identify students in need of academic support early in the program; Review the Associate Director's position to identify further academic support strategies for students; Re-examine the coordination and integration of assignments; Explore alternatives to support multilingual students; Explore alternatives to support students who are native English-language speakers.

Objective 4: *Building on the strength of the current MSW, the school intends to explore growth for graduate studies, including a PhD, based on the field of anti oppression with marginalized communities.* Initiatives include: While not directly related to the undergraduate program, such developments will have implications for the academic milieu in which Social Work undergraduates are immersed.

Objective 5: *Enhance and sustain educational opportunities, including access, for Aboriginal peoples.* Initiatives include: Maintain a commitment to the Ryerson-FNTI partnership; Explore the feasibility of broadening the Ryerson-FNTI model for urban Aboriginal students; Increase outreach to members of the Aboriginal community through high schools within the Toronto area with a significant percentage of Aboriginal students, community programs for attaining the General Education Diploma (GED) and continuing education program partnerships with agencies such as Miziwe Biik Aboriginal Employment

and Training; Continue to create an environment that welcomes and supports Aboriginal students and community members within the School.

Objective 6: *Enhance solidarity with and among students, staff, faculty, alumni, and community partners.* Initiatives include: Enhance collaborative initiatives between students and faculty with respect to writing, conferences and student-run groups; Review and expand student participation in governance of the School so that students develop a greater sense of community and solidarity; Develop mechanisms to garner 'authentic' student input around engagement; Develop formal mechanisms to garner alumni input surrounding curriculum and field outreach and to develop new as well as deepen existing community partnerships; Increase student, alumni, and community participation in informing our curriculum; Enhance student engagement in overall life of the school; Enhance interdisciplinary teams; Enhance community partnerships.

Objective 7: *Strengthen capacity for leadership in anti-oppression and anti-colonial scholarship and research.* Initiatives include: Develop supports for faculty, particularly for untenured faculty, to enable them to publish in peer-reviewed journals and to obtain research funding; Develop policy to articulate the School's position on anti-oppressive and anti-colonial scholarship, development and research at local, national and international levels; Integrate diverse efforts of faculty working in the above areas of scholarship, development and research; Develop mechanisms to organize, highlight and showcase the scholarship, development and research in the School of Social Work; Continue existing partnerships and create new ones that allow us to engage in international exchanges of faculty and students.

Objective 8: *Strengthen capacity of leadership in innovative and transformative anti-oppression and anti-colonial pedagogy and teaching methodologies.* Initiatives include: Explore and implement opportunities to bring community into the classroom and bring the classroom into the community. From an anti-colonial perspective this could be bringing Elders or Traditional People into the classroom to teach certain components. This could be for all courses, not just Aboriginal specific courses. This would enhance current practices of experiential learning; Revise teaching evaluations to reflect the curriculum; Review and revise course outlines to incorporate methodologies consistent with curriculum; Host conference/develop publications on anti-oppression and anti-colonial pedagogy and teaching methodologies.

Objective 9 (University Strategy 20): *The University will work to expand the staff complement where possible, recognizing the vital impact of staff support on the educational mission.* In the context of the School, two resource issues are priorities. These are:

Resources: There is a need to develop additional supports for faculty who currently have limited access within the School to administrative staff support for teaching and research responsibilities. There is a need to examine the level of support for students within the School.

Space: The School need of a space that will permit it to function more effectively as a community of faculty, staff, and students.

ASC Evaluation

The ASC assessment of the periodic program review of the *Bachelor of Social Work* and its recommendations are as follows:

Curricular Redundancy/Student Workload/Disability Studies Minor. The ASC recognizes and applauds the rapid response of the program to these concerns raised by students and the PRT. Curricular modifications made in F2010, for F2011 implementation, are noted above and should go a long way to rectifying these issues. **The ASC recommends that the effectiveness of these curricular changes on eliminating curricular redundancy, mitigating student workload concerns and facilitating the Disability Minor should be reviewed over time and adjustments made if needed.**

Students voiced concerns about a perhaps excessive focus on an anti-oppression theoretical framework for the program. It is true that the program's mission is to view the practice of social work through an anti-oppression lens; this is one of the distinctive features of Ryerson's program. However, other theoretical frameworks are also presented. Recent (F2010) revisions to the curriculum have emphasized presentation of other frameworks even earlier in the program so that starting in F2011 Y1 students will be exposed to a variety of frameworks in their Foundations course and in the course *Social Theory*. Further, the Y2 practice course (*Transformative Social Work Practice*) offers students opportunities to explore how the various frameworks can be used in practice settings. This exploration continues in Y3 research and practice courses. ASC compliments the program for responding in a timely and coherent fashion to these student concerns.

As noted above, section 2.5.4 of the Self-Study lays the basis for a full UDLEs analysis but the analysis is incomplete. **ASC recommends that a full UDLEs analysis be carried out and the outcomes included in a follow-up report.**

While the Self-Study supplies a wealth of data about the program, there are several items for which additional detail could be provided. In particular, data on enrollment in all courses (required and elective) and details of average class size should be included. **ASC recommends that this data be provided in a follow-up report.**

The PRT recommended that the change to the frequency of faculty field visits be monitored for possible negative impact on program quality. The program has initiated steps to address this concern. **The ASC supports the program's initiative and supports the PRT's recommendation for on-going monitoring.**

Follow-up Report

In keeping with usual procedure, a follow-up report which addresses the recommendations stated in the ASC Evaluation Section is to be submitted to the Dean of the Faculty of Community Services and the Provost and Vice President Academic by the end of June, 2012.

Recommendation

Having satisfied itself of the merit of this proposal, ASC recommends:

That Senate approve the Periodic Program Review of the Bachelor of Social Work degree program.

B. Items from the Chang School of Continuing Education

B1. Review of the Advanced Certificate in International Business

1. PREAMBLE: The Chang School currently offers a 9-course *Certificate in International Business* (IB) in collaboration with the Department of Global Management Studies (GMS, Ted Rogers School of Business Management). The IB certificate is an “advanced certificate” in the sense that admission to it relies on completion of a previous Chang School certificate, or a degree, or college diploma (see below). The review of the IB Certificate is part of the normal Chang School quality assurance process. In this instance, the review opportunity is being used to propose a restructuring and rebranding of the Certificate to respond to some weaknesses identified in the current version. Part of this change is a reassignment of the Certificate so it is no longer an “advanced certificate” and a renaming to *Certificate in Global Management Studies*.

2. THE CURRENT CERTIFICATE:

Objectives- The goal of the Certificate is to provide students instruction in a number of functional areas of business with emphasis on international (i.e., cross-border) transactions. The Certificate is meant to provide students with knowledge and skills which permit them to:

- Effectively communicate ideas and concepts in a cross-cultural business environment.
- Analyze the cultural, political, economic and social factors that influence cross-border marketing.
- Formulate and implement effective cross-border marketing strategies.
- Understand the significance of international trade to the Canadian economy and to appreciate the role of the export manager in areas such as export pricing, documentation, shipping, insurance and sourcing private and public sector export promotion assistance.
- Appreciate the role of international trade agreements and institutions (WTO, NATFA) and how these influence the international sale of products and services.

Structure- The current certificate has 6 required courses (CCMN443, CGMS522, CGMS723, CZIB100 (practicum project), CLAW724 and CMHR700) and students may also choose 3 electives from a list of 16 courses. Three of the required courses have pre-requisites which student may have met in previous studies. If not, these three courses, or their equivalent, would need to be completed before starting the certificate program.

Admissions- Admission to the current certificate requires a Chang School of Continuing Education Certificate in Accounting-Finance, or Business Communications, or Business Management, or Hospitality

and Tourism Management, or Purchasing, or Retail Management, or an undergraduate degree, or a 3-year college diploma as well as CECN 104, CECN 204, CGMS 401, CMHR 405, CMKT 100.

3. ISSUES WITH THE CURRENT CERTIFICATE:

1. *Low Interest in the Certificate*- While the individual required courses that comprise the Certificate show strong enrollments (e.g., CGMS 522 has had between 30 and 50 registrants each year since 2009), the Certificate graduation rate has been extremely low. During the 2004/2004 to 2008/2009 period, only 7 students completed the Certificate, and program registrations have been in the low single digits for the same time period.
2. *Limited Course Offerings*- Frequent cancellation of required Certificate courses has undermined the reputation of the program. Having said that, students interviewed felt the courses they did take were of satisfactory quality.
3. *Lack of Opportunities*- The current curriculum provides no opportunities for students to acquire in-depth regional business knowledge.

4. DEVELOPMENT PLAN:

Goals and Objectives- The review proposes to retain the goals and objectives of the current Certificate noted above. It also proposes a number of ways to address the three concerns mentioned previously.

Certificate in Global Management Studies: A New Name, a New Purpose- The review proposes to rename/rebrand the certificate to *Certificate in Global Management Studies*. This reflects the repositioning of the revised certificate as a “ladder” into the Department of GMS’s recently (2009) launched Global Management major. This major is one of the most popular degree paths in the TRSBM. By drawing a direct connection between the Certificate and entry to this degree option, it is anticipated the perceived value of the Certificate will increase. This laddering aspect is considered a major competitive advantage for the certificate, as is the growing reputation of the TRSBM.

Admissions-

Current Admissions Requirements: Eligible applicants must have completed a Ryerson certificate in Accounting – Finance, Business Communication, Business Management, Hospitality and Tourism Management, Purchasing and Supply Chain Management, Retail and Services Management, or an undergraduate degree, or a three-year college diploma, as well as the following courses or equivalents: CECN 104 Economics: Introductory Microeconomics, CECN 204 Economics: Introductory Macroeconomics, CGMS 401 Global Management: Operations Management, CMHR 405 Human Resources: Organizational Behaviour and Interpersonal Skills, CMKT 100 Marketing: Principles of Marketing

Revised Admission Requirements: Prospective students are required to have the minimum of an OSSD with six Grade 12 U or M credits, or equivalent; or mature student status. The revised certificate is

structured around a core of required courses which provide students with a solid curricular platform; one that is grounded in the conduct of international marketing, of international trade, and of multinational enterprise management. Accordingly, several pre-requisites must be completed by students before taking the required courses: namely, CGMS 200, CGMS 401 and CMKT 100.

Revised Curriculum Structure- The full curriculum, and a comparison with the current version, is provided at the end of this section.

The revised Certificate will consist of 6 degree-credit courses (This tries to address Issue 1. A more compact certificate will be more appealing to students as it can be completed in a shorter time period for less financial outlay.) All courses will be offered in classroom settings, at least for the time being. Four of the courses (CGMS 522, CGMS 722, CGMS 724 and the practicum, CZIB 100) are required. All three of the first-mentioned courses are offered each Fall and Winter semester, and CGMS 522 is also offered in Spring/Summer each year (Addresses Issue 2). Students will also be required to select 2 electives from a list of 10 courses. Among these are several courses offering in-depth regional business knowledge (e.g., CGMS 691 *The Asian Business Environment*, CGMS 695 *The Middle-Eastern Business Environment*) in an attempt to address Issue 3. Successful completion of all 6 courses with a CGPA of 2.00 or better, is required for a student to receive the Certificate.

Note that depending on whether students have some of the pre-requisites prescribed under the Admissions policy (or their equivalent), the number of courses required to complete the certificate may range from six to nine, including a single term practicum.

The Practicum- The practicum, CZIB 100, may only be taken after successful completion of the other 3 required courses and the 2 electives. While the detailed data collection mode and analytical approach used may vary by student interest and need, it is expected that this Pass/Fail course will be used to integrate material covered in the earlier courses.

5. ACADEMIC GOVERNANCE AND MANAGEMENT: The revised Certificate will continue to be housed in the Department of Global Management Studies (GMS) in the Ted Rogers School of Business Management (TRSBM). GMS maintains a standing curriculum sub-committee which is responsible for reviewing the Department's curriculum, including that related to Chang School certificates, and making recommendations to the Department Council. Curricular changes to GMS courses which impact the core of the B.Comm. program must also be approved by TRSBM's School Council. In addition, the Chang School Program Director or designate is an ex-officio, non-voting member of the curriculum committee and is routinely invited to attend meetings and participate in discussions.

6. DETAILED CURRICULUM: The following table summarizes and compares the current and revised curricula:

Current Certificate in International Business	Proposed Global Management Studies Certificate	Course Prerequisites
Required (six)	Required (four)	(direct entry or)
CCMN 443		
CGMS 522	GMS 522	CMKT 100 or HTM 302
CGMS 723	CGMS 723	CGMS 401 or HTF 506
	CGMS 724	CGMS 401 or HTF 506
CZIB 100	CZIB 100	(permission)
CLAW 724		
CMHR 700		
Electives (chose three)	Electives (chose two)	
CECN 503		
CECN 606		
CECN 607		
CECN 609		
CECN 707		
CECN 721		
CECN 802		
CECN 821		
CFIN 621	CFIN 621	CFIN 401
CGMS 550		
	CGMS 450	CGMS 401
	CGMS 601	CECN 104 and 204
	CGMS 690	CGMS 200
	CGMS 691	CGMS 200

	CGMS 692	CGMS 200
	CGMS 695	CGMS 200
	CGMS 802	CGMS 401
	CGMS 805	CGMS 401
	CLAW 724	CLAW 122
CGMS 724		
CHST 500		
CITM 350		
CLAW 723		
CPHL 307		
CPOL 607		
Admission Requirements: Certificate in Accounting-Finance, or Business Communications, or Business Management, or Hospitality and Tourism Management, or Purchasing, or Retail Management, or UGrad degree, or 3-yr college diploma as well as: CECN 104, CECN 204, CGMS 401, CMHR 405, CMKT 100	Admission Requirements: OSSD with six Grade 12 U or M credits, or equivalent; or mature student status CGMS 200, CGMS 401, CMKT 100	

Recommendation

Having satisfied itself of the merit of this proposal, ASC recommends:

That Senate approve the Review of the Certificate in International Business program.

B2. Restructuring of the Chang School Certificates in Public Relations and Graphic Communications.

B.2.1. CERTIFICATE IN PUBLIC RELATIONS: ADDED COURSES AND CURRICULUM RESTRUCTURING.

To provide certificate students with more flexibility and choice in course selection the following changes were submitted to the Chang School Council (Memo to Chang School Council, 23 March 2011). Currently the certificate allows no course choice for students.

The proposed changes derive from a focus group of current certificate students held in Fall 2010 and a Program Advisory Council held in January 2011. The changes include:

1) Three new courses (each 21 hours in duration) to be added: CDPR XXX Social Media and Public Relations; CDPR YYY Presentation Skills for Public Relations; and CDPR ZZZ Advanced Public Relations Writing. 2) A restructuring to be effected of the present eight required courses into required and elective categories.

The structure of the revised curriculum is:

Required Courses:

CDPR 201	Public Relations Principles I
CDPR 107	Public Relations Project
CDPR 111	Writing for Public Relations

Electives: Students choose five 42 hour courses or equivalent combination of electives totalling 210 hours from the following list.

42 Hour Courses

CDPR 104	Planning Programming and Budgeting
CDPR 105	Research and Program Evaluation
CDPR 106	Media Relations
CDPR 113	Internal Communications Management
CDPR 114	Reputation Management

21 Hour Courses (Students may substitute two of the following 21 hours courses for any of the above 42 hour electives.)

CDPR1	Social Media and Public Relations
CDPR1	Presentation Skills for public Relations

CDPR2 Advanced public Relations Writing

Recommendation

Having satisfied itself of the merit of this proposal, ASC recommends:

That Senate approve the changes to the Certificate in Public Relations.

B.2.2. CERTIFICATE IN GRAPHIC COMMUNICATIONS: ADDED/DELETED COURSES AND CURRICULUM RESTRUCTURING.

To provide students with more flexibility and choice a number of changes have been made to this Certificate (Memo to Chang School Council, March 2011). Currently students must complete 10 courses and there is no electivity. The proposed changes include:

1) The number of courses required for completion has been reduced from ten to seven. 2) The certificate has been restructured into required and elective course categories. 3) The course CMKT 100: *Principles of Marketing* has been deleted and finally the course CGRA 320: *Bindery and Finishing I* has been added.

The structure of the revised curriculum is:

Required:

CDGA 651	Graphic Communications Processes
CGRA 102	Layout and Typography I
CGRA 103	Introduction to Electronic Premedia I
CGRA 104	Printing Processes I

Electives (Choose 3):

CGRA 116	Estimating in the Graphic Arts
CGRA 202	Layout and Typography II
CGRA 203	Introduction to Electronic Premedia II
CGRA 204	Printing Processes II
CGRA 230	Selling in the Graphic Arts
CGRA 320	Bindery and Finishing I

Recommendation

Having satisfied itself of the merit of this proposal, ASC recommends:

That Senate approve the changes to the Certificate in Graphic Communications.

C. Proposals from the Faculty of Arts

C1. Proposal for the Bachelor of Arts in History degree program

1. PREAMBLE

The Department of History proposes to introduce a Specialist Bachelor of Arts degree in History for an annual intake of 50 student full-time equivalents in 2012-13. This 40-course degree will be based on the common arts platform and will include 20 history courses. Furthermore, the department would like to serve a large number of additional students through offering a Minor in History from the same date. The curriculum is designed in such a way that a 13-course major can be introduced at a later date.

These initiatives will meet societal needs in terms of professional and general post-secondary education. Currently, demand for History programs in the Toronto area exceeds the ability of the region's universities to serve students while, looking ahead, growth in overall demand for university placements in Ontario will increase substantially, with Ryerson expecting to absorb the bulk of its share of this expansion through new initiatives. Further, they will provide a strong undergraduate Arts education with the broad benefits common to such programs as well as embrace particular Ryersonian concerns to develop students' intellectual and technical skills to be highly competitive in career choices.

The Ryerson distinctive aspects of the proposed degree will enhance the department's attractiveness to students looking for a different kind of bachelor's degree in History within the larger humanities milieu as well as those attracted to other faculties at Ryerson whose programs allow students to study in the Faculty of Arts. These distinctions, combined with Ryerson's larger ability to align the study of History with subject areas that normally are not combined in other universities, such as Business (in addition to traditional groupings in the Arts), should enable Ryerson to attract a wide range of high quality students with diverse interests, talents, and potentials.

Careers for graduates lie in directly related fields (such as Public History), or to take up jobs where History graduates are represented well (such as the media, civil service, and non-governmental organizations or NGOs), or work in other realms where their skills are valued (such as business or cultural industries); or move on to further academic training (such as in faculties of education or law, or in graduate History, discipline-related, or interdisciplinary programs). Many of these careers require the ability to communicate, analyse, conduct research, and understand new media. The department's programs are distinct in offering such a range of specialized courses dedicated to the development of these practical skills in addition to courses that explore more common modes of historical inquiry. Ryerson History graduates would therefore be especially well prepared to pursue such career opportunities.

2. ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS

Admission requirements apply to the common arts platform. That is, O.S.S.D. with six Grade 12 U/M courses including Grade 12 U English. The preferred English is ENG4U/EAE4U with a minimum of 70% in the English course. Subject to competition, required high school performance may exceed the minimum indicated in the calendar.

It should be noted that “while our comparator institutions in the GTA stipulate minimum GPA requirements for Arts programs admission in the mid-70s, the actual” grade percentages “of successful applicants has climbed to 83.9 (U of T) and 80.7 (York) in 2009.”³ In comparison, the incoming average held by Arts and Contemporary Studies (ACS) students at Ryerson, who probably are representative of the students the new History programs would attract, is 81.2 per cent

3. ENROLLMENT, RESOURCES AND IMPLEMENTATION

The annual enrollment target is 50 students in the specialist program. The proposed program requires 6.3 FTE faculty to be phased in over the four-year roll out period. The financial analysis provided by the University Planning Office indicates the program is viable with this target and this level of faculty resource requirement. It should be noted that this evaluation was done assuming no students in a History major.

If approved, the proposed new program in *History* will start in Fall 2012.

4. CURRICULUM- Curriculum details are provided in Appendix C2.

Distinctiveness of the Curriculum: Compared to other undergraduate History degree programs in Ontario, the Ryerson curriculum will be similar in terms of:

- providing opportunities for students to explore a range of historical themes in typical History courses offered at differing levels of complexity across geographical and temporal space while gaining the benefits of a liberal arts education; and,
- placing comparable requirements on students to complete their degrees, which is important to ensure Ryerson’s competitiveness in attracting people and in preparing them for their futures.

However, the curriculum will also incorporate distinctly Ryerson components including:

Historian’s Craft Courses: requiring students to take courses in a series called H-Craft (Historian’s Craft) that, beyond exploring fundamental historiographical and methodological themes in highly focused contexts to a greater extent than is common in Ontario, will put special emphasis on developing skills in research, analysis, and literary competence beyond the level that normally can be achieved in regular

³ Ryerson University, Department of English, “Proposal for a Bachelor of Arts Degree in English,” draft, 5 May 2010, 58.

courses, thus preparing students to be highly competitive in entering the labour force or in pursuing further studies;

Common Arts Platform: requiring students to follow the larger Faculty of Arts template that fits Ryerson's distinct approach to undergraduate education;

Heritage Studies Optional Courses: providing students with the option to pursue courses to prepare them to enter the museum, historic site, and heritage fields at a level appropriate for people with undergraduate degrees, while also affording students a background in exploring these realms intellectually or in preparation for post-baccalaureate studies;

Options for Experiential Learning: providing students with opportunities to obtain course credit for completing experiential learning opportunities in History through work placements, internships, research assistantships, and other such settings beyond the levels of experiential learning already built into regular courses;

Optional Thesis: providing the option for students to write an undergraduate thesis;

Career Seminars: These non-credit seminars will be available to students and students will be strongly encouraged to take them. They will be related to career planning but are also a way to build cohesion within the history student body; and,

Potential for Double Majors: when initiated at a later date, allowing students to combine studies across fields that normally would not be available elsewhere in the province, such as completing a double Major in an Arts subject and in a subject in another faculty once inter-faculty agreements can be arranged (e.g., Tourism), along with the opportunity to complete more typical and popular double Majors within Arts (e.g., History with Politics and Public Administration).

Curriculum Objectives: Program goals and student learning outcomes are detailed in Appendix D of the proposal. To summarize, the program's goals are to provide the students with the following:

Goal 1: Students will comprehend the intellectual and other foundations of historical and modern societies, including the interconnectedness of people, ideas, things, and places.

Goal 2: Students will learn how to assess critically – in oral, written, and other forms – the merit of diverse ideas and approaches to historical and other problems.

Goal 3: Students will be capable of formulating interesting, meaningful, and appropriate lines of inquiry, and will be able to present clear, articulate, logically reasoned, and persuasive essays and other presentations based on the analysis of multiple historical sources of various types.

Goal 4: Students will possess a superior set of "career-ready" skills and will know how to apply the Historian's craft to professional, real-world situations as well as post-graduate study opportunities.

Goal 5: Students can participate as thoughtful, active members of society, and can contribute to the evolution of the world around them more effectively than they otherwise would be able to do.

OCAV Degree Level Expectations: Appendix D of the proposal presents an analysis of how the proposed courses map to the program-level goals (see Curriculum Objectives section immediately above) and how these in turn map to the OCAV UDLEs which are now part of Ryerson's degree approvals policy (Senate Policy 112). The mapping tables indicate how individual courses and clusters of courses support both program and OCAV DLEs at an introductory, reinforcing or proficiency level.

Common Arts Platform: The specialist (and later major) curriculum in History will conform to the common arts platform. This curriculum template provides orderly and efficient direction for students to achieve their undergraduate goals and follow their career aspirations. The platform as applied to History is described in Appendix C1.

Structure of Courses: The program in History will be divided into:

Required H-Craft courses that will be methodologically focused and that will put particular emphasis on skills development to a degree that is difficult to achieve in most university courses in order to give Ryerson students a significant advantage upon entering the labour force or in pursuing further studies (e.g., "Reading, Writing, and Using History" and "History and New Media"), and which will be supported by additional allotments of support from teaching assistants compared to the norm in order to provide a higher degree of feedback on student efforts to maximize the opportunity to develop their skills;

Required Capstone "Senior Seminar" and optional "Thesis" courses to allow students to deepen their expertise while honing and demonstrating advanced skills at a professional level;

Area History Courses which the department broadly divides into the histories of Science, Technology, and the Tangible World; the Americas; Africa; the Middle East; Asia; Europe; and International Relations, but which include offerings that explore more than one of these categories at a time;

Optional Courses directed for those who wish to enter the heritage sector upon graduation or take up graduate studies in the field (e.g., "Museology and Public History"); and,

Optional "Experiential History" courses for intensive professional development (such as work placements) that exceed the experiential opportunities available within regular courses (and which can be combined with courses, such as in Heritage Management or Area History, to solidify student expertise for future studies and career development).

The majority of courses in History must be taken at the upper levels rather than the lower. The breakdown of courses for the 20-course Specialist, 13-course Major, and six-course Minor is summarized in Table C1, below.

The History Minor: The proposal for the History Minor is presented in the next section of this report.

Table C1.1: Distribution of Courses amongst the Specialization, Major and Minor in History

Types of Courses	Number of History Courses		
	Minor	Major	Specialist
Historian's Craft	1	3	4
Area History	2-5	5-9	9-14
and "Senior Seminars"	0	1	1- 2*
and/or "Thesis"	0	0	0-1*
Heritage Management	0-3	0-3	0-3
"Experiential History"	0	0-1	0-2
<i>Total number of History courses</i>	6	13	20
<i>Total number of degree courses</i>	40	40	40

*Specialists take either two "Senior Seminars" or one "Senior Seminar" and the "Thesis" course.

Relationship between a History Major and the Arts and Contemporary Studies (ACS) Program: There is a 12-course History Option within the 40-course ACS degree that might appear to be comparable to the 13-course Major in history envisaged in this proposal. Despite the outward similarities, the two programs are different in their requirements and benefits, and the members of the History department see the two existing in parallel at least during the early years of the implementation of the new Major. History will facilitate the transfer of students from one to the other program to meet their evolving interests and to enhance the chances of success. At the same time, the proposers of the History degree believe that the new subject-based Majors produced by the Faculty of Arts will necessitate a review of how ACS might evolve within the new faculty milieu, and the Department of History, in its commitment to ACS, will be an active participant in those discussions.

5. THE PEER REVIEW TEAM (PRT) REPORT

As mandated by Senate Policy 112, a team⁴ of peers visited Ryerson on March 14, 2011 to evaluate the proposed Bachelor of Arts degree program in History. The PRT endorsed the proposed program, describing it as "strong" and likely to contribute to a "vibrant and productive academic life at Ryerson". The PRT was certain that the demand for arts programs, including history, in the GTA will remain high.

The PRT made a number of recommendations to improve the program. These include:

Immediate Recommendations:

1. Clarify for students the difference between the 12-course ACS "History Option," and the 13-course History major, when the latter is launched.

⁴ The team was composed of Profs. A. Gordon (University of Guelph), D. Anastakis (Trent University) and P. Dutil (Ryerson University).

2. Move to the establishment of a major in History as quickly as possible, given Department resources.
3. Emphasize an obvious strength in Canadian history within the department by demarcating the “Americas” field as “Canada and the Americas.”
4. Bring up to date the proposed Canadian course offerings.
5. Adjust the program’s goals and learning objectives. The PRT suggested that the goals as currently formulated were “too broad and beyond measure”. They went so far as to recommend an alternate set of goals.
6. Accentuate the skills development and awareness component of the H-Craft courses.
7. Allow, where possible and in the context of the History Department’s rigorous course standards, for courses outside of History to be cross-listed as history courses. This should be done within the confines of the tri-partite degree structure.

Longer-term recommendations:

8. In relation to the last point above, in the longer term future a number of non-traditional, historically-oriented fields and their courses could become part of a uniquely Ryersonian History BA. For instance, there are numerous historical courses listed in the Proposal in Appendix E (pp. 138-43) in fields such as Architecture and Architectural Science, Fashion, Image Arts/Media Arts, Interior Design, and Journalism.
9. These fields could be utilized to develop either a specialization within the History BA, or as a future certificate program in addition to the BA, one that reflects this uniquely Ryersonian opportunity. For example, a “History BA with a Specialization in Fashion” or Architecture is something that would not be available at other universities. Such opportunities could attract students and faculty to the program, and fully realize the Ryersonian twist within the History program.
10. Eventually develop a certificate or post-graduate/continuing education certificate that allows for some recognition of the “Historical Management” option, if students take all the courses offered in this sub-field of specialization. This, too, would be in keeping with the Ryersonian twist.

Area History Teaching Depth: An area of weakness flagged by the PRT is that while the department is relatively strong in teaching Canada/USA/Europe, it lacks depth in antiquities, the Middle East, south-east Asia, Africa and Latin America. In light of the diverse nature of Ryerson’s students, these gaps represent a challenge to the department.

Resources: Additional faculty are indicated (and planned for), but space limitations and a shortage of support staff were also noted.

6. RESPONSE TO THE PRT REPORT

As required by the policy, the proposing unit has provided a response to the PRT report.

H-Craft Courses: The department agrees with the PRT's assessment that clearer articulation of the value of the H-craft courses needs to be made in promoting the program. The department also notes that the PRT agreed with the choice to make experiential components optional based on the arguments made in the proposal.

Program Goals and Outcomes: The department does not recognize clear differences between the goals articulated in the original proposal and those suggested by the PRT. The department notes that its goals as originally formulated map to the OCAV UDLEs (Appendix D in the proposal). In light of the fact that the OCAV UDLEs have already been accepted as policy at Ryerson (and are being implemented across the province), the department is comfortable moving forward with this original set of program goals/learning outcomes.

Growth Needs: The department generally agrees with the PRT's suggestion that it needs to grow and develop expertise in area history to meet student needs (e.g., Middle East, Africa etc.). Its initial response is to strategically schedule the courses it now has on the books to expand the range presented during any single student's Ryerson career. As more hires take place, the gaps in expertise can be filled. Staff needs have been incorporated in the needs analysis done by the Planning Office.

History Major vs ACS History Option: The department agrees that the relationship between these two curriculum packages needs to be clarified. Discussions with the ACS program are already underway.

Canadian History: The department is generally comfortable with the suggestions made by the PRT about modifications to the Canadian history content of the program. The department will initiate discussion to evaluate how and to what extent these suggestions should be acted on.

Cross-Listing of Courses: There is a large number of history-grounded courses offered outside the department (e.g., in Architecture). Further, many history courses might supplement studies in other programs. The department favours a cross-listing approach to facilitating these opportunities. It also supports the recommendation to create suitable minors.

Heritage Management: The department is open to ideas such as minors or certificates which would support education in heritage management/curatorship and similar areas.

7. ASC EVALUATION

The ASC assessment of the proposal for the *Bachelor of Arts in History degree program* is as follows:

Program Distinctiveness: Virtually every university in Ontario offers an undergraduate History degree. It is therefore important that the proposed Ryerson program has features which distinguish it from the others. The History department has created a model which is distinct from other History programs. The core of the program is built on three pillars of course clusters: The common Arts platform, the four H-craft courses, and the two seminar courses. This core provides Ryerson students with an exceptional depth and range of experiences not normally found in History BAs across the province. Literary and

analytical skills are a major emphasis as is a focus on cultural literacy. Further, the opportunity for students to add courses in heritage management as well as experiential learning opportunities to the core provides possibilities not found at other institutions.

Program Demand: History is the most popular degree choice in Faculties of Arts second only to English. In light of Ryerson's current experience with demand for the BA in English (1000 applicants for 60 spaces), the ASC believes that demand will not be a significant concern. Additional weight for this view comes from the fact that there were 4500 enrollments in History courses at Ryerson last year and an additional 2800 in Chang School versions of the courses.

The Relationship between the History Major and the ACS History Option: As noted by the PRT, the relationship between these curriculum packages needs to be clarified. The Interim Dean of Arts has indicated that the ACS option will remain the *de facto* History major for the time being. This may change over time based on discussion involving the ACS program and the History program. The Academic Standards Committee accepts this commitment as a reasonable approach allowing the specialist History degree and the History minor to move forward at this time.

Program Objectives: The ASC fully supports the History department in its decision to move forward with its own program-level learning objectives rather than accepting those suggested by the PRT.

Recommendation

Having satisfied itself of the merit of this proposal, ASC recommends:

That Senate approve the Bachelor of Arts in History degree program.

C2. Proposal for a Minor in History

The History Department has proposed a six-course Minor in History. The detailed curriculum is provided in Appendix C2. The purpose of the Minor is to provide opportunities for non-History students across Ryerson to study aspects of History, either out of personal interest or to supplement their professional studies.

Recommendation

Having satisfied itself of the merit of this proposal, ASC recommends:

That Senate approve the Minor in History.

C3. Proposal for a Bachelor of Arts in Environment and Urban Sustainability

1. PREAMBLE The proposed Bachelor of Arts program in *Environment and Urban Sustainability* (EUS) is a highly interdisciplinary program which has been designed to deliver a high-quality education that provides grounding in the well-established geographical tradition of environmental analysis, augmented by relevant content from professional programs across the university.

The program will address the need for a new generation of leaders who understand environmental issues from the perspectives of both specialist, in-depth knowledge and generalist knowledge. These graduates will be able to place issues in a broader social, historical and political context and demonstrate effective communication and problem-solving skills. Graduates are expected to find careers in a wide range of sectors including environmental protection, conservation/preservation of natural resources, environmental sustainability, environmental education/communication/research, graduate studies, preparation for teaching among others. These careers may be in the public sector, in advocacy agencies, in the private sector, consultancies or education.

The EUS degree will support Ryerson's academic plans to provide innovative, cross-disciplinary programs. It also supports and expands on a number of current program foci on sustainability at Ryerson, particularly in an urban context, as well as the institutional-level commitment to sustainability made when Ryerson signed the Talloires Declaration.

2. PROGRAM OBJECTIVES The EUS program-level learning expectations indicate that graduates will:

1. Demonstrate comprehensive knowledge of the historical context, current issues, theoretical bases, application of professional practice, and limitations in relation to environmental management;
2. Critically assess sustainable management practices and policies, focusing on the urban environment by applying acquired knowledge, tools and paradigms;
3. Develop an integrated working knowledge of methods appropriate to practical field studies related to the environment in urban settings;
4. Communicate research studies in the form of reports, essays and oral presentations with skill and confidence;
5. Confidently demonstrate the expertise and proficiency required to manage and function in professional and academic work environments;

6. Identify an individualized area of focus and develop and apply expertise of an interdisciplinary nature through the selection of optional Professional and other courses;

7. Apply an integrated, systematic and scientific approach to address issues of the environment and urban sustainability.

3. ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS

Prospective students are required to have an O.S.S.D. or equivalent with six Grade 12 U/M or OAC courses, including Grade 12 U English in the range of 70 percent. ENG4U/EAE4U is the preferred English. Subject to competition, candidates may be required to present averages/grades above the minimum. For applicants not direct from high school, admission will be at the discretion of the Faculty of Arts.

4. ENROLLMENT, RESOURCES AND IMPLEMENTATION

The intake target indicated is 50 students in the Y1 cohort. The proposed program requires 7.2 FTE faculty (5.6 RFA) to be phased in over the four-year roll out period.

If approved, the proposed new program in *EUS* will start in Fall 2012.

5. THE PROGRAM

Curriculum: The *EUS* curriculum is based on the Faculty of Arts Social Science Platform. The platform supports five key skills deemed vital for success in an environmental career: communications, project management, computer proficiency, critical thinking/judgment and knowledge of policy/legislation. The arrangement also benefits students in terms of transfer between programs.

The *EUS* curriculum corresponds to a specialist model as defined by the Faculty of Arts: 20 courses in *EUS*. There is also a proposed major in *EUS* consisting of 13 *EUS* courses which may be paired with another Arts major.

The following Tables summarize the specialist curriculum structure. Detailed curriculum tables are presented in Appendix C3.

Table C3.1. First Year Curriculum Structure

FALL	WINTER
EUS xxx: Environment and Sustainability	EUS xxx: Sustaining the City's Environments
Humanities Elective	Humanities Elective
SSH 205: Academic Writing and Research	SSH 105: Critical Thinking
First Yr. Open (Arts or Non-Arts) Elective	First Yr. Non-Arts Elective
First Yr. Social Science Elective	First Yr. Social Science Elective

Table C3.2. Upper Year Curriculum Structure

FALL	WINTER
YEAR II	
ENH 617: Applied Ecology <u>or</u> BLG 143: Biology I	EUS xxx: Research and Statistics
EUS xxx: Reading Neighbourhood Environments	EUS xxx: Patterns of Demography and Environment
Specialization Slot	GEO 313: Geography of the Physical Environment
SSH 301: Research Design and Qualitative Methods	Open Arts or Non-Arts Elective
Lower Level Liberal Study	Lower Level Liberal Study
YEAR III	
EUS xxx: Ecological Processes in the Canadian Landscape	EUS xxx: Nature in Fragments: The Legacy of Sprawl
POG xxx: Urban Policy Strategies for Sustainable Development	GEO 513: Physical Geography in Decision Support

Specialization Slot	Specialization Slot
Open Arts or Non-Arts Elective	Open Arts or Non-Arts Elective
Upper Level Liberal Study	Upper Level Liberal Study
YEAR IV	
EUS xxx: Field Studies in Urban Ecology	EUS xxx: Senior Projects in Environment and Urban Sustainability
Specialization Slot	Specialization Slot
Specialization Slot	Specialization Slot
Open Arts or Non-Arts Elective	Open Arts or Non-Arts Elective
Upper Level Liberal Study	Upper Level Liberal Study

Tables C3.1 and C3.2 Note: There are 17 new EUS courses proposed as well as one each in PHL, POG and SOC.

Courses Drawn from outside the Geography Department: In order to achieve the multi-disciplinarity required for the degree, a substantial number (40 of 57) of professional elective courses are to be taken in departments outside of the Department of Geography. These are intended to permit students to develop areas of focus including: Policy, Community, Science, Design and Management. The proposal documents commitments from the various departments to make these courses available to EUS students.

The Proposed Curriculum and the OCAV UDLEs

The proposal provides an analysis of the proposed *core* courses. Recognizing that a number of the core courses (e.g., all EUS xxx and WKT xxx) courses don't yet exist, the UDLEs analysis cannot be as complete as one would expect from a periodic program review. A number of core courses (e.g., GEO 313 etc.) are currently on the books.

The UDLES Process- In a nutshell, the UDLEs analysis requires a program to define its learning goals/objectives/outcomes. The program then demonstrates how the program courses support these program-level expectations (PLEs) and how these, in turn, support the OCAV UDLEs. Normally the contribution of a given course supports a program-level learning outcome at an introductory (I), reinforcing (R) or mastery/proficiency (M) level.

EUS Program-Level Learning Expectations- The program goals have been identified above.

Mapping of the Program-Level Expectations to OCAV UDLEs- The tables in Appendix R (proposal pgs. 226 - 230) summarize the outcome of the mapping of the courses to the PLEs and of the PLEs to the OCAV UDLEs.

Each of the 6 OCAV UDLEs is supported by two-or-more of the PLEs.

Mapping of the Program-Level Expectations to Courses to OCAV UDLEs- The core courses in the EUS program support all PLEs with an appropriate mix of I, R and M level content. PLE 1 (demonstrate comprehensive knowledge), PLE 4 (communication of research results orally and in writing) and PLR 5 (demonstrate expertise/proficiency needed to manage/function in professional/work environments) are particularly strongly supported at an R level. The electives (Professional, Professionally-Related and Liberal Studies) support PLEs 4 – 7 at I and M levels.

Experiential Learning: The program provides an experiential learning component. There is one Y4 course (*Senior Projects in EUS*) which may provide some experiential learning and EL is imbedded in a number of the proposed EUS courses (e.g., the required course *Environment and Sustainability* will have a field component). There is also an option for up to two “periods” of work experience. This is a (ideally) paid internship/placement which would be undertaken in the summers between Y2/Y3 and Y3/Y4. These will be separate courses (WKT xxx and WKT xxy) and would be graded Pass/Fail. There would be no co-op fee for these courses.

6. PEER REVIEW ASSESSMENT AND PROGRAM RESPONSE

In accordance with the Senate Policy #112 *Approval Process for New Undergraduate Programs*, a peer review team⁵ (PRT) assessed the program. While the PRT generally endorsed the degree, they did flag a number of issues that need further attention. These were presented as 10 recommendations. The recommendations are listed here and the response of the program is provided in *italics*.

1. Develop a better articulation of program goals and learning objectives.

A detailed description has been added to Section 3.3 of the proposal.

2. Provide some additional explanation of the meaning of the term ‘sustainability’ for the purposes of the program.

This has been incorporated into Section 2.0.

⁵ Profs. M. Haight (University of Toronto), V. Maclaren (University of Waterloo) and P. Robinson (Ryerson University).

3. Include instruction on theories of environment and urban sustainability.

The theoretical basis for environment and urban sustainability is already incorporated into specific EUS courses including EUS xxx Ecological Processes in the Canadian Landscape, EUS xxx Senior Projects in Environment and Urban Sustainability, and EUS xxx Ecological Restoration. The theoretical underpinnings have been made more explicit in the calendar descriptions for EUS xxx Environment and Sustainability and EUS xxx Patterns of Demography and Environment.

4. Consider the possibility of offering a B.Sc in Environment and Urban Sustainability for those taking the science stream.

The Department concurs. This is a medium-term goal to be pursued in conjunction with colleagues in Science provided it can be shown not to compete adversely with the proposed EUS in Arts.

5. Offer students advice starting in year 1 on how to design their programs in order to meet upper level course pre-requisites.

This point is made in Section 5.0 of the proposal. With such a broadly-based program, we agree that it is imperative that the resources required for academic advising for students be made available.

6. Clarify the meaning of the term 'co-op' or replace the term with a more appropriate word such as 'placement' or 'internship'.

We have adopted the term "placement," in part to distinguish from the required internship in the Department's program in Geographical Analysis.

7. Consider adding more experiential learning opportunities to the program in second and/or third year.

These are already incorporated into several courses. For example, the calendar description for the required course EUS xxx Reading Neighbourhood Environments is explicit in this regard: "Students will have the opportunity to develop their own appreciation for the importance of these factors by analyzing or reading the environments of selected Toronto locales in fieldwork projects." The Department will ensure that field studies and other experiential learning opportunities are a component of courses in each year.

8. Reconcile the courses offered in the elective streams with the descriptions of those streams and with the urban focus of the program.

Table 3.6 in the proposal shows the course packages which might be taken in each of the thematic areas/streams (Policy, Community, Science, Design and Management). It was included

in the proposal for illustrative purposes. It does not provide a complete listing of courses nor is it intended as a tool for curriculum planning by students. The table has been edited to reflect specific suggestions of the reviewers.

9. Ensure that sufficient faculty resources are allocated to the important fourth year capstone course and that sufficient staff and faculty resources are available for the co-op program.

The Department commits to negotiating to assure appropriate levels of staff and faculty resources.

10. Ensure that sufficient funds will be available to support the growth in TA and field laboratory equipment requirements.

These are reflected in the detailed financial assessment for the program prepared by the University Planning Office. The Department commits to an ongoing effort to negotiate appropriate levels of funding.

7. ASC EVALUATION

ASC raised several issues with the proposing group. Some were also raised by the PRT. This section summarizes the concerns and the program's responses to them.

Definition of Sustainability. Sustainability is a broad term which has many shades of meaning. To quote from the proposal "Sustainability is an aspiration term; however, it has proved useful as a concept, precisely because it combines the idea of prescriptive action, with that of enduring, defensible properties, located in scientific principles". In the proposal there is a sense that sustainability carries meaning related to Geographical traditions embracing environmental management and resource use, but it also goes beyond this. ASC feels that the openness attributed to the term is valid in the context of the interdisciplinary nature of the degree and given that its learning objectives are well articulated.

Number of New Courses. There are 20 new courses indicated for the BA. However, only three of these are to be offered exclusively to EUS students (the two fourth year required courses and the statistics course). The remaining courses are open to other Faculty of Arts students as either electives in the common platform or as professionally related electives to other Arts programs, and as professional courses in the Politics and Sociology programs. In addition, certain courses may also be available to students outside the Faculty of Arts (e.g., Architecture). ASC agrees that the offering of courses to diverse groups should mitigate any concerns about low enrolments in the courses.

Science Courses- Tension between Depth and Breadth. Many of the social/policy aspects of environmental studies are informed by scientific information and understanding. The proposal

recognizes this fact by including a number of science courses in the curriculum (especially as electives) and the thematic area of Science. However, the ASC noted that there is limited Science content in the *required* category. The program's response is that there are in fact 5 Science-focused courses in the required category (in ecology as well as covering climatology, soil science, biogeography, and geomorphology). While most of these are taught by the Department of Geography, the Geography faculty who will teach them are scientists by training. In addition, the ecology course (which may be substituted by a biology course taught by FEAS) is taught by the School of Occupational and Public Health. The program is most open to further discussion with Science departments in the Faculty of Engineering, Architecture and Science to explore possible minors and double majors. ASC supports this direction.

Integrative/Capstone Elements. The curriculum is highly multi-disciplinary. The ASC was interested to know what integrative elements exist in the curriculum. The program responded by pointing out that the required EUS course *Senior Projects in Environment and Urban Sustainability* is, explicitly, a capstone course. The required EUS course *Field Studies in Urban Ecology* is less explicitly so, but also serves the same function. So, there are one or more required courses each semester which provide a common base for all students. ASC concludes that the curriculum offers a sufficient level of integration.

Recommendation

Having satisfied itself of the merit of this proposal, ASC recommends:

That Senate approve the Bachelor of Arts in Environment and Urban Sustainability degree program.

Appendix C1. Curriculum of the proposed Bachelor of Arts in History degree program

OVERVIEW: See the chart at the end of this Appendix for details of the four-year progression through the degree. See pp. 138-43 of the proposal for a list of 'professionally related' courses that the department obtained permission to list on its tables.

Within a forty-course program, including six liberal studies courses and twelve elective/minor courses, students will take twenty-three courses directed specifically to the degree in History:

- three common platform skills-oriented courses (SSH 205, SSH105, SSH 301)
- four Historian's Craft (H-Craft) courses (HIS-coded; see below);
- fourteen Area History, Experiential History, and Heritage Management courses (HIS-coded; see below)
- either two Senior Seminars or one Senior Seminar and a Thesis Course (HIS-coded; see below)

Of the twenty HIS courses, at least eleven must be upper level courses. (Lower levels are the 100 and 200 series; upper levels are the 300 and 400 series.)

Up to five liberal studies courses offered by the Department of History under the HST designation may be used towards the Specialist Degree as long as the overall course matrix taken contains a minimum of eleven upper level courses. (History liberal studies courses are coded HST; lower levels are in the 100-400 series; upper levels are in the 500-900 series.)

First-year students may take Levels 1 and 2 courses; second-year students may take Levels 1-3 courses; third- and fourth-year students may take Levels 2-4 courses.

Requirements related to anti- and prerequisites must be followed, including their application between program and liberal studies courses.

The course numbering below is tentative; however, the designation of courses at lower and upper levels will remain unchanged should a different numbering system be used.

SPECIFIC:

A. Common Platform

Students take these three courses (normally with the first two in first year and the third in second year):

SSH 205 The Fundamentals of Academic Writing
 SSH 105 Critical Thinking
 SSH 301 Research Design and Qualitative Methods

B. Historian's Craft

The following two courses (normally in second year):

Lower Level

HIS 200	Reading, Writing, and Using History	H-Craft 1
HIS 201	Hearing, Seeing, and Speaking History	H-Craft 2

Upper Level

One of the following (normally in third year):

HIS 300	History and New Media	H-Craft 3a
HIS 301	Life Stories: Oral History	H-Craft 3b
HIS 302	Archaeology and Material Culture	H-Craft 3c

This course (normally in third year):

HIS 305	Locating the Past: Archival Research	H-Craft 4
---------	--------------------------------------	-----------

C. Area History, Heritage Management, and Experiential History

Fourteen courses, spread across the four years of the degree as indicated in the chart at the end of this document:

Lower Level

HIS 104	Ten Days that Shook the World	Area
HIS 105	Inventing Popular Culture	Area
HIS 106	Technology, Warfare, and Social Change	Area
HIS 107	Colonization, Colonialism, and Independence	Area
HIS 210	Museology and Public History	Heritage Management
HIS 216	History of Science to 1700	Area
HIS 217	History of Science from 1700	Area
HIS 225	History of Technology to 1900	Area
HIS 231	The Iberian Atlantic World	Area
HIS 238	Canada: The Origins of Conflict	Area
HIS 239	Canada: Defining a Nation	Area
HIS 248	American History to 1877	Area
HIS 249	American History from 1877	Area
HIS 256	Early Africa I: Neolithic to Iron Age	Area
HIS 257	Early Africa II: c.1450-1880	Area
HIS 261	The Near East to 600 CE	Area
HIS 262	Introduction to the Islamic World	Area
HIS 265	Themes in Modern Asian History	Area
HIS 275	Ancient Greece and Rome	Area
HIS 277	Mediaeval Europe, 400-1350	Area
HIS 278	Europe, 1350-1715	Area
HIS 279	Europe, 1715-1870	Area
HIS 280	Europe, 1870-Present	Area

HIS 290 International Relations to 1945	Area
HIS 291 International Relations from 1945	Area

Upper Level

HIS 310 Curating the Past	Heritage Management
HIS 311 Managing Heritage Resources	Heritage Management
HIS 314 Innovators, Capitalists, and Managers	Area
HIS 315 Film, Television, and 20th-Century History	Area
HIS 318 Medicine from Antiquity to 1500 CE	Area
HIS 320 Science and Technology in Islamic History	Area
HIS 322 Astronomy vs. Astrology	Area
HIS 326 Controlling the World	Area
HIS 328 Science, Corporations, and the Environment	Area
HIS 331 Latin America to 1800	Area
HIS 332 Latin America from 1800	Area
HIS 333 The Caribbean to 1804	Area
HIS 334 The Caribbean from 1804	Area
HIS 338 The Child in History	Area
HIS 340 Toronto: Wilderness to Metropolis	Area
HIS 342 Canadian Cultural Industries	Area
HIS 343 Immigrant Experience in Canadian History	Area
HIS 344 Asian Diasporas in North America	Area
HIS 345 Canada in the International Sphere	Area
HIS 346 The United States after 1945	Area
HIS 350 Women and Gender in U.S. History	Area
HIS 352 Culture/Politics of Difference in the U.S.	Area
HIS 353 The American City	Area
HIS 354 African-American History	Area
HIS 355 Material Cultures of North America	Area
HIS 356 Ancient Egypt	Area
HIS 358 Colonial Africa	Area
HIS 359 Post-Colonial Africa	Area
HIS 360 The African Diaspora	Area
HIS 361 The Mughal Empire, 1526-1764	Area
HIS 362 South Asia from 1764	Area
HIS 363 The Ottoman Empire	Area
HIS 364 The Middle East from 1908	Area
HIS 366 The Qing Dynasty, 1634-1911	Area
HIS 367 Modern China from 1911	Area
HIS 369 Modern Japan from 1868	Area
HIS 375 Rome: Republic and Empire	Area
HIS 377 Society in the High Middle Ages, 1100-1500	Area
HIS 378 The Renaissance in Europe	Area
HIS 379 The European Reformation	Area
HIS 383 The Long 18th Century: Britain, 1688-1815	Area

HIS 384 Victorian Britain	Area
HIS 385 20th-Century Britain	Area
HIS 386 British Empire and the World	Area
HIS 388 Modern France	Area
HIS 390 Modern Germany	Area
HIS 392 Modern Russia	Area
HIS 394 War to War: World Conflict, 1900-45	Area
HIS 395 The Cold War: An International History	Area
HIS 396 History of Terrorism	Area
HIS 397 Modern Peacekeeping and Intervention	Area
HIS 398 History of International Organizations	Area
HIS 414 Experiential Learning I	Experiential History*
HIS 415 Experiential Learning II	Experiential History*

D. Senior Seminars and Thesis Course

Either two senior seminars or one senior seminar and a thesis course (normally taken in fourth year)

:

Upper Level

HIS 401 History of Science and Technology	Senior Seminar
HIS 402 Americas	Senior Seminar
HIS 403 Africa	Senior Seminar
HIS 404 Middle East	Senior Seminar
HIS 405 Asia	Senior Seminar
HIS 406 Europe	Senior Seminar
HIS 407 International Relations	Senior Seminar
HIS 408 Cross-Field Studies	Senior Seminar
HIS 410 Thesis Course	Thesis*

* Students normally must have a GPA of 3.00 to take HIS 414 or 415.

** Students must have a GPA of 3.33 across the HIS and HST courses to take HIS 410.

The Common Arts Platform for the Specialist History Program

FALL	WINTER
YEAR I	
Specialization Slot	Specialization Slot
SOC. SCI./HUM. Elective	SOC. SCI./HUM. Elective
SSH 205: The Fundamentals of Academic Writing	SSH 105: Critical Thinking

First Yr. Open (Arts or Non-Arts) Elective	First Yr. Non-Arts Elective
First Yr. Arts Elective	First Yr. Arts Elective
YEAR II	
Specialization Slot (H-Craft 1)	Specialization Slot (H-Craft 2)
Specialization Slot	Specialization Slot
Specialization Slot	Specialization Slot
SSH 301: Research Design and Qualitative Methods	Potential Minor Slot
Lower Level Liberal Study	Lower Level Liberal Study
YEAR III	
Specialization Slot (H-Craft 3a, b, or c)	Specialization Slot (H-Craft 4)
Specialization Slot	Specialization Slot
Specialization Slot	Specialization Slot
Potential Minor Slot	Potential Minor Slot
Upper Level Liberal Study	Upper Level Liberal Study
YEAR IV	
Specialization Slot (Senior Seminar)	Specialization Slot (Senior Seminar or Thesis)
Specialization Slot	Specialization Slot
Specialization Slot	Specialization Slot
Potential Minor Slot	Potential Minor Slot
Upper Level Liberal Study	Upper Level Liberal Study

Here, specialization slots refer to core History courses, including H-Craft courses. The same template can be modified to accommodate a double major (see pg. 9 in the proposal). Note that the structure provides students with an opportunity to achieve a minor if they desire.

Appendix C2. Curriculum of the proposed Minor in History

The Minor in History consists of six courses: one Historian's Craft (H-Craft) course; and, five other History courses. Of the six courses, at least three must be upper level courses. Up to two liberal studies courses offered by the Department of History under the HST designation may be used towards the Minor as long as the overall course matrix taken contains a minimum of three upper level courses.

Note: The course numbering below is tentative; however, the designation of courses as lower and upper levels will remain unchanged should a different numbering system be used.

A. Historian's Craft

One of the following:

Lower Level

HIS 200 Reading, Writing, and Using History H-Craft 1

HIS 201 Hearing, Seeing, and Speaking History H-Craft 2

Upper Level

HIS 300 History and New Media H-Craft 3a

HIS 301 Life Stories: Oral History H-Craft 3b

HIS 302 Archaeology and Material Culture H-Craft 3c

HIS 305 Locating the Past: Archival Research H-Craft 4.

B. Area History and Heritage Management: Five of the following:

Lower Level

HIS 104 Ten Days that Shook the World

HIS 105 Inventing Popular Culture

HIS 106 Technology, Warfare, and Social Change

HIS 107 Colonization, Colonialism, and Independence

- HIS 210 Museology and Public History
- HIS 216 History of Science to 1700
- HIS 217 History of Science from 1700
- HIS 225 History of Technology to 1900
- HIS 231 The Iberian Atlantic World
- HIS 238 Canada: The Origins of Conflict
- HIS 239 Canada: Defining a Nation
- HIS 248 American History to 1877
- HIS 249 American History from 1877
- HIS 256 Early Africa I: Neolithic to Iron Age
- HIS 257 Early Africa II: c.1450-1880
- HIS 261 The Near East to 600 CE
- HIS 262 Introduction to the Islamic World
- HIS 265 Themes in Modern Asian History
- HIS 275 Ancient Greece and Rome
- HIS 277 Mediaeval Europe, 400-1350
- HIS 278 Europe, 1350-1715
- HIS 279 Europe, 1715-1870
- HIS 280 Europe, 1870-Present
- HIS 290 International Relations to 1945
- HIS 291 International Relations from 1945

Upper Level

- HIS 310 Curating the Past
- HIS 311 Managing Heritage Resources

- HIS 314 Innovators, Capitalists, and Managers
- HIS 315 Film, Television, and 20th-Century History
- HIS 318 Medicine from Antiquity to 1500 CE
- HIS 320 Science and Technology in Islamic History
- HIS 322 Astronomy vs. Astrology
- HIS 326 Controlling the World
- HIS 328 Science, Corporations, and the Environment
- HIS 331 Latin America to 1800
- HIS 332 Latin America from 1800
- HIS 333 The Caribbean to 1804
- HIS 334 The Caribbean from 1804
- HIS 338 The Child in History
- HIS 340 Toronto: Wilderness to Metropolis
- HIS 342 Canadian Cultural Industries
- HIS 343 Immigrant Experience in Canadian History
- HIS 344 Asian Diasporas in North America
- HIS 345 Canada in the International Sphere
- HIS 346 The United States after 1945
- HIS 350 Women and Gender in U.S. History
- HIS 352 Culture/Politics of Difference in the U.S.
- HIS 353 The American City
- HIS 354 African-American History
- HIS 355 Material Cultures of North America
- HIS 356 Ancient Egypt

HIS 358 Colonial Africa

HIS 359 Post-Colonial Africa

HIS 360 The African Diaspora

HIS 361 The Mughal Empire, 1526-1764

HIS 362 South Asia from 1764

HIS 363 The Ottoman Empire

HIS 364 The Middle East from 1908

HIS 366 The Qing Dynasty, 1634-1911

HIS 367 Modern China from 1911

HIS 369 Modern Japan from 1868

HIS 375 Rome: Republic and Empire

HIS 377 Society in the High Middle Ages, 1100-1500

HIS 378 The Renaissance in Europe

HIS 379 The European Reformation

HIS 383 The Long 18th Century: Britain, 1688-1815

HIS 384 Victorian Britain

HIS 385 20th-Century Britain

HIS 386 British Empire and the World

HIS 388 Modern France

HIS 390 Modern Germany

HIS 392 Modern Russia

HIS 394 War to War: World Conflict, 1900-45

HIS 395 The Cold War: An International History

HIS 396 History of Terrorism

HIS 397 Modern Peacekeeping and Intervention

HIS 398 History of International Organizations.

Appendix C3. Curriculum of the proposed Bachelor of Arts in Environment and Urban Sustainability degree program

Curriculum Tables for the Specialist BA in EUS

Curriculum: Environment and Urban Sustainability (EUS)

EUS Specialization

FIRST SEMESTER

REQUIRED:

SSH 205 Academic Writing and Research
EUS xxx Environment and Sustainability

Humanities Elective (Table I).

Open Arts or Non-Arts Elective (Table I or Table III).

First Year Social Science Elective (Table I).

SECOND SEMESTER

REQUIRED

SSH 105 Critical Thinking
EUS xxx Sustaining the City's Environments

Humanities Elective (Table I).

Non-Arts Elective (Table III).

First Year Social Science Elective (Table I).

THIRD SEMESTER

REQUIRED:

SSH 301 Research Design and Qualitative Methods
ENH 617 Applied Ecology*
EUS xxx Reading Neighbourhood Environments

* For those students intending to take additional Science courses (BLG and CHY), BLG 143: Biology I may be substituted for ENH 617.

PROFESSIONAL ELECTIVE: One course (Table II).

LOWER LEVEL LIBERAL STUDIES: One course.

FOURTH SEMESTER

REQUIRED

EUS xxx Research and Statistics
EUS xxx Patterns of Demography and Environment
GEO 313 Geography of the Physical Environment⁶

OPEN ARTS OR NON-ARTS ELECTIVE (potential minor slot): one course.

LOWER LEVEL LIBERAL STUDIES: One course.

SUMMER

OPTIONAL PLACEMENT

WKT xxx EUS Internship Placement I

FIFTH AND SIXTH SEMESTERS

REQUIRED:

EUS xxx Ecological Processes in the Canadian Landscape
EUS xxx Nature in Fragments: The Legacy of Sprawl
GEO 513 Physical Geography in Decision Support
POG xxx Urban Policy Strategies for Sustainable Development

PROFESSIONAL ELECTIVES: Two courses (Table II).

OPEN ARTS OR NON-ARTS ELECTIVES (potential minor slot): two courses.

UPPER LEVEL LIBERAL STUDIES: Two courses.

SUMMER

OPTIONAL PLACEMENT

WKT xxx EUS Internship Placement II

SEVENTH AND EIGHTH SEMESTERS

⁶ GEO 313 will be moved to the Winter semester.

REQUIRED:

EUS xxx Field Studies in Urban Ecology
 EUS xxx Senior Projects in Environment and Urban Sustainability

PROFESSIONAL ELECTIVES: Four courses (Table II).**OPEN ARTS OR NON-ARTS ELECTIVES (potential minor slot): two courses.****UPPER LEVEL LIBERAL STUDIES: Two courses.****REQUIRED GROUP 1 TABLE I⁷**

A total of four to five courses is required, as grouped below. No more than two courses may be taken from any one subject area.

A. A minimum of two of the following are required:

ACS 100 Ideas that Shape the World I
 ACS 200 Ideas that Shape the World II
 ENG 108 The Nature of Narrative I
 ENG 208 The Nature of Narrative II
 FRE *** A French Course
 FRE *** A French Course
 HST xxx
 HST xxx
 HST xxx
 HST xxx
 PHL 101 Plato and the Roots of Western Philosophy
 PHL 201 Problems in Philosophy
 PHL 333 Philosophy of Human Nature
 PHL 366 Introduction to Existentialism

B. A minimum of two of the following are required:

CRM 100 Introduction to Canadian Criminal Justice
 CRM 102 Introduction to Crime and Justice
 ECN 104 Introductory Microeconomics
 ECN 204 Introductory Macroeconomics
 GEO 131 Energy, Earth, and Ecosystems
 GEO 151 Location, Location, Location
 POG 100 People, Power and Politics
 POG 110 Canadian Politics
 PSY 102 Introduction to Psychology I
 PSY 202 Introduction to Psychology II
 SOC 105 Introduction to Sociology
 SOC 107 Sociology of Everyday Life
 SSH 100 Introduction to the Social Sciences
 SSH 102 Learning and Development Strategies

PROFESSIONAL TABLE III

⁷ This table is standardized for all programs in the Platform.

A minimum of 7 courses are required from:

ASC 102	The Built World - Management of Finite Resources
ASC 200	Sustainable Practices: Principles [prerequisite: ASC 102]
ASC 403	Site Development and Planning
ASC 501	Architecture Science: Sustainable Housing Design
ASC 852	Landscape and Ecological Design
ASC 855	Designing with Green Building Ratings
BLG 340	Environmental Biology [prerequisites: BLG 151 and CHY 261]
BLG 401	Ecotoxicology [prerequisites: BLG 151 and CHY 261]
CHY 142	Organic Chemistry I [prerequisite: CHY 103]
CHY 261	Biochemistry I [prerequisite: CHY 142]
CHY 423	Environmental Science [prerequisites: BLG 144, CHY 113 and CHY 142]
ECN 502	Economics of Natural Resources [prerequisites: ECN 104 and ECN 204]
ECN 510	Environmental Economics [prerequisite: ECN 104]
ENH 122	Introduction to Epidemiology
ENH 424	Water Quality
ENH 524	Pollution Control
ENH 825	Risk Assessment
EUS xxx	Sustainable Transportation and Energy Strategies
EUS xxx	Sustainability in Organizations
EUS xxx	Climate Change: Science, Mitigation and Adaptation
EUS xxx	Measuring Sustainability
EUS xxx	Sustainable Cities: A Comparative Review
EUS xxx	Cities at Risk
EUS xxx	Waste and Waste Management
EUS xxx	Ecological Restoration
GEO 411	Resource and Environmental Planning [prerequisite: GEO 131]
GEO 514	Resource Management in Northern Canada [prerequisite: GEO 131]
GEO 581	GIS, Geographic Data and Mapping
GEO 612	Environmental Decision Making [prerequisite: GEO 131]
GEO 671	Developmental and Environmental Law
GEO 681	GIS and Geographic Analysis
HTT 510	Sustainable Tourist Development [prerequisite: HTT 303]
HST 562	Science, Corporations and the Environment
HST 788	Water Use in History
IDE 309	Sustainable Design
LAW 535	Environmental and Business Law
OHS 322	Introductory Toxicology
OHS 422	Advanced Toxicology
PHL xxx	Environmental Ethics
PLE 715	Environmental Assessment
PLE 835	Ecological Design
POG 415	Environmental Politics and Policy
SOC xxx	Environmental Sociology

PROFESSIONALLY-RELATED TABLE III⁸**A minimum of one of the following is required.**

ACC 100	Introductory Financial Accounting
ACC 406	Introductory Management Accounting
ACC 414	Intermediate Accounting I
BLG 143	Biology I
BLG 144	Biology II
BLG 151	Microbiology I
CHY 103	General Chemistry I
CHY 113	General Chemistry II
CHY 213	Analytical Chemistry III
CMN 279	Introduction to Contemporary Business Communication
CMN 313	Organizational Problem Solving and Report Writing
CMN 314	Professional Presentations
CYC 101	Intro to Child and Youth Care
CYC 201	Child Abuse and Neglect
CYC 401	Theories of Change for Children and Youth
INP 901	Developing Effective Organizations
INP 902	Program Evaluation
INP 910	Strategic Planning
INT 900	Program Planning and Evaluation Strategies
INT 905	Conflict Resolution and Dispute Negotiation
INT 908	Homelessness in Canadian Society
INT 917	Urban Community Development
ITM 102	Business Information Systems I
ITM 305	Systems Analysis and Design
ITM 350	Concepts of eBusiness
LAW 122	Business Law
LAW 525	Law of the Marketplace
LAW 529	Employment and Labour Law
MHR 405	Organizational Behaviour and Interpersonal Skills
MHR 505	Organizational Behaviour II
MHR 522	Industrial Relations
MKT 100	Marketing I
MKT 300	Marketing Metrics and Analysis
MKT 423	Marketing Research
MKT 600	Integrated Case Analysis
OHS 208	Occupational Health and Safety Law
OHS 477	Integrated Disability Management
OHS 508	Occupational Health
PCS 120	Physics I
PCS 130	Physics II
SCI 102	Chaos and Fractals
SCI 104	Physics Answers to Everyday Questions

⁸ This table is standardized for all programs in the Platform.

New Courses

EUS xxx Environment and Sustainability
EUS xxx Sustaining the City's Environments
EUS xxx Reading Neighbourhood Environments
EUS xxx Patterns of Demography and Environment
EUS xxx Research and Statistics
EUS xxx Ecological Processes in the Canadian Landscape
EUS xxx Nature in Fragments: The Legacy of Sprawl
EUS xxx Field Studies in Urban Ecology
EUS xxx Senior Projects in Environment and Urban Sustainability
EUS xxx Sustainable Transportation and Energy Strategies
EUS xxx Sustainability in Organizations
EUS xxx Climate Change: Science, Mitigation and Adaptation
EUS xxx Measuring Sustainability
EUS xxx Sustainable Cities: A Comparative Review
EUS xxx Cities at Risk
EUS xxx Waste and Waste Management
EUS xxx Ecological Restoration
PHL xxx Environmental Ethics
POG xxx Urban Policy Strategies for Sustainable Development
SOC xxx Environmental Sociology

Respectfully Submitted,



Chris Evans, Chair for the Committee

ASC Members:

Keith Alnwick, Registrar

Diane Schulman, Secretary of Senate (non-voting)

Chris Evans, ASC Chair, Vice Provost Academic

Robert Murray, Philosophy

Andrew Hunter, Philosophy

Jane Saber, Business Management

Tim McLaren, Information Technology Management

Alexandra Bal, Image Arts

Gene Allen, Journalism

Pamela Robinson, Urban Planning

Jacque Gingras, Nutrition

Jacob Friedman, Mechanical & Industrial Engineering

Noel George, Chemistry & Biology

Cecile Farnum, Library

Des Glynn, Continuing Education

Andrew West, Politics & Public Administration

Jennifer Cartwright, Business Management

YEATES SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

REPORT TO SENATE, MAY 3, 2011

1. Complex Program Changes – ***Master of Business Administration*** (for information)
2. Complex Program Changes – ***Management of Technology and Innovation (MMSc)*** (for information)
3. Complex Program Changes – ***Management of Technology and Innovation (MBA)*** (for information)
4. Revised Policy 142 - Policy and Procedures for Admissions and Studies - Master's and PhD Programs

Motion:

To approve the changes to Policy 142 (Policy and Procedures for Admissions and Studies - Master's and PhD Programs) as submitted by YSGS Council.

Documents Attached:

- i) Proposed changes chart
- ii) Revised Policy

Submitted by:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "D Foster". The signature is written in a cursive, somewhat stylized font.

Debora Foster, Interim Dean
Chair, Yeates School of Graduate Studies Council

1. Complex Program Changes – ***Master of Business Administration***

Add a new course “Principles of Management” to replace MB8003 “Marketing” as an MBA foundation course.

The MBA and MMSc programs include “Foundation”, courses which are required of candidates who do not hold a BComm or equivalent.

The current Foundation requirements are: MB 8002 Quantitative Methods and Info Systems; MB8003 Marketing; MB8004 Accounting; MB8005 Finance; and, MB8006 Economics. Due to limited demand, MB8002 has not been offered; rather students are directed to take an introductory statistics course in Continuing Education. Recognizing the importance of financial, statistical and economic literacy, all courses except Marketing are being retained.

Once in the full MBA program, students get considerable marketing content in the required courses MB8107 Advanced International Marketing and MB8103 Strategy in the International Business Environment. The Management of Technology and Innovation students get core marketing content in MT8213 Technology and Organizational Strategy and MT8216 Global Markets and Technology Trends.

The new “Principles of Management” course would ensure that all non-BComm graduates in the program are introduced to the key non-financial concepts important for manager, including governance, the history of management thought, entrepreneurship, information systems and operations, as well as marketing.

The students will be ensured of having a broader general understanding of all organizational functions, including marketing, than they would have under the current curriculum.

2. Complex Program Changes – ***Management of Technology and Innovation (MMSc)***

Changes to the MMSc program are as follows:

The current course load of eight courses will be returned to the original course load of six courses and a pass/fail seminar course as follows:

- a. Three of the six courses would be required; two research methods courses (MT8103 and MT8104) and one course in common theory in IT (MT8219: Theories of Tech and Org). The three remaining courses would be electives and would be customized for each student.
- b. Graduate level electives could be taken from any discipline including the MBA and be determined in cooperation with the student’s supervisor and approved by the Program Director.
- c. A Pass/Fail research seminar course will be required for graduation. The students will be required to participate in regular research seminars over the course of the program.

Currently, the MMSc program is struggling to become an academically oriented program that services students interested in research. Since 2006, only 7 students have graduated from this program and the majority of students have extended their participation beyond the current one year limit. There are a number of issues with the current approach and we would like to make modifications that begin to address some of these issues.

In any research organization it is important to have sustainable research output. Sustainability can only be achieved through a constant flow of graduate students. In order to increase the number and quality of publications, faculty members must supervise their own graduate students. In order to grow our MMSc graduate program, new faculty members must have ready access to graduate students and a local environment that strongly supports graduate student training and interaction. Graduate student supervision also provides opportunities and experience to all faculty members for extending their knowledge in a specific research direction through coaching of the research and the student and through involvement in student publications, grant applications and research presentations.

According to the current graduate calendar, eight one-semester/one credit courses are currently required in the MMSc program (6 courses plus 2 research methods courses). This is a modification of the originally approved proposal for the MMSc program requiring 6 courses one-semester courses (taken as 12 modules). We recommend a return to the course load of 6 credit courses and a pass/fail research seminar course as in the original program and a 5 credit thesis, which will bring this program back into harmony with other thesis related master's programs.

Consistent with the comparator programs, this course load assumes that students have an undergraduate degree in business and thus have already completed courses equivalent to the first year in a two year MBA program. Students who do not possess this background will be required to complete the appropriate foundational courses or equivalents: Quantitative Methods and Info Systems, Marketing, Accounting, Finance, and Economics.

3. Complex Course Changes – *Management of Technology and Innovation (MBA)*

We propose to remove the two remaining 0.5 credit courses from the core requirements in the MBA/MTI program. These two courses are MT8217 Ethics and Corporate Social Responsibility and MT8205 Advanced Project Management (each worth 0.5 credit, see Table 1). A second project management course, MT8206 Advanced Project Management II is offered as an elective.

We would like to add a full credit course in Ethics and Corporate Social Responsibility, MT8108, which is already offered in the MBA Global program (MB8108 Reg Government and Soc Responsibility Mgmt) and in fact the 0.5 course required in the MBA/MTI course, MT8217, occurs within the MB8108 course (6 weeks of the 12 weeks of MB8108 makes up the MT8217 and given by the same instructor). Ethics and corporate responsibility are becoming critical topics to introduce into business education as they are becoming much more prominent in the functioning of business. Cases such as the collapse of Enron provide evidence of what can happen when ethics are either ignored or not understood well enough. As a result, we would like the Ethics and Corporate Social Responsibility to be a core course.

We would also like to combine MT8205 and MT8206 (Advanced Project Management I and II) into one full credit course Advanced Project Management MT8220. In addition, this full credit would be offered as an elective course rather than a core course. We expect that since Project Management is critical to MTI, most students will opt to take this course as a full credit elective. In this way, we preserve the program as a seven credit core and three credit elective program. Finally, we would like to delete the 0.5 credit course, MT8206, from the elective listing for the program.

The justification for this revision is that 0.5 credit courses are insufficient to support the pedagogical needs of students and the program and the logistics for managing 0.5 credit courses (finding instructors, offering appropriate electives and tracking course requirements) are onerous and unnecessary. The MBA Global and the MMSc programs have transferred to full credit courses and this revision would allow harmonization with these other programs. Finally, many students in this program have requested that they be allowed to continue

in the MT8217/MB8108 course beyond the 6 weeks and a majority of MTI students take the elective 0.5 credit in Project Management (MT8206) to complement the 0.5 credit course in the core requirement.

4. Revised Policy 142 - Policy and Procedures for Admissions and Studies - Master's and PhD Programs

Ryerson University
 Yeates school of Graduate Studies
 MA and PhD Admissions and Studies Policy
Proposed changes SUMMARY

CURRENT POLICY (changes indicated by bold font)	RATIONALE FOR CHANGE
SECTION A: GENERAL POLICIES	
1. Admission	
1.4 <u>Transfer of Credit (p. 3)</u> Where a candidate has completed appropriate graduate courses at another accredited academic institution, and a degree has not been conferred using these courses , they may be recognized in partial fulfilment of Ryerson's graduate degree requirements.	Clarification of past and current practice, which is consistent with other Canadian Universities. Courses at the graduate level are not allowed to be used for more than one degree.
1.5 <u>Readmission (p.3)</u> Students who voluntarily withdraw from a program with a Satisfactory Progress Report may be considered for readmission... If a student withdraws when the only outstanding program requirement is the capstone requirement (thesis, dissertation, project, MRP, etc.) and then wishes to re-enter the program, he/she will be required to pay fees for the terms during which they were absent. This complies with the requirement for continuous registration from admission to completion of a graduate program.	Clarification of past and current practice This addition to the policy addresses the issue of students who withdraw, continue to work on their thesis/dissertation, and then reapply to the program when the work is almost complete, thus avoiding fees.
2. Categories of Students (p.4)	
2.1.2. <u>PhD Student (p.4)</u> ...A graduate student who transfers from a Master's to a PhD program, without completing the Master's program, may not normally transfer back to the Master's program.	Clarification of past and current practice

<p>2.1.4 <u>Part-time Student</u> (p.4)</p> <p>. A student may change status from full-time to part-time or part-time to full-time subject to consultation with and the approval of the program Director and the Dean of Graduate Studies. Normally, a student may not transfer from full-time to part-time when the only remaining graduation requirement is a thesis, major research paper or project.</p>	<p>Consistent with the policy of maintaining enrollment in the program to which student was admitted until graduation. This encourages students to complete their program in a timely manner, and discourages the avoidance of paying part-time fees while completing their thesis/dissertation on a full-time basis.</p>
<p>3. Residency, Enrolment and Fees (p.6)</p>	
<p>3.3 <u>Leave of Absence (LOA)</u> (p.6)</p> <p>3.3.2 Parental leave</p> <p>A parental LOA may be taken by an enrolled graduate student at the time of pregnancy, birth or adoption and/or to provide full-time care during the child's first year. Parental leave must be completed within twelve months of the date of birth or custody. Parental leave can be taken for a maximum of three semesters.</p>	<p>Additional section for clarification. Past and current practice.</p>
<p>3.3.3 Terms of a Leave of Absence (p.6)</p> <p>LOA may be granted by the Program Director. Students will not normally be granted more than one LOA during their graduate program. A LOA is normally for one term, but cannot exceed three terms.</p> <p>Under extraordinary circumstances, students may apply for a second LOA, which must be approved by the Program Director and the Dean of Graduate Studies....</p> <p>...A student who is returning from a LOA must register for a minimum of one term before completion of the program.</p>	<p>To give more discretion to the Program Director, and to accommodate programs which offer required courses only once per year.</p> <p>New policy allowing more than one LOA in extraordinary circumstances, with a second level of authorization required.</p> <p>The student should not be engaged in academic work while not enrolled and not paying fees. The student should return from the LOA and continue in their program from the point at which they started the LOA.</p>
<p>3.4 <u>Program Transfer from Master's to Doctoral level</u> (p.6)</p> <p>.... The requirements for this type of transfer include: completion of all course requirements for the Master's degree with a minimum 3.67 GPA; demonstrated strong research potential, and Program Director and supervisor permission.</p>	<p>Clarifying the "specific conditions" referred to in previous policy.</p>

<p>3.6 <u>Voluntary Withdrawal (p.7)</u></p> <p>...If a student withdraws and subsequently wishes to return to the program... Readmission is not guaranteed...</p>	<p>Clarification of past and current practice</p>
<p>3.7 <u>Administrative Withdrawal (p.7)</u></p> <p>A student who has not participated in nor paid fees for his/her program and has had no communication with her/his program for a term, will be withdrawn by the program.</p> <p>If a student has been withdrawn by the program for non-participation and subsequently wishes to return to the program, he/she must reapply through the Graduate Admissions Office. Readmission is not guaranteed and may be subject to conditions such as course or other academic work in addition to the normal curriculum.</p>	<p>Clarification of past and current practice</p> <p>Clarification of past and current practice</p>
<p>3.8.2 Extension of time to Completion (p.7)</p> <p>Under extenuating circumstances, students may petition the Program Director for a one term extension of the time to completion for the program. The Program Director, in consultation with the supervisor, will make the final decision. A petition for an extension of more than one term or a second petition must be submitted to the Dean of Graduate Studies.</p> <p>If a student does not submit a petition for extension by the last date to add a course for the term, or if the petition is not approved, the student will be withdrawn by the program. Subsequently, if the student wishes to return to the program, he/she must reapply. Readmission is not guaranteed, and may be subject to conditions such as course or other academic work in addition to the normal curriculum. A student who reapplies having worked on, or completed their research, thesis, major research paper, project, dissertation, or any other academic work, during the cancelled period will be required to enrol for at least one additional semester, and will be required to pay fees for the period of non-enrolment.</p>	<p>Currently all applications for extension require authorization by the Dean. The first extension can now be made by the Program Director, in consultation with the supervisor.</p> <p>Clarification of past and current practice.</p>
<p>4. Academic Assessment (p.8)</p>	
<p>4.2 <u>Milestone Assessment (p. 10)</u></p> <p>A Milestone is a component of a program which is required for graduation, but is not offered in a traditional in-class course framework. Examples are graduate seminars, theses, major research papers/projects, comprehensive/candidacy examinations, dissertations, and WHIMIS certification. The final assessment will normally be Pass/Fail.</p>	<p>Clarification. Definition comes from the Graduate Calendar.</p>

<p>Students will normally be enrolled in a Milestone when they are ready to commence work on the Milestone.</p> <p>A failed course taken previously or in the same term in combination with an UNS result in a Milestone, or a second UNS result in a Milestone, will result in academic withdrawal from the program.</p>	<p>Current practice.</p> <p>Clarification of current practice. It is not currently well understood.</p>
<p>4.3 <u>Academic Standing</u> (p.10)</p> <p>PROVISIONAL: A student has one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One Unsatisfactory (UNS) progress report for a Milestone, and no failed grades • One failed grade and no Unsatisfactory (UNS) progress reports for a Milestone • a cumulative GPA lower than 2.67 for Master’s students • a cumulative GPA lower than 3.00 for Doctoral students • Has failed to meet a specific program requirement. <p>Students who fail to have a Provisional Plan approved prior to the official last date to add a course in the semester following the application of the Provisional standing, may have their enrolment cancelled for that semester, or be withdrawn from the program.</p>	<p>Allows the student to stay on provisional standing until a required course may be repeated. For course only offered in one semester per year, this may take until the next year for the repeat to take place.</p> <p>Clarification of current practice</p>
<p>SECTION B: MASTER’S SUPERVISION AND THE THESIS, MAJOR RESEARCH PAPER OR PROJECT (p.11)</p>	
<p>5. Faculty Advisor/Supervisor (p. 11)</p>	
<p>5.1 ...If a faculty advisor is initially assigned to a student in a program in which research is involved, a supervisor will be assigned as soon as the student’s research area is identified.</p> <p>...The role of the faculty advisor/supervisor is to provide academic advising, monitor the student’s progress toward the completion of the program, and ensure that a <i>Progress Report</i> is submitted to the Program Director at the end of each term.</p> <p>Where a thesis, major research paper or major project is part of a student’s curriculum, the student’s supervisor will recommend a</p>	<p>Clarification of past and current practice. Faculty Advisor and Supervisor were originally treated synonymously in this document.</p> <p>Added to emphasize the advising role.</p> <p>Deleted the appointment of a supervisory</p>

<p>Program of Study. In addition, the supervisor shall:</p> <p>5.1.2 review the student's proposal and recommend its approval to the Program Director normally not less than one to two terms (depending on the length of the program) prior to the expected date of program completion;</p> <p>5.1.4 assign an UNS assessment for the term's progress on a Progress Report, in the event that the student does not present a Progress Report for review, and the student's Academic Standing will be adjusted accordingly;</p> <p>5.1.5 evaluate the readiness of the thesis (and the paper or project if required) to be examined orally, and make a recommendation to the Program Director regarding a date for the defence and the composition of the Examining Committee;</p>	<p>committee. This is not done for Master's students.</p> <p>Changed from "not less than three months."</p> <p>To address the issue of students who do not meet with their supervisor.</p> <p>The responsibility for appointing the examining committee was previously omitted from the Policy, but this has been the practice.</p>
<p>6 Master's Examinations (p. 12)</p>	
<p>6.1 Requirement for examination (p. 12)</p> <p>Master's theses are subject to formal oral examinations.¹⁸ Major research papers or projects that are not components of individual courses in a program may be subject to formal written and/or oral examination as required by the program.</p>	<p>Clarifies current practice that <u>all</u> theses require an oral examination.</p>
<p>6.2 <u>Readiness for Examination</u> (p. 12)</p> <p>The supervisor, in consultation with the student, will determine that the written work is ready to stand for defence and will establish an Examining Committee and schedule the defence.</p> <p>In cases where consensus is not reached with regard to readiness, the student has the right to petition the program Director in order to have the written work stand for defence, establish the Examining Committee and schedule the defence. Where the Program Director is the student's supervisor, the student may petition the Dean of Graduate Studies.</p>	<p>New section that in paragraph one clarifies current practice and in paragraph two provides a solution to a supervisory issue which may occur.</p>
<p>6.4 <u>Conduct of the Oral Examination (Master's)</u> (p.13)</p>	<p>Previously this section had PhD and Master's procedures combined and was confusing.</p>

¹⁸ In special circumstances, alternate arrangements may be made for an oral examination, as approved by the Program Director.

<p>6.4.1 Circulation of the thesis (p. 13)</p> <p>The candidate will provide sufficient copies of the thesis for each committee member. A copy will be given to each member of the committee no less than four weeks before the defense.</p>	<p>Current and past practice</p>
<p>6.4.7 Decisions (p. 13)</p> <p>...The student must pass both the oral examination and the written work.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Major Revision <p>....If the decision by consultation on the major revisions is unsatisfactory, the examination is reconvened.</p> <p>Upon reconvening, a final “Report of the Oral Examining Committee” should be completed and signed by all members of the committee. One copy should immediately be given to the student, and a copy should be delivered to the Yeates School of Graduate Studies as soon as possible. Decisions are limited to Accept or Fail.</p>	<p>Past and current practice.</p> <p>New addition in the spirit of fairness to the student to defend the major revisions.</p>
<p>6.5 Submission and Deposit of a Thesis (p. 13)</p>	<p>Internal procedures were deleted; Library and Archives Canada information was updated.</p>
<p>SECTION C: DOCTORAL SUPERVISION AND THE DISSERTATION (p.15)</p>	
<p>7 Faculty Advisor/Supervisor (p.15)</p>	
<p>...If a faculty advisor is initially assigned, a supervisor will be assigned as soon as the student’s research area is identified.</p>	<p>Clarification of past and current practice. Faculty Advisor and Supervisor were originally treated synonymously in this document.</p>
<p>8. PhD Preparatory Phase (p.15)</p>	
<p>Every Doctoral program requires that the student complete one or more preparatory or foundation phases. This may take the form of one or more of the following examples: comprehensive examination, candidacy examination, qualifying examination, dissertation proposal, and/or proposal defence....</p> <p>...In addition, individual programs may require an internal preliminary examination before approval to go to formal presentation which may</p>	<p>Examples added.</p> <p>Added to reflect current practice.</p>

<p>include an external examination.</p>	
<p>9. Dissertation (p.15)</p>	
<p>9.1 Supervision (p. 15)</p> <p>The Program Director shall forward to the Dean of Graduate Studies the recommendations for committee appointments, normally not later than the beginning of the third year of study.</p>	<p>Pro-rating the time to completion for P/T students was deleted from this paragraph, since they have the same time to completion as FT students.</p>
<p>9.1.5 (p. 15)</p> <p>review the student's progress on the dissertation at least once a term. The progress must be reported on the Progress Report, which is to be written in consultation with the student. If the progress is deemed unsatisfactory (i.e. a UNS designation is given on the Progress Report), detailed reasons for this judgement should be included on the Progress report, as well as specific instructions on deliverables for the following term. The student's Academic Standing will become Provisional and the Progress Report in this case will act as the Provisional contract. A copy of the Progress Report should be given to the student, the Program Director, and the Director of Academic Administrative Services, Graduate Studies.</p>	<p>More detail added regarding the supervisor's responsibility for reviewing students' progress, reflecting past and current practice.</p>
<p>9.1.7 (p. 16)</p> <p>ensure that a copy of the student's dissertation is sent to the external examiner as far as possible in advance of a scheduled oral examination, but no less than six weeks prior to the date scheduled.</p>	<p>Changed from 4 to provide sufficient time for external examiner to review and write report.</p>
<p>9.2 <u>Readiness for Examination</u> (p.16)</p> <p>The supervisor, in consultation with the student, will determine that the dissertation is prepared to stand for defence.</p> <p>In cases where consensus is not reached with regard to readiness, the student has the right to petition the Program Director in order to have the dissertation stand for defence. Where the Program Director is the student's supervisor, the student may petition the Dean of Graduate Studies.</p>	<p>New section that in paragraph one clarifies current practice and in paragraph two provides a solution to a supervisory issue which may occur.</p>
<p>9.3 <u>Examining Committee</u> (p. 16)</p> <p>...The Examining Committee will normally be composed of the supervisor/co-supervisor...</p>	<p>Correction from "One member of the supervisory committee"</p>
<p>9.4.1 Copies of the dissertation (p. 17)</p> <p>The candidate will provide to the supervisor sufficient copies of the</p>	<p>New section. Current practice.</p>

<p>dissertation for all committee members.</p>	
<p>9.4.4 Non-Attendance (p. 17)</p> <p>...If any committee member is absent, and has not been replaced by a delegate, the examination may proceed only with the approval of the student and the Dean of Graduate Studies or his/her delegate....</p>	<p>In the interest of fairness to the student.</p>
<p>9.4.8 Decisions (p. 18)</p> <p>...If the external examiner is not in attendance, and the committee cannot reach a decision, the Chair will consult with the External Examiner in a timely manner. If necessary, the Chair will cast the deciding ballot.</p> <p>Major Revision</p> <p>...If the decision by consultation on the major revisions is unsatisfactory, the examination is reconvened.</p> <p>Upon reconvening, a final “<i>Report of the Oral Examining Committee</i>” should be completed and signed by all members of the committee. One copy should immediately be given to the student, and a copy should be delivered to the Yeates School of Graduate Studies as soon as possible. Decisions are limited to Accept or Fail.</p>	<p>New addition in the spirit of fairness to the student to defend the major revisions.</p>
<p>6.5 and 9.5 Submission & Deposit of a Thesis/Dissertation (p. 14 and 19)</p>	<p>Internal procedures were deleted; Library and Archives Canada information was updated.</p>
<p>6.4.9 and 9.4.10 Recommendation for Governor-General's Gold Medal for Academic Excellence (p. 14 and 19)</p>	<p>Procedures were eliminated. Policy of recommendation remains.</p>

POLICY 142 – POLICIES AND PRODECURES FOR ADMISSIONS AND STUDIES (MASTER’S AND PHD PROGRAMS)

SECTION A: GENERAL POLICIES

1. Admission

- 1.1 General Admission Requirements
 - Applicants for admission to a Master’s Program:
 - Applicants for admission to a PhD Program
- 1.2 English Language Proficiency
- 1.3 Program Specific Admission Requirements
- 1.4 Transfer of Credit
- 1.5 Readmission
- 1.6 Admission Decisions

2. Categories of Students

- 2.1 Program Students
 - 2.1.1 Master’s Student
 - 2.1.2. PhD Student
 - 2.1.3 Full-time Student (to be developed)
 - 2.1.4 Part-time Student
- 2.2 Non-Program Students
 - 2.2.1 Ontario Visiting Graduate Students (OVGS)
 - 2.2.2 Canadian Visiting Graduate Students (CVGS)
 - 2.2.3 Graduate Special Students
 - 2.2.4 Exchange Students(to be developed)
 - 2.2.5 Visiting Research Students (to be developed)

3. Residency, Enrolment and Fees

- 3.1 Residency
- 3.2 Continuous Enrolment
- 3.3 Leave of Absence (LOA)
 - 3.3.1 Medical or compassionate leave
 - 3.3.2 Parental leave
 - 3.3.3 Terms of a Leave of Absence
- 3.4 Transfer from Master’s to PhD
- 3.5 Course Related Policies
- 3.6 Voluntary Withdrawal
- 3.7 Administrative Withdrawal
- 3.8 Time to completion
 - 3.8.1 Maximum time to completion
 - 3.8.2 Extension of time to Completion

3.9 Fees

4. Academic Assessment

- 4.1 Course Assessment
 - 4.1.1 Grading System
 - 4.1.2 Other Course Performance Designations
- 4.2 Milestone Assessment
- 4.3 Academic Standing

SECTION B: MASTER'S SUPERVISION AND THE THESIS, MAJOR RESEARCH PAPER OR PROJECT

5. Faculty Advisor/Supervisor

6. Master's Examinations

6.1 Requirement for examination

6.2 Readiness for Examination

6.3 Examining Committee Composition

6.3.1 Thesis Examining Committees

6.3.2 MRP Examining Committees

6.4 Conduct of the Oral Examination

6.4.1 Circulation of the thesis

6.4.2 Role of the Chair

6.4.3 Non-Attendance

6.4.4 Presentation

6.4.5 Questions (which follow the oral presentation)

6.4.6 Deliberations

6.4.7 Decisions

6.4.8 Copies of the Written Work

6.4.9 Recommendation for Governor-General's Gold Medal for Academic Excellence

6.5 Submission and Deposit of a Thesis

SECTION C: DOCTORAL SUPERVISION AND THE DISSERTATION

7. Faculty Advisor/Supervisor

8. PhD Preparatory Phase

9. Dissertation

9.1 Supervision

9.2 Readiness for Examination

9.3 Examining Committee

9.4 Conduct of the Oral Examination

9.4.1 Circulation of the dissertation

9.4.2 External Examiner's Report

9.4.3 Role of the Chair

9.4.4 Non-Attendance

9.4.5 Presentation

9.4.6 Questions (which follow the oral presentation)

9.4.7 Deliberations

9.4.8 Decisions

9.4.9 Copies of the Dissertation

9.4.10 Recommendation for Governor-General's Gold Medal for Academic Excellence

9.5 Submission and Deposit of Dissertation

SECTION A: GENERAL POLICIES**1. Admission****1.1 General Admission Requirements**

The following University requirements govern admission to all graduate Programs at Ryerson.

Applicants for admission to a Master's Program:

- a) will have graduated from a four-year approved undergraduate university Program or equivalent,
- b) will have a minimum of a B cumulative GPA or equivalent in the final two years of the Program, and
- c) will have demonstrated a capacity to succeed in the Program for which they have applied.

Applicants for admission to a PhD Program:

- a) should hold an acceptable Master's degree with at least a B standing, and
- b) will have demonstrated a capacity to succeed in the Program for which they have applied.

1.2 English Language Proficiency

Applicants whose language of instruction during their undergraduate studies was other than English will be required to take a Test of English Proficiency. Minimum achievement scores for the Yeates School of Graduate Studies and its programs will be posted on the graduate admissions website.

1.3 Program Specific Admission Requirements

Where individual programs have additional requirements, these will be listed on the Yeates School of Graduate Studies Admissions website, on the programs website and where admission requirements are listed on program publications.

1.4 Transfer of Credit

Where a candidate has completed appropriate graduate courses at another accredited academic institution, and a degree has not been conferred using these courses, they may be recognized in partial fulfilment of Ryerson's graduate degree requirements. A limit of 50% of the course requirements may be from courses taken outside of the program.

Responsibility for assessing the appropriateness of such courses shall rest with the Director of the program. Credit for such work shall not exceed fifty percent of the program's degree course requirements.

1.5 Readmission

Students who voluntarily withdraw from a program with a Satisfactory Progress Report may be considered for readmission. As a condition of re-admission, additional course work or other academic work may be required by the program.

If a student withdraws when the only outstanding program requirement is the capstone requirement (thesis, dissertation, project, MRP, etc.) and then wishes to re-enter the program, he/she will be required to pay fees for the terms during which they were absent. This complies with the requirement for continuous registration from admission to completion of a graduate program.

1.6 Admission Decisions

Final authority for admission decisions rests with the Dean of Graduate Studies.

The Graduate Admissions Office will provide the administrative support structure and is responsible for the formal offer of admission or non-approval letters. Non-approved application files are kept for one year from the date of submission. Admission decisions are final.

Ryerson reserves the right to close the application process for programs without notice.

2. Categories of Students

2.1 Program Students

2.1.1 Master's Student

An applicant who has met the Yeates School of Graduate Studies and program admission requirements, and who has accepted an official offer of admission, may be admitted to a Master's program.

Where an applicant has met the minimum requirements of the Yeates School of Graduate Studies but may require one or two additional undergraduate credits to meet the admission requirements of the program, the candidate may be admitted into a program with specific post-admission conditions. The conditions will be defined in the offer of admission to the candidate and on the student's Program of Study, as will the number of semesters, normally one or two, allowed to successfully fulfil the requirements. Other conditions which may be required by a program will also be defined in the offer of admission and/or the Program of Study. Failure to meet the post-admission conditions will result in Withdrawal from the program.

2.1.2. PhD Student

An applicant who has met the Yeates School of Graduate Studies and program admission requirements and who has accepted an official offer of admission may be admitted to a PhD program. Normally, PhD candidates will pursue full-time studies.

Under certain circumstances, a Master's candidate can apply to transfer to a PhD program, and vice-versa. Such transfer is subject to the approval of the graduate Program Director and the candidate's acceptance of any specific conditions. The specific conditions will be defined in the offer of admission to the candidate, including the number of terms allowed to successfully fulfil the requirements.

A graduate student who transfers from a Master's to a PhD program, without completing the Master's program, may not normally transfer back to the Master's program.

2.1.3 Full-time Student

To be developed

2.1.4 Part-time Student

A part-time student may not register in more than two courses per term. A student may change status from full-time to part-time or part-time to full-time subject to consultation with and the approval of the program Director and the Dean of Graduate Studies. Normally, a student may not transfer from full-time to part-time when the only remaining graduation requirement is a thesis, major research paper or project.

2.2 Non-Program Students

2.2.1 Ontario Visiting Graduate Students (OVGS)

The Ontario Visiting Graduate Student (OVGS) plan allows a graduate student registered at another Ontario university (the home university) to enrol in graduate courses at another Ontario university (the host university) while remaining registered at the home university.

Students accepted at Ryerson University using this plan are enrolled in the "OVGS" program. The application for admission will not be complete until the request has been approved by the graduate Program Director and the Dean of Graduate Studies of both the home university and Ryerson.

Students register at, pay fees to, and may continue to receive funding from their home university and are enrolled as OVGS students at Ryerson, where they pay no fees. An administrative fee is paid to Ryerson by the home university.

The courses selected must meet the requirements for the student's degree program. Normally, there must be no comparable course(s) offered at the home university. Such courses may not be in addition to their curriculum requirements, nor may they be audited. Normally, a visiting student will be allowed to enrol in the equivalent of two one-credit courses under this plan.

An OVGS student is subject to all Ryerson University administrative and academic requirements, including the significant dates that apply to graduate student enrolment at Ryerson.

2.2.2 Canadian Visiting Graduate Students (CVGS)

The Yeates School of Graduate Studies at Ryerson will allow a graduate student registered at a Canadian university (the home university) outside of Ontario to enrol in a graduate course at Ryerson while remaining registered at and paying tuition fees to his/her home university. The student will be required to pay an administrative fee equivalent to the amount set by the OVGS program per one-term credit. Students register at, pay fees to, and may continue to receive funding from their home university and are admitted to the "CVGS" program at Ryerson University.

The application for admission will not be complete until the request has been approved by the graduate Program Director and the Dean of Graduate Studies of both the home university and Ryerson.

The courses selected must meet the requirements for the student's degree program. Normally, there must be no comparable course(s) offered at the home university. Such courses may not be in addition to curriculum requirements and may not be audited. Normally, a visiting student will be allowed to enrol in the equivalent of two one-credit courses under this plan.

A CVGS student is subject to all Ryerson University administrative and academic requirements, including the significant dates that apply to graduate student enrolment at Ryerson.

2.2.3 Graduate Special Students

Under exceptional circumstances, students may apply to become a "Graduate Special Student" if they meet the eligibility requirements for the Yeates School of Graduate Studies and the program which offers the course that the student is applying to take. A Special Student Application form may be obtained from the Graduate Admissions Office, and all documentation and fees required of a program student must be submitted to the Graduate Admissions Office.

Graduate Special Students are limited to a maximum of two graduate courses. Access to courses is subject to approval of the Program Director and the instructor of the course, space permitting.

Special Students are eligible for evaluation in the courses taken, but courses taken as a Special Student may not be used subsequently for credit in a Ryerson graduate program.

2.2.4 Exchange Students

To be developed.

2.2.5 Visiting Research Students

To be developed.

3. Residency, Enrolment and Fees

3.1 Residency

Students must complete at least 50% of their program's degree course requirements, and a thesis, major project, major research paper or dissertation, where applicable, while enrolled in the program from which they are graduating.

3.2 Continuous Enrolment

Students in graduate programs will be required to maintain continuous enrolment in every semester of their program until all requirements of their program have been met, unless they have been granted a Leave of Absence or have withdrawn from the program.

3.3 Leave of Absence (LOA)

3.3.1 Medical or Compassionate leave

In cases such as severe illness or extreme financial difficulty, a student may petition for a LOA.

3.3.2 Parental leave

A parental LOA may be taken by an enrolled graduate student at the time of pregnancy, birth or adoption and/or to provide full-time care during the child's first year. Parental leave must be completed within twelve months of the date of birth or custody. Parental leave can be taken for a maximum of three semesters.

3.3.3 Terms of a Leave of Absence

LOA may be granted by the Program Director. Students will not normally be granted more than one LOA during their graduate program. A LOA is normally for one term, but cannot exceed three terms.

Under extraordinary circumstances, students may apply for a second LOA, which must be approved by the Program Director and the Dean of Graduate Studies.

Students who are granted a LOA will not be required to pay fees during the leave, nor will that term of the leave be included in the calculation of time to completion for the degree. Students on a LOA will not be entitled to use the services of the University or the program, during the leave.

A student who is returning from a LOA must register for a minimum of one term before completion of the program.

The student should discuss in advance, what conditions, if any, need to be met upon return.

A student who fails to return from a LOA on the expected date will be withdrawn from his/her program.

3.4 Program Transfer from Master's to Doctoral level

In exceptional circumstances, a Ryerson Master's student may transfer into a Ryerson Doctoral program, without completing the Master's degree. The requirements for this type of transfer include: completion of all course requirements for the Master's degree with a minimum 3.67 GPA; demonstrated strong research potential, and Program Director and supervisor permission.

Subsequent to such a transfer, if the Doctoral program is not completed, the student may not transfer back to the Master's program, nor receive a Master's degree in that program.

3.5 Course related policies

3.5.1 All graduate course additions and deletions must be authorized by the student's program and all must be initiated by the dates listed on the Significant Dates in the Graduate Calendar.

3.5.2 A \$100 (subject to change) Addition to Enrollment Record fee will be levied for each course or grade added to a student's enrollment after the deadline dates.

3.5.3 Students may substitute a different course for a previously failed elective course, with authorization from the student's program. Students are required to submit a GPA Adjustment Form to Enrollment Services and Student Records no later than the final date to add a course for the term.

3.5.4 Students may be allowed to repeat a course once, with authorization from the Program Director, which would not normally be withheld. The original grade will continue to appear on the student's academic record, but only the last grade achieved for a repeated course (whether higher or lower) will count in the GPA. If at least one of the course attempts results in a passing grade, the course will count towards graduation requirements.

3.6 Voluntary Withdrawal

A student who is unable to participate in a Program of Study, or who finds it necessary to discontinue in their program, must officially withdraw from the program

If a student withdraws and subsequently wishes to return to the program, he/she must reapply through the Graduate Admissions Office. **Readmission is not guaranteed**, and may be subject to conditions such as course or other academic work in addition to the normal curriculum.

3.7 Administrative Withdrawal

A student who has not participated in nor paid fees for his/her program and has had no communication with her/his program for a term, will be withdrawn by the program.

If a student has been withdrawn by the program for non-participation and subsequently wishes to return to the program, he/she must reapply through the Graduate Admissions Office. **Readmission is not guaranteed** and may be subject to conditions such as course or other academic work in addition to the normal curriculum.

3.8 Time to completion

3.8.1 Maximum time to completion

For students in a full-time Master's program, three years is the maximum time from initial registration to completion.

For students in a part-time Master's program, five years is the maximum time from initial registration to completion. Part-time Master's students should be aware that there is a minimum degree fee based on the minimum time to completion for a full-time student in the program, as stated on the YSGS website. A "Balance of Degree Fee" is assessed just prior to graduation, and is based on tuition fees only, as published on the fees schedule in effect at the time of graduation.

For students who request a change in status from part-time to full-time or from full-time to part-time, the effect on the time for completion will be pro-rated.

For students registered in a PhD program (part- or full-time), the time for completion of the program is six years from their initial registration in the program.

3.8.2 Extension of time to Completion

Under extenuating circumstances, students may petition the Program Director for a one term extension of the time to completion for the program. The Program Director, in consultation with the supervisor, will make the final decision. A petition for an extension of more than one term or a second petition must be submitted to the Dean of Graduate Studies.

If a student does not submit a petition for extension by the last date to add a course for the term, or if the petition is not approved, the student will be withdrawn by the program. Subsequently, If the student wishes to return to the program, he/she must reapply. Readmission is not guaranteed, and may be subject to conditions such as course or other academic work in addition to the normal curriculum. A student who reapplies having worked on, or completed their research, thesis, major research paper, project, dissertation, or any other academic work., during the cancelled period will be required to enrol for at least one additional semester, and will be required to pay fees for the period of non-enrolment.

3.9 Fees

Students are required to pay fees from initial enrolment in a program until graduation or official withdrawal. However, students who are granted a Leave of Absence (LOA) will not be required to pay fees during the leave, nor will that term of the leave be included in the calculation of time to completion for the degree. Students on a LOA will not be entitled to use the services of the University or the program, during the leave.

There is a minimum degree fee based on the minimum time to completion for a full-time student in the program, as stated on the YSGS website. If a student completes his/her program without paying the minimum degree fee, a "Balance of Degree Fee" may be assessed just prior to graduation. The fee is based on tuition fees only, as published on the fees schedule in effect at the time of graduation.

4. Academic Assessment

4.1 Course Assessment

Satisfactory performance requires a grade of at least B- at the Master's level and at least B for the Doctoral level, or a Pass i Pass/Fail courses, in all courses taken for credit towards graduation requirements.

4.1.1 Grading System

Master's Level		Doctoral Level	
Letter Grade	Conversion Range Percentage Scale to Letter Grades	Letter Grade	Conversion Range Percentage Scale to Letter Grades
A+	90-100	A+	90-100
A	85-89	A	85-89
A-	80-84	A-	80-84
B+	77-79	B+	77-79
B	73-76	B	73-76
B-	70-72	F	0-72
F	0-69		

Final assessment for courses is either recorded as one of the above letter grades or as one of the other designations that are defined below.

4.1.2 Other Course Performance Designations

AEG: (Aegrotat) - credit granted by the Dean of Graduate Studies, in consultation with the instructor, only under exceptional circumstances when there has been acceptable performance in a course and some course work remains to be completed.

AUD: (Audit) – course attended as auditor only. A graduate student may audit the equivalent of one two-credit course or two one-credit courses in any graduate or under-graduate program at Ryerson without additional fee.

Courses taken for audit will not count for credit toward the student's Program, but will appear on the student's transcript with the designation "AUD" in lieu of a grade.

To audit a course, a student must have written approval from his/her supervisor and the Instructor for the course. Any requirements of the auditor must be defined in writing by the Instructor at the time of authorization. Failure of the auditor to fulfil the requirements will result in withdrawal from the course.

CNC: (Course not for credit) - course not for credit in the current program, this designation is recorded on the transcript as information supplementary to the grade earned in the course.

CRT: (Credit) - transfer credit achieved through an acceptable grade in an equivalent graduate course which has been completed at Ryerson or in a graduate program at another institution and which is deemed equivalent to a course in the student's graduate program. Equivalency is determined by the Program Director or faculty member who is responsible for teaching the course in the student's

graduate program. Such credit should be granted as a part of the admission process. (See also section 1.4 Transfer of Credit.) For a student already registered in the Program, this type of credit will normally require a Letter of Permission from the student's graduate Program Director prior to registering in the course.

Transfer credits will count toward the student's graduation requirements. A student may not receive transfer credits for more than 50% of his/her current Program course requirements.

DEF (Deferred) - an interim grade assigned during the investigation of academic misconduct (as described under the Student Code of Academic Conduct). The DEF grade will be replaced by an official course grade upon resolution of the matter.

FNA: (Failure, Non Attendance) - awarded by the instructor when the student has been absent from most meetings and/or has submitted no work for evaluation. This grade will be assigned when a student abandons a course without completing a formal withdrawal prior to established deadline dates. This grade is counted as a failure in the calculations of grade point average and academic standing.

GNR: (Grade not recorded) – grades have not been submitted for an entire class. The student should immediately initiate an inquiry with the faculty member and/or graduate program.

INC: (Incomplete) - incomplete course work or a missed final examination due to documented medical or compassionate grounds*. An INC can be awarded only when some work remains to be completed and when the completion of the outstanding work or an alternative final examination may result in a passing grade. The outstanding work or alternative examination must be completed by a specified date not later than the end of classes in the next term. The INC will be replaced by an official course grade when the work is completed, or with an "F" if not completed. An INC is not included in GPA calculation, nor as a credit or failed course.

*Students must petition their instructor to receive an INC within three working days, or as soon as reasonably possible, of the missed final examination or final assignment deadline. Supporting documentation (e.g. Ryerson Medical Certificate) must be provided. Instructors awarding an INC grade must provide the student, within seven working days, with a written statement of outstanding work to be completed and the deadline for completion or alternate examination. The instructor must also file a copy of this documentation with the student's graduate program office.

INP: (In Progress) – indicates coursework in progress with at least one more term of formal course enrolment and study is required for completion (e.g. extended absence requires repeating the course, or a Directed Study course is still in progress). An INP is not included in GPA calculation, nor as a credit or failed course.

PSD: (Passed) - acceptable performance in a course graded only pass or fail, as predefined in the Graduate Calendar.

4.2 Milestone Assessment

A Milestone is a component of a program which is required for graduation, but is not offered in a traditional in-class course framework. Examples are graduate seminars, theses, major research papers/projects, comprehensive/candidacy examinations, dissertations, and WHIMIS certification. The final assessment will normally be Pass/Fail.

Students will normally be enrolled in a Milestone when they are ready to commence work on the Milestone.

A student with satisfactory performance in a Milestone (as recorded on the Progress Report) will continue in with "INP" (in progress) on the Progress Report in every term until completion. A student with unsatisfactory performance during a term will have UNS (unsatisfactory) on the Progress Report. An UNS is equivalent to an F for Academic Standing calculations.

A failed course taken previously or in the same term in combination with an UNS result in a Milestone, or a second UNS result in a Milestone, will result in academic withdrawal from the program.

4.3 Academic Standing

At the end of each semester, grades will be published on the Ryerson student administrative system, indicating students' academic standing for that term.

CLEAR: Master's students must have at least a minimum passing grade of 2.67 (or PSD in the case of a pass/fail graded course) in each graduate course during the semester.

PhD students must have at least a minimum passing grade of 3.00 (or PSD in the case of a pass/fail graded course) in each graduate course during the semester.

Students with a CLEAR standing may continue in their Program of Study.

PROVISIONAL: A student has one of the following:

- One Unsatisfactory (UNS) progress report for a Milestone, and no failed grades
- One failed grade and no Unsatisfactory (UNS) progress reports for a Milestone
- a cumulative GPA lower than 2.67 for Master's students
- a cumulative GPA lower than 3.00 for Doctoral students
- Has failed to meet a specific program requirement.

A student with PROVISIONAL standing may not continue his/her Program of Study until a specific Provisional Plan to correct academic deficiencies has been authorized in writing by their supervisor and Program Director, signed by the student, and recorded with the Office of the Registrar. Normally the deficiencies must be addressed within a maximum of one year. Students who are substituting a different course for a failed course must request, before the last day to add courses, that the substituted course be used in place of the failed course for GPA calculation and graduation requirements. (see also section 3.5.3)

Students who fail to have a Provisional Plan approved prior to the official last date to add a course in the semester following the application of the Provisional standing, may have their enrolment cancelled for that semester, **or be withdrawn from the program.**

WITHDRAWN: A student has unsatisfactory performance in one of the following:

- Two Unsatisfactory (UNS) progress reports for a Milestone
- Two failed grades
- One failed grade and one Unsatisfactory (UNS) progress report in a Milestone
- Failure to develop a Provisional Plan
- Failure to meet the requirements of a Provisional Plan
- A final performance designation of Fail for a thesis, major project/paper, or dissertation
- Failure to complete the graduate program within the allowable time to completion.

A student who has been withdrawn from the program is not eligible for readmission into that program.

OPEN: An academic standing has not been assigned and the student may continue in the program; normally assigned when there is an INP or INC grade during the term.

SECTION B: MASTER'S SUPERVISION AND THE THESIS, MAJOR RESEARCH PAPER OR PROJECT

5. Faculty Advisor/Supervisor

5.1 At the time of enrolment in a program, a student will normally be assigned a faculty advisor or supervisor who is a Yeates School of Graduate Studies member from the student's program. **If a faculty advisor is initially assigned to a student in a program in which research is involved, a supervisor will be assigned as soon as the student's research area is identified.**

In consultation with the student, the faculty advisor/supervisor will recommend an initial Program of Study and submit this for approval to the Program Director normally within the first four weeks of the program. The role of the

faculty advisor/supervisor is to provide academic advising, monitor the student's progress toward the completion of the program, and ensure that a *Progress Report* is submitted to the Program Director at the end of each term.

Where a thesis, major research paper or major project is part of a student's curriculum, the student's supervisor will recommend a *Program of Study*. In addition, the supervisor shall:

- 5.1.1 meet regularly with the student;
- 5.1.2 review the student's proposal and recommend its approval to the Program Director normally not less than one to two terms (depending on the length of the program) prior to the expected date of program completion;
- 5.1.3 review the student's progress on the thesis/mrp at least once a term. The student's progress must be reported on the *Progress Report*, which is to be written by the supervisor in consultation with the student. If the progress is deemed unsatisfactory (i.e. a UNS designation is given on the *Progress Report*), detailed reasons for this judgement should be included on the report, as well as specific instructions on deliverables for the following term. The student's Academic Standing will become Provisional and the *Progress Report* in this case may act as the *Provisional Plan*. A copy of the report should be given to the student, the Program Director, and the Director of Academic Administrative Services, Yeates School of Graduate Studies.
- 5.1.4 assign an UNS assessment for the term's progress on a Progress Report, in the event that the student does not present a Progress Report for review, and the student's Academic Standing will be adjusted accordingly;
- 5.1.5 evaluate the readiness of the thesis (and the paper or project if required) to be examined orally, and make a recommendation to the Program Director regarding a date for the defence and the composition of the Examining Committee;
- 5.1.6 ensure that a copy of the student's thesis is sent to each member of the student's Examining Committee as far as possible in advance of a scheduled oral examination, but no less than three weeks prior to the date scheduled.

6 Master's Examinations

6.1 Requirement for examination¹⁹

Master's theses are subject to formal oral examinations. Major research papers or projects that are not components of individual courses in a program may be subject to formal written and/or oral examination as required by the program.

6.2 Readiness for Examination

The supervisor, in consultation with the student, will determine that the written work is ready to stand for defence and will establish an Examining Committee and schedule the defence.

In cases where consensus is not reached with regard to readiness, the student has the right to petition the program Director in order to have the written work stand for defence, establish the Examining Committee and schedule the defence. Where the Program Director is the student's supervisor, the student may petition the Dean of Graduate Studies.

6.3 Examining Committee Composition

6.3.1 Thesis Examining Committees

The Examining Committee will be composed of four members: the student's supervisor; the Program Director or designate; one faculty from the student's program who is a member of YSGS; and one faculty member who is not involved in the student's research but who is a member of YSGS and who may or may not be from within the program. Where there is a co-supervisor, one vote shall be shared. The Program Director, or designate, shall serve as the non-voting Chair of the committee. The Dean may approve the appointment of an expert

¹⁹ In special circumstances, alternate arrangements may be made for an oral examination, as approved by the Program Director.

professional in the field of the thesis, or a Ryerson University faculty member who is not a member of the Yeates School of Graduate Studies, to serve as a member of the Examining Committee.

6.3.2 MRP Examining Committees

Where an oral examination of a major research project or paper is part of the student's Program of Study, the student's supervisor after consultation with the student, will recommend to the Program Director the appointment of an Examining Committee. The Examining Committee will normally be composed of three members: the student's supervisor(s); the Program Director or designate; and one faculty member from the student's program who is a member of YSGS. The Program Director, or designate, shall serve as the non-voting Chair of the committee. The Dean of Graduate Studies may approve the appointment of an expert professional in the field of the research paper/project, or a Ryerson University faculty member who is not a member of the Yeates School of Graduate Studies, to serve as a member of the Examining Committee.

MASTER'S EXAMINING COMMITTEES				
	Thesis		Major Research Paper/Project (where required by the program)	
	Number of members	Number of votes	Number of members	Number of votes
Supervisor(s)	1 or more	1	1 or more	1
Program Director or designate	Chair	0 unless a tie	Chair	0 unless a tie
YSGS Faculty - within program	1 or 2	1 or 2	1	1
YSGS Faculty - outside of program	1 if only 1 within the program	1 if only 1 within the program		

6.4 Conduct of the Oral Examination (Master's)

6.4.1 Circulation of the thesis

The candidate will provide sufficient copies of the thesis for each committee member. A copy will be given to each member of the committee no less than four weeks before the defense.

6.4.2 Role of the Chair

The Chair is responsible for maintaining decorum during the examination, and ensuring that the candidate is given a fair and equitable assessment of his/her work.. The examination is public, but the Chair has the authority to exclude persons whose conduct disturbs the examination. The Chair then presides over the deliberations of the Examining Committee but is a non-voting member, except in the case of a tie.

6.4.3 Non-Attendance

Any member of the committee that cannot attend the defense must submit a written report to the Chair at least one week before the defense. The Chair will then appoint a delegate, who cannot be an existing member of the committee, to carry the absent member's report to the examination.

No more than two members may be absent from the defense. The supervisor(s) must attend the defense. If any committee member is absent, and has not been replaced by a delegate, the examination may proceed only with the approval of the student and the Dean of Graduate Studies or his/her delegate. A delegate has the status of a committee member, and her/his vote substitutes for that of the absent member.

6.4.4 Presentation

The examination begins with an oral presentation by the candidate using whatever aids are required to make an effective presentation. This presentation should be limited to no more than 20 minutes, with the focus being on the main contributions and conclusions of the work.

6.4.5 Questions (which follow the oral presentation)

The Chair gives priority to questions from members of the committee. Usually the questions by the supervisor are last. The Chair must ascertain that all of the questions from an absent committee member have been adequately presented by the delegate who may also pose any additional questions deemed necessary. If found to be appropriate or relevant, the Chair may ask questions that have been previously submitted to the committee by non-committee members in attendance.

6.4.6 Deliberations

Only the Examining Committee will be present during deliberations.

6.4.7 Decisions

The decision of the Examining Committee shall be by vote and shall be based on the written work and on the candidate's ability to defend it. **The student must pass both the oral examination and the written work.** The "*Report of the Oral Examining Committee*" should be completed and signed by the members of the committee. One copy should immediately be given to the student, and a copy should be delivered to the Yeates School of Graduate Studies as soon as possible. The following decisions are open to the Examining Committee:

Oral Examination:

- Pass
- Fail

Written work:

- Accept
Any minor revisions ranging from typographical errors to specified insertions or deletions that do not radically modify the development/argument of the paper shall be clearly specified in writing and the student's Supervisor shall ensure that they are made. When the Supervisor confirms that the changes have been made, the examination requirement has been met.
- Major Revision
Detailed reasons for referring the paper for major revision ranging from re-writing a large part of a chapter to including additional work will be supplied in writing by the Chair of the Examining Committee to the Dean, the Program Director and the candidate within one week following the oral examination.

The Examining Committee must give final approval to the major revisions by reconvening the examination or by consultation.

If the decision by consultation on the major revisions is unsatisfactory, the examination is reconvened.

Upon reconvening, a final "*Report of the Oral Examining Committee*" should be completed and signed by all members of the committee. One copy should immediately be given to the student, and a copy should be delivered to the Yeates School of Graduate Studies as soon as possible. Decisions are limited to Accept or Fail.

- Fail
Detailed reasons for the decision will be supplied in writing by the Chair of the Examining Committee to the Dean, the Program Director, and the candidate within one week following the oral examination.

6.4.8 Copies of the Written Work

All copies of the written work must be returned to the student upon conclusion of the oral examination

6.4.9 Recommendation for Governor-General's Gold Medal for Academic Excellence

The Chair of the Examining Committee must determine whether the Committee wishes to recommend the candidate for the Governor-General's Gold Medal for Academic Excellence.

6.5 Submission and Deposit of a Thesis

Following the successful examination and completion of all corrections or revisions, the candidate will submit the final copy of the approved thesis, along with verification by the candidate's supervisor and Program Director, that all required corrections or revisions have been made, in accordance with the submission procedures of the Yeates School of Graduate Studies.

If, at the time of final submission, the candidate wishes to protect any rights to publication or to obtain a patent that may arise from the candidate's research, or to delay circulation of the document for any other legitimate academic reason, the candidate may apply in writing to the Dean of Graduate Studies to withhold the thesis from circulation or copying for a period of no more than twelve months from the date of successful final examination.

As a condition of engaging in a graduate program of the University, the author of a thesis grants certain licenses and waivers with respect to the circulation and copying of the thesis. These licenses and waivers take effect upon the submission of the copies listed above, except in the case defined in the previous paragraph, where they will take effect following the period of withholding. They are as follows:

- 6.5.1 the University Library will be permitted to allow consultation of the thesis as part of the library collection and the making of single copies for another library or similar institution or for an individual for private study and research; and
- 6.5.2 submission of theses to the Library and Archives Canada will be made as agreed to by the candidate on the *Library and Archives Canada Non-exclusive Licence to Reproduce Theses* form. The LAC does not accept major research papers/projects.

SECTION C: DOCTORAL SUPERVISION AND THE DISSERTATION

7 Faculty Advisor/Supervisor

At the time of enrolment in a Doctoral program, a student will normally be assigned a faculty advisor or supervisor who is a Yeates School of Graduate Studies member from the student's program. **If a faculty advisor is initially assigned, a supervisor will be assigned as soon as the student's research area is identified.**

In consultation with the student, the faculty advisor/supervisor will recommend an initial Program of Study and submit this for approval to the Program Director normally within the first four weeks of the program. The role of the faculty advisor/supervisor is to provide academic advising, monitor the student's progress toward the completion of the program, and ensure that a *Progress Report* is submitted to the Program Director at the end of each term.

8. PhD Preparatory Phase

Every Doctoral program requires that the student complete one or more preparatory or foundation phases. **This may take the form of one or more of the following examples: comprehensive examination, candidacy examination, qualifying examination, dissertation proposal, and/or proposal defence.**

The preparatory phase requirements must normally be successfully completed within two years, and no later than three years, from the date of program registration.

In addition, individual programs may require an internal preliminary examination before approval to go to formal presentation which may include an external examination.

9. Dissertation

9.1 Supervision

The student's Supervisor, after consultation with the student, will recommend to the Program Director the appointment of a Dissertation Supervisory Committee of two to four persons, composed of the Supervisor (and co-Supervisor(s), if applicable) and at least one other Yeates School of Graduate Studies faculty member from the student's program. Where appropriate, a Yeates School of Graduate Studies faculty member from outside the student's program, a faculty member from outside the Yeates School of Graduate Studies or an expert professional in the field of the dissertation may be recommended as a member of the Dissertation Supervisory Committee, subject to the approval of the Dean of Graduate Studies.

The Program Director shall forward to the Dean of Graduate Studies the recommendations for committee appointments not later than the beginning of the third year of study. The supervisor will chair the Supervisory Committee.

The Supervisor will chair the Supervisory Committee.

The Supervisor together with the Supervisory Committee shall:

- 9.1.1 meet regularly with the student;
- 9.1.2 review the student's background preparedness, and set the dates for the Preparatory evaluations.
- 9.1.3 Upon successful completion of the Preparatory Phase, the Supervisory Committee shall forward the recommendation to proceed with the research to the Program Director for approval. Upon unsuccessful completion of the comprehensive exam, detailed reasons for the decision will be supplied in writing by the Supervisor to the Dean of Graduate Studies, the Program Director and the student within two weeks;
- 9.1.4 formally approve the dissertation proposal;
- 9.1.5 review the student's progress on the dissertation at least once a term. The progress must be reported on the Progress Report, which is to be written in consultation with the student. If the progress is deemed unsatisfactory (i.e. a UNS designation is given on the Progress Report), detailed reasons for this judgement should be included on the Progress report, as well as specific instructions on deliverables for the following term. The student's Academic Standing will become Provisional and the Progress Report in this case will act as the Provisional contract. A copy of the Progress Report should be given to the student, the Program Director, and the Director of Academic Administrative Services, Graduate Studies.
- 9.1.6 evaluate the readiness of the dissertation to be examined, and make a recommendation to the Program Director regarding the formation of the Dissertation Examining Committee (as outlined in 9.3)
- 9.1.7 ensure that a copy of the student's dissertation is sent to the external examiner as far as possible in advance of a scheduled oral examination, but no less than **six** weeks prior to the date scheduled.
- 9.1.8 ensure that a copy of the student's dissertation is sent to all other members of the student's Examining Committee as far as possible in advance of a scheduled oral examination, but no less than four weeks prior to the date scheduled.

9.2 Readiness for Examination

The supervisor, in consultation with the student, will determine that the dissertation is prepared to stand for defence.

In cases where consensus is not reached with regard to readiness, the student has the right to petition the Program Director in order to have the dissertation stand for defence. Where the Program Director is the student's supervisor, the student may petition the Dean of Graduate Studies.

9.3 Examining Committee

The student's Supervisory Committee, after consultation with the student, will recommend to the Program Director the appointment of an Examining Committee. The Examining Committee will normally be composed of the **supervisor/co-supervisor**; two faculty members from the student's program who are members of YSGS; one faculty member from outside of the program who is a member of the Yeates School of Graduate

Studies; one member external to the University who is an expert in the field of the dissertation, experienced with PhD level graduate studies, and at arm's length from the dissertation; and the Dean of Graduate Studies or designate, who shall serve as the non-voting Chair of the committee. If appropriate, an additional member may be recommended who is an expert professional in the field of the dissertation, or a Ryerson University faculty member who is not a member of the Yeates School of Graduate Studies.

The Program Director shall forward his/her recommendation regarding the composition of the Dissertation Examining Committee to the Dean of the Yeates School of Graduate Studies for approval and appointment. When the committee is appointed, the Supervisor will set the examination date.

DOCTORAL EXAMINING COMMITTEE		
	Number of members	Number of votes
Supervisor(s)	1 or more	1
YSGS Faculty - Within program	2	2
YSGS Faculty - Outside program	1	1
Dean, YSGS or designate	Chair	0 unless a tie
External Examiner	1	1

9.5 Conduct of the Oral Examination

9.5.1 Copies of the dissertation

The candidate will provide to the supervisor sufficient copies of the dissertation for all committee members.

9.4.2 External Examiner's Report

A response will be sent to the Program Director within four weeks from the receipt of the dissertation. The external examiner's report shall be given to the supervisor and the student one week before the examination

9.4.3 Role of the Chair

The Chair is responsible for maintaining decorum during the examination, and ensuring that the candidate is given a fair and equitable assessment of his/her work. The examination is public, but the Chair has the authority to exclude persons whose conduct disturbs the examination. The Chair then presides over the deliberations of the Examining Committee but is a non-voting member, except in the case of a tie.

9.4.4 Non-Attendance

If the External Examiner is not in attendance, a delegate who is not another member of the committee shall present the external examiner's questions to the candidate.

If an internal member of the committee cannot attend the defense, he/she must submit a written report to the Chair at least one week before the defense. The Chair will then appoint a delegate, who cannot be an existing member of the committee, to carry the absent member's report to the examination.

No more than two members may be absent from the defense. The supervisor must attend the defense. If any committee member is absent, and has not been replaced by a delegate, the examination may proceed only with the approval of the student and the Dean of Graduate Studies or his/her delegate. A delegate has the status of a committee member, and their vote substitutes for that of the absent member.

9.4.5 Presentation

The examination begins with an oral presentation of the dissertation by the candidate using whatever aids are required to make an effective presentation. This presentation should normally be limited to no more than 20 minutes, with the focus being on the main contributions and conclusions of the work.

9.4.6 Questions (which follow the oral presentation)

The Chair gives priority to questions from members of the committee. Usually the external examiner's questions are presented first followed by those of the committee, with those of the supervisor last.

The Chair must ascertain that all of the questions from an absent committee member have been adequately presented by the delegate who may also pose any additional questions where appropriate.

If found to be appropriate or relevant, the Chair may ask questions that have been previously submitted to the committee by non-committee members in attendance.

9.4.7 Deliberations

Only the Examining Committee will be present during deliberations. If the external examiner is absent, the delegate presents the external examiner's full report of the dissertation to the committee.

Acceptance of the dissertation will be based on a vote by the committee.

9.4.8 Decisions

The decision of the Examining Committee shall be by vote and shall be based on the dissertation and on the candidate's ability to defend it.

If the external examiner is not in attendance, and the committee cannot reach a decision, the Chair will consult with the External Examiner in a timely manner. If necessary, the Chair will cast the deciding ballot.

The "Report of the Oral Examining Committee" should be completed and signed by the members of the committee. One copy should immediately be given to the student, and a copy should be delivered to the Yeates School of Graduate Studies as soon as possible. The following decisions are open to the Examining Committee:

Oral Examination:

- Satisfactory
- Unsatisfactory

Written Dissertation:

- Accept
Any minor revisions ranging from typographical errors to specified insertions or deletions that do not radically modify the development/argument of the paper shall be clearly specified in writing and the student's Supervisor shall ensure that they are made. When the Supervisor confirms that the changes have been made, the examination requirement has been met.
- Major Revision
Detailed reasons for referring the paper for major revision ranging from re-writing a large part of a chapter to including additional work will be supplied in writing by the Chair of the Examining Committee to the Dean, the Program Director and the candidate within one week following the oral examination.

The Examining Committee must give final approval to the major revisions by reconvening the examination or by consultation. If the decision by consultation on the major revisions is unsatisfactory, the examination is reconvened.

Upon reconvening, a final "Report of the Oral Examining Committee" should be completed and signed by all members of the committee. One copy should immediately be given to the student, and a copy should be delivered to the Yeates School of Graduate Studies as soon as possible. Decisions are limited to Accept or Fail.

- Fail
Detailed reasons for the decision will be supplied in writing by the Chair of the Examining Committee to the Dean, the Program Director, and the candidate within one week following the oral examination.

9.4.9 Copies of the Dissertation

All copies of the dissertation will be returned to the student.

9.4.10 Recommendation for Governor-General's Gold Medal for Academic Excellence

The Chair of the Examining Committee must determine whether the Committee wishes to recommend the candidate for the Governor-General's Gold Medal for Academic Excellence.

9.5 Submission and Deposit of Dissertation

Following the successful examination and completion of all corrections or revisions, the candidate will submit the final copy of the approved dissertation, along with verification by the candidate's supervisor and the Program Director, that all required corrections or revisions have been made, **in accordance with the submission procedures of the Yeates School of Graduate Studies.**

If, at the time of final submission, the candidate wishes to protect any rights to publication or to obtain a patent that may arise from the candidate's research, or to delay circulation of the document for any other legitimate academic reason, the candidate may apply in writing to the Dean of Graduate Studies to withhold the dissertation from circulation or copying for a period of no more than twelve months from the date of successful final examination.

As a condition of engaging in a graduate program of the University, the author of a dissertation grants certain licenses and waivers with respect to the circulation and copying of the dissertation. These licenses and waivers take effect upon the submission of the copies listed above, except in the case defined in the previous paragraph, where they will take effect following the period of withholding. They are as follows:

- i) the University Library will be permitted to allow consultation of the dissertation as part of the library collection and the making of single copies for another library or similar institution or for an individual for private study and research; and
- ii) Submission to the Library and Archives Canada will be made as agreed to by the candidate on the *Library and Archives Canada Non-exclusive Licence to Reproduce Theses form*.

Motion for Academic Accommodations in the 2011 Provincial Election

Rationale

Youth voter turn-out is historically much lower than the average voter turnout for provincial elections and statistics show that people who vote from a young age are more likely to continue to vote throughout their lives.

The provincial government plays a uniquely important role in the lives of the stakeholders of the University, as it earmarks per student funding on which access to, and quality of post-secondary education is contingent.

Ryerson is largely a commuter campus and many of our students may be away from their local polling station during the hours of poll operation to attend classes. As a result, many students will need to be able to leave late or return early if they have classes scheduled on October 6, 2011 to be able to vote. Students who face academic penalties for missing class in order to vote are less likely to participate in this election. Furthermore, advance polls do not necessarily facilitate voting as they may also be during class hours. Ryerson as a whole should play a role in encouraging all eligible students to engage in the democratic process.

Motion

Be it Resolved That Senate supports finding ways to ensure that student voters are able to participate in the provincial election on Thursday, October 6, 2011, including but not limited to encouraging faculty to not schedule tests, in class presentations or assignments on Election Day.

Be it Further Resolved That the Vice-Provost Academic work with students and faculty to determine what reasonable accommodations can be made to allow students to vote.

Andrew McAllister
Student Senator

To: Dr Diane Schulman, Secretary of Senate
From: Des Glynn, Vice Chair, Chang School Council
Subject: Discontinued Certificates
Date: 15 April 2011

The following certificates, offered through the G. Raymond Chang School of Continuing Education, were approved for discontinuation by the Chang School Council in the 2010-2011 academic year.

- Certificate in Audio Production (December 15th)
- Certificate in Television Production Fundamentals (December 15th)
- Certificate in Database and Knowledge Management (March 9th)
- Certificate in Information Systems Development (March 9th)
- Certificate in eBusiness (March 9th)

In the case of each certificate, low course enrollments together with low certificate registration and certificate completion comprised the rationale for discontinuation. In all cases, naturally, students will be appropriately advised and arrangements shall be made for registered students to complete their certificates.

Supporting documentation is on file in the Office of the Senate.