Academic Governance and Policy Committee (AGPC)
Report #S2019-1

1.   Academic Governance and Policy Committee (AGPC) - M. Benarroch

   1.1   Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP) Policy Revisions (see attached) –
            K. MacKay

            Motion: *That Senate approve the Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP)*
            Policy Revisions.

   1.2   Policy #60: Academic Integrity – K. MacKay

            Motion: *That Senate approve the Policy 60: Academic Integrity.*

   1.3   Policy 166: Course Management – K. MacKay

            Motion: *That Senate approve Policy 166: Course Management replacing*
            Policy 145: Undergraduate Course Management and
            Policy 151: Yeates School of Graduate Studies Course Management.

Respectfully submitted,

M. Benarroch, Chair,
Provost and Vice-President, Academic

On behalf of the Committee:
K. MacKay, Vice-Provost, Academic
J. McMillen, Vice-Provost, Students
C. Hack, Registrar
D. Bell, Secretary of Senate
T. Duever, Dean, Faculty of Engineering & Architectural Science
D. Checkland, Faculty of Arts
S. Dolgoy, Faculty, Faculty of Communication and Design
R. Meldrum, Faculty of Community Services
S. Sabatinos, Faculty, Science
K. Kumar, Faculty, Faculty of Engineering & Architectural Science
R. Hudyma, Faculty, Ted Rogers School of Management
A.M. Brinsmead, Program Director, G. Raymond Chang School of Continuing Education
F. Khan, Undergraduate Student Senator
J. Circo, Undergraduate Student Senator
R. Kucheran, Yeates School of Graduate Studies Student Senator

RYERSON UNIVERSITY
POLICY OF SENATE

INSTITUTIONAL QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESS

Policy Number: 110

Previous Approval Dates: May 3, 2011; November 4, 2014

Policy Approval Date: March 6, 2018

Next Policy Review Date: May 2023 *(or sooner at the request of the Provost and Vice-President Academic or Senate)*

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

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

The University's IQAP includes the following policies:

Policy 110: Institutional Quality Assurance Process
Policy 112: Development of New Graduate and Undergraduate Programs
Policy 126: Periodic Program Review of Graduate and Undergraduate Programs
Policy 127: Curriculum Modifications: Graduate and Undergraduate Programs

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

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

3. DEFINITIONS

3.1. Dean of Record

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

3.2. Degree Level Expectations (DLEs)

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

3.3. Designated Academic Unit

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

3.4. Expedited Approvals

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

3.5. Field

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

3.6. Final Assessment Report (FAR)

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

3.7. Graduate Program

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

3.7.1. Degree Program

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

3.7.2. Diploma Program
A graduate program that is one of three types:

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

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

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

3.8. Joint Program

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

3.9. Letter of Intent

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

3.10. New Program

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

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

3.11. Undergraduate Program

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

4. EXTERNAL AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY
4.1. Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (Quality Council)

4.1.1. Has ultimate authority for the approval of Ryerson University's IQAP and any subsequent revisions.

4.1.2. Reviews and approves proposals for all new undergraduate and graduate programs.

4.1.3. Reviews undergraduate and graduate periodic program review FARs and major modifications.

4.1.4. On an eight-year cycle audits the quality assurance process for periodic program review, new programs and major modifications and determines whether the University has acted in compliance with the provisions of its IQAP. Assesses the extent to which the University has responded to the recommendations and suggestions of the audit report.

5. INTERNAL AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY
5.1. Ryerson University Board of Governors

5.1.1. Approves new program proposals based on financial viability.

5.2. Senate

5.2.1. Exercises final internal authority for the approval of all new undergraduate and graduate programs.

5.2.2. Exercises final authority for the approval of all undergraduate and graduate periodic program reviews.

5.2.3. Exercises final authority for the approval of all major modifications to curriculum/programs for all academic programs.

5.2.4. Exercises final internal authority for the approval and review of all new and

revised academic policies.

5.3. Standing Committees and Governance Council of Senate

5.3.1. **Academic Governance and Policy Committee (AGPC):** A Standing Committee of Senate that proposes, oversees, and periodically reviews Senate policies and University procedures regarding any matter within the purview of Senate.

5.3.2. **Academic Standards Committee (ASC)[1]:** A Standing Committee of Senate that assesses and provides recommendations to Senate for approval of new undergraduate program proposals, undergraduate periodic program reviews, minor curriculum modifications (Category 3), and major curriculum modifications to undergraduate programs.

5.3.3. **Yeates School of Graduate Studies Council (YSGS Council):** A Governance Council of Senate that assesses and provides recommendations to Senate for approval of new graduate program proposals, graduate periodic program reviews, and major curriculum modifications to graduate programs.

5.3.3.1. **YSGS Programs and Planning Committee (PPC):** Assesses and makes recommendations to YSGS Council on new graduate program proposals, graduate periodic program reviews, and major curriculum modifications to graduate programs.

5.4. Provost and Vice-President Academic

5.4.1. Assumes overall responsibility for the IQAP policies and procedures, and policy reviews.

5.4.2. Authorizes new program Letters of Intent, the development of new program proposals, and authorizes the commencement, implementation and budget of new programs.

5.4.3. Following Senate approval, reports to the Board of Governors (i) new program proposals for review of their financial viability; and (ii) outcomes of periodic program reviews.

5.4.4. Should there be a disagreement between Faculty Deans or Dean of Record or between a Faculty Dean and a Department/School or Faculty Council, where appropriate, the Provost and Vice-President Academic will decide how to proceed.

5.4.5. Reports to the Quality Council, as required. This responsibility may be delegated to the Vice-Provost Academic.

---

[1] ASC assesses Chang School certificate proposals, revisions, and reviews within the parameters of Ryerson Senate Policy 76.

5.4.6. Approves any budget allocations related to academic programs.

5.4.7. Is responsible for the University's participation in the Quality Council cyclical audit process.

5.5. Deputy Provost and Vice-Provost University Planning

5.5.1. Develops program costing and evaluates societal need, differentiation, sustainable applicant pool, and outcomes of new program proposals.

5.5.2. In collaboration with the relevant offices, supports new program development, ~~and~~ implementation and monitoring.

5.5.3. Analyzes program costing for major curriculum modifications and other minor curriculum modifications, as required, to programs.

5.5.4. Provides institutional data for the development of new programs, periodic program reviews, and major modifications.

5.6. Vice-Provost Academic

5.6.1. Submits undergraduate new program Letters of Intent to the Provost and Vice-President Academic; submits full undergraduate new program proposals to the Academic Standards Committee (ASC); submits to Senate a brief of a new undergraduate program proposal along with the ASC's recommendations; and, in collaboration with relevant offices, supports new program development, ~~and~~ implementation and monitoring.

5.6.2. Maintains periodic program review schedules for undergraduate programs; communicates, advises, and monitors the periodic program review process; assesses the undergraduate periodic program review self-study and appendices for completeness prior to giving permission for a peer review team site visit; submits undergraduate periodic program reviews and subsequent follow-up reports to the ASC; submits to Senate an undergraduate periodic program review FAR and the ASC's recommendations; submits periodic program review follow-up reports to Senate, for information.

5.6.3. Advises undergraduate programs on curriculum modifications and has final authority, where necessary, to determine if a modification to an undergraduate program is considered major or minor; submits Category 3 minor curriculum modification proposals and major curriculum modification proposals to the ASC for assessment; submits to Senate Category 3 minor curriculum modifications proposals and major curriculum modification proposals and the ASC's recommendations for approval.

5.6.4. Resolves disputes between Faculty Deans or Dean of Record or between a Faculty Dean or Dean of Record and a Department/School/Faculty Council with respect to undergraduate curriculum modifications.

5.6.5. Reports, as required, to the Quality Council, in consultation with the Provost and Vice-President Academic, including an annual report on Senate-approved undergraduate and graduate major curriculum modifications and FARs of periodic program reviews.

5.6.6. Implements the Quality Council Audit process, and oversees the undergraduate requirements of the cyclical Audit.

5.6.7. Posts the Executive Summary of new undergraduate and graduate programs and the Final Assessment Report of undergraduate and graduate periodic program reviews on the Ryerson University Curriculum Quality Assurance website with links to the Senate website and the Provost and Vice-President Academic's website.

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

5.7.1. Submits new graduate program Letters of Intent to the Provost and Vice-President Academic; submits new graduate program proposals to the YSGS Council for approval to recommend to Senate; submits to Senate a brief of the new graduate program proposal and YSGS Council's recommendation for approval; and, in collaboration with relevant offices, supports new program development, ~~and~~ implementation and monitoring.

5.7.2. Maintains periodic program review schedules for graduate programs; communicates, advises, and monitors the periodic program review process; gives permission for a peer review team site visit following the YSGS Programs and Planning Committee's (PPC) assessment of the graduate periodic program review self-study and appendices for completeness, and submits graduate periodic program reviews and subsequent follow-up reports to the YSGS PPC, followed by the YSGS Council. Submits to Senate a graduate periodic program review FAR and the YSGS Council's recommendations; submits periodic program review follow-up reports to Senate, for information.

5.7.3. Advises programs on curriculum modifications; submits minor curriculum modification proposals to the Programs and Planning Committee for review; submits major curriculum modification proposals to the Programs and Planning Committee followed by the YSGS Council for approval to recommend to Senate, followed by submission to Senate.

5.7.4. Submits to Senate the YSGS Council's recommendations regarding new graduate programs, periodic program reviews for graduate programs, Category 3 minor curriculum modifications (for information), and major curriculum modifications.

5.7.5. Resolves disputes between Faculty Deans or Dean of Record or between a Faculty Dean or Dean of Record and a Department/School/Faculty Council with respect to graduate curriculum modifications.

5.7.6. Appoints Peer Review Teams for graduate programs, as appropriate, in consultation with the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record.

5.7.7. Responds to the Peer Review Team Report as well as to the Program Response and the Faculty Dean's Response to the Peer Review Team Report for new graduate degree program proposals and for periodic program reviews of graduate programs, as applicable.

5.7.8. Oversees the graduate requirements of the Quality Council cyclical audit process.

5.8. Faculty Dean or Dean of Record

5.8.1. Submits Letters of Intent for new program proposals to the Vice-Provost Academic or the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS, as appropriate.

5.8.2. Submits full new program proposals to the Vice-Provost Academic or the Vice-Provost and Dean of the YSGS, as appropriate, and, in collaboration with relevant offices, supports new program development and implementation.

5.8.3. Reviews ~~Endorses~~ an undergraduate periodic program review self-study and appendices prior to submission to ~~a Peer Review Team~~Department/School/Faculty Council(s) and endorses following Council endorsement.

5.8.4. Endorses a periodic program review self-study and appendices of graduate programs in consultation with the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS.

5.8.5. Appoints Peer Review Teams for undergraduate programs.

5.8.6. Provides consultation to the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS regarding the appointment of Peer Review Teams for graduate programs, where applicable.

5.8.7. Reviews mandated Follow-up Reports to ensure progress with the recommendations from ASC or YSGS Council. If it is believed that there has not been sufficient progress, an additional update and course of action by a specified date may be required.

5.8.8. Endorses minor modifications (Category 2 and Category 3) and major modifications to undergraduate programs.

5.8.9. Endorses minor modifications (Category 2 and Category 3) and major

modifications to graduate programs, in consultation with the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS.

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

5.8.11. Responds to reports of the periodic program review and/or new program Peer Review Team and subsequent program responses, as applicable.

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

5.9.1. Oversees the preparation of a Letter of Intent for new program proposals and submits to the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record, as appropriate;

5.9.2. Oversees preparation of a new program proposal and submits to the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record, as appropriate;

5.9.3. For periodic program reviews of undergraduate and graduate programs, oversees the preparation of the program self-study and appendices and presents the completed documents to the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record for initial review prior to presentation to Department/School/Program and Faculty Councils, where applicableas appropriate.

5.9.4. Prepares a response to the periodic program review reports of Peer Review Teams for undergraduate and graduate programs.

5.9.5. Prepares a mandated periodic program review follow-up report for submission to the Provost and Vice-President Academic, Faculty Dean or Dean of Record, and Vice-Provost Academic or Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS, as appropriate.

5.9.5.5.9.6. Administers the periodic program review implementation plan to ensure that it is effectively accomplished in a timely manner.

5.9.6.5.9.7. Prepares minor and major curriculum modifications, as required, and submits, as required, to the Department/School/Program and Faculty Council (where applicable) and to the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record.

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

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

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

5.10.3. Endorses <u>undergraduate and graduate</u> periodic program review self-studies and appendices to be forwarded to the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record.

5.10.4. For undergraduate programs, endorses Category 1 minor curriculum modifications (or designates another approval process), Category 2 and Category 3 minor curriculum modifications, and major curriculum modifications, and recommends these to the appropriate Faculty Dean of Dean of Record.

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

6. REVIEW OF IQAP POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

6.1. The Academic Governance and Policy Committee (AGPC) recommends to Senate the establishment of a Policy Review Committee, mandated by Senate, to undertake a periodic review or special review of an IQAP policy or policies.

6.2. Any revision of the University's IQAP policies requires approval by Senate, and any substantive revisions require ratification by the Quality Council.

6.3. Procedures associated with the IQAP policies are reviewed by the Provost and Vice-President Academic, as needed, to ensure their currency and effectiveness.

APPENDIX 1: DEGREE LEVEL EXPECTATIONS FOR UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS	
UNDERGRADUATE DEGREE	**Baccalaureate/Bachelor's Degree: honours** *This degree is awarded to students who have demonstrated the following:*
EXPECTATIONS	

1. Depth and Breadth of Knowledge	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:
	  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	An understanding of methods of enquiry or creative activity, or both, in their primary area of study that enables the student to: 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	a. The ability to review, present and critically evaluate qualitative and quantitative information to:
	  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
	b. The ability to use a range of established techniques to:
	  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	a. Qualities and transferable skills necessary for further study, employment, community involvement and other activities requiring:
	  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 2: DEGREE LEVEL EXPECTATIONS FOR GRADUATE PROGRAMS	
MASTER'S DEGREE	*This degree is awarded to students who have demonstrated:*
EXPECTATIONS	
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,
2. Research and Scholarship	A conceptual understanding and methodological competence that: 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,** On the basis of that competence, has shown at least one of the following: 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	a. The qualities and transferable skills necessary for employment requiring: 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	*This degree extends the skills associated with the Master's degree and is awarded to students who have demonstrated the following:*
EXPECTATIONS	
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	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	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	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.

April 1, 2019

Dr. Michael Benarroch
Provost and Vice President Academic
Ryerson University
Toronto, ON M5B 2K3

Dear Dr. Benarroch:

I am writing in follow-up to Ryerson University's revised Institutional Quality Assessment Processes (IQAP) that was submitted on November 18, 2018. We thank you and Dr. Kelly MacKay for taking the time to meet with the Secretariat on January 21, 2019 and also for subsequently completing the IQAP checklist, as per the request of the Quality Council. As promised, the Quality Council reviewed this checklist at its meeting on March 22 and has prepared for you some guidance on next steps. What follows describes each of the aspects of the revised IQAP that we ask that you please address before re-ratification.

Policy 112 – New Programs

1. The requirement for a new program to be monitored following its implementation is missing from the protocols. The IQAP therefore needs to be amended to explicitly require this step with details regarding what the monitoring process will be (as per the Quality Assurance Framework (QAF 2.4.3)).

2. Section 4.3, pp 16 – 17: The details listed as required for the external reviewers' reports for *new programs* are those that section 4.2.3 b) of the QAF lists as the requirements for the *self-study for a cyclical program review*. While the University may choose to add these to the items that external reviewers should address in their evaluation of a new program, it must also include an explicit statement that the evaluation criteria for new programs (as detailed in section 2.1 of the QAF) are addressed in the report.

Policy 126 – Cyclical Program Reviews

1. P. 9– regarding access to and integrity of data: QAF evaluation criteria 4.2.3 b) 2. and 3. would be addressed if the IQAP referenced that the source of the data is Ryerson's University Planning Office.

2. Sections 1.9.1 and 1.10.1, p. 9: The IQAP requires the self-study to include recommendations and an Implementation Plan, as well as an Executive Summary suitable for posting on the website. These sections of the IQAP are italicized, suggesting Ryerson has interpreted these to be QAF requirements. However, the QAF details the Final Assessment Report, Implementation Plan and Executive Summary requirements as being a separate stage that occurs later in the process, after the responses to the external reviewer(s) report have been finalized (QAF 4.2.5 b) 1 – 5 and 4.2.5 c) 1 - 4). The IQAP

should be amended to ensure that the QAF requirements for the Final Assessment Report, Implementation Plan and Executive Summary are undertaken at the appropriate stage and are all adequately being met.

3. Section 3.5, p. 10: Please add explicit reference to an "Implementation Plan" to this section on reviewing joint programs.

4. Section 7.1.1, p. 13: This section indicates that Peer Review Teams are required for graduate diploma programs. As this is not required by the QAF and it is assumed this is not the actual practice of Ryerson, it would be best to remove this requirement from the IQAP to ensure this does not become an issue in a future audit.

Policy 127 – Curriculum Modifications

1. Section 3.2.3, p. 2; section 1.3.1, p. 6; and section 1.3.1, p. 12: These sections include change in program name and/or degree designation as an example of a minor modification. These program changes should instead fall under the protocols for major modifications (as is evidenced by all other universities' IQAPs and in their Annual Reports on Major Modifications). The list in Appendix A to Policy 127 should also be updated accordingly.

In addition to the above, the Quality Council has identified, in Appendix 1 as attached, a list of suggestions for further improvements to Ryerson University's IQAP, for your consideration. Although the implementation of these suggestions are not as critical, the University may find it helpful to include these amendments in order to improve and clarify its quality assurance processes.

We look forward to receiving your revised IQAP in due course. Please do not hesitate to get in touch with Ian Orchard if you have any questions.

Sincerely yours,

Paul W. Gooch
Chair

cc: Kelly MacKay, Vice-Provost, Academic
        Tina West, Director, Curriculum Quality Assurance
        Ian Orchard, Senior Director Academic, Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance

SUGGESTED IMPROVEMENTS TO RYERSON UNIVERSITY'S IQAP

	RYERSON UNIVERSITY'S IQAP SECTION	NOTES FOR CONSIDERATION
Policy 112 – New Programs		
1.	Section 10.1, p. 21	It would be helpful to reiterate in this section that new programs must commence within 36 months of QC approval (as stated on page 5, Section 6)
2.	Section 2.1, p. 9	Defines constitution of a New Program Advisory Committee (for undergraduate programs only).
		This concept is not referenced again anywhere else in the IQAP. It would be helpful to either provide more detail regarding the role of the NPAC in the development and subsequent approval of a new program proposal or to remove this reference from the IQAP.
Policy 126 – Cyclical Program Reviews (CPRs)		
3.	Section 1.1.3, p. 7	"*Program addresses societal need*" is italicized, suggesting this is a QC requirement but it is actually an MTCU one.
4.	Section 3, p. 10	Protocol for Joint Programs
		It would be helpful to indicate here who is responsible for initiating a cyclical program review and that in doing so, the specific program(s) to be reviewed will be identified. Linked to this, it would be helpful if the self-study also explicitly requires a clear indication of which program(s) is/are the subject of review.
5.	Section 10.4, p. 21	States: "The FAR should include all the elements that are required within Quality Council's Quality Assurance Framework".
		It would greatly strengthen the IQAP to either explicitly list these requirements in the IQAP or add a hyperlink to the Quality Council's webpage on this section of the QAF.
6.	Policy 126	The Quality Council could not find details to cover the requirements detailed in QAF 4.2.6 d) 1. – 4 (Reporting Requirements – public access). It would be helpful to explicitly add a statement with regards to the extent of public access to the documents listed.
Policy 127 – Curriculum Modifications		
7.	Appendix A	Under the list of Examples of Major Modifications"
		For the bullet: "Significant changes to the program learning outcomes" it might be worth adding "that do not meet the threshold of new program" to complete the sentence.
Other		
8.	Policy 112 (new programs) section 4.4.1, p. 17 and	These sections of the IQAP indicate that the unit will provide all documentation associated with a new program proposal or cyclical program review. Best practice would be that the unit not have any direct

	RYERSON UNIVERSITY'S IQAP SECTION	**NOTES FOR CONSIDERATION**
	Policy 126 (CPRs) sections 7.4.1.1 and 7.4.1.2, p. 16	contact with the external reviewers, except to meet with them during the site visit. We strongly suggest that the IQAP be amended so that either the relevant Dean or Vice Provost's Office take over this responsibility.

Tina West <bwest@ryerson.ca>

QC Chair Letter: Ryerson University's Revised IQAP

Tina West <bwest@ryerson.ca>   Fri, Apr 12, 2019 at 4:03 PM
To: Hillary Barron <hbarron@cou.ca>
Cc: "MacKay, Kelly" <k7mackay@ryerson.ca>, "Dy, Cyndy" <cdy@ryerson.ca>, Shevanthi Dissanayake <shevandi@cou.ca>,
Cindy Robinson <crobinson@cou.ca>

Hello Hillary,

Thank you for the valuable feedback and recommendations to our IQAP. We have gone through our set of policies and
have incorporated these recommendations using track changes (see attached Word document that spells out where the
required changes were made). Would you kindly review and let us know whether we have appropriately interpreted and
captured your feedback in our revised documents? Please let me know if any of the changes are unclear.
We look forward to hearing back from you soon!

Thank you,
Tina

Bettina West | DBA
Director, Curriculum Quality Assurance
Office of the Vice-Provost Academic
Associate Professor, TRSM Department of Marketing

T: 416-979-5000 x 556752

[Quoted text hidden]

5 attachments

- **IQAP - pol 110_QC feedback_April_2019.docx**
  58K

- **IQAP - pol 112_QC feedback_April_2019.docx**
  81K

- **IQAP - pol 126_QC feedback_April_2019.docx**
  85K

- **IQAP - pol 127_QC feedback_April_2019.docx**
  86K

- **Response to QC list of required+recommended changes to IQAP.docx**
  14K

Policy 112 – New Programs

1. The requirement for a new program to be monitored following its implementation is missing from the protocols. The IQAP therefore needs to be amended to explicitly require this step with details regarding what the monitoring process will be (as per the Quality Assurance Framework (QAF 2.4.3)).

We have amended our policies to reflect this missing requirement, as follows:

Policy 110 – Sections 5.5.2, 5.6.1, 5.7.1 in the Policy.

Policy 112 – Sections 5.5.3, 5.6.5, 5.7.6 and Section 7 in the Policy, and Section 11 in the Procedures.

2. Section 4.3, pp 16 – 17: The details listed as required for the external reviewers' reports for *new programs* are those that section 4.2.3 b) of the QAF lists as the requirements for the *self-study for a cyclical program review*. While the University may choose to add these to the items that external reviewers should address in their evaluation of a new program, it must also include an explicit statement that the evaluation criteria for new programs (as detailed in section 2.1 of the QAF) are addressed in the report.

We have revised Policy 112, Section 4.3 accordingly.

Policy 126 – Cyclical Program Reviews

1. P. 9– regarding access to and integrity of data: QAF evaluation criteria 4.2.3 b) 2. and 3. would be addressed if the IQAP referenced that the source of the data is Ryerson's University Planning Office.

We have incorporated language identifying our University Planning Office as the source of data in Policy 126, Section 1.9.1.

2. Sections 1.9.1 and 1.10.1, p. 9: The IQAP requires the self-study to include recommendations and an Implementation Plan, as well as an Executive Summary suitable for posting on the website. These sections of the IQAP are italicized, suggesting Ryerson has interpreted these to be QAF requirements. However, the QAF details the Final Assessment Report, Implementation Plan and Executive Summary requirements as being a separate stage that occurs later in the process, after the responses to the external reviewer(s) report have been finalized (QAF 4.2.5 b) 1 – 5 and 4.2.5 c) 1 - 4). The IQAP should be amended to ensure that the QAF requirements for the Final Assessment Report, Implementation Plan and Executive Summary are undertaken at the appropriate stage and are all adequately being met.

We have removed these sections from the requirements listed in the Self-study section and moved them to Section 10 – Final Assessment Report.

3. Section 3.5, p. 10: Please add explicit reference to an "Implementation Plan" to this section on reviewing joint programs.

We have added both Implementation Plan and Executive Summary to this section.

4. Section 7.1.1, p. 13: This section indicates that Peer Review Teams are required for graduate diploma programs. As this is not required by the QAF and it is assumed this is not the actual practice of Ryerson, it would be best to remove this requirement from the IQAP to ensure this does not become an issue in a future audit.

While we continue to see value in reviewing graduate diploma programs on a cyclical basis, we agree that they need not be included in the same cyclical program review process as required by the QAF for degree programs. We have removed this language from the policy.

Policy 127 – Curriculum Modifications
1. Section 3.2.3, p. 2; section 1.3.1, p. 6; and section 1.3.1, p. 12: These sections include change in program name and/or degree designation as an example of a minor modification. These program changes should instead fall under the protocols for major modifications (as is evidenced by all other universities' IQAPs and in their Annual Reports on Major Modifications). The list in Appendix A to Policy 127 should also be updated accordingly.
We have removed this example of program change from the category 3 minor modification sections, and added it to the category of major modifications – see addition as part of Appendix A (pg.21).

In addition to the above, the Quality Council has identified, in Appendix 1 as attached, a list of suggestions for further improvements to Ryerson University's IQAP, for your consideration. Although the implementation of these suggestions are not as critical, the University may find it helpful to include these amendments in order to improve and clarify its quality assurance processes.

We have gone through each of the suggestions outlined in Appendix 1 and have updated our IQAP policies accordingly, where appropriate.

We thank the Quality Council for the thoughtful and detailed attention they have given to our IQAP, and look forward to a response.

RYERSON UNIVERSITY
POLICY OF SENATE

INSTITUTIONAL QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESS

Policy Number: 110

Previous Approval Dates: May 3, 2011; November 4, 2014

Policy Approval Date: March 6, 2018

Next Policy Review Date: May 2023 *(or sooner at the request of the Provost and Vice-President Academic or Senate)*

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

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

The University's IQAP includes the following policies:

Policy 110: Institutional Quality Assurance Process
Policy 112: Development of New Graduate and Undergraduate Programs
Policy 126: Periodic Program Review of Graduate and Undergraduate Programs
Policy 127: Curriculum Modifications: Graduate and Undergraduate Programs

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

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

3. DEFINITIONS

3.1. Dean of Record

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

3.2. Degree Level Expectations (DLEs)

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

3.3. Designated Academic Unit

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

3.4. Expedited Approvals

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

3.5. Field

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

3.6. Final Assessment Report (FAR)

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

3.7.   Graduate Program

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

3.7.1. **Degree Program**

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

3.7.2. **Diploma Program**
A graduate program that is one of three types:

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

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

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

3.8.   Joint Program

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

3.9.   Letter of Intent

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

3.10.   New Program

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

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

3.11. Undergraduate Program

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

4. EXTERNAL AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY
4.1. Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (Quality Council)

4.1.1. Has ultimate authority for the approval of Ryerson University's IQAP and any subsequent revisions.

4.1.2. Reviews and approves proposals for all new undergraduate and graduate programs.

4.1.3. Reviews undergraduate and graduate periodic program review FARs and major modifications.

4.1.4. On an eight-year cycle audits the quality assurance process for periodic program review, new programs and major modifications and determines whether the University has acted in compliance with the provisions of its IQAP. Assesses the extent to which the University has responded to the recommendations and suggestions of the audit report.

5. INTERNAL AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY
5.1. Ryerson University Board of Governors

5.1.1. Approves new program proposals based on financial viability.

5.2. Senate

5.2.1. Exercises final internal authority for the approval of all new undergraduate and graduate programs.

5.2.2. Exercises final authority for the approval of all undergraduate and graduate periodic program reviews.

5.2.3. Exercises final authority for the approval of all major modifications to curriculum/programs for all academic programs.

5.2.4. Exercises final internal authority for the approval and review of all new and

revised academic policies.

5.3. Standing Committees and Governance Council of Senate

5.3.1. **Academic Governance and Policy Committee (AGPC):** A Standing Committee of Senate that proposes, oversees, and periodically reviews Senate policies and University procedures regarding any matter within the purview of Senate.

5.3.2. **Academic Standards Committee (ASC)[1]:** A Standing Committee of Senate that assesses and provides recommendations to Senate for approval of new undergraduate program proposals, undergraduate periodic program reviews, minor curriculum modifications (Category 3), and major curriculum modifications to undergraduate programs.

5.3.3. **Yeates School of Graduate Studies Council (YSGS Council):** A Governance Council of Senate that assesses and provides recommendations to Senate for approval of new graduate program proposals, graduate periodic program reviews, and major curriculum modifications to graduate programs.

5.3.3.1. **YSGS Programs and Planning Committee (PPC):** Assesses and makes recommendations to YSGS Council on new graduate program proposals, graduate periodic program reviews, and major curriculum modifications to graduate programs.

5.4. Provost and Vice-President Academic

5.4.1. Assumes overall responsibility for the IQAP policies and procedures, and policy reviews.

5.4.2. Authorizes the development of new program proposals, and authorizes the commencement, implementation and budget of new programs.

5.4.3. Following Senate approval, reports to the Board of Governors (i) new program proposals for review of their financial viability; and (ii) outcomes of periodic program reviews.

5.4.4. Should there be a disagreement between Faculty Deans or Dean of Record or between a Faculty Dean and a Department/School or Faculty Council, where appropriate, the Provost and Vice-President Academic will decide how to proceed.

5.4.5. Reports to the Quality Council, as required. This responsibility may be delegated to the Vice-Provost Academic.

---

[1] ASC assesses Chang School certificate proposals, revisions, and reviews within the parameters of Ryerson Senate Policy 76.

5.4.6. Approves any budget allocations related to academic programs.

5.4.7. Is responsible for the University's participation in the Quality Council cyclical audit process.

5.5. Deputy Provost and Vice-Provost University Planning

5.5.1. Develops program costing and evaluates societal need, differentiation, sustainable applicant pool, and outcomes of new program proposals.

5.5.2. In collaboration with the relevant offices, supports new program development, and implementation and monitoring.

5.5.3. Analyzes program costing for major curriculum modifications and other minor curriculum modifications, as required, to programs.

5.5.4. Provides institutional data for the development of new programs, periodic program reviews, and major modifications.

5.6. Vice-Provost Academic

5.6.1. Submits undergraduate new program Letters of Intent to the Provost and Vice-President Academic; submits full undergraduate new program proposals to the Academic Standards Committee (ASC); submits to Senate a brief of a new undergraduate program proposal along with the ASC's recommendations; and, in collaboration with relevant offices, supports new program development, and implementation and monitoring.

5.6.2. Maintains periodic program review schedules for undergraduate programs; communicates, advises, and monitors the periodic program review process; assesses the undergraduate periodic program review self-study and appendices for completeness prior to giving permission for a peer review team site visit; submits undergraduate periodic program reviews and subsequent follow-up reports to the ASC; submits to Senate an undergraduate periodic program review FAR and the ASC's recommendations; submits periodic program review follow-up reports to Senate, for information.

5.6.3. Advises undergraduate programs on curriculum modifications; submits Category 3 minor curriculum modification proposals and major curriculum modification proposals to the ASC for assessment; submits to Senate Category 3 minor curriculum modifications proposals and major curriculum modification proposals and the ASC's recommendations for approval.

5.6.4. Resolves disputes between Faculty Deans or Dean of Record or between a Faculty Dean or Dean of Record and a Department/School/Faculty Council

with respect to undergraduate curriculum modifications.

5.6.5. Reports, as required, to the Quality Council, in consultation with the Provost and Vice-President Academic, including an annual report on Senate-approved undergraduate and graduate major curriculum modifications and FARs of periodic program reviews.

5.6.6. Implements the Quality Council Audit process, and oversees the undergraduate requirements of the cyclical Audit.

5.6.7. Posts the Executive Summary of new undergraduate and graduate programs and the Final Assessment Report of undergraduate and graduate periodic program reviews on the Ryerson University Curriculum Quality Assurance website with links to the Senate website and the Provost and Vice-President Academic's website.

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

5.7.1. Submits new graduate program Letters of Intent to the Provost and Vice-President Academic; submits new graduate program proposals to the YSGS Council for approval to recommend to Senate; submits to Senate a brief of the new graduate program proposal and YSGS Council's recommendation for approval; and, in collaboration with relevant offices, supports new program development, and implementation and monitoring.

5.7.2. Maintains periodic program review schedules for graduate programs; communicates, advises, and monitors the periodic program review process; gives permission for a peer review team site visit following the YSGS Programs and Planning Committee's (PPC) assessment of the graduate periodic program review self-study and appendices for completeness, and submits graduate periodic program reviews and subsequent follow-up reports to the YSGS PPC, followed by the YSGS Council. Submits to Senate a graduate periodic program review FAR and the YSGS Council's recommendations; submits periodic program review follow-up reports to Senate, for information.

5.7.3. Advises programs on curriculum modifications; submits minor curriculum modification proposals to the Programs and Planning Committee for review; submits major curriculum modification proposals to the Programs and Planning Committee followed by the YSGS Council for approval to recommend to Senate, followed by submission to Senate.

5.7.4. Submits to Senate the YSGS Council's recommendations regarding new graduate programs, periodic program reviews for graduate programs, Category 3 minor curriculum modifications (for information), and major curriculum modifications.

5.7.5. Resolves disputes between Faculty Deans or Dean of Record or between a

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

5.7.6. Appoints Peer Review Teams for graduate programs, as appropriate, in consultation with the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record.

5.7.7. Responds to the Peer Review Team Report as well as to the Program Response and the Faculty Dean's Response to the Peer Review Team Report for new graduate degree program proposals and for periodic program reviews of graduate programs, as applicable.

5.7.8. Oversees the graduate requirements of the Quality Council cyclical audit process.

5.8. Faculty Dean or Dean of Record

5.8.1. Submits Letters of Intent for new program proposals to the Vice-Provost Academic or the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS, as appropriate.

5.8.2. Submits full new program proposals to the Vice-Provost Academic or the Vice-Provost and Dean of the YSGS, as appropriate, and, in collaboration with relevant offices, supports new program development and implementation.

5.8.3. Endorses an undergraduate periodic program review self-study and appendices prior to submission to a Peer Review Team.

5.8.4. Endorses a periodic program review self-study and appendices of graduate programs in consultation with the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS.

5.8.5. Appoints Peer Review Teams for undergraduate programs.

5.8.6. Provides consultation to the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS regarding the appointment of Peer Review Teams for graduate programs, where applicable.

5.8.7. Reviews mandated Follow-up Reports to ensure progress with the recommendations from ASC or YSGS Council. If it is believed that there has not been sufficient progress, an additional update and course of action by a specified date may be required.

5.8.8. Endorses minor modifications (Category 2 and Category 3) and major modifications to undergraduate programs.

5.8.9. Endorses minor modifications (Category 2 and Category 3) and major modifications to graduate programs, in consultation with the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS.

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

5.8.11.Responds to reports of the periodic program review and/or new program Peer Review Team and subsequent program responses, as applicable.

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

5.9.1. Oversees the preparation of a Letter of Intent for new program proposals and submits to the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record, as appropriate;

5.9.2. Oversees preparation of a new program proposal and submits to the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record, as appropriate;

5.9.3. For periodic program reviews of undergraduate and graduate programs, oversees the preparation of the program self-study and appendices and presents the completed documents to the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record for initial review prior to presentation to Department/School/Program and Faculty Councils, where applicable.

5.9.4. Prepares a response to the periodic program review reports of Peer Review Teams for undergraduate and graduate programs.

5.9.5. Prepares a mandated periodic program review follow-up report for submission to the Provost and Vice-President Academic, Faculty Dean or Dean of Record, and Vice-Provost Academic or Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS, as appropriate.

5.9.6. Prepares minor and major curriculum modifications, as required, and submits to the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record.

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

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

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

5.10.3.Endorses periodic program review self-studies and appendices to be forwarded to the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record.

5.10.4.For undergraduate programs, endorses Category 1 minor curriculum modifications (or designates another approval process), Category 2 and Category 3 minor curriculum modifications, and major curriculum modifications, and recommends these to the appropriate Faculty Dean of

Dean of Record.

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

6. REVIEW OF IQAP POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

6.1. The Academic Governance and Policy Committee (AGPC) recommends to Senate the establishment of a Policy Review Committee, mandated by Senate, to undertake a periodic review or special review of an IQAP policy or policies.

6.2. Any revision of the University's IQAP policies requires approval by Senate, and any substantive revisions require ratification by the Quality Council.

6.3. Procedures associated with the IQAP policies are reviewed by the Provost and Vice-President Academic, as needed, to ensure their currency and effectiveness.

APPENDIX 1: DEGREE LEVEL EXPECTATIONS FOR UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS	
UNDERGRADUATE DEGREE	**Baccalaureate/Bachelor's Degree: honours** *This degree is awarded to students who have demonstrated the following:*
EXPECTATIONS	

1. Depth and Breadth of Knowledge	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:
	  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	An understanding of methods of enquiry or creative activity, or both, in their primary area of study that enables the student to: 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	a. The ability to review, present and critically evaluate qualitative and quantitative information to:
	   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
	b. The ability to use a range of established techniques to:
	   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	a. Qualities and transferable skills necessary for further study, employment, community involvement and other activities requiring:
	   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 2: DEGREE LEVEL EXPECTATIONS FOR GRADUATE PROGRAMS

MASTER'S DEGREE	*This degree is awarded to students who have demonstrated:*
EXPECTATIONS	
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,
2. Research and Scholarship	A conceptual understanding and methodological competence that: 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,** On the basis of that competence, has shown at least one of the following: 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	a. The qualities and transferable skills necessary for employment requiring: 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	*This degree extends the skills associated with the Master's degree and is awarded to students who have demonstrated the following:*
EXPECTATIONS	
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	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	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	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.

RYERSON UNIVERSITY
POLICY OF SENATE

DEVELOPMENT OF NEW GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

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

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

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

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

Policy 110: Institutional Quality Assurance Process
Policy 112: Development of New Graduate and Undergraduate Programs
Policy 126: Periodic Program Review of Graduate and Undergraduate Programs
Policy 127: Curriculum Modifications: Graduate and Undergraduate Programs

1. **PURPOSE**

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

2. **SCOPE**

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

3. **DEFINITIONS**

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

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

4. **EXTERNAL AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY**
   4.1. Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (Quality Council)

   4.1.1. The Quality Council requires that new undergraduate and graduate program proposals are appraised by the Quality Council's Appraisal Committee. The Quality Council has the authority to approve or decline new program proposals.

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

5. **INTERNAL AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY**
   5.1. Ryerson University Board of Governors
   Approves new program proposals based on financial viability.

   5.2. Senate

   5.2.1. Senate has final internal authority for the approval of all new undergraduate and graduate programs.

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

   5.3. Standing Committees and Governance Council of Senate

   5.3.1. **Academic Standards Committee (ASC):** A standing Committee of Senate that assesses and provides recommendations to Senate for approval of new undergraduate program proposals.

   5.3.2. **Yeates School of Graduate Studies Council (YSGS Council):** A Governance Council of Senate that assesses and provides recommendations to Senate for approval of new graduate program proposals.

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

5.4. Provost and Vice-President Academic

    5.4.1. Authorizes and oversees the posting of new program Letters of Intent to the Ryerson community.

    5.4.2. Authorizes the development of new program proposals, and authorizes the commencement, implementation and budget of new programs.

    5.4.3. Following Senate approval, reports new program proposals to the Board of Governors for review of financial viability.

    5.4.4. Submits Senate approved new program proposals to the Quality Council for approval.

5.5. Deputy Provost and Vice-Provost University Planning

    5.5.1. Develops program costing and evaluates societal need, differentiation, and sustainable applicant pool, and evaluates employability of graduates for new program proposals.

    5.5.2. In collaboration with the relevant offices, supports new program development and implementation.

    5.5.3. Provides institutional data for the development and monitoring of new programs.

5.6. Vice-Provost Academic

    5.6.1. Submits undergraduate new program Letters of Intent to the Provost and Vice-President Academic.

    5.6.2. Reviews for completeness new undergraduate program proposals, after endorsement by the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record and prior to submission of the proposal to a Peer Review Team (PRT).

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

    5.6.4. Submits to Senate undergraduate new program proposal briefs and ASC's recommendations for approval.

    5.6.5. In collaboration with the relevant offices, supports new undergraduate program development and, implementation and monitoring.

    5.6.6. Posts an Executive Summary of new undergraduate and graduate programs on the Ryerson University Curriculum Quality Assurance website with links to the Senate website and the Provost and Vice-President Academic's website.

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

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

5.7.1. Submits graduate new program Letters of Intent to the Provost and Vice-President Academic.

5.7.2. Submits new graduate program proposals to the PPC for a review for completeness, after endorsement by the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record and prior to submission of the proposal to a PRT.

5.7.3. Appoints PRTs for graduate programs in consultation with the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record.

5.7.4. Submits new graduate program proposals to the PPC and the YSGS Council.

5.7.5. Submits to Senate graduate new program proposal briefs and the YSGS Council's recommendations for approval regarding new graduate programs.

5.7.6. In collaboration with the relevant offices, supports new graduate program development, and implementation and monitoring.

5.7.7. Responds to the PRT Report, the designated academic unit's response to the PRT Report and the Faculty Dean's Response to the PRT Report for graduate programs.

5.7.8. Develops a manual that details the process and supports the preparation of new graduate program proposals.

5.8. Faculty Dean or Dean of Record[1]

5.8.1. Submits Letters of Intent for new program proposals to the Vice-Provost Academic or to the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS, as appropriate.

5.8.2. Submits new program proposals to the Vice-Provost Academic or to the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS, as appropriate.

5.8.3. In collaboration with the relevant offices, supports new program development and implementation.

5.8.4. Appoints PRTs for undergraduate programs.

5.8.5. Provides consultation to the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS regarding the

---

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

appointment of PRTs for graduate programs.

5.8.6. Responds to the PRT Report as well as to the designated academic unit's response to the PRT Report for undergraduate and graduate programs.

5.9. Designated Academic Unit

5.9.1. Oversees preparation of a Letter of Intent for new program proposals and submits to the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record, as appropriate.

5.9.2. Oversees preparation of a new program proposal and submits to the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record, as appropriate.

5.9.3. Prepares a written response to the PRT Report for undergraduate and graduate programs.

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

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

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

6. IMPLEMENTATION

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

7. MONITORING

At the end of the second academic year after a new program has commenced, a brief report from the academic unit will be filed with the Office of the Vice Provost Academic (for undergraduate programs) or the Office of the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS (for graduate programs) for submission to Senate, summarizing student registrations compared to projections; student retention; the status of issues raised in the implementation plan; and, any challenges faced by the program together with how these challenges are being addressed.

7.8. REVIEW OF IQAP POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

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

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

PROCEDURES

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

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

A Field[2] can be declared as part of a graduate new program proposal.

1. LETTER OF INTENT

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

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

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

1.1. LETTER OF INTENT CONTENT

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

Basic information

1.1.1. Name and brief description of the proposed program, the proposed degree designation(s), identification of the designated academic unit, and the program governance structure; and

1.1.2. Discussion of the overlap between, and/or integration of, the program with other existing or planned programs at Ryerson.

---

[2] Refer to Senate Policy 110 for definition

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

1.1.3. Alignment with University's plans

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

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

1.1.3.3. *Appropriateness of degree nomenclature.*

1.1.4. Societal Need

1.1.4.1. Evidence of societal need and labour market demand;

1.1.4.2. Evidence of student demand; and

1.1.4.3. Comparison of the proposed program with the most similar programs in Ontario or beyond and indicating that the proposed program differs from others in one or more significant ways. If there are significant similarities between the proposed program and existing programs, a case for duplication should be made.

1.1.5. Admission requirements

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

1.1.5.2. *Sufficient explanation of alternative requirements, if any, for admission into a graduate, second-entry or undergraduate program, such as minimum grade point average, additional languages or portfolios, along with how the program recognizes prior work or learning experience.*

1.1.6. Structure

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

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

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

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

program balance requirements outlined in Ryerson Senate Policy #2.

1.1.7. **Mode of delivery**

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

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

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

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

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

1.1.9. **Appendices**

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

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

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

    1.1.9.4. Appendix IV: An executive summary.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1.2.6. If the proposal is deemed ready for review, the Provost and Vice-President Academic will post the complete Letter of Intent and the Executive Summary on the Provost and Vice-President Academic's website for a period of one month[3].

1.2.7. Review of the Letter of Intent by any interested member of the Ryerson community. Written comments/feedback on the new program proposal may be submitted to the Provost and Vice-President Academic within the specified community-response period.

1.3. AUTHORIZATION TO PROCEED

1.3.1. The Provost and Vice-President Academic will respond to the Letter of Intent after the expiry of the one-month community response period.

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

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

2. NEW PROGRAM PROPOSAL

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

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

---

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

2.1.1. program learning outcomes;

2.1.2. proposed courses and curriculum structure;

2.1.3. equipment and other required support (where relevant);

2.1.4. likely employment patterns for graduates; and

2.1.5. any other aspects of the proposed program related to its learning outcomes, structure, societal relevance, and experiential learning opportunities.

> **Commented [BW1]:** Removed as a requirement, on advice of QC.

2.2.2.1. Full New Program Proposal

2.2.1.2.1.1. Letter of Intent

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

2.2.2.2.1.2. Program content

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

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

2.2.2.3.2.1.2.3. *Identification of any unique or creative curriculum or program innovations or components*, and experiential learning components;

2.2.2.4.2.1.2.4. *For research-focused graduate programs, clear indication of the nature and suitability of the major research* (scholarly, research and creative) *requirements for degree completion*; *and*

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

2.2.3.2.1.3. Assessment of teaching and learning

2.2.3.1.2.1.3.1. *Appropriateness of the proposed methods for the assessment of student achievement of the program learning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations;*

2.2.3.2.2.1.3.2. *Completeness of plans for documenting and demonstrating the level of performance of students, consistent with the University's statement of its Degree Level Expectations*; *and*

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

~~2.2.4~~ 2.1.4.   **Resources** (developed in consultation with the University Planning Office)

For all new program proposals

~~2.2.4.1~~ 2.1.4.1. Report by the University library on existing and proposed collections and services to support the program's learning outcomes; and

~~2.2.4.2~~ 2.1.4.2. *Evidence that there are adequate resources to sustain the quality of scholarship produced by undergraduate students as well as graduate students' scholarship, research, and* creative *activities, including information technology support, and laboratory access.*

Resources for undergraduate programs only

~~2.2.4.3~~ 2.1.4.3. *Evidence of and planning for adequate numbers and quality of:*

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

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

iii) *planned/anticipated class sizes*;

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

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

Resources for graduate programs only

~~2.2.4.4~~ 2.1.4.4. *Evidence that faculty have the recent research (scholarly, research and creative) or professional/clinical expertise needed to sustain the program, promote innovation and foster an appropriate intellectual climate;*

~~2.2.4.5~~ 2.1.4.5. *Where appropriate to the program, evidence that financial assistance for students will be sufficient to ensure adequate quality and numbers of students*; *and*

~~2.2.4.6~~ 2.1.4.6. *Evidence of how supervisory loads will be distributed, and the qualifications and appointment status of faculty who will provide instruction and supervision.*

~~2.2.5~~ 2.1.5.   **Quality and other indicators**

~~2.2.5.1~~ 2.1.5.1. *Definition and use of indicators that provide evidence of quality of the faculty (e.g., qualifications, research, innovation,* creative, *and*

> *scholarly record; appropriateness of collective faculty expertise to contribute substantively to the proposed program); and*

2.2.5.2.2.1.5.2. *Evidence of a program structure and faculty research* (scholarly, research and creative) *that will ensure the intellectual quality of the student experience.*

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

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

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

2.2.7.2.1.7.   **Appendices (in addition to Appendices I-IV, as described in Section 1.1.9 above)**

2.2.7.1.2.1.7.1. Appendix V: *Curriculum Vitae of the faculty members who will be involved in the development/delivery of the proposed program, formatted as per local norm.*

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

2.2.7.3.2.1.7.3. Appendix VII: Documentation of approvals and related communications[4].

2.2.8.2.1.8.   **Preliminary External Review for Graduate Programs**

2.2.8.1.2.1.8.1. If a graduate program so desires, it may engage an external consultant to review the written documents, normally prior to presenting the proposal to the Department/School/Program Council and Faculty Council for endorsement, where appropriate. The consultant will be selected in consultation with the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record and the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS, and may not be a member of the subsequent PRT.

3. ENDORSEMENT AND REVIEW OF NEW PROGRAM PROPOSAL

3.1. Faculty Dean or Dean of Record Endorsement

3.1.1. The Faculty Dean or Dean of Record assumes involvement with all stages of the full proposal including review of the proposal before presentation to

---

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

Department/School/Program Council(s) and Faculty Council(s), where appropriate. After the new program proposal has been endorsed by the Department/School/Program Council(s) and Faculty Council(s), where appropriate, it will be forwarded to the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record for endorsement. Inter-Faculty programs will require the endorsement of the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record of all involved Faculties.

3.2. Departmental/School/Faculty Council Endorsement

3.2.1. The full proposal for a new undergraduate or graduate program will be presented to the relevant Departmental/School/Program Council(s) and Faculty Councils, where appropriate, for review and endorsement. The appropriate Council(s) will be determined in accordance with Senate policies. Where such a Council does not exist, the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record shall establish an appropriate committee, comprising members of related Department/School/Program Councils and Faculty Councils, where appropriate.

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

3.3. Undergraduate Review for Completeness

3.3.1. Once an undergraduate new program proposal is endorsed by the participating Department/School Council(s) and the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record, the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record will submit the proposal to the Vice-Provost Academic who will conduct a preliminary review for completeness of the proposal prior to the Peer Review Team receiving the proposal.

3.4. Graduate Review for Completeness

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

4. PEER REVIEW

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

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

4.1. SELECTION OF PEER REVIEW TEAM (PRT) MEMBERS

4.1.1. All members of the PRT will be at arm's length[5] from the program under review.

4.1.2. The external and internal reviewers will be active and respected in their field, and normally associate or full professors with program management experience.

4.1.3. If graduate and undergraduate reviews are done simultaneously, the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record, and the Vice-Provost Academic and the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS must decide if a combined PRT or separate PRTs are required. Separate PRT reports are required.

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

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

4.1.4.1. One external reviewer; and

4.1.4.2. One further external reviewer, or an internal reviewer from a related discipline (or interdisciplinary group) within the university. Internal reviewers are not members of the designated academic unit under review. Internal reviewers will provide external reviewers with an institutional perspective on related policies and processes.

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

4.1.4.4. External review of new undergraduate program proposals will normally be conducted on-site, but may be conducted by desk audit, videoconference or an equivalent method if the external reviewer is satisfied that the off-site option is acceptable.

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

---

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

The PRT for graduate new program proposals will consist of:

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

4.1.5.2. One further external reviewer, or an internal reviewer from a related discipline (or interdisciplinary group) within the university. Internal reviewers are not members of the designated academic unit under review. Internal reviewers will provide external reviewers with an institutional perspective on related policies and processes.

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

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

4.2. APPOINTMENT OF PEER REVIEW TEAM (PRT) MEMBERS

4.2.1. Undergraduate

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

4.2.1.2. The designated academic unit will provide the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record with names and brief biographies of four or more faculty external to Ryerson and two or more faculty internal to Ryerson (if applicable).

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

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

4.2.2. Graduate

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

4.2.2.2. The designated academic unit will provide the Vice-Provost and Dean,

YSGS with names and brief biographies of four or more faculty external to Ryerson and two or more faculty internal to Ryerson (if applicable).

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

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

4.3. THE MANDATE OF THE PEER REVIEW TEAM (PRT)

The general mandate of the PRT is to evaluate and report in writing on the academic quality of the proposed program and the capacity of the designated academic unit to deliver it in an appropriate manner. The report of the PRT will address all of the followingevaluate the new proposed program against the following criteria:

4.3.1. the consistency and alignment of the program's learning outcomes with the institution's mission, and academic plans, clarity and appropriateness of its requirements and associated learning outcomes in addressingand degree level expectations, and appropriateness of the degree nomenclature;

4.3.2. the alignmentappropriateness of the program's admission requirements for the learning outcomes established for completion of the program, with the admission requirements and sufficient explanation of any alternative admission requirements;

4.3.3. the appropriateness of the program's structure and regulations to meet specified program learning outcomes and degree level expectations, and for graduate programs a rationale for program length to ensure program requirements can be reasonably completed within the proposed time period;

4.3.4. the effectiveness ofways in which the curriculum in reflecting addresses the current state of the discipline or area of study, and the effectivenessidentification of innovative or creative curriculum components. For graduate programs, an indication of the nature and suitability of the major research (scholarly, research and creative) requirements for degree completion, and evidence of the requirement for students to take a minimum of two-thirds of the course requirements from among graduate level courses;

4.3.5. the appropriateness of the proposed mode(s) of delivery to meet the intended program'sslearning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations;

4.3.6. the appropriateness of proposed methods used to assess, document and demonstrate student achievement of the program's defined learning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations;

4.3.7. ~~the appropriateness and effectiveness~~adequacy of the administrative unit's planned ~~of the~~ use of human, physical and financial resources and institutional commitment to supplement the resources where necessary, evidence of a sufficient number and quality of faculty, and evidence of adequate resources to sustain quality scholarship, research, and creative activities;

4.3.8. for graduate programs, evidence of faculty ~~the qualifications, appointment status and recent~~ research (scholarly, research and creative) or professional/clinical expertise ~~of faculty~~needed to sustain the program, promote innovation and foster an appropriate intellectual climate, ~~and~~ evidence of sufficient student financial assistance to ensure quality and numbers of students, and evidence of how supervisory loads will be distributed to provide qualified faculty instruction and supervision;

4.3.9. for undergraduate programs, ~~the~~ evidence of planning for adequate numbers and quality of faculty and staff to achieve the ~~learning outcomes~~ program goals ~~of the program~~, of planned/anticipated class sizes, of supervision for experiential learning opportunities (if required) and of adjunct and part-time faculty; and

4.3.10. indicators of quality including faculty, program structure and faculty research (scholarly, research and creative) that will ensure the intellectual quality of the student experience.

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

4.4.1. The PRT will be provided with a Letter of Invitation from the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record for undergraduate programs or the Vice-Provost and Dean YSGS for graduate programs, along with the PRT's mandate, information on the University, and its mission and mandate. Once confirmed, the Dean of Record for undergraduate programs or the Vice-Provost and Dean YSGS for graduate programs~~The designated academic unit~~ will provide to the PRT a site visit agenda along with the new program proposal and all documentation pertinent to its approval to this point. This communication will remind the PRT of the confidentiality of the documents presented.

4.5. THE PEER REVIEW TEAM (PRT) SITE VISIT

The PRT will be provided with:

4.5.1. Access to program administrators, staff, and faculty (including representatives from joint or collaborative Ontario institutions), administrators of related departments and librarians, and students (including representatives from joint or collaborative Ontario institutions), as appropriate.

4.5.2. Coordination of site visits to Ontario institutions offering joint programs

(excluding college collaborative programs), where appropriate, and any additional information that may be needed to support a thorough review.

4.5.3. Undergraduate

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

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

4.5.4. Graduate

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

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

4.6. PEER REVIEW TEAM (PRT) REPORT

4.6.1. Undergraduate

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

4.6.2. Graduate

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

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

5.1. DESIGNATED ACADEMIC UNIT'S RESPONSE

  5.1.1. **Undergraduate and Graduate**

    5.1.1.1. Within four weeks of receipt of the PRT Report, the designated academic unit will submit its response to the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record. The response will identify any corrections or clarifications and will indicate how the PRT recommendations are being accommodated, or if they are not to be accommodated, reasons for this.

5.2. FACULTY DEAN OR DEAN OF RECORD'S RESPONSE

  5.2.1. **Undergraduate**

    5.2.1.1. Within four weeks of receipt of the designated academic unit's response, a written response to the PRT Report must be provided by the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record. The Faculty Dean or Dean of Record will provide a response to each of the following:

      5.2.1.1.1.   the recommendations of the PRT;

      5.2.1.1.2.   the designated academic unit's response to the PRT Report; and

      5.2.1.1.3.   any changes in organization, policy or governance required to meet the recommendations.

      5.2.1.1.4.   If the new program proposal is revised following, or as a result of, the PRT's Report, the original and the revised documents must be resubmitted through the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record to the Vice-Provost Academic.

      5.2.1.1.5.   If the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record and the Vice-Provost Academic believe that this document differs substantially from the original, it must be resubmitted to the Department/School/Program Council(s) and Faculty Councils, where appropriate, for further endorsement before providing decanal endorsement.

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

  5.3.1. **Graduate**

    5.3.1.1. Within four weeks of receipt of the designated academic unit's response, a written response to the PRT Report must be provided by the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record and by the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS. The Faculty Dean or Dean of Record and the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS will each provide a response to the following:

5.3.1.1.1.　the recommendations of the PRT;

5.3.1.1.2.　the designated academic unit's response to the PRT Report;

5.3.1.1.3.　any changes in organization, policy or governance required to meet the recommendations; and

5.3.1.1.4.　the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS will also provide a response to the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record's Response.

5.3.1.2. If the new program proposal is revised following, or as a result of, the PRT's Report, the original and the revised documents must be resubmitted through the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record to the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS.

5.3.1.3. If the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record and the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS believe that this document differs substantially from the original, it must be resubmitted to the Department/School/Program Council(s) for further endorsement before providing decanal endorsement.

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

6.1. Undergraduate

6.1.1.　The designated academic unit submits to the Vice-Provost Academic the new program proposal, with any revisions, together with the PRT Report, the responses to the PRT Report by the designated academic unit and by the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record, and the associated documentation (see Section 2.2.7). The Vice-Provost Academic will submit the full new program proposal to the ASC.

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

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

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

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

6.2. Graduate

6.2.1.　The designated academic unit submits to the YSGS, for submission to the PPC, the new program proposal, with any revisions, together with the PRT

Report, the responses to the PRT Report by the Designated Academic Unit, the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record, and the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS, and the associated documentation (see Section 2.2.7). The PPC will make one the following recommendations:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

7. SENATE APPROVAL

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

8. QUALITY COUNCIL APPROVAL

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

9. PRESENTATION TO THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS

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

10. PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

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

11. MONITORING

At the end of the second academic year after a new program has commenced, a brief report from the academic unit will be filed with the Office of the Vice Provost Academic (for undergraduate programs) or the Office of the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS (for graduate programs) for submission to Senate, summarizing student registrations compared to projections; student retention; the status of issues raised in the implementation plan; and, any challenges faced by the program together with how these challenges are being addressed.

~~11.~~12. PERIODIC PROGRAM REVIEW

All new undergraduate and graduate degree programs~~, graduate degree programs, and graduate diploma programs~~ will be reviewed no more than eight years after implementation and in accordance with Ryerson University Senate Policy 126: Periodic Program Review of Graduate and Undergraduate Programs.

APPENDIX A

Choosing Arm's Length Reviewers

Best practice in quality assurance ensures that reviewers are at arm's length from the program under review. This means that reviewers/consultants are not close friends, current or recent collaborators, former supervisor, advisor or colleague.

Arm's length does not mean that the reviewer must never have met or even heard of a single member of the program. It does mean that reviewers should not be chosen who are likely, or perceived to be likely, to be predisposed, positively or negatively, about the program.

Examples of what <u>may not </u>violate the arm's length requirement:

- Appeared on a panel at a conference with a member of the program

- Served on a granting council selection panel with a member of the program

- Author of an article in a journal edited by a member of the program, or of a chapter in a book edited by a member of the program

- External examiner of a dissertation by a doctoral student in the program

- Presented a paper at a conference held at the university where the program is located

- Invited a member of the program to present a paper at a conference organized by the reviewer, or to write a chapter in a book edited by the reviewer

- Received a bachelor's degree from the university (especially if in another program)

- Co-author or research collaborator with a member of the program more than seven years ago

- Presented a guest lecture at the university

- Reviewed for publication a manuscript written by a member of the program

Examples of what <u>may</u> violate the arm's length requirement:

- A previous member of the program or department under review (including being a visiting professor)

- Received a graduate degree from the program under review

- A regular co-author and research collaborator with a member of the program, within the past seven years, and especially if that collaboration is ongoing

- Close family/friend relationship with a member of the program

- A regular or repeated external examiner of dissertations by doctoral students in the program

- The doctoral supervisor of one or more members of the program

ADDITIONAL ADVICE FOR CHOOSING EXTERNAL REVIEWERS/CONSULTANTS

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

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

RYERSON UNIVERSITY
POLICY OF SENATE

PERIODIC PROGRAM REVIEW OF GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

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

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

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

Policy 110: Institutional Quality Assurance Process

Policy 112: Development of New Graduate and Undergraduate Programs

Policy 126: Periodic Program Review of Graduate and Undergraduate Programs

Policy 127: Curriculum Modifications: Graduate and Undergraduate Programs

1. **PURPOSE**

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

2. **SCOPE**

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

3. DEFINITIONS

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

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

4. EXTERNAL AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY

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

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

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

5. INTERNAL AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY

5.1. **Senate**

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

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

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

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

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

2

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

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

5.3.1. Following Senate approval, reports the outcomes of a PPR to the Board of Governors.

5.3.2. Submits FARs, including Implementation Plans and Executive Summaries, for all undergraduate and graduate PPRs to Quality Council annually, as per Quality Council's required process.

5.3.3. Is responsible for the University's participation in the Quality Council cyclical audit process.

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

5.4.1. Provides institutional data for PPRs.

5.5. **Vice-Provost Academic**

5.5.1. Has authority for PPRs of all undergraduate degree programs.

5.5.2. Is responsible for the undergraduate PPR schedule, for informing programs in written format of their forthcoming review, and for providing an orientation to PPR.

5.5.3. Is responsible for advising and monitoring throughout the PPR process.

5.5.4. Assesses PPR self-studies and appendices for completeness and determines if there are any issues prior to submission to a Peer Review Team (PRT).

5.5.5. Forwards complete PPRs to the ASC for their review and recommendation for approval to Senate.

5.5.6. Ensures that there is a FAR, Implementation Plan, and Executive Summary for each PPR.

5.5.7. Submits an undergraduate program FAR, including recommendations from ASC, for assessment and approval by Senate.

5.5.8. Forwards mandated follow-up reports to the ASC for their information, assessment, and report to Senate, then forwards to Senate for information.

5.5.9. Develops a manual that details the process and supports the preparation of

the PPR of undergraduate degree programs.

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

5.6.1. Has authority for PPRs of all graduate programs.

5.6.2. Is responsible for the graduate PPR schedule, for informing graduate programs in written format of their forthcoming review, and for providing an orientation to PPR.

5.6.3. Is responsible for advising and monitoring throughout the PPR process.

5.6.4. Responds to the PRT Report as well as to the Program Response and the Faculty Dean's Response to the PRT Report for graduate programs.

5.6.5. Ensures that there is a FAR, Implementation Plan, and Executive Summary for each graduate PPR.

5.6.6. Submits graduate program FARs, including recommendations, to Senate for assessment and approval.

5.6.7. Forwards mandated follow-up reports to YSGSC for its information, assessment, and report to Senate, then forwards to Senate for information.

5.6.8. Develops a manual that details the process and supports the preparation of the PPR of graduate degree programs.

5.7. **Faculty Dean or Dean of Record[1] [2]**

5.7.1. Reviews the undergraduate PPR self-study and appendices prior to submission to Department/School/Program/Faculty Council(s) and endorses the self-study and appendices following Council endorsement.

5.7.2. Appoints Peer Review Teams (PRT) for undergraduate programs.

5.7.3. Provides consultation to the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS regarding the appointment of PRTs for graduate programs.

5.7.4. Responds to the PRT Report as well as to the Program Response to the PRT Report for undergraduate and graduate programs.

5.7.5. For undergraduate programs, reviews mandated follow-up reports to ensure progress with the recommendations from ASC and ensures that the implementation plan is effectively accomplished in a timely manner. If it is believed that there has not been sufficient progress, an additional update and

---

[1] The Dean of Record for interdisciplinary graduate programs that cross faculty lines is the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS (Policy 45).
[2] See Ryerson Senate Policy 110 for definition.

course of action by a specified date may be required.

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

5.8. **Chair/Director**

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

5.8.1.1. Oversees the preparation of the undergraduate program self-study and appendices within the appropriate timelines.

5.8.1.2. Actively engages faculty, staff and students in the periodic program review process.

5.8.1.3. Presents a completed PPR self-study and appendices to the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record for initial review prior to presentation to Department/School/Program and/or Faculty Councils, as appropriate.

5.8.1.4. Prepares a response to the PRT Report.

5.8.1.5. Prepares the mandated PPR follow-up report for submission to the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record, and the Vice-Provost Academic by the specified date, normally within one year of Senate approval of the program review.

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

5.8.2. **Graduate Program Director**

5.8.2.1. Oversees the preparation of the graduate program self-study and appendices within the appropriate timelines.

5.8.2.2. Actively engages Chairs/Directors, faculty, staff and students in the periodic program review process.

5.8.2.3. Presents a completed PPR self-study and appendices to the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record for graduate programs for initial review prior to presentation to Program Council.

5.8.2.4. Prepares a response to the PRT Report.

5.8.2.5. Prepares the mandated PPR follow-up report for submission to the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record, and the Vice-Provost and Dean YSGS by the specified date, normally within one year of Senate

approval of the review.

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

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

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

6. REVIEW OF IQAP POLICY AND PROCEDURES

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

POLICY 126: PERIODIC PROGRAM REVIEW FOR GRADUATE AND

UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

PROCEDURES

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

1.   THE SELF-STUDY REPORT

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

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

1.1.1. *Program requirements and learning outcomes are consistent with the University's mission and academic plan;*

1.1.2. *Program requirements and learning outcomes are clear, appropriate and align with the institution's statement of the undergraduate and/or graduate Degree Level Expectations; and*

1.1.3. *Program addresses societal need.*

1.2. **Admission requirements**

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

1.3. **Curriculum**

1.3.1. *The curriculum reflects the current state of the discipline or area of study;*

1.3.2. *Evidence of any significant innovation or creativity in the content and/or delivery of the program,* including experiential learning opportunities; and

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

1.4. **Teaching and assessment**

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

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

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

1.5. **Resources**

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

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

1.6. **Quality indicators**

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

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

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

1.7. **Quality enhancement**

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

1.8. **Additional graduate program criteria**

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

1.8.2. Quality and availability of graduate supervision; and

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

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

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

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

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

1.9. **Recommendations and Implementation Plan**

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

1.10. **Executive Summary**

1.10.1. 1.8.4. *An executive summary suitable for posting on the university website.*

1.11. 1.9. **Appendices**

1.11.1. 1.9.1. Appendix I: Data provided by Ryerson's University Planning Office, and reports supporting the self-study, as outlined in PPR Manuals

1.11.2. 1.9.2. Appendix II: *Concerns and recommendations raised in previous reviews: document and address*

1.11.3. 1.9.3. Appendix III: Faculty Curriculum Vitae

1.11.4. 1.9.4. Appendix IV: Courses Outlines

1.11.5. 1.9.5. Appendix V: Documentation of Approvals and Related Communications[3]

Detailed guidelines for the Self-Study and Appendices are in PPR Manuals, provided by

> **Commented [BW1]:** Not a requirement of the Self-Study – moved to Section 10: FAR.

---

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

the Office of the Vice-Provost Academic and the Yeates School of Graduate Studies.

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

   2.1. Where there are concurrent undergraduate and graduate PPRs, separate self-studies and appendices are required.

   2.2. External peer reviews of both undergraduate and graduate programs may be coordinated if the Department/School chooses to do so; however, separate PRT Reports are required.

3. **PROTOCOL FOR JOINT PROGRAMS**

   3.1. The self-study clearly identifies which program(s) is/are the subject of review, and explains how input was received from faculty, staff and students at each partner institution. There will be a single self-study, initiated by the Vice-Provost Academic (for undergraduate joint programs) or by the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS (for graduate joint programs), in consultation with the partner institution.

   3.2. Selection of the reviewers involves participation by each partner institution.

      3.2.1. Where applicable, selection of the internal reviewer requires joint input;

      3.2.2. The selection of the peer reviewer could include one internal to represent all partners; and

      3.2.3. The selection could give preference to an internal reviewer who is from another joint program, preferably with the same partner institution.

   3.3. The site visit involves all partner institutions and preferably at all sites.

      3.3.1. Reviewers consult faculty, staff and students at each partner institution, preferably in person.

   3.4. Feedback on the reviewers' report is solicited from participating units at each partner institution, including the Deans or Dean of Record.

   3.5. Preparation of a FAR, including Implementation Plan and Executive Summary, requires input from each partner.

      3.5.1. There is one FAR, including Implementation Plan and Executive Summary, that is subject to the appropriate governance processes at each partner institution;

      3.5.2. The FAR, including Implementation Plan and Executive Summary is posted on the university website of each partner;

3.5.3. Partner institutions agree on an appropriate monitoring process for the Implementation Plan ~~section of the FAR~~; and

3.5.4. The FAR, including Implementation Plan and Executive Summary should be submitted to the Quality Council by all partners.

4. PROTOCOL FOR INTERDISCIPLINARY AND MULTIDISCIPLINARY PROGRAMS

4.1. For multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary programs the Faculty Dean of Record will oversee the periodic program review.

4.2. The self-study clearly explains how input was received from faculty, staff and students of the program. There will be a single self-study and site visit.

5. PROTOCOL FOR ACCREDITED PROGRAMS

5.1. PPRs may be coordinated with any professional accreditation review, if feasible, and accreditation review information can be used to supplement the PPR; however, a self-study and appendices, separate from an accreditation review, are required.

5.2. In the case of accredited programs, at their discretion, the Vice-Provost Academic or the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS, as applicable, may require a separate Peer Review Team when the accrediting body's assessment does not fully cover all the areas required by the University's PPR process. The Peer Review Team Report must be a separate document from the Accreditation PRT Report.

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

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

6.1.1. Following the review of the self-study and appendices by the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record, the Department/School/Program Council and Faculty Council, as appropriate, will review and endorse the self-study and appendices. A record will be kept of the date(s) of the relevant Council meeting(s), along with any qualifications or limitations placed by the Council(s) on the endorsement.

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

6.2.1. Following endorsement by the Department/School/Program/Faculty Council(s), as appropriate, the self-study and appendices, along with any qualifications or limitations, will be sent to the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record for presentation to the Program Advisory Council (PAC) for its review and comments. A record will be kept of the date(s), minutes, and

members attending the meeting(s). A response to the comments of the PAC may be included in the Peer Review Team (PRT) Report (see Section 7.6) and/or the responses to the PRT Report (see Section 8).

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

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

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

6.4. **Vice-Provost Academic**

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

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

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

7. **PEER REVIEW**

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

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

7.1.1. PRTs are required for program reviews for undergraduate and graduate degree programs, and graduate diploma programs.

> **Commented [BW2]:** Removed on the advice of QC. Consider alternate means of reviews for PMDips.

7.1.2. All members of the PRT will be at arm's length[4] from the program under review.

7.1.3. The external and internal reviewers will be active and respected in their

---

[4] See Appendix A for information on arm's length selection of PRT members.

field, and normally associate or full professors with program management experience.

7.1.4. If graduate and undergraduate program reviews are done concurrently, the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record, and the Vice-Provost Academic and the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS must decide if combined or separate Peer Review Teams are required. Separate PRT Reports from the Peer Review Team(s) are required.

7.1.5. **Undergraduate**

The PRT for undergraduate program reviews will consist of:

7.1.5.1.   One external reviewer qualified by discipline and experience to review the program(s); and

7.1.5.2.   One further external reviewer, or an internal reviewer from a related discipline (or interdisciplinary group) within the university. Internal reviewers are not members of the program under review. Internal reviewers will provide external reviewers with an institutional perspective on related policies and processes.

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

7.1.6. **Graduate**

The PRT for graduate program reviews will consist of:

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

7.1.6.2.   One further external reviewer, or an internal reviewer from a related discipline (or interdisciplinary group) within the university. Internal reviewers are not members of the program under review. Internal reviewers will provide external reviewers with an institutional perspective on related policies and processes.

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

7.1.7. **Concurrent Reviews**

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

7.1.7.1.   Two external reviewers qualified by discipline and experience to review the programs; and

7.1.7.2.   One further external reviewer, or an internal reviewer from a related discipline (or interdisciplinary group) within the university. Internal reviewers are not members of the program under review. Internal reviewers will provide external reviewers with an institutional perspective on related policies and processes.

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

7.2.1. **Undergraduate**

7.2.1.1.   The membership of the undergraduate PRT will be determined and appointed by the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record based on written information provided by the program.

7.2.1.2.   The program will provide the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record with names and brief biographies of four or more faculty external to Ryerson and two or more faculty internal to Ryerson (if applicable).

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

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

7.2.2. **Graduate**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

7.4.1. **Undergraduate**

   7.4.1.1.   The PRT will be provided with a Letter of Invitation from the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record, the PRT's mandate, and

information on the University and its mission ~~and mandate~~. ~~The program~~Once confirmed, the Dean will provide to the PRT a site visit agenda, and ~~along with~~ the self-study with all appendices. This communication will remind the PRT of the confidentiality of the documents presented.

7.4.2. **Graduate**

7.4.2.1. The PRT will be provided with a Letter of Invitation from the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS~~. T,~~ the ~~graduate program~~PRT's ~~will provide their~~ mandate, and information on the University and its mission. Once confirmed, the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS will provide to the PRT a site visit agenda, and the self-study with all appendices. This communication will remind the PRT of the confidentiality of the documents presented.

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

7.5.1. The PRT will be provided with:

7.5.1.1. Access to program administrators, staff, and faculty (including representatives from joint or collaborative Ontario institutions), administrators of related departments and librarians, and students (including representatives from joint or collaborative Ontario institutions), as appropriate.

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

7.5.2. **Undergraduate**

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

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

7.5.3. **Graduate**

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

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

7.5.4. Concurrent

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

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

7.6. PEER REVIEW TEAM (PRT) REPORT

7.6.1. Undergraduate

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

7.6.2. Graduate

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

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

8.1. PROGRAM RESPONSE

8.1.1. Undergraduate

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

- Comments, corrections and/or clarifications of items raised in the PRT Report;

- A revised implementation plan with an explanation of how the revisions reflect the further PRT recommendations and/or respond to the weaknesses or deficiencies identified in the PRT Report; and

- An explanation of why recommendations of the PRT will not be acted upon.

8.1.2. **Graduate**

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

- Comments, corrections and/or clarifications of items raised in the PRT Report;

- A revised implementation plan with an explanation of how the revisions reflect the further PRT recommendations and/or respond to the weaknesses or deficiencies identified in the PRT Report; and

- An explanation of why recommendations of the PRT will not be acted upon.

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

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

- The recommendations proposed in the self-study report;

- Further recommendations of the PRT;

- The Program Response to the PRT Report;

- Any changes in organization, policy or governance required to meet the recommendations;

- The resources that would be provided to support the implementation of selected recommendations; and

- A proposed timeline for the implementation of any of those recommendations.

8.2.1.1.   If the self-study report or the implementation plan is revised

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

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

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

- The recommendations proposed in the self-study report;

- Further recommendations of the PRT;

- The Program Response to the PRT Report;

- The Faculty Dean's Response to the PRT Report;

- Any changes in organization, policy or governance required to meet the recommendations;

- The resources that would be provided to support the implementation of selected recommendations; and

- A proposed timeline for the implementation of any of those recommendations.

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

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

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

9.1.1. For undergraduate programs, the PPR, which includes the Self-Study Report and Appendices (Section 1), with revisions if required, the PRT Report, the

Program Response, and the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record's Response is submitted to the Vice-Provost Academic for submission to the ASC for assessment.

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

9.1.2.1.　　Senate approve the PPR, with a mandated follow-up report(s).

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

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

9.1.2.4.　　The PPR, as submitted, be rejected.

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

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

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

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

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

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

9.2.2.1.　　Senate approve the PPR, with a mandated follow-up report(s).

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

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

9.2.2.4.　　The PPR, as submitted, be rejected.

10. FINAL ASSESSMENT REPORT (FAR)

10.1. For undergraduate programs, the Office of the Vice-Provost Academic will prepare for Senate a Final Assessment Report (FAR)[5], which includes:

    10.1.1. ~~the~~ ~~PPR~~ implementation plan that identifies and prioritizes program recommendations for implementation, who will be responsible for acting on those recommendations, and timelines for acting on and monitoring the implementation of those recommendations, and

    ~~10.1.1.~~10.1.2. an executive summary suitable for posting on the university website.

10.2. For graduate programs, the Office of the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS will prepare for Senate a FAR, which includes:

    10.2.1. the ~~PPR~~ implementation plan that identifies and prioritizes program recommendations for implementation, who will be responsible for acting on those recommendations, and timelines for acting on and monitoring the implementation of those recommendations, and

    ~~10.1.2.~~10.2.2. an executive summary suitable for posting on the university website.

~~10.2.~~10.3. If there is a concurrent review of an undergraduate and a graduate program, separate FARs will be prepared for Senate.

~~10.3.~~10.4. The FAR should include all the elements that are required within Quality Council's Quality Assurance Framework.

11. SENATE APPROVAL

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

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

12. FOLLOW-UP REPORT

12.1. The PPR Report to Senate will include a date, within one year of Senate approval of the PPR, for a mandated follow-up report to be submitted to the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record and the Vice-Provost Academic or the Vice-

---

[5] See Ryerson Senate Policy 110 for a definition.

Provost and Dean, YSGS, as appropriate, on the progress of the implementation plan and any further recommendations. The PPR Report to Senate may also include a date(s) for subsequent follow-up reports.

12.2. The Chair/Director and Faculty Dean or Dean of Record, and the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS, if applicable, are responsible for requesting any additional resources identified in the PPR through the annual academic planning process. The relevant Faculty Dean or Dean of Record, or the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS, if applicable, is responsible for providing the identified resources, if feasible, and the Provost and Vice-President Academic is responsible for final approval of requests for extraordinary funding. Requests should normally be addressed, with a decision to either fund or not fund, within two budget years of the Senate approval of the PPR.

12.3. The follow-up report will include an indication of any resources that have been provided at the time of the report.

12.4. The follow-up report(s) will be reviewed by the Faculty Dean or Dean of Record and ASC or YSGS Council, as appropriate. If it is believed that there has not been sufficient progress on the implementation plan, an additional update and course of action by a specified date may be required.

12.5. The follow-up report will be forwarded to Senate as an information item following review by the ASC or YSGS Council, as appropriate.

13. DISTRIBUTION REQUIREMENTS

13.1. Under the direction of the Vice-Provost Academic and the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS, the Office of the Vice-Provost Academic shall publish the Executive Summary, the FAR, and the action of Senate for each approved PPR on Ryerson University's Curriculum Quality Assurance website with links to the Senate website and the Provost and Vice-President Academic's website, all of which are publicly-accessible.

13.2. Complete PPR documentation, respecting the provisions of FIPPA, will be made available through the Office of the Vice-Provost Academic and Office of the Vice-Provost and Dean, YSGS.

13.3. The Provost and Vice-President Academic will submit annually the FARs of all approved PPRs to the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (Quality Council), as per the required process.

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

APPENDIX I

Choosing Arm's Length Reviewers

Best practice in quality assurance ensures that reviewers are at arm's length from the program under review. This means that reviewers/consultants are not close friends, current or recent collaborators, former supervisor, advisor or colleague.

Arm's length does not mean that the reviewer must never have met or even heard of a single member of the program. It does mean that reviewers should not be chosen who are likely, or perceived to be likely, to be predisposed, positively or negatively, about the program.

Examples of what <u>may not</u> violate the arm's length requirement:

- Appeared on a panel at a conference with a member of the program

- Served on a granting council selection panel with a member of the program

- Author of an article in a journal edited by a member of the program, or of a chapter in a book edited by a member of the program

- External examiner of a dissertation by a doctoral student in the program

- Presented a paper at a conference held at the university where the program is located

- Invited a member of the program to present a paper at a conference organized by the reviewer, or to write a chapter in a book edited by the reviewer

- Received a bachelor's degree from the university (especially if in another program)

- Co-author or research collaborator with a member of the program more than seven years ago

- Presented a guest lecture at the university

- Reviewed for publication a manuscript written by a member of the program

Examples of what <u>may</u> violate the arm's length requirement:

- A previous member of the program or department under review (including being a visiting professor)

- Received a graduate degree from the program under review

- A regular co-author and research collaborator with a member of the program, within the past seven years, and especially if that collaboration is ongoing

- Close family/friend relationship with a member of the program

- A regular or repeated external examiner of dissertations by doctoral students in the program

- The doctoral supervisor of one or more members of the program

ADDITIONAL ADVICE FOR CHOOSING EXTERNAL REVIEWERS/CONSULTANTS

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

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

RYERSON UNIVERSITY
POLICY OF SENATE

CURRICULUM MODIFICATIONS: GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

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

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

Policy 110: Institutional Quality Assurance Process
Policy 112: Development of New Graduate and Undergraduate Programs
Policy 126: Periodic Program Review of Graduate and Undergraduate Programs
Policy 127: Curriculum Modifications: Graduate and Undergraduate Programs

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

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

3. DEFINITIONS

3.1. Major Modifications[1]: Substantial program changes, including the following: requirements that differ significantly from those existing at the time of the previous periodic program review; significant changes to learning outcomes; or significant changes to the faculty engaged in delivering the program and/or to the essential resources, such as where there have been changes in mode(s) of delivery. Examples of Major Modifications are provided in Appendix A of this policy. Expedited approvals[2]

---

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

by the Quality Council for Major Modifications and new or substantially modified graduate Fields within an existing program are only required at the request of the university.

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

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

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

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

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

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

4. EXTERNAL AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY

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

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

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

5. INTERNAL AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY

5.1. Senate

5.1.1. Has the final authority to approve Major Modifications to undergraduate and graduate programs.

5.1.2. Has the final authority to approve Category 3 Minor Modifications to undergraduate programs.

5.1.3. Has the final authority to approve, as a consent item, Category 2 Minor

Modifications to undergraduate programs.

5.1.4. Receives for information Category 3 Minor Modifications to graduate programs.

5.1.5. Has final internal authority for the approval of all new and revised academic policies.

5.2. Standing Committees and Governance Council of Senate

5.2.1. **Academic Standards Committee (ASC):** A Standing Committee of Senate that assesses and provides recommendations to Senate for approval of Category 3 Minor Modifications and Major Modifications to undergraduate programs; and assesses Category 2 Minor Modifications, as required, and recommends to Senate, for information.

5.2.2. **Yeates School of Graduate Studies Council (YSGS Council):** A Governance Council of Senate that assesses and makes recommendations to YSGS Council on Major Modifications and Category 3 Minor Modifications to graduate programs.

5.2.2.1. **YSGS Programs and Planning Committee (PPC):** Assesses and makes recommendations to YSGS Council on Major Modifications and Category 3 Minor Modifications to graduate programs.

5.3. Provost and Vice-President Academic

5.3.1. Has overall responsibility for this policy and its procedures and review.

5.3.2. Reports outcomes of all undergraduate and graduate Major Modifications to Quality Council on an annual basis.

5.4. Deputy Provost and Vice-Provost University Planning

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

5.5. Vice-Provost Academic

5.5.1. Has final authority, where necessary, to determine if a modification to an undergraduate program is considered major or minor.

5.5.2. Advises undergraduate programs on curriculum modifications.

5.5.3. Has the authority to submit Category 2 Minor Modifications for undergraduate programs to the Academic Standards Committee (ASC) for assessment and recommendation to Senate.

5.5.4. Submits Category 3 Minor Modifications and Major Modification proposals for undergraduate programs to the Academic Standards Committee (ASC) for assessment and recommendation to Senate.

5.5.5. Submits to Senate the ASC's recommendations regarding Category 2 Minor Modifications, Category 3 Minor Modifications and Major Modifications.

5.5.6. Submits, on an annual basis, Senate-approved undergraduate and graduate Major Modifications to the Provost and Vice-President Academic for a report to the Quality Council.

5.5.7. Resolves disputes between Faculty Deans/Dean of Record or between a Faculty Dean/Dean of Record and a Department/School/Program or Faculty Council with respect to curriculum modifications, as required.

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

5.6.1. Has final authority, where necessary, to determine if a modification to a graduate program is considered major or minor.

5.6.2. Advises graduate programs on curriculum modifications.

5.6.3. Approves Category 2 Minor Modifications.

5.6.4. Submits Category 3 Minor Modifications and Major Modification proposals to the YSGS Council, for assessment and recommendation to Senate.

5.6.5. Submits to Senate, for information, the YSGS Council's recommendations regarding Category 3 Minor Modifications.

5.6.6. Submits to Senate the YSGS Council's recommendations regarding Major Modifications.

5.6.7. Resolves disputes between Faculty Deans/Dean of Record or between a Faculty Dean/Dean of Record and a Department/School/Program or Faculty Council with respect to curriculum modifications, as required.

5.7. Faculty Dean or Dean of Record

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

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

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

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

5.8.1. Oversees preparation of Minor and Major Modifications.

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

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

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

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

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

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

6. REVIEW OF POLICY AND PROCEDURES

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

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

POLICY 127: CURRICULUM MODIFICATIONS FOR GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

PROCEDURES: UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

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

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

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

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

1. MINOR MODIFICATIONS

1.1. CATEGORY 1   MINOR MODIFICATIONS

1.1.1. **Description**: Category 1 Minor Modifications include:
- revisions to course description, title, and requisites; and
- minor changes to course hours that entail an overall change of two hours or less for a single-semester course, or four hours or less for a two-semester course.

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

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

1.2. CATEGORY 2   MINOR MODIFICATIONS

1.2.1. **Description:** Category 2 Minor Modifications include:
- routine changes to curriculum including course repositioning, additions,

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

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

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

1.2.3. **Required Endorsements and Approvals:**
- Department/School/Program/Faculty Council(s) of the Program Department(s)/Schools(s), for endorsement;
- Faculty Dean of Program Department(s)/School(s), for endorsement;
- Department/School/Program/Faculty Council(s) of Teaching Department/School, where applicable, for endorsement;
- Faculty Dean of Teaching Department/School, where applicable, for endorsement; and
- Senate, for approval as a consent agenda item.

1.3. CATEGORY 3 MINOR MODIFICATIONS[3]

1.3.1. **Description:** Category 3 Minor Modifications include:
- change in program admission requirements;
- program-specific variations on grading, graduation, and/or Academic Standing;
- small changes to the total number of courses needed for graduation in a program (less than 5%);

---

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

- new Minors and substantial changes to existing Minors;
- new Concentrations and substantial changes to existing Concentrations;
- new Optional Specialization or substantial changes to existing Optional Specialization;
- changes to existing Co-op curriculum and/or schedule (note that introducing or deleting a Co-op is a Major Modification); and
- deletion of a **required** course or courses in a program's curriculum provided by another Teaching Department/School, only in cases where the Teaching Department/School Council and/or the Faculty Dean of the Teaching Department/School disputes the course deletion; and.
- changes to program name and/or degree designation, including Honours designation.

1.3.2. **Consultations:** Consultations should start as early in the process as possible. Consultations will continue, as needed, throughout the proposal development.
- Vice-Provost Academic
- Registrar or Assistant Registrar, Curriculum Management
- Registrar and Director, Admissions
- Undergraduate Calendar Publications Editor
- University Planning Office, if additional resources (e.g., faculty, space, and/or technology) may be needed as a result of the implementation of the proposed course and/or curriculum change
- Library, if course/program changes have implications for Library resources
- Department/Schools affected by the proposed changes and their Faculty Deans
- Chang School Program Director, School Council, and Faculty Dean, if Chang School courses or certificates are affected

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

1.3.4. **REQUIRED PROPOSAL:** Consideration must be given to the effect of the change on students in each year of the program, including Majors, Double Majors, Concentrations, Co-op, Direct Entry, advanced standing and out-of-phase students. The proposal should contain the following information, as appropriate:
- the existing and the proposed curriculum modification, showing the revisions
- the rationale for the curriculum modification, including information on comparator programs (where relevant)
- changes to pre-requisites, if relevant
- program learning outcomes
- the effect of the proposed change on the program learning outcomes,

enrolment targets, retention, and academic standing
- the implementation date and implementation plan, and provisions for retroactivity

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

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

2. MAJOR MODIFICATIONS

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

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

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

2.2. **Consultations**
Consultations with the following individuals and/or groups should start as early in the process as possible and continue, as needed, throughout the proposal development:
- Vice-Provost Academic
- Curriculum Development Consultant
- Registrar, Assistant Registrar, Curriculum Management
- Director, Admissions
- Undergraduate Calendar Publications Editor
- University Planning Office, if additional resources (e.g., faculty, space, and/or technology) may be needed as a result of the implementation of the proposed course and/or curriculum change
- Department/Schools affected by the proposed changes and their Faculty Deans
- Chang School Program Director, School Council, and Faculty Dean, if Chang

School courses or certificates are affected

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

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

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

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

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

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

2.4.1 PROPOSAL (mandatory)
Include all the following in the proposal:
1. a summary of the proposed changes and the rationale in light of your stated

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

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

a) consistency of the curriculum modification with the institution's mission and academic plans;
b) appropriateness of degree nomenclature;
c) appropriateness of the program's admission requirements for the learning outcomes established for completion of the program;
d) sufficient explanation of alternative requirements, if any, for admission into a second-entry or undergraduate program, such as minimum grade point average, additional languages or portfolios, along with how the program recognizes prior work or learning experience;
e) ways in which the curriculum modification addresses the current state of the discipline or area of study;
f) identification of any unique curriculum or program innovations or creative components;
g) appropriateness of the proposed mode(s) of delivery to meet the intended program learning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations;

h) appropriateness of the proposed methods for the assessment of student achievement of the intended program learning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations;
i) completeness of plans for documenting and demonstrating the level of performance of students, consistent with the institution's statement of its Degree Level Expectations;
j) adequacy of the administrative unit's planned utilization of existing human, physical and financial resources, and any institutional commitment to supplement those resources, to support the curriculum modification;
k) participation of a sufficient number and quality of faculty who are competent to teach and/or supervise in the program when the curriculum modification is implemented;
l) evidence that there are adequate resources to sustain the quality of scholarship produced by undergraduate students including library support, information technology support, and laboratory access;
m) evidence that faculty have the recent research or professional/clinical expertise needed to sustain the program, promote innovation and foster an appropriate intellectual climate;
n) where appropriate to the program, evidence that financial assistance for students will be sufficient to ensure adequate quality and numbers of students;
o) evidence of how supervisory loads will be distributed, and the qualifications and appointment status of faculty who will provide instruction and supervision, if appropriate;
p) evidence of and planning for adequate numbers and quality of: (a) faculty and staff to achieve the goals of the program; or (b) of plans and the commitment to provide the necessary resources in step with the implementation of the program; (c) planned/anticipated class sizes; (d) provision of supervision of experiential learning opportunities (if required); and (e) the role of adjunct and part-time faculty;
q) definition and use of indicators that provide evidence of quality of the faculty (e.g., qualifications, research, innovation and scholarly record; appropriateness of collective faculty expertise to contribute substantively to the proposed curriculum modification); and
r) evidence of a program structure and faculty research that will ensure the intellectual quality of the student experience.
a) ~~consistency of the curriculum modification with the institution's mission and academic plans;~~
b) ~~ways in which the curriculum modification addresses the current state of the discipline or area of study;~~
c) ~~identification of any unique curriculum or program innovations or creative components;~~
d) ~~for research-focused graduate programs, clear indication of the nature and suitability of the major research requirements for degree completion, if applicable;~~
e) ~~appropriateness of the proposed mode(s) of delivery to meet the intended program learning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations;~~
f) ~~appropriateness of the proposed methods for the assessment of student achievement of the intended program learning outcomes and Degree Level~~

~~Expectations;~~

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

h) ~~adequacy of the administrative unit's planned utilization of existing human, physical and financial resources, and any institutional commitment to supplement those resources, to support the curriculum modification;~~

i) ~~participation of a sufficient number and quality of faculty who are competent to teach and/or supervise in the program when the curriculum modification is implemented;~~

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

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

POLICY 127: CURRICULUM MODIFICATIONS FOR GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

PROCEDURES: GRADUATE PROGRAMS

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

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

Submission Deadline: February 1

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

1. MINOR MODIFICATIONS

1.1. CATEGORY 1 MINOR MODIFICATIONS

1.1.1. Description: Category 1 Minor Modifications typically include:
- revisions to course description, title, and requisites;
- minor changes to course hours with a cumulative change of two hours or less for a one credit course or four hours or less for a multi-credit course.

1.1.2. Required Approvals
- Graduate Program Council, for approval.

1.1.3. Required Forms
- Graduate course Change form – Active Courses (GCC-A)
- Graduate Course Change Summary form (GCCS)
  - Summarizes all course changes for the upcoming academic year
  - Every course listed in a GCCS form must have a corresponding GCC form

1.2. CATEGORY 2   MINOR MODIFICATIONS

1.2.1. Description: Category 2 Minor Modifications include:
- routine changes to curriculum including course repositioning, additions, deletions;
- significant changes in course hours with a cumulative change of three hours or more for a one-credit course or five hours or more for a multi-credit course;
- a change to the mode of delivery of a course; and

- course weight variations.

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

1.2.3. Forms

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

1.2.3.2. Graduate Approvals and Consultations form (GAC) **–** All of the following which apply must be indicated on the form. If additional space is needed for approvals, additional forms may be used.
- Subject Librarian: regarding library resource needs/changes.
- Additional resources needed (i.e. faculty, space, technology) as a result of the implementation of the proposed course and/or curriculum changes. If additional resources are needed, the form will be forwarded to the University Planning Office for review.
- Deleting an elective course in another program's curriculum: there must be consultation with that program.

1.2.3.3. Graduate Course Change Summary form (GCCS)
- Summarizes all course changes for the upcoming academic year
- Every course listed in a GCCS form must have a corresponding GCC-A or -N form

1.3. CATEGORY 3 MINOR MODIFICATIONS

1.3.1. Description: Category 3 Minor Modifications include:
- change in program admission requirements;
- program-specific variations on grading, promotion, graduation, and/or academic standing; and
- minor changes to existing Fields.; and
- changes to program name and/or degree designation with applicable implementation date.

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

1.3.3. Forms and Documents

1.3.3.1. Proposal
- Changes in admission, promotion, grading, graduation, or academic standing policy:
  - Include copies of both the existing and the proposed policy, identifying the changes, and the rationale for them.

- - Minor changes to existing Fields:
    - o Include a list of current Fields (if applicable) with an outline of requirements.
  - ~~Changes to program name and/or degree designation:~~
    - o ~~Include an explanation of why the current designation is inappropriate and why the proposed designation is preferable; designations used by comparator programs; comparison to the admissions requirements and curriculum of programs using the proposed designation; confirmation of recognition of the proposed designation by industry and/or relevant professions; where relevant, views of alumni and current program students.~~
  - Provisions for retroactivity.

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

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

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

    1.3.3.4.   Graduate Approvals and Consultations form (GAC) – All of the following which apply must be indicated on the form. If additional space is needed for approvals, additional forms may be used.
  - Subject Librarian: regarding library resource needs/changes.
  - Additional resources needed (i.e. faculty, space, technology) as a result of the implementation of the proposed course and/or curriculum changes. If additional resources are needed, the form will be forwarded to the University Planning Office for review.
  - Deleting an elective course in another program's curriculum: there must be consultation with that program.

    1.3.3.5.   Graduate Course Change Summary form (GCCS)
  - Summarizes all course changes for the term submitted.
  - Every course listed in a GCCS form must have a corresponding GCC-A or -N form.

2. MAJOR MODIFICATIONS

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

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

Vice-Provost Academic for further clarification.

2.2. Required Endorsements and Approvals

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

2.3. Documentation

All Major Modifications require preparation of a proposal as per Section 2.43.1 below. The University, at its discretion, may request that the Quality Council review a Major Modification proposal, which normally falls under the Expedited Approval process and, thus, would require completion of a Supplemental Proposal (Section 2.43.2).

The process for Major Modifications undergoing Expedited Approval consists of the preparation of the proposal as outlined in Sections 2.43.1 and 2.43.2. The Expedited Approval process does not require an External Peer Review (see Policy 112 Section 4.0).

2.3.1. PROPOSAL (mandatory)

Include all of the following in the proposal:

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

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.

2.3.2. SUPPLEMENTAL PROPOSAL

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

a) consistency of the curriculum modification with the institution's mission and academic plans;
b) appropriateness of degree nomenclature;
c) appropriateness of the program's admission requirements for the learning outcomes established for completion of the program;
d) sufficient explanation of alternative requirements, if any, for admission into a graduate or second-entry program, such as minimum grade point average, additional languages or portfolios, along with how the program recognizes prior work or learning experience;
e) for graduate programs, a clear rationale for program length that ensures that the program requirements can be reasonably completed within the proposed time period;
f) ways in which the curriculum modification addresses the current state of the discipline or area of study;
g) identification of any unique curriculum or program innovations or creative components;
h) for research-focused graduate programs, clear indication of the nature and suitability of the major research requirements for degree completion, if applicable;
i) evidence that each graduate student in the program is required to take a minimum of two-thirds of the course requirements from among graduate level courses;
j) appropriateness of the proposed mode(s) of delivery to meet the intended program learning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations;
k) appropriateness of the proposed methods for the assessment of student achievement of the intended program learning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations;
l) completeness of plans for documenting and demonstrating the level of performance of students, consistent with the institution's statement of its Degree Level Expectations;
m) adequacy of the administrative unit's planned utilization of existing human, physical and financial resources, and any institutional commitment to supplement those resources, to support the curriculum modification;
n) participation of a sufficient number and quality of faculty who are competent to teach and/or supervise in the program when the curriculum modification is implemented;

o) evidence that there are adequate resources to sustain the quality of scholarship produced by graduate students' scholarship and research activities, including library support, information technology support, and laboratory access;
p) evidence that faculty have the recent research or professional/clinical expertise needed to sustain the program, promote innovation and foster an appropriate intellectual climate;
q) where appropriate to the program, evidence that financial assistance for students will be sufficient to ensure adequate quality and numbers of students;
r) evidence of how supervisory loads will be distributed, and the qualifications and appointment status of faculty who will provide instruction and supervision, if appropriate;
s) evidence of and planning for adequate numbers and quality of: (a) faculty and staff to achieve the goals of the program; or (b) of plans and the commitment to provide the necessary resources in step with the implementation of the program; (c) planned/anticipated class sizes; (d) provision of supervision of experiential learning opportunities (if required); and (e) the role of adjunct and part-time faculty;
t) definition and use of indicators that provide evidence of quality of the faculty (e.g., qualifications, research, innovation and scholarly record; appropriateness of collective faculty expertise to contribute substantively to the proposed curriculum modification); and
u) evidence of a program structure and faculty research that will ensure the intellectual quality of the student experience.

> a) consistency of the curriculum modification with the institution's mission and academic plans;
> b) ways in which the curriculum modification addresses the current state of the discipline or area of study;
> c) identification of any unique curriculum or program innovations or creative components;
> d) for research-focused graduate programs, clear indication of the nature and suitability of the major research requirements for degree completion, if applicable;
> e) appropriateness of the proposed mode(s) of delivery to meet the intended program learning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations;
> f) appropriateness of the proposed methods for the assessment of student achievement of the intended program learning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations;
> g) completeness of plans for documenting and demonstrating the level of performance of students, consistent with the institution's statement of its Degree Level Expectations;
> h) adequacy of the administrative unit's planned utilization of existing human, physical and financial resources, and any institutional commitment to supplement those resources, to support the curriculum modification;
> i) participation of a sufficient number and quality of faculty who are competent to teach and/or supervise in the program when the curriculum modification is implemented;

~~j) evidence that there are adequate resources to sustain the quality of scholarship produced by graduate students' scholarship and research activities, including library support, information technology support, and laboratory access;~~

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

APPENDIX A

Major Modifications - Undergraduate and Graduate

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

a) Requirements for the program that differ significantly from those existing at the time of the previous cyclical program review;

b) Significant changes to the learning outcomes;

c) Significant changes to the faculty engaged in delivering the program and to the essential physical resources as may occur, for example, where there have been changes to the existing modes of delivery.

Examples of Major Modifications:

- Significant change in the laboratory time of a program
- The introduction or deletion of a research paper, thesis or capstone project
- The introduction or deletion of work experience, co-op, internship, or practicum, or portfolio
- Considerable changes to courses comprising a significant proportion of the program
- Significant change in the total number of courses required for graduation in a program
- Change to the name of the School or Department
- Change in program name and/or degree designation
- The creation of a double major based on existing degree programs
- Significant changes to the program learning outcomes that do not meet the threshold of 'new program'[4]
- Changes to program content, other than those listed above, that affect the learning outcomes, but do not meet the threshold for a 'new program'
- The introduction, deletion, or change to a full- or part-time program option
- The merger of two or more programs
- Significant changes to the faculty engaged in delivering the program and to the essential resources such as when there have been changes to the existing modes of delivery (for example, a new institutional collaboration or a move to online, blended or hybrid learning).
- Considerable curriculum changes due to changes to the faculty delivering the program: for example a large proportion of the faculty retires; or the expertise of new hires changes the focus of research and teaching interests
- Changes to the essential resources, where these changes impair the delivery of the approved program
- New bridging options for college diploma graduates
- The establishment of an existing degree program at another institution or location
- The offering of an existing program substantially online where it had previously been offered in face-to- face mode, or vice versa
- The creation, deletion or re-naming of a field in a graduate program
- Any change to the requirements for graduate program candidacy examinations, field studies or residence requirements

---

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

Ryerson University
SENATE POLICY 60: ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

INFORMATION REGARDING PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO POLICY AND PROCEDURES

Policy 60 was implemented on September 1, 2015. Its review date is 2018.

As per the Senate Policy Framework, a Policy Review Committee (PRC) was established, the members of which are listed below:

- Donna Bell, Secretary of Senate
- Tara Burke, Faculty, Dept of Psychology
- Nenita Elphick, Program Director, Chang School
- John Paul Foxe, Director, Academic Integrity Office (Co-Chair)
- Suzanne Hicks, Administrative Assistant, Academic Integrity Office
- Miljana Horvat, Associate Dean Graduate Programs, FEAS
- Kelly MacKay, Vice Provost Academic (Co-Chair)
- Andrew McWilliams, Faculty, Dept of Chemistry and Biology
- Richard Meldrum, Faculty, School of Occupational and Public Health
- Simran Rattan, Student representative
- Andrea Ridgley, Academic Integrity Specialist, Academic Integrity Office
- Akshit Sharma, Student representative
- Lesley Zannella, Graduate student representative

The PRC held community consultations to hear feedback from the Ryerson community on Policy 60 and its Procedures. Feedback was collected in a number of ways:

- Four town halls were held for students, faculty and staff (two for each)
- An email address was set up to receive feedback from community members
- Members of the PRC held numerous meetings with stakeholders including the Registrar's Office, the Yeates School of Graduate Studies (YSGS), Human Rights Services and with each of the Deans
- A broad range of stakeholders were invited to provide feedback on drafts of Policy 60 and its Procedures

The view of the PRC is that the current Policy 60 is generally working well and no identified need for substantive changes were present at the time the review commenced. However, the Policy and Procedures are not aligned with the Senate Policy Framework and, therefore, this is an excellent opportunity to reformulate the documents and make any amendments that are required.

The aim is to make these documents:
Easy to Read; Easy to Understand; Easy to Use;
and to conform with the Senate Policy Framework. The Framework provides the following definitions:

Policy:
A formal statement or principle or a plan that reflects the University's values, goals, expectations or desired results related to an area under the purview of Senate.

Procedures:
The appropriate and necessary steps required to comply with the policy.

NOTE: Policy determines WHAT is to be achieved; procedures determine HOW it is to be achieved.

Guidelines:
General statements, recommendations, administrative instructions, best practices or interpretation of policy or procedures to assist users in carrying out the mandatory processes stipulated in a policy's procedures.

The following changes are included in the DRAFT revisions to Policy 60:

1. Contents of policy and procedures reformatted to align with Senate Policy Framework.

2. The values from the current Policy 60 remain; in addition reference to the values in the Senate Policy Framework is made.

3. Duplication of information in policy and procedures removed. Additional information that is not required in policy or procedures removed (see definitions above) – and will be in Academic Integrity Guidelines/Departmental Manual – the information to be shared with relevant parties as needed/required in order not to overwhelm readers of the policy/procedures with (important) information that is not the WHAT or HOW and at a time not relevant to them. Example: the order of proceedings in a hearing should be made available to persons going to a hearing; details regarding dropping a course is needed when a person facing a suspicion of misconduct wants to drop. This information can be more appropriately be provided on AIO website, in Q&As, in Information Sheets, etc.

4. Definition section added to Policy. All existing definitions grouped under this. Several new definitions added for clarity e.g. Discussion – previously referred to Facilitated Discussion or Non-Facilitated Discussion – now both covered under Discussion and the two categories of Discussion are FD and NFD.

5. Academic Misconduct: two categories added to the definition: Self-Plagiarism and Contract Cheating.

6. Definition of Academic Misconduct appears in the Definition section, with the categories of misconduct that are *included* in the definition named but the details of the categories appear in Appendix A. This is to facilitate the reading of the policy and indicates that the categories are not exhaustive.

7.   Definition of Eligible Investigator amended to specifically include the persons who can investigate *Submission of Falsified Documents in the Admissions Process* (see Procedures 13.1). Also new Procedures 9.8: "A support person (for the **respondent**) …" This previously referred to "*responding faculty person*" but this does not cover the persons investigating *Falsified Documents in the Admission Process* – thus amended to include these staff members.

8.   Similar or related information has been grouped in one place wherever possible, e.g. Procedures 9 - *Representation, Support, and Witnesses.* All relevant information regarding who can be at a discussion or hearing with the student or respondent can be found in one place (instead of under Discussion, AIC hearings, SAC hearing, penalty hearings, etc., where some information was repeated – but not all – and therefore possibilities for misinterpretation existed). All information regarding the role that these persons can play in the discussion or hearing can also be found in one place – Procedures 9).

9.   There are at present some issues with the process regarding *Submission of Falsified Documents in the Admissions Process* in several places in the policy and procedures. The reason is that this is not a process that often has to be dealt with and the process has not been clearly articulated. When falsified documents in the admission process are discovered the student is advised that the offer of admission is revoked… and the matter usually ends there. Therefore, there has generally not been a need to use other provisions of Policy 60. However, it is essential that this be rectified, as the university does not want to discover the shortfalls when a student takes the University on judicial review. Many processes for appeals to RAC and GAAC simply refer to the procedures for AIC. However, this is not always accurate in the present policy/procedures and there is no provision regarding who sends out notices and decisions; who schedules the appeals; whether higher/lower penalties can be assigned; etc. The amendment of "Eligible Investigator" is an example of a shortfall being corrected in the proposed amendments.
     Discussions with the Registrar's office and YSGS have taken place and the following process is included in this Draft: Where there is falsification in the admission process – the offer of admission is revoked. If it has been determined that the student has begun classes, then the provisions of Policy 60 and its accompanying Procedures will apply. The AIO will administer appeals to RAC and GAAC.

10. Example of a discrepancy in current procedures relating to *Falsified Documents in the Admission Process*: Under Section 5.5.8 – *Other Consequences* - (in current policy) states: "In cases where official documents or pertinent information is discovered after the student has been admitted to Ryerson, that were omitted by the student in the application/admission process, the student will normally be withdrawn from their program and the university on the grounds of academic misconduct regardless of their current level of study (see Procedures)." However, "withdrawn" has a very specific meaning in the policy and this is not the terminology in current (and proposed) Procedures, where the offer of admission is revoked. Therefore, this provision amended in new Policy 60 Section 7.1.8.

"Once classes have begun, for academic misconduct relating to the admissions process, the minimum consequence is a DN on the academic record, but an initial decision maker can <u>revoke</u> the student's offer of admission, and/or recommend additional penalties as outlined in Policy 60, Section 7.2."

11. The DDM pilot program is formalized – "If the faculty member is a member of CUPE 1 or CUPE 2 and does not wish or is unable to pursue the matter, they may request that another decision maker be appointed. A Designated Decision Maker (DDM) will then be assigned." (Policy 60, Section 6.1.5 OPTION B)

12. Additional provision added – where a faculty member is <u>not</u> CUPE 1 or CUPE 2 but circumstances require that a DDM is assigned: "In appropriate circumstances, where the faculty member is not a CUPE 1 or CUPE 2 member, the Chair of DDMC (or designate) together with the Director of AIO (or designate) may determine that a DDM will be assigned (e.g. see Policy 60, Section 20)." (Policy 60, Section 6.1.5 OPTION B)

13. Provision made to provide students in advance of the discussion with evidence available to the AIO or decision maker. "Any evidence available to the AIO that can be transmitted electronically to the student, in advance of the discussion, shall also be sent to the student, by the AIO (if appropriate). In the case of an NFD, any evidence available to the decision maker that can be transmitted electronically to the student, in advance of the discussion, shall be provided (if appropriate) to the student (by the decision maker). Evidence may be presented to the student at the discussion. However, every effort will be made to provide as much information as possible in advance of the discussion." (Policy 60, Section 6.2.5)

14. The process for dealing with allegations of prejudice, discrimination, or harassment during the academic integrity process has caused great uncertainly (Section 20). Discussions (especially with HRS) have taken place regarding this provision and it is agreed that the two processes (Policy 60 and HRS) cannot run as parallel processes. The Policy (Section 20) now provides:

If there are concerns or allegations of prejudice, discrimination, or harassment related to a suspicion that a student has engaged in academic misconduct, the student must consult with Human Rights Services (HRS).

A student may share a concern or allegation of prejudice before, during, or after a discussion (FD/NFD). Normally, such concerns or allegations of prejudice, discrimination, or harassment will be dealt with before a discussion occurs and no decision regarding misconduct will be made until the processes under HRS are completed. A student may also make a claim of prejudice, discrimination, or harassment during the appeal process.

In cases where a finding of discrimination is made, the initial decision maker will be an appointed DDM and not the person against whom the student has registered a concern or allegation regarding prejudice, discrimination, or

harassment. In cases where there is no finding of discrimination, the person against whom the concern or allegation of prejudice, discrimination, or harassment was made, can request a DDM be appointed (as per Policy 60, Section 6.15).

15.   All deadlines for appeals made consistent.

16.   Role of Policy 60 Faculty Advisor extended - now provides faculty with "advice, support, and guidance on issues related to academic integrity and the preparation of *materials for discussion and* hearings under this policy." (Policy 60, Section 5.4)

17.   The term "normally" removed where possible for clarity and certainty.

18.   Progressive Discipline (Section 9) consequence added: "Although the DN is not a penalty, a consequence of a DN is that a student cannot be on a Dean's List or be nominated for other internal awards or scholarships in the academic year that the misconduct occurred."

19.   Appeals to SAC can only occur if one of the four (4) categories specified is satisfied (see Section 15.1) At present the SAC determines whether the requirement is met and, if so, SAC will to hear the matter. New Panel – Senate Appeals Review Panel – and Procedures (11.7.2) proposed.

20.   Information on the Academic Integrity Resources available to students has been moved from procedures to policy. It is important that this information be immediately available to students who find themselves in a position that they need advice on Academic Misconduct processes.

21.   Under Resources: "The AIO is neutral with respect to all cases and is neither an advocate for students or faculty nor a decision maker in the process of deciding whether misconduct occurred." In the current policy the following statement is made: "The sole exception is found in Policy 60, Section 5.4.2, where the AIO Director (or designate) participates in the decision regarding whether a penalty hearing or a warning is warranted after two Disciplinary Notations (DNs) have been placed on an undergraduate's student record. The AIO plays no further role in deciding the outcome of a given case, or the nature of any penalty." This "exception" diminishes the appearance of neutrality of the AIO and is not an exception in accordance with the definition of "decision maker" (new introduction):
   "The person (eligible investigator) or panel authorized to make a decision regarding whether academic misconduct has taken place or not."

   Section 5.1 therefore now states: "The Director of Academic Integrity participates in procedural determinations in certain circumstances (see Procedures 2.4.4)." This refers to the *three (3) situations* (not just one) where the DDMC and Director of AIO have to make decisions about the procedures to be followed:
   - a second DN with respect to calling a penalty hearing regarding Progressive Discipline;

- further information of a serious nature becoming available after a finding of no academic misconduct which requires a determination of whether a re-opening of proceedings is warranted;
- assigning a DDM as decision maker where the eligible investigator (who is not a CUPE 1 or CUPE 2 member) does not wish or is unable to pursue the suspicion of academic misconduct or in other appropriate circumstances (see Policy 60, Section 20).

22. Section 5.4.5. in the existing Policy provides: "With respect to graduate students, a second finding of academic misconduct in course work, <u>or a single finding of academic misconduct in supervised graduate research</u>, shall automatically require a penalty hearing regarding DW or, if recommended, Expulsion." The underlined portion removed in new Procedures 7.4 – resulting in graduate misconduct in course work and research-related work both being subject to automatic penalty hearing after two findings of misconduct.

23. New – see Policy 60, Section 7. – PENALTIES. Section 7.1.3. provides: "The minimum penalty for misconduct with respect to non-course program requirements work by a graduate student is a "D-UNS."

24. In current Policy 60, a DN remains on a graduate student's internal record <u>after graduation</u>. In light of the new range of penalties for graduate students, it is proposed that the DN be removed from the internal record upon graduation (as it currently is for undergraduate and Chang School students).

25. Section 7.2.1.3 provides: "Graduate students cannot be assigned a DS." (This exists in current Policy also). There is a large gap between a DN and DW that can be assigned to a graduate student. Two new penalties are being introduced

    Disciplinary Action (DA)
    An academic standing for a graduate student to indicate academic misconduct. A DA will be placed on both the student's academic record and transcript and cannot be removed.

    Disciplinary Action, with Suspension (DA-S)
    An academic standing where a graduate student is removed from a program for a period of up to two (2) years, after which the student may request to re-enroll in the program. A DA-S will be placed on both the student's academic record and transcript and cannot be removed.

26. It is not always clear which term a DS commences. Clarification is now offered in Procedures 8.1.4. "The DS will normally begin in the term following the one in which the misconduct that led to the DS recommendation occurred. For students in undergraduate full-time programs, this will normally be a fall or winter term or terms, as the spring/summer is not normally considered an academic term for undergraduate full-time students."

(May 29, 2019)

POLICY - DRAFT (May 29, 2019)

RYERSON UNIVERSITY
POLICY OF SENATE

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

Policy Number:	60
Policy Approval Date:	**xxxx**
Next Policy Review Date:	**yyyy**
Responsible Office:	Provost and Vice President Academic
Contact Office:	Academic Integrity Office

_____

1.   PURPOSE OF POLICY

1.1.   The purpose of this policy is to guide the Ryerson University (the
"University") community in understanding: i) what academic integrity and
misconduct are for students; ii) the processes the University will follow
when there is a suspicion of student academic misconduct; and iii) the
academic penalties and other consequences that may be imposed if
students are suspected of engaging or found to have engaged in academic
misconduct.

2.   APPLICATION AND SCOPE

2.1.   This policy applies to all current and former University students
(undergraduate, graduate, and continuing education) and applies to all
academic activities, whether on or off campuses, whether within or outside
of a course.

2.2.   Suspicions of research misconduct that may have occurred under the
auspices of the University but are in no way directed towards academic
advantage or benefit, are to be addressed under Policy 118: Scholarly,
Research and Creative Activity (SRC) Integrity rather than this policy.

2.3. In some programs, students may be required to abide by the standards of a professional code of ethics or code of conduct as a condition of successful completion of a practicum or field placement. Where such professional codes substantively differ from or impose requirements at variance with this policy, violations of such codes are not to be pursued under this policy.

3. DEFINITIONS

3.1. **Academic Misconduct**
Any behaviour that undermines the university's ability to evaluate fairly students' academic achievements, or any behaviour that a student knew, or reasonably ought to have known, could gain them or others unearned academic advantage or benefit, counts as academic misconduct.

Included in academic misconduct are: Plagiarism, including self-plagiarism; contract cheating; cheating; misrepresentation of personal identity or performance; submission of false information; contributing to academic misconduct; damaging, tampering, or interfering with the scholarly environment; unauthorized use of intellectual property; misconduct in re-graded/re-submitted work. While this list characterizes the most common instances of academic misconduct, it is not intended to be exhaustive. A more comprehensive list of inclusions can be found in Appendix A.

3.2. **Balance of Probabilities**
For a finding of misconduct to be supported, based on the information presented, it is more likely than not that the student engaged in academic misconduct. The onus is on the University to establish that misconduct has occurred.

3.3. **Decision Maker**
The person (eligible investigator) or panel authorized to make a decision regarding whether academic misconduct has taken place or not, and/or the appropriateness of the associated penalty.

3.4. **Deferred (DEF)**
An interim grade assigned during the investigation of academic misconduct. The DEF grade will be replaced by an official course grade upon resolution of the matter.

3.5. **Designated Decision Maker (DDM)**
A trained faculty member who can be assigned to act as the decision maker with respect to suspicions of academic misconduct. The DDMs make up the Designated Decision Makers' Council, of which there is a Chair, who assigns cases to individual DDMs.

3.6. **Disciplinary Action (DA)**
An academic standing for a graduate student to indicate academic misconduct. A DA will be placed on both the student's academic record and transcript and cannot be removed.

3.7. **Disciplinary Action, with Suspension (DA-S)**
An academic standing for a graduate student where they are removed from a program for a period of up to two (2) years, after which the student may request to re-enroll in the program. A DA-S will be placed on both the student's academic record and transcript and cannot be removed.

3.8. **Disciplinary Notation (DN)**
A notation placed on a student's academic record when they have been found to have engaged in academic misconduct. The DN is removed from the academic record upon graduation.

3.9. **Disciplinary Suspension (DS)**
An academic standing where a student is removed from a program for a specified period of one (1) term to two (2) years, after which the student will be automatically reinstated. A DS will be placed on both the academic record and transcript, but will be removed from the transcript upon graduation.

3.10. **Disciplinary-Unsatisfactory (D-UNS)**
A progress designation for a graduate student that is granted for unsatisfactory progress for reasons of academic misconduct related to non-course based graduate program requirements.

3.11. **Disciplinary Withdrawal (DW)**
An academic standing where a student is permanently withdrawn from a specific program and fully withdrawn from the University as a whole for a period of at least two (2) years. After serving the specified period, a student assigned a DW may apply to other programs/certificates at the University. A DW will be placed on both the student's academic record and transcript and cannot be removed.

3.12. **Discussion**
A meeting between a decision maker and student(s) suspected of academic misconduct. The meeting can be facilitated (FD) or non-facilitated (NFD).

3.13. **Eligible Investigator**
A person authorized to investigate suspicions of academic misconduct, and can be any one of the following:

- Ryerson employees holding an academic position at the University, which includes Designated Decision Makers (DDMs, see below)
- course instructors employed by the University
- the Registrar (or designate)

- the Vice-Provost and Dean, Yeates School of Graduate Studies (YSGS) (or designate)

3.14. **Expulsion**
An academic standing involving permanent removal of a student from the University.

3.15. **Failure in a Pass-Fail Course (FLD)**
Failure to meet the minimum acceptable standards for a course graded on a pass/fail basis. Failures in such courses will not be included in calculating the grade point average but will be counted as a failed course to determine academic standing for approved department/school standing variations and for graduation.

3.16. **Natural Justice**
This is composed of four (4) principles: the right to know the case against you; the right to an impartial and unbiased decision maker; the opportunity to be heard; the right to a decision and the rationale for that decision.

3.17. **Penalty – Assigned**
A penalty that does not have to be approved by a higher-level decision maker (e.g. AIC or SAC).

3.18. **Penalty – Recommended**
A penalty that has been recommended by a decision maker that must be assigned by a higher-level decision maker.

3.19. **Progressive Discipline**
Increases the penalties/consequences assigned with repeated violations.

3.20. **Respondent**
Is the person who replies to the appeal or penalty hearing.

3.21. **Support Person**
An individual who attends a discussion or hearing solely for the purpose of support; they play no official role in any aspect of the academic integrity process.

4. PRINCIPLES

4.1. **Senate Policy Framework**
The values stipulated in the University's Senate Policy Framework are applicable and fundamental to this policy.

4.2. **Fundamental Values of Academic Integrity**

This policy is premised on the commitment of the University to foster and uphold the highest standards of *academic integrity,* the fundamental values of which are *honesty, trust, fairness, respect, responsibility, courage[1].* These values are central to the development and sharing of knowledge. All members of the University community, including faculty, students, graduate assistants (GAs), and staff, have a responsibility to adhere to and uphold them in their teaching, learning, evaluation, research, and creative activity. This includes a responsibility to take action if they have reasonable grounds for thinking that academic misconduct has occurred.

4.3. **Educational Emphasis**
One of the central values motivating this policy is that of education. The University recognizes it has a role in fostering academic integrity by providing students and faculty with information and learning opportunities about the nature and importance of academic integrity. Those involved in applying this policy are to keep this emphasis in mind at all stages of the processes described in this policy and the accompanying Procedures.

4.4. **Fair Process**
The University recognizes that it is a serious matter for students to be involved in an academic misconduct investigation and is therefore committed to handling these matters in a respectful, timely, and thoughtful manner. The University will apply the policy in a non-adversarial, investigative manner that is consistent with the principles of natural justice, including the right to know the case against you; to be heard and the right to a timely and fair decision based on the merits of each individual case. Within the decision-making processes associated with the implementation of this policy, as well as any related procedures, all decision makers will make reasonable efforts to acquire all the information needed to make a fair decision and will do so in an unbiased manner.

4.5. **Awareness of Academic Integrity**
All members of the University community have a responsibility to inform themselves about academic integrity and misconduct, including the contents of this policy. Anyone with concerns or questions about academic integrity should consult with the Academic Integrity Office (AIO) or, in the case of students unsure about a particular matter, the appropriate instructor or academic supervisor. The AIO provides educational material and information about this policy for the use of faculty, staff, and students.

4.6. **Academic Integrity and Graduate Education**
In graduate education it is essential that an environment exist where faculty and students have the utmost regard for academic integrity. Graduate students often engage in research with a large degree of

---

[1] *International Centre for Academic Integrity (2013)*

independence. Therefore, they are expected to and must pursue their academic and research activities in a manner that is consistent with the highest standards of ethical and scholarly practice.

4.7. **Accommodation**
All processes and procedures associated with this policy are to be carried out in accord with relevant law and University policy concerning the accommodation of students (see Policy 159: Academic Accommodation of Students with Disabilities).

5. UNIVERSITY RESOURCES

5.1. The mandate of the Academic Integrity Office (AIO) is to ensure that this policy and the accompanying Procedures are carried out in a fair and transparent way, and to provide educational resources to the Ryerson community regarding academic integrity and misconduct. The AIO provides guidance and support to students and decision makers and ensures that both parties are aware of their rights and responsibilities. The AIO is neutral with respect to all cases and is neither an advocate for students or faculty nor a decision maker in the process of deciding whether misconduct occurred. The Director of the Academic Integrity Office participates in procedural determinations in certain circumstances (see Procedures 2.4.4).

5.2. Members of the Ryerson community may consult with the AIO regarding any academic misconduct procedure or concern.

5.3. The Office of the Ombudsperson (which is confidential, impartial, and independent) may also be consulted at any time.

5.4. Faculty involved with suspicions of student academic misconduct may consult the Policy 60 Faculty Advisor (appointed by the Vice-Provost Academic), whose role is to provide advice, support, and guidance on issues related to academic integrity and the preparation of materials for discussions and hearings under this policy.

5.5. Students involved at any stage of the formal processes regarding academic misconduct may consult, as appropriate, with an advocate from either the Ryerson Students' Union (RSU) for undergraduate or graduate students or the Continuing Education Students' Association at Ryerson (CESAR).

6. SUSPICIONS OF ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

6.1. Preliminary Investigation

6.1.1. The formal processes to investigate suspicions of academic misconduct may be initiated by any eligible investigator. All others, including but not limited to, students, graduate assistants (GAs), other staff, associate members of the Yeates School of Graduate Studies (YSGS), and external examiners, who become aware of possible misconduct should report the basis for their concern to an appropriate eligible investigator.

6.1.2. An eligible investigator conducts a preliminary inquiry. The purpose is to see whether there is a sufficient basis to support a reasonable belief that misconduct may have occurred.

6.1.3. This preliminary inquiry is conducted prior to contacting the student and will be completed in such a fashion that the student's identity is kept confidential.

6.1.4. If the eligible investigator is not a faculty member (e.g. the Registrar), and they conclude that there is a sufficient basis to support a reasonable belief that misconduct may have occurred, they will continue as the decision maker.

6.1.5. If the eligible investigator is a faculty member and they conclude that there is a sufficient basis to support a reasonable belief that misconduct may have occurred, they have two (2) options:

OPTION A: The faculty member may continue with the matter as the decision maker; or

OPTION B: If the faculty member is a member of CUPE 1 or CUPE 2 and does not wish or is unable to pursue the matter, they may request that a Designated Decision Maker (DDM) be assigned. In appropriate circumstances, where the faculty member is not a CUPE 1 or CUPE 2 member, the Chair of DDMC (or designate) together with the Director of AIO (or designate) may determine that a DDM will be assigned (e.g. see Policy 60, Section 20).

6.2. Discussion (FD/NFD)

6.2.1. If the eligible investigator has formed a reasonable belief that misconduct has occurred; a discussion between a decision maker and the student will be arranged via the Academic Integrity Office (AIO).

6.2.2. The purpose of a discussion is to allow the decision maker to present to the student(s) the basis for their suspicion; for the

student(s) to offer their perspective, to answer questions, and articulate their perspective on the facts; and for there to be a fair and transparent discussion. Discussions are to be carried out in a spirit of inquiry, and to be neither accusatory nor adversarial.

6.2.3. The decision maker can elect to hold a Facilitated Discussion (FD) or a Non-Facilitated Discussion (NFD).

6.2.4. An FD *will* be held:
- if the student prefers an FD to an NFD; the student has a right to an FD
- in cases of suspected misconduct in supervised research/non-course program requirements
- in cases involving graduate students
- where decision makers opt to have a group discussion where multiple students are under a related suspicion

6.2.5. Students must be notified of a suspicion of academic misconduct in a confidential and timely manner. The notification of a suspicion to the student must include a detailed summary of the basis for the suspicion to enable the student to prepare for the discussion; it is insufficient simply to specify the category of misconduct. Any evidence available to the AIO that can be transmitted electronically to the student, in advance of the discussion, shall also be sent to the student, by the AIO (if appropriate). In the case of an NFD, any evidence available to the decision maker that can be transmitted electronically to the student, in advance of the discussion, shall be provided (if appropriate) to the student (by the decision maker). Evidence may be presented to the student at the discussion; however, every effort will be made to provide as much information as possible in advance of the discussion.

6.2.6. In an FD, the facilitator will ensure that the discussion is respectful, investigative, non-adversarial, and educational (where possible), and that both parties are given an opportunity to voice their perspective.

6.2.7. Students may not drop a course in which there is a suspicion of academic misconduct.

6.2.8. Suspicions of misconduct relating to supervised research/non-course program requirements require special procedures to be followed–see Procedures 1.5. Suspicions of misconduct relating to falsified documents in the Admissions process, discussion, or hearing require special procedures to be followed – see Procedures 13.

6.2.9. No findings related to the suspected misconduct shall be made or communicated prior to, or during a discussion.

6.2.10. The decision maker is not to notify the student of the outcome or discuss the matter with the student while the student awaits the formal decision.

6.2.11. If a student fails to attend a discussion and fails to notify the AIO or decision maker (in the case of an NFD) in a timely way to re-schedule, the decision maker may proceed without the student's input. If the decision maker fails to attend the discussion and fails to notify the AIO in a timely way, the matter shall be dismissed and "no finding of misconduct" registered via the AIO.

6.3. **After the Discussion (F/D or NFD)**

6.3.1. After the discussion, the decision maker will decide, based on the information available and applying a "balance of probabilities" standard of proof, whether academic misconduct has occurred.

6.3.2. Whether or not there is a finding of academic misconduct, a decision maker may assign educational requirements such as educational workshops and/or online quizzes.

6.3.3. If it is found that misconduct has occurred, the decision maker will determine an appropriate penalty or consequence as per the Penalty Guidelines maintained by the AIO.

6.3.4. If it is found that misconduct has not occurred, no further proceedings related to the suspicion as set out in the notice to the student may be initiated. Any work in question will be assessed/re-assessed/re-graded in accordance with the processes outlined in Policy 162: Grade Reassessment and Grade Recalculation. Notwithstanding the above, in exceptional cases further information that becomes known may be so serious as to require review.

6.3.5. The student will receive, via the AIO, a discussion decision letter outlining:
- whether or not there has been a finding of misconduct
- the reason(s) for the decision
- information regarding any penalties, consequences, or educational requirements assigned, as well as appeals procedures

7. PENALTIES

7.1. **Penalties that may be Assigned by an Initial Decision Maker, Academic Integrity Council (AIC), or Senate Appeals Committee (SAC)**

7.1.1. The minimum penalty for undergraduate or continuing education students is a grade reduction on any academic work, ranging in severity up to and including a grade of "zero" (0) on the work.

7.1.2. The minimum penalty for misconduct with respect to work submitted in a course by a graduate student is a grade of "zero" (0) on the work.

7.1.3.   The minimum penalty for misconduct with respect to non-course program requirements by a graduate student is a grade of "D-UNS."

7.1.4.   Where the component of academic work is worth 10% or less of the final course grade, an additional penalty (i.e. in addition to a grade of "zero" (0) on the work) may be assigned. The additional penalty cannot exceed 10% of the final course grade. Students must be given prior notice that such a penalty will be assigned (e.g. on the course outline, on the assignment handout, etc.).

7.1.5.   A grade of "F" or "FLD" in the course may be assigned.

7.1.6.   Temporary or permanent removal from a co-op program option, placement, internship, or practicum in which the student is currently enrolled may be assigned.

7.1.7.   For academic misconduct outside of a course, the minimum consequence is a DN on the academic record, but an initial decision maker may *recommend* additional penalties as outlined in Policy 60, Section 7.2.

7.1.8.   Once classes have begun, for academic misconduct relating to the admissions process, the minimum consequence is a DN on the academic record, but an initial decision maker can revoke the student's offer of admission, and/or recommend additional penalties as outlined in Policy 60, Section 7.2.

NOTE: The determination regarding whether academic misconduct occurred in a course or outside a course is dependent on whether there is a graded component or not.

7.2.   **Penalties that may be Recommended by the Initial Decision Maker, Recommended or Assigned by the AIC, Registrar's Appeals Committee (RAC), Graduate Admissions Appeals Committee (GAAC), or Assigned by the SAC**

7.2.1.   **Disciplinary Suspension (DS)**

7.2.1.1.   While an initial decision maker may recommend a DS, it may only be assigned by the AIC, RAC, or SAC.

7.2.1.2.   The length of the suspension, between one (1) term and two (2) years, and when the suspension will commence, is *recommended* by the initial decision maker, or Program Director, or Chair/Director and assigned by the AIC, RAC, or SAC.

7.2.1.3.   Graduate students cannot be assigned a DS.

7.2.2.   **Disciplinary Action (DA), Disciplinary Action, with Suspension (DA-S)**

7.2.2.1. While an initial decision maker may recommend a DA, or a DA-S for a graduate student. It may only be assigned by the AIC, GAAC, or SAC.

7.2.2.2. For a DA-S the length of removal from a program can be up to two (2) years. When the removal will commence is recommended by the initial decision maker or Graduate Program Director and assigned by the AIC, GAAC, or SAC.

7.2.2.3. Undergraduate students cannot be assigned a DA or a DA-S.

7.2.3. **Disciplinary Withdrawal (DW)**

7.2.3.1. While a DW may be recommended by an initial decision maker, the AIC, RAC, or GAAC, it may only be assigned by the SAC.

7.2.3.2. An initial decision maker, Program Director (or designate), AIC, RAC, or GAAC may recommend that the length of the DW be longer than two (2) years; however, the SAC will make a final decision as to how long the withdrawal period will be.

7.2.4. **Expulsion**

7.2.4.1. Expulsion may be recommended by the initial decision maker or by the AIC, RAC, or GAAC.

7.2.4.2. Expulsion can only be assigned by the SAC.

7.2.4.3. An Expulsion is effective immediately upon the Senate Appeals Committee decision.

7.2.5. **Revocation of a Degree, Diploma, or Certificate**

7.2.5.1. Revocation of a Degree, Diploma, or Certificate may be recommended by the initial decision maker, the Program Director, Chair/Director, the relevant Dean (or designate), the AIC, RAC, or GAAC, but only assigned by the SAC.

8. **OTHER CONSEQUENCES**

A consequence of a student being found to have engaged in academic misconduct is the placing of a DN on the student's academic record. Whether or not there is a finding of academic misconduct, a decision maker may assign educational requirements, such as educational workshops and/or online quizzes.

There may be other consequences as a result of a suspicion or finding of misconduct. See Procedures 6.

9. PROGRESSIVE DISCIPLINE

9.1. Students found to have engaged in academic misconduct will have a Disciplinary Notation (DN) placed on their academic record. This is used to track findings of academic misconduct. Although the DN is not a penalty, a consequence of a DN is that a student cannot be on a Dean's List or be nominated for other internal awards or scholarships in the academic year that the misconduct occurred.

9.2. The principle of Progressive Discipline increases the penalties/consequences assigned with repeated violations. Therefore, when a student is found to have engaged in academic misconduct their academic record will be reviewed by Student Records to check whether any other DN exists. If there is a prior DN, they will notify the AIO and a penalty hearing may be convened to consider additional penalties (see Procedures 7).

9.3. Once a decision to convene a penalty hearing is made, the AIO will notify the student of the hearing, including the type and length of the penalty recommended.

10. REPRESENTATION, SUPPORT, AND WITNESSES AT DISCUSSIONS AND HEARINGS

10.1. **At discussions:**
- Students may be accompanied by an advocate from the RSU or CESAR, but not by legal counsel; students are expected to be present and speak for themselves especially with respect to matters of fact
- Students may also be accompanied by a support person
- Students and decision makers may bring witnesses

10.2. **At AIC hearings:**
- Students may be accompanied by an advocate from the RSU or CESAR, but not by legal counsel; students are expected to be present and speak for themselves especially with respect to matters of fact
- Students and respondents may be accompanied by a support person
- Students and respondents may bring witnesses

10.3. **At RAC/GAAC hearings:**
- Students may be accompanied by an advocate from the RSU, but not by legal counsel; students are expected to be present and speak for themselves especially with respect to matters of fact
- Students and respondents may be accompanied by a support person
- Students and respondents may bring witnesses

10.4. **At SAC hearings:**
- Students may be accompanied by an advocate from the RSU or CESAR, or legal counsel (i.e. a lawyer); students are expected to be present and speak for themselves especially with respect to matters of fact
- The respondent may be represented by legal counsel (i.e. a lawyer)
- Students and respondents may be accompanied by a support person
- Students and respondents may bring witnesses

11. APPEALS AND PENALTY HEARINGS

11.1. The Academic Integrity Council (AIC), the Registrar's Appeals Committee (RAC), Graduate Admissions Appeals Committee (GAAC), and Senate Appeals Committee (SAC) are responsible for appeals and penalty hearings regarding academic misconduct arising under this policy.

11.2. With the exception of appeals relating to the submission of falsified documents, students must appeal first to the AIC and may only appeal further to the SAC on the grounds provided in Policy 60, Section 15.1.

11.3. Appeals related to the submission of falsified documents in the admissions process (see Procedures 13) are made to RAC (for undergraduate) or to GAAC (for graduate students).

12. APPEALS COMMITTEES

12.1. A member of the Academic Integrity Office or Secretary of Senate (or designate) will be present at hearings for the purpose of providing advice on procedural issues and/or responding to questions concerning students' academic records.

12.1.1. **Academic Integrity Council (AIC)**
The AIO shall establish an Academic Integrity Council, comprised of faculty and student representatives from each of the Faculties.

The AIC will conduct appeal and penalty hearings subsequent to an initial finding of misconduct. AIC panels shall consist of two (2) faculty members and one (1) student.

12.1.2. **Registrar's Appeals Committee (RAC)**
The Registrar shall establish an Appeals Committee comprised of a minimum of three (3) members of the Registrar's Office for appeals outside of a course that are deemed to be the responsibility of the Registrar's Office. The Registrar will be a permanent member of this committee and will appoint a designate and/or other members to panels as needed based on the issue.

12.1.3. **Graduate Admissions Appeals Committee (GAAC)**
The Vice-Provost and Dean YSGS shall establish an Appeals Committee comprised of a minimum of three (3) members of the Graduate Admissions Office for appeals outside of a course that are deemed to be the responsibility of the Graduate Admissions Office. The Vice-Provost and Dean YSGS will be a permanent member of this committee and will appoint a designate and/or other members to panels as needed based on the issue.

12.1.4. **Senate Appeals Committee (SAC)**
The Senate Appeals Committee is established by the Senate By-Law. It shall consider appeals of the decisions of the AIC or other hearings as specified within this policy (e.g. see Procedures 13.1). See the specific grounds for appeals from AIC, RAC, or GAAC to SAC in Policy 60, Section 15.1. SAC panels shall consist of two (2) faculty members and one (1) student.

13. APPEALS – GENERAL REGULATIONS

13.1. Appeals are initiated by students.

13.2. Students have ten (10) business days from the date of issue of the discussion decision letter to submit an appeal to the AIC/RAC/GAAC.

13.3. In specified circumstances (see Policy 60, Section 15.1) a further appeal may be made to the SAC. Students have ten (10) business days from the date of issue of the appeal decision letter to submit an appeal to the SAC.

13.4. Students have ten (10) business days from the date of issue of the letter of Revocation of Offer of Admission or Revocation of Degree, Diploma, or Certificate as a result of falsification of documents in the admissions

process (see Procedures 13.1) to submit an appeal to RAC (for undergraduate) or GAAC (for graduate students).

13.5. If an appeal is not filed by the deadline, the decision will stand.

13.6. Appeal hearings are not open to the public due to privacy and confidentiality issues.

13.7. Appeal hearings are not to be audio or video recorded. No minutes are taken. The decision letter is the only official record of the hearing.

13.8. An AIC, RAC, GAAC, or SAC panel may confirm, increase, or decrease the penalty assigned by the initial decision maker, or the penalty recommended to it.

13.9. Students may remain in class and may enroll in courses while their case is under appeal. A student will not, however, be able to register in a course where a pre-requisite is the course that is under appeal.

14. APPEALS TO THE AIC, RAC, or GAAC

14.1. A student found to have engaged in academic misconduct may appeal the finding of misconduct and, in some cases, the penalty assigned.

14.2. A student assigned the *minimum penalty* on an assignment, test, or exam, or assigned a course grade reduction (as allowed in Policy 60, Section 7.1.4), *may* appeal *the finding of misconduct but not the penalty* to the AIC. The "minimum penalty" is a grade reduction on a specific piece of work, including a grade of "zero" (see Policy 60, Section 7.1).

14.3. The DN that is placed on the student's record after a finding of misconduct may not be appealed, nor may an appeal panel order its removal.

14.4. If the assigned penalty is a grade of "F" or "FLD" in the course, or if there is a recommendation for a penalty of DS, DA, DA-S, DW, Expulsion, or Revocation, a student may appeal the penalty alone (which means they accept the finding), or may appeal the penalty in conjunction with the finding. When both penalty and finding are appealed, they will be heard together.

14.5. The possible outcomes of an appeal to the AIC, RAC, or GAAC are:

14.5.1. grant or deny the appeal, in whole or in part
14.5.2. confirm or alter (increase or decrease) an earlier penalty

14.5.3. uphold or overturn a recommendation for a DS, DA, DA-S, DW, Expulsion, or Revocation

14.6. If an appeal is granted (i.e. a finding of misconduct is overturned), the penalty and the DN will be removed, and any related work shall be assessed/re-assessed/re-graded as appropriate (see Policy 162: Grade Reassessment and Grade Recalculation). Consequences (see Procedures 6) may still be applicable.

15. APPEALS TO THE SAC

15.1. A student may appeal a decision made by the AIC, RAC, or GAAC to the SAC. The right to this second level of appeal is limited and the onus is on the student to make a case for why the appeal should be heard based on one or more of the following four (4) grounds:

15.1.1. New Evidence: there is new evidence submitted with the Senate package that was not presented at the AIC, RAC, or GAAC hearing and which has a reasonable possibility of affecting the decision. The appeal should state what the evidence is and briefly give reasons as to how and/or why it might affect the finding;

15.1.2. Substantial Procedural Error: when it is believed there has been a substantial error in how Policy 60: Academic Integrity was applied, which could have affected the decision reached by the AIC, RAC, or GAAC. The appeal should state what the procedural error was and give reasons regarding how and/or why it may have affected the finding and/or reasons why its correction would reasonably be expected to do so;

15.1.3. Evidence Not Previously Considered: evidence submitted as part of the AIC, RAC, or GAAC package or was stated verbally at the AIC, RAC, or GAAC hearing that was not considered by the panel. The appeal should identify the evidence not considered, provide the rationale for why it is believed this evidence was not considered, and give reasons why consideration of it would be reasonably likely to affect the finding and/or alter the penalty assigned;

15.1.4. Higher Penalty: if a higher penalty has been assigned by the AIC, RAC, or GAAC than that recommended or assigned by the initial decision maker.

15.2. If, in receiving the appeal, the Senate Office believes that the grounds have not been met (as per Policy 60, Section 15.1) to warrant an appeal submission, a Senate Appeals Review Panel (SARP) will be convened. The SARP, comprised of two faculty members and a student from SAC, plus the Secretary of Senate (or designate), and the Director of AIO (or designate), both acting as a resource persons, will determine whether the

student has satisfied the onus stipulated in Policy 60, Section 15.1. The decision of the SARP is final. The Secretary of Senate will inform the student whether an appeal to SAC will proceed or not.

15.3. The possible outcomes of an appeal to the SAC are:

15.3.1. grant or deny the appeal, in whole or in part
15.3.2. confirm or alter (increase or decrease) an earlier penalty
15.3.3. uphold or overturn a recommendation for a DW, Expulsion, or Revocation

15.4. If an appeal is granted (i.e. a finding of misconduct is overturned), the penalty, and the DN will be removed, and the work shall be assessed/re-assessed/re-graded as appropriate (see Policy 162: Grade Reassessment and Grade Recalculation). Consequences (see Procedures 6) may still be applicable.

15.5. All decisions of the SAC are final and may not be appealed.

16. PENALTY HEARINGS

16.1. Penalty hearings are generated either by:

16.1.1. a decision maker or decision-making panel, recommending a more severe penalty than they are authorized to assign (e.g. a recommended penalty of suspension by an initial decision maker - see Policy 60, Section 7 for penalties that decision makers are authorized to assign); or
16.1.2. Progressive Discipline regarding repeated misconduct (see Policy 60, Section 9).

16.2. Students must be notified of the penalty hearing and the penalty recommended.

16.3. Penalty hearings are not open to the public due to privacy and confidentiality issues.

16.4. Penalty hearings are not to be audio or video recorded. No minutes are taken. The decision letter is the only official record of the hearing.

16.5. Students may remain in class and may enroll in courses while the outcome of a penalty hearing is pending.

17. CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND PERCEPTION OF BIAS

Appeal and penalty hearings must be, and be perceived to be, fair. Therefore:

17.1. No member of a hearing panel shall have had any prior involvement with the case under appeal.

17.2. No member of a panel shall have had any prior participation (as eligible investigator, decision maker, or other decision-making panel) in any other academic misconduct matter where this student was suspected of academic misconduct.

17.3. No panel members shall be selected from the student's home department.

18. VERIFICATION

The University or any eligible investigator may verify documents submitted under this policy and its Procedures at any stage of the proceedings.

19. PROTECTION OF PRIVACY

Any evidence involving personal information relating to individuals other than the student who is the subject of the investigation or proceeding, must be accompanied by the consent of those individuals authorizing the University to collect, verify, or share that information.

20. ALLEGATIONS OF PREJUDICE, DISCRIMINATION, OR HARASSMENT

20.1. If there are concerns or allegations of prejudice, discrimination, or harassment related to a suspicion that a student has engaged in academic misconduct, the student must consult with Human Rights Services (HRS).

20.2. A student may share a concern or allegation of prejudice before, during, or after a discussion (FD/NFD). Normally, such concerns or allegations of prejudice, discrimination, or harassment will be dealt with before a discussion occurs and no decision regarding misconduct will be made until the processes under HRS are completed. A student may also make a claim of prejudice, discrimination, or harassment during the appeal process.

20.3. In cases where a finding of discrimination is made, the initial decision maker will be an appointed DDM and not the person against whom the student has registered a concern or allegation regarding prejudice, discrimination, or harassment. In cases where there is no finding of discrimination, the person against whom the concern or allegation of prejudice, discrimination, or harassment was made, can request a DDM be appointed (as per Policy 60, Section 6.15).

21. NOTIFICATIONS

All communications relating to suspicions of academic misconduct will be sent to the student via their Ryerson email account, which is the University's official means of communication with students.

22. STATISTICS

The Academic Integrity Office will maintain statistics on Academic Misconduct, reporting these, in a non-identifying manner, annually to Senate.

RELATED PROCEDURES:

Procedures: Academic Integrity

RELATED POLICIES:

Policy 118: Scholarly, Research and Creative Activity (SRC) Integrity

Policy 159: Academic Accommodation of Students with Disabilities

Policy 162: Grade Reassessment and Grade Recalculation

APPENDIX A - ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT (See Policy 60, Section 3.1)

1. **Plagiarism** includes but is not limited to:
    1.1. claiming, submitting, or presenting the words, ideas, artistry, drawings, images, or data of another person, including information found on the Internet and unpublished materials, as if they are one's own, without appropriate referencing
    1.2. claiming, submitting, or presenting someone else's work, ideas, opinions, or theories as if they are one's own, without proper referencing
    1.3. claiming, submitting, or presenting another person's substantial compositional contributions, assistance, edits, or changes to an assignment as one's own
    1.4. claiming, submitting, or presenting collaborative work as if it were created solely by oneself or one's group
    1.5. minimally paraphrasing someone else's work by changing only a few words, and/or not citing the original source

2. **Self-plagiarism** refers to the practice of submitting the same work, in whole or in part, for credit in two or more courses, or in the same course more than once, without the prior written permission of the instructor. Self-plagiarism can also include presenting one's own previously published work as though it were new.

3. **Cheating** includes but is not limited to:
    3.1. having ready access to and/or using aids or devices (including wireless communication devices) not expressly allowed by the instructor during an examination, test, quiz, or other evaluation
    3.2. copying another person's answer(s) on a test, exam, quiz, lab report, or other work to be evaluated
    3.3. copying another person's answers, with or without their permission, to individually assigned projects
    3.4. consulting with another person or with unauthorized materials outside of an examination room during the examination period (e.g. discussing an exam or consulting materials during an emergency evacuation or when permitted to use a washroom)
    3.5. improperly submitting an answer to a test or examination question completed, in whole or part, outside the examination room unless expressly permitted by the instructor
    3.6. resubmitting altered test or examination work after it has already been evaluated
    3.7. presenting falsified or fabricated material, including research results
    3.8. improperly obtaining, through deceit, theft, bribery, collusion, or otherwise, access to examination paper(s) or set of questions, or other confidential information
    3.9. collaborating on work to be evaluated where such collaboration has been expressly forbidden by the instructor

4. **Contract Cheating** occurs when a third party completes work, with or without payment, for a student, who then submits the work as their own, where such input is not permitted.

5. **Misrepresentation of Personal Identity or Performance** includes but is not limited to:
   5.1. submitting stolen or purchased assignments, research or creative work
   5.2. impersonating someone or having someone impersonate you in person, in writing, or electronically (both the impersonator and the individual impersonated, if aware of the impersonation, may be subject to a penalty)
   5.3. falsely identifying oneself or misrepresenting one's personal performance outside of a particular course, in a course in which one is not officially enrolled, or in the admissions process (e.g. submission of portfolios, essays, transcripts, or documents)
   5.4. withholding or altering academic information, portfolios, essays, transcripts, or documents, including during the admissions process

6. **Submission of False Information** includes but is not limited to:
   6.1. submitting altered, forged, or falsified medical or other certificates, or documents for academic consideration, or making false claims for such consideration, including in or as part of an academic appeal, or the academic misconduct process
   6.2. submitting false academic credentials to the University
   6.3. altering, in any way, official documents issued by the University
   6.4. submitting falsified letters of reference

7. **Contributing to Academic Misconduct** includes but is not limited to:
   7.1. offering, giving, sharing, or selling essays, questions, and/or answers to tests or exams, quizzes, or other assignments unless authorized to do so
   7.2. allowing work to be copied during an examination, test, or for any other assignment

8. **Damaging, Tampering, or Interfering with the Scholarly Environment** includes but is not limited to:
   8.1. obstructing and/or disturbing the academic activities of others
   8.2. altering the academic work of others in order to gain academic advantage
   8.3. tampering with experiments or laboratory assignments
   8.4. altering or destroying artistic or creative works such as drawings or films
   8.5. removing, altering, misusing or destroying University property to obstruct the work of others
   8.6. unauthorized access to, stealing, or tampering with any course-related material
   8.7. unauthorized access to, or tampering with, library materials, including hiding them in a place where they will not readily be found by other members of the Ryerson community

9. **Applicability of Research-Related Activities**

   For purposes of this policy, "supervised research" is treated as a separate category to accord with the *Tri-Agency Framework: Responsible Conduct of Research*, and includes academic milestones such as Comprehensive Examinations, Major Research Papers, Research or Thesis Proposals, Theses and Dissertations, as well as the research and associated writing carried out towards any of these at either the undergraduate or graduate level. (See Procedures 1.5 regarding the process to be followed in addressing suspicions of misconduct in these areas.) Suspicions of research misconduct that may have occurred under the auspices of Ryerson University, but are in no way directed towards academic advantage or benefit, are to be addressed under Policy 118: Scholarly, Research and Creative Activity (SRC) Integrity rather than Policy 60: Academic Integrity.

10. **Unauthorized Use of Intellectual Property**

    Use of the intellectual property of others for distribution, sale or profit without the authorization of the owner of that material. This includes slides and presentation materials used in a class wherever the owner of those materials has not authorized further use.

11. **Misconduct of Re-graded/Re-submitted Work**

    All of the provisions of this policy will apply to work that is re-assessed (See Policy 162: Grade Reassessment and Grade Recalculation).

12. **Violations of Specific Departmental or Course Requirements**

    Instructors may, in order to encourage Academic Integrity, include additional specific requirements as long as these are consistent with this policy. Any additional requirements must be published in the course outline (see also Policy 60, Section 7.1.4).

APPENDIX B - GLOSSARY OF ABBREVIATED TERMS

AIC	Academic Integrity Council
AIO	Academic Integrity Office
ARUCC	Association of Registrars of Universities and Colleges of Canada
CE	The G. Raymond Chang School of Continuing Education
CESAR	Continuing Education Students' Association of Ryerson
DA	Disciplinary Action
DA-S	Disciplinary Action, with Suspension
DDM	Designated Decision Maker
DDMC	Designated Decision Makers' Council
DEF	Deferred (grade)
HRS	Human Rights Services
DN	Disciplinary Notation
DS	Disciplinary Suspension
DW	Disciplinary Withdrawal
FD	Facilitated Discussion
FLD	Failed in a pass/fail course
GA	Graduate Assistant
GAAC	Graduate Admissions Appeals Committee
GPD	Graduate Program Director
INC	Incomplete (grade)
NFD	Non-Facilitated Discussion
OVPRI	Office of the Vice President Research and Innovation
PD	Program Director
RSU	Ryerson Students' Union
SAC	Senate Appeals Committee
SARP	Senate Appeals Review Panel
TA	Teaching Assistant
D-UNS	Disciplinary-Unsatisfactory
RAC	Registrar's Appeals Committee
VPRI	Vice President Research and Innovation
YSGS	Yeates School of Graduate Studies

***PROCEDURES – DRAFT *** (May 29, 2019)

RYERSON UNIVERSITY
POLICY OF SENATE

PROCEDURES: ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

_____

1. INVESTIGATING A SUSPICION OF ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

1.1.   An eligible investigator who has a suspicion of academic misconduct by a student or students should proceed with their inquiry/investigating unless informing another person is more appropriate.

1.2.   The purpose of the investigation is to see whether there is a sufficient basis to support a reasonable belief that misconduct may have occurred. This involves collecting information regarding the suspected misconduct by means such as examining work submitted or checking work for originality by various means (e.g. Internet searches, text comparison, use of originality detection tools, websites, clarifying what an invigilator may have observed or discovered, etc.). In unusual cases, or where investigators have questions or concerns regarding how to proceed, they should consult with the AIO.

1.3.   Along with any collection or verification of evidence, the eligible investigator may consult, in confidence, with various parties, including their Chair/Director, Program Director (required in the case of supervised research activities), or the AIO. Throughout all such consultations, confidentiality and the privacy of those involved are to be fully respected and protected.

1.4.   Suspicions of academic misconduct occurring in courses, where there is a graded component, are covered by Policy 60, Section 6.

1.5.   Academic misconduct in supervised research/non-course program requirements

The following process applies to all suspicions of misconduct in academic work done towards the completion of supervised research for credit, which includes academic "milestones" such as Comprehensive Examinations, Major Research Papers, Research or Thesis Proposals, Theses and Dissertations, as well as the research and associated writing carried out towards any of these at the undergraduate or graduate level.

1.5.1. Before registering a suspicion of misconduct involving the supervised research activities of a student, the person raising a concern must consult with the relevant Program Director (PD) (or designate), who will determine who should act as the eligible investigator/decision maker.

1.5.2. In cases where the person (or persons) raising the suspicion is an eligible investigator (and in a case involving a graduate student, is also a member of the Yeates School of Graduate Studies) they may continue as the decision maker provided the PD is in agreement. The PD or their faculty designate may act as a co-respondent.

1.5.3. In cases where the person (or persons) raising the suspicion does not wish to proceed, or is in a conflict of interest, or is not an eligible investigator, the PD may choose to pursue the case themselves (with or without a co-respondent), or to assign a faculty designate. If there is disagreement between the Program Director and the person raising the suspicion regarding how to proceed, the matter will be referred to the relevant Dean. The Dean shall, in consultation with the AIO, decide who shall be the decision maker(s).

1.5.4. In the case of an externally funded student suspected of misconduct in supervised research activities, an additional decision maker, external to the University and with disciplinary expertise, will also be present (see Policy 118: Scholarly, Research and Creative Activity and these Procedures 1.5.10). The Office of the Vice President Research and Innovation (OVPRI) will arrange for this individual to attend the FD. In some cases, the Graduate Program Director (GPD) may also be present as a co-decision maker. While the GPD will normally be able to confirm whether the student is externally funded, the AIO may also consult with the OVPRI, the Dean and/or the Vice-Provost and Dean YSGS to make this determination.

1.5.5. This decision maker will investigate the basis of the suspicion. Prior to requesting a discussion (FD/NFD) and, therefore, prior to contacting the student, the decision maker may ask one or more faculty members with subject matter expertise to review the evidence in order to clarify the import of the evidence and identify areas where further evidence or clarification should be sought. This must be done making all reasonable efforts to protect confidentiality, including the identity of the student(s) whose academic work is in question. The decision maker must also determine whether the student receives tri-agency funding in support of their supervised research activities.

1.5.6. If the decision maker(s) determines there is reasonable belief that misconduct has occurred, they must formally register a suspicion with the AIO and a discussion must be scheduled as per Policy

60, Section 6.2.

1.5.7. In recognition of the severity of the potential impact of even a formal suspicion upon students at the graduate level, there is no option of a non-facilitated discussion (NFD) with these students.

1.5.8. Where a group discussion is held it must be an FD. If students have been to a group discussion, they may request an individual meeting; however, they may also still be required to attend a group meeting.

1.5.9. In all cases of suspected misconduct in non-course program requirements, the Vice President Research and Innovation (VPRI) must be notified by the AIO. In the case of graduate student misconduct, the Dean and/or the Vice-Provost and Dean YSGS must also be notified of the suspicion.

1.5.10. In the case of a student in receipt of tri-agency funding, the VPRI will assign an additional investigator, external (i.e. arms-length) to the university, who will also attend and participate in the FD as an investigator and decision maker and will sign a confidentiality agreement registered with the OVPRI.

1.5.11. This entire process should be conducted in a timely manner and concluded, as per Policy 118: SRC Integrity Policy, within six (6) months. If circumstances warrant and appropriate justification is provided, this timeline may be extended.

2. DESIGNATED DECISION MAKERS' COUNCIL (DDMC)

2.1. To ensure that there is an available, trained group of faculty Designated Decision Makers (DDMs) to pursue referred suspicions of academic misconduct, there shall be a Designated Decision Makers' Council (DDMC). A list of current DDMs shall be maintained by the AIO and forwarded annually to Senate as information.

2.2. Faculty members wishing to serve as DDMs may apply through the AIO.

2.3. DDMs will receive training in Policy 60: Academic Integrity, the related Procedures, and the principles of natural justice.

2.4. There shall be a Chair of the DDMC who shall be elected by and from the DDMs and approved by Senate for a two-year term (renewable). The Chair will work collaboratively with the AIO to oversee the functioning of the DDM process, including:

2.4.1. Recruiting, selecting and training (both initial and ongoing) of DDMs

2.4.2. monitoring DDM workload and appropriate assignment of cases

2.4.3. identifying issues emerging from cases that need to be addressed

2.4.4. reviewing cases together with the Director of AIO (or designate)

involving:

    2.4.4.1. a second DN with respect to calling a penalty hearing regarding Progressive Discipline

    2.4.4.2. further information of a serious nature becoming available after a finding of no academic misconduct which requires a determination of whether a re-opening of proceedings is warranted

    2.4.4.3. assigning a DDM as decision maker where the eligible investigator, who is not a CUPE 1 or CUPE 2 member, and who does not wish, or is unable to pursue the suspicion of academic misconduct or in other appropriate circumstances (e.g. see Policy 60, Section 20)

3. DESIGNATED DECISION MAKERS (DDMs)

3.1.   The Chair of the Designated Decision Makers' Council (DDMC) (or designate) in consultation with the Director of the AIO (or designate) will assign a trained DDM from those available when OPTION B of Policy 60, Section 6.1.5 is applicable.

3.2.   Cases where group misconduct (two or more students) is suspected should always be discussed with the AIO in order to determine a fair and appropriate process. In some cases, it may not be advisable to refer such cases to a DDM.

3.3.   Once a DDM is assigned, the DDM assumes the role of decision maker in its entirety. The DDM will pursue the matter and be the decision maker with respect to any finding regarding academic misconduct.

3.4.   The referring faculty member can expect to be contacted by the DDM within 3-5 business days of the request for a DDM to be assigned. When contacted, the referring faculty member must be prepared to provide the DDM with all available evidence/information related to the suspicion.

3.5.   The referring faculty member will also be asked to submit a recommendation regarding an appropriate penalty should the DDM make a finding of academic misconduct.

3.6.   The referring faculty member shall direct any inquiries from the student to the AIO.

3.7.   The DDM will notify the AIO and the faculty member within five (5) business days as to whether or not they are proceeding with the case. If the DDM opts to proceed, they will register the suspicion via the AIO, and the student will be notified by University email.

3.8.   When a DDM has assigned a penalty, the referring faculty member will be notified by the DDM of the decision. It is then the responsibility of the referring faculty member to apply the penalty as per the decision of the DDM. The referring faculty member must not modify or in any way alter the decision or penalty assigned by the DDM. The decision maker or referring faculty member must ensure that any grade updates or grade change forms are submitted in a timely manner.

NOTE: Once a faculty member refers the matter to a DDM, they have given all decision-making authority with respect to whether academic misconduct has occurred to the DDM. The referring faculty member may not appeal either the decision of the DDM or any penalty or consequences assigned or recommended. The referring faculty member may, however, still be called as a witness in the event of an appeal.

4. DISCUSSIONS

4.1.   The notice regarding a discussion will inform the student as to whether they will be meeting with their instructor, a DDM, or other decision maker; the name of the person who is the decision maker must be provided.

4.2.   Any requests by students or faculty for accommodation in a discussion, or to advise of a scheduling conflict, should be communicated to the AIO upon receipt of the notice.

4.3.   The discussion (FD/NFD) should normally be held within five (5) business days of the date of notice. In cases where an external decision maker is required to attend the FD, as in the case of suspected misconduct in supervised research activities, this timeline may be extended.

4.4.   If the student cannot attend at the scheduled time, it is their obligation to contact the decision maker or AIO (whoever sent the notice), in a timely manner, to make arrangements for a new mutually agreed-upon time. In cases where a new time/date is arranged, the decision maker or AIO (whoever sent the initial notice) will re-issue the notice. Normally, a discussion will not be rescheduled more than once.

4.5.   If the decision maker wishes to schedule subsequent discussions to bring forth other information related to the matter, this should occur as soon as possible and before a finding is made as a result of the initial discussion. In such cases, the student must be notified, within the timelines for registering a decision, that there will be further discussions and the reasons for this delay.

4.6.   Students wishing to request an FD instead of a scheduled NFD should contact the AIO directly at aio@ryerson.ca once they receive notice of an

NFD, and before the time/date when the NFD is scheduled to be held. The NFD will be cancelled and the AIO will then communicate the scheduled time and date of the FD to the student and the decision maker (and other relevant parties).

4.7. In the case of suspected group (i.e. two or more students) academic misconduct, the decision maker may first contact the AIO to assist in determining a fair process. In most instances students will be asked to attend individual discussions. However, a decision maker may request the AIO to schedule a group discussion.

    4.7.1. Where a group discussion is held it must be an FD. If students have been assigned to a group discussion, they may request an individual meeting; however, they may also still be required to attend a group meeting.

    4.7.2. The decision maker will determine an appropriate means of evaluating the work of students who may have been involved in group work but are deemed not to be involved in the academic misconduct.

4.8. What should each party bring to a discussion?

    4.8.1. Decision makers must be prepared to present the evidence in support of their suspicion before and/or at the discussion (e.g. course outlines, assignment guidelines, plagiarism detection reports).

    4.8.2. If applicable, students should bring rough notes, drafts, or other supporting materials to the discussion as they desire or as requested by the decision maker.

4.9. Who may be present at a discussion?

    4.9.1. The decision maker, the student(s) suspected of academic misconduct and the facilitator (for an FD) will be present.

    4.9.2. When appropriate, a third party such as an exam invigilator or Teaching Assistant/Graduate Assistant (TA/GA) who brought the complaint to the eligible investigator/decision maker may also be present.

    4.9.3. The student, if they so elect, may also have a support person and/or advocate from RSU or CESAR present. Note, that in most cases, all parties are expected to be physically present. However, when necessary, virtual attendance (e.g. via video conference, telephone conference, etc.) can be arranged. Note: The support person is an individual who attends a discussion or hearing for the purpose of support; they play no official role in any aspect of the academic integrity process. The advocate from RSU or CESAR, if requested to do so by the student, can prepare students for and/or

accompany them to discussions (FD/NFD). The advocate may raise questions of the decision maker and speak during the discussions, but students are expected to be present, and speak for themselves especially with respect to matters of fact. It is the student's responsibility to inform the AIO if a support person will be present.

4.10.   How is the discussion recorded?

    4.10.1.   Discussions are not to be audio or video recorded. The facilitator (in an FD) or decision maker (in an NFD) will complete a summary of discussion form, which is intended to be an official, though not verbatim, record of what was said.

    4.10.2.   The decision maker and student (as well as the facilitator in an FD) will sign the summary of discussion form. In cases where the FD is conducted virtually, the facilitator will request verbal agreement.

    4.10.3.   The decision maker, in an NFD, will provide a copy of the summary of decision form to the student. In an FD, the AIO will provide the decision maker and student with a copy of the summary of discussion form.

4.11.   What happens after a discussion?

    4.11.1.   After the discussion the decision maker will consider the information presented by all parties and only then will make a decision regarding whether misconduct has occurred.

    4.11.2.   Following an FD, the decision maker will have three (3) business days from the discussion to register a decision regarding the suspected misconduct. The AIO will issue the decision letter, within five (5) business days of the discussion, via University email, to the student and other relevant parties

    4.11.3.   Following an NFD, the decision maker will send out the decision letter within five (5) business days of the discussion, via the AIO automated system to the University email of the student and other relevant parties.

    4.11.4.   Should decision makers require an extension of these deadlines, they must contact the AIO, who will notify the student of the extended time.

    4.11.5.   Students who wish to drop a course after a finding regarding misconduct has been made, should see Procedures 5 for eligibility. Students eligible to drop a course who are prevented from doing so on RAMSS (during the 3-day period prior to drop date) must inform the Registrar's Office at sr.misconduct@ryerson.ca within the stated time periods to request to drop the course.

5. DROPPING A COURSE DURING THE ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT PROCESS

Students may not drop a course in which there is a suspicion of academic misconduct. The Registrar's Office, at the start of this process, will place a DEF on the student's academic record for the course under review.

5.1.   If the student drops the course before the matter is resolved, the Registrar's Office will re-enroll the student in that course and will notify the student and the AIO of the re-enrollment.

5.2.   If there is no finding of academic misconduct, and the decision is sent on or prior to the published deadline to drop a course, the student may drop the course. See *Academic Integrity Guidelines* [insert link] regarding how to proceed, particularly when the decision is sent less than three (3) days prior to the published drop date.

5.3.   If there is no finding of academic misconduct and the decision is sent after the published deadline to drop a course has passed, but prior to the official last day of the term, the student has up to two (2) days from the date/time of the decision being sent to request to drop the course. See *Academic Integrity Guidelines* [insert link] regarding how to proceed with such a request.

5.4.   If there is a finding of misconduct and the decision is sent on or prior to the published deadline to drop a course, and any penalty assigned is less than an "F" in the course, the student may drop the course. See *Academic Integrity Guidelines* [insert link] regarding how to proceed, particularly when the decision is sent less than three (3) days prior to the published drop date. In such a case, a Disciplinary Notation (DN) will still be placed on the student's academic record.

5.5.   If there is a finding of misconduct and a grade of "F" is assigned for the course, whether before or after the published drop deadline, the student may not drop the course. That grade of "F" shall remain on the student's transcript and a DN will be placed on the student's academic record.

5.6.   If there is a finding of misconduct and the decision is sent after the published deadline to drop a course, and a penalty of less than an "F" is assigned, the student may normally not request a late course drop.

6. CONSEQUENCES

6.1.   A consequence of a student being found to have engaged in academic

misconduct is the placing of a DN on the student's academic record. The DN does not appear on the official transcript. A DN notation shall remain until a student graduates at which time it shall be removed. If a student does not graduate in the normal maximum time they may request, via their Chair/Dean, or for Chang School Students, via the Chair/Director of the Department/Program in which the misconduct took place, to have the DN removed from their academic record. Non-program/non-certificate students may request via their Chair/Director the removal of the DN from their academic record after 5 years.

6.2.   Whether or not there is a finding of academic misconduct, a decision maker may assign educational requirements such as educational workshops and/or online quizzes. The AIO should receive confirmation when any workshop or quiz is completed.

6.3.   There may be other consequences as a result of a suspicion or finding of misconduct, including but not limited to the following:

6.3.1.   A decision maker may require a student who has engaged in academic misconduct to replace any damaged or destroyed material.
6.3.2.   Students in receipt of scholarships, bursaries, etc., may, where external funders require the University to report to them any cases of academic misconduct, face consequences related to funding.
6.3.3.   Previously assigned grades may be adjusted.
6.3.4.   A student's graduation may be delayed until all relevant academic misconduct matters have concluded.
6.3.5.   The University may be required to inform outside parties whose interests may have been adversely affected by the academic misconduct.
6.3.6.   In the case of forged documents, official or otherwise, the Registrar's Office, Director of Admissions, or Manager of Admissions may share the information with counterparts who are members of the Association of Registrars of the Universities and Colleges of Canada (ARUCC) and/or Government officials (e.g. Canada Border Services Agency, CBSA).
6.3.7.   In cases where falsified documents are submitted or pertinent information/documents are omitted/withheld in the Admissions Process, the offers of admission can be revoked regardless of the student's current level of study.
6.3.8.   In some instances, criminal charges may be sought.
6.3.9.   Where warranted, the issue may be pursued under Policy 61: Non-Academic Misconduct.

NOTE: See Policy 60, Section 7, for a complete list of penalties that can be assigned or recommended under Policy 60 as a result of a finding of academic misconduct.

7. PROGRESSIVE DISCIPLINE

7.1.   The DN placed on a student's academic record after a finding of academic misconduct is not a penalty and does not appear on official transcripts. It will be removed by the Registrar's Office at the request of the AIO if an appeal of academic misconduct is successful.

7.2.   In the case of undergraduate or continuing education students who receive a second DN, the Chair of the DDMC (or designate), Director of the AIO (or designate), and the relevant Program Director (or designate) will jointly decide whether a penalty hearing is warranted given the nature of the violations. Their decision will be based on a full review of the nature of the prior offences including the penalties and consequences assigned. In such cases, the Program Director (or designate) shall recommend a penalty of a Disciplinary Suspension (DS) ranging from one (1) term to two (2) years.

7.3.   If the decision is that the nature of the violations leading to these two DNs does not warrant a penalty hearing, (i.e. based on a review of the severity and circumstances of the two prior DNs), the student will be notified by the AIO that their case has been reviewed, that their DNs will remain on their academic record, and that any further finding of academic misconduct will automatically result in a penalty hearing, recommending a penalty ranging from a DS of one (1) term up to Expulsion.

7.4.   With respect to graduate students, a second finding of academic misconduct shall automatically require a penalty hearing regarding DA-S, DW, or Expulsion.

7.5.   A student with a previous DS, DA, or DA-S who has a further finding of academic misconduct will have a penalty hearing regarding the appropriateness of the recommended penalty, normally a DW.

7.6.   A student with a previous DW who has a further finding of academic misconduct will have a penalty hearing regarding the appropriateness of the recommended penalty, normally an Expulsion.

7.7.   Students who received a DN on their transcript prior to September 1, 2015, in the first half of their program or certificate, are now in the final year of their program, and who have no subsequent misconducts, may request, via their Chair/Director to have the DN removed from their transcript. Part-time undergraduate program students who received a DN on their transcript prior to September 1, 2015, may request the removal of the DN from their transcript one calendar year after completing the first half of their program. The removal of the DN is at the discretion of the Chair/Director and this decision may not be appealed. If the student is found to have engaged in subsequent academic misconduct, the DN will be reinstated.

7.8.	The Registrar's Office will place a graduation hold on the student's record. Students will not be approved to graduate until the matter is resolved.

8. PENALTIES (ramifications of DS, DA, DA-S, DW, Expulsion, Revocation of Degree, Diploma, or Certificate)

8.1.	Disciplinary Suspension (DS)

8.1.1.	The DS designation shall be placed on both the student's academic record and official transcript and remain there until a student graduates. In cases where a student does not graduate in the normal period during which a program is to be completed, or the student has not enrolled in a course at Ryerson University for at least five (5) years, a written request to the Chair/Director of the program can be made to remove the DS from the transcript. If there is a subsequent finding of misconduct prior to graduation the DS will be re-instated on the transcript.

8.1.2.	While on a DS a student may not take courses at Ryerson University, including at The Chang School, nor do a placement, work experience hours, internship, or any other program requirements.

8.1.3.	Course work taken elsewhere during the period of Disciplinary Suspension will not be credited towards GPA calculations, Academic Standing, or graduation requirements within the student's program.

8.1.4.	The DS will normally begin in the term following the one in which the misconduct that led to the DS recommendation occurred. For students in undergraduate full-time programs, this will normally be a fall or winter term or terms, as the spring/summer is not normally considered an academic term for undergraduate full-time students.

8.1.5.	A student who is assigned a DS is automatically reinstated into their program or may apply to any other program or certificate after serving the specified period of suspension and after meeting any specified conditions established by the AIC, RAC, GAAC, or SAC.

8.2.	Disciplinary Action (DA), Disciplinary Action, with Suspension (DA-S)

8.2.1.	A DA or DA-S shall be placed on both the graduate student's academic record and official transcript.

8.2.2.	A DA will remain on both the student's academic record and official transcript and cannot be removed.

8.2.3.	A DA-S will remain on both the student's academic record and official transcript and cannot be removed.

8.2.4.	While on a DA-S, a graduate student may not apply to any other Ryerson University program, or take courses, including at The

Chang School, do a placement, work experience hours, internship, or any other program requirements including research.

8.2.5. Courses taken elsewhere and research progress completed during the DA-S will not be credited towards GPA calculations, Academic Standing, or graduation requirements within any Ryerson University program.

8.2.6. The DA-S will normally begin in the term following the one in which the misconduct that led to the DA-S occurred.

8.2.7. A graduate student who is assigned a DA-S may request to re-enroll after the period of suspension. The Graduate Program Director (or designate) and Vice-Provost and Dean YSGS (or designate) will decide whether the graduate student can re-enroll in the program. If a graduate student is not allowed to re-enroll, they may apply to other programs/certificates at Ryerson University.

8.3. Disciplinary Withdrawal (DW)

8.3.1. A DW shall be permanently noted on a student's academic record and official transcript.

8.3.2. While on a DW a student may not re-apply to any other Ryerson University program, or take courses, including at The Chang School, or do a placement, work experience hours, internship, or any other program requirements during the period of Disciplinary Withdrawal.

8.3.3. Course work taken elsewhere during this period will not be credited towards GPA calculations, Academic Standing, or graduation requirements within any Ryerson University program.

8.3.4. The DW will normally begin on the date of the SAC decision letter, or as required to support the decision outcome.

8.3.5. After serving the specified period, a student assigned a DW may apply to other programs/certificates at Ryerson University.

8.4. Expulsion

8.4.1. Students who are expelled from the University shall not be allowed to register or enroll in any course, program, or certificate offered by Ryerson University, including through The Chang School.

8.4.2. Expulsion will take effect on the date of the SAC decision letter.

8.4.3. Expulsion shall be permanently noted on a student's academic record and official transcript.

8.5. Revocation of a Degree, Diploma, or Certificate

8.5.1. Revocation of a Degree, Diploma, or Certificate shall be permanently noted on a student's academic record and official transcript.

9. REPRESENTATION, SUPPORT PERSONS, AND WITNESSES

9.1.   The advocate from the RSU or CESAR, if requested to do so by the student, can prepare students for, and/or accompany them to discussions (FD/NFD), as well as to appeal and penalty hearings. Students are strongly encouraged to contact an advocate for assistance/advice regarding appeal and penalty hearing submissions. It is the student's responsibility to notify the AIO before the discussion/hearing if an advocate will be present.

9.2.   The advocate may raise questions of the decision maker and speak during the discussions or hearing, but students are expected to be present, and speak for themselves especially with respect to matters of fact.

9.3.   At an SAC hearing students may be accompanied and represented by an advocate from the RSU or CESAR or by legal counsel. The advocate or legal counsel may speak on behalf of the student, may confer with the student as necessary, and may ask questions as appropriate. Students are expected to be present and speak for themselves especially with respect to matters of fact.

9.4.   At an SAC hearing, the University may retain legal counsel to represent the respondent. Legal counsel may speak on behalf of the respondent and may confer with the respondent as necessary and ask questions as appropriate. The respondent is expected to be present and answer questions, especially with respect to matters of fact.

9.5.   The Panel Chair, in unusual circumstances, may request advice from, or the presence of, legal counsel prior to or during the hearing with respect to matters of process.

9.6.   The Senate Office must be given three (3) business days' notice if legal counsel will be present at a hearing.

9.7.   The Panel Chair has the authority to postpone, delay, or proceed with the hearing, should the advocate or legal counsel fail to attend. The Panel Chair's rationale shall be included in the preamble to the decision.

9.8.   A support person (for the student) may be present at a discussion or hearing. A support person (for the respondent) may be present at a hearing. The support person may not participate in the discussion or hearing. They remain silent and do not sit at the table or take notes. They may confer with the student or respondent only outside the discussion/hearing. It is the student's responsibility to notify the AIO before the discussion/hearing if a support person will be present.

9.9.   It is the responsibility of the appellant and respondent to notify the AIO or Senate Office, in advance of the hearing (before the notice of hearing is distributed) of any witnesses they intend to call, and also their responsibility

to ensure the presence of those witnesses. The decision whether to proceed in the absence of invited witnesses or to adjourn and re-schedule will be made by the Panel Chair.

10. DECISION-MAKING BODIES: TERMS OF REFERENCE

For a description of the various appeals committees, see Policy 60, Section 12. Additional information regarding decision-making panels appears below.

10.1.   All members of each of the decision-making University panels must ensure that they are acting in an unbiased and fair manner at all times; they are expected to exemplify commitment to fair decision-making and academic integrity.

10.2.   Any person participating in an appeal or other hearing must disclose any potential conflict of interest, if known, no fewer than five (5) business days before the hearing. If the perceived conflict is with a panel member, unless the conflict of interest is resolved, the panel member shall be replaced.

10.3.   If either party raises a conflict of interest concern regarding any panel member(s) once the hearing has begun, the hearing panel will, *in camera*, judge the extent and validity of the conflict, and the Panel Chair will make a decision as to whether the panel member may sit on the appeal. The panel member(s) who is/are challenged may offer a statement but may not take part in the panel's decision on the conflict. If the panel member is excused, the hearing may be adjourned and a new hearing scheduled or may be held without that panel member if the student, responding faculty member(s) and remaining panel members agree.

10.4.   The AIC and SAC, whenever possible, should be representative of all teaching Faculties (including the Yeates School of Graduate Studies). For graduate student hearings, the student panel member shall be a graduate student and normally, for an undergraduate student hearing, the student panel member shall be an undergraduate student.

10.5.   The AIO or Secretary of Senate shall name in advance which faculty member will chair the hearing and write the decision letter.

10.6.   Faculty members of AIC and SAC shall be appointed for a two-year term (renewable). Students shall be appointed for a one-year term (renewable).

10.7.   Faculty members and students wishing to serve on the SAC and AIC may apply through the AIO (for AIC) and the Senate Office (for SAC). Members shall be selected through a recruitment process that aims for a high level of diversity with respect to subject expertise, social demographics, and

academic discipline.

10.8. The role of a decision-making panel is to inquire and investigate, making all reasonable efforts to ensure that it has received all available relevant information regarding the facts of the case prior to making a finding.

10.9. Members of decision-making panels shall receive training in Policy 60: Academic Integrity, the related Procedures, and the principles of natural justice.

10.10. Each appeals committee should convene as a whole at least once each academic year to discuss relevant issues that have arisen in cases, to receive ongoing in-service training, and to make any recommendations for changes to Policy 60 and the related Procedures.

10.11. Decision makers and Panel Chairs are responsible for communicating the basis for their findings in a timely way and as clearly as possible, in accordance with the educational emphasis of Policy 60: Academic Integrity and the related Procedures.

11. APPEALS

11.1. Information

For information relating to Appeals, please contact:

- AIO for appeals to AIC, RAC, or GAAC [provide website or link]

- Senate Office for appeals to SAC [provide website or link]

11.2. General Appeals Information

11.2.1. Students are encouraged to seek assistance in preparing appeals from an advocate from RSU or CESAR.

11.2.2. Students may remain in class and may enroll for courses while their case is under appeal. If a suspicion is registered at a time such that an appeal hearing cannot be scheduled until the next semester, students may enroll for courses and continue in their program until a final decision is made. A student will not, however, be able to register in a course where a pre-requisite is the course that is under appeal. If the decision results in a DS, DA-S, DW, or Expulsion being imposed, the student will be dropped from all courses and the fees refunded. However, the appeal panel will have the responsibility and authority to determine whether a DS, DA-S, or DW will come into effect at the end of the previous term or at the end of the term in which the student is currently enrolled.

11.2.3. Appeal hearings must be scheduled as soon as possible based upon the availability of the student, the decision maker, and the panel members. All parties must make all reasonable efforts to facilitate scheduling. Reasonable effort should be made to accommodate the availability of the advocate from RSU or CESAR, or legal counsel.

11.2.4. Students and Respondents must receive at least ten (10) business days' notice of the date, time, and place of the hearing. This notice will include the names of all parties who will be in attendance, including the panel members, the appellant, the respondent, any witnesses, and the advocate from the RSU or CESAR, if any. Copies of the appellant's and respondent's submissions will be distributed to all parties (students, respondents, advocates, and panel members) and to relevant University administration at least five (5) business days in advance of the hearing.

11.2.5. A hearing may be scheduled with fewer than ten (10) business days' notice with the written agreement of the student and the initial decision maker/respondent (or designate).

11.2.6. NOTE: It is the responsibility of the appellant and respondent to notify legal counsel (if applicable) and any witnesses they wish to have at the hearing, of the date and details of the hearing.

11.2.7. The responsible office may determine that a resource person familiar with some area of procedure or practice relevant to the case should be present at the hearing to answer questions.   A resource person may answer questions but may not ask questions of the appellant or respondent. A resource person cannot speak to whether misconduct took place. If a resource person has knowledge relevant to the specific actions of either the appellant or respondent, they should be called only as an witness.

11.2.8. The decision(s)/finding(s) of a panel will be communicated to the appropriate office, within five (5) business days of the hearing.

11.2.9. The appropriate office will send by University email the decision letter written by the Panel Chair to the student within ten (10) business days of the hearing. If the student does not receive the decision within this time, they should contact the AIO or Senate Office. The decision letter must state the decision and the reasons for the decision based on the facts of the case.

11.3. Student responsibility in submitting an appeal to the AIC, RAC or GAAC

11.3.1. Forms and instructions for the filing of an appeal to the AIC, RAC, or GAAC can be found on the AIO website [insert link] and are also available from the AIO.

11.3.2. An AIC, RAC, or GAAC appeal form must be filed with the AIO by the student, in person, within ten (10) business days from the date of issue of the discussion decision letter. The student appellant

must submit all documentation listed on the checklist provided on the AIC, RAC, or GAAC form. Students must ensure that all parts of the form are completed. Incomplete submissions will not be accepted.

11.3.3. In appealing to the AIC, RAC, or GAAC, students are asked to address in their submission (and subsequently at the hearing) the facts surrounding the initial suspicion and finding, as well as whether those facts support the finding and/or penalty.

11.3.4. If, after the student has submitted an appeal, new evidence becomes available that the student wishes to include, the student must contact the AIO as soon as possible. If the student does not have a reasonable opportunity to submit this evidence in advance of the hearing (e.g. this evidence only came to light less than 24 hours before the hearing was scheduled), they may bring it to the hearing, along with seven (7) copies to be distributed as appropriate. The person submitting the new evidence should provide an explanation of why this information was not provided in advance of the hearing. The Panel will decide whether the evidence will be accepted. The most important criteria for the admission of new evidence are: its relevance to whether misconduct occurred; its relevance to the appropriateness of the penalty assigned/recommended; and/or its authenticity, which may need to be verified.

11.4. AIO responsibility in receipt of an appeal to the AIC, RAC, or GAAC

11.4.1. The AIO will forward a student's complete appeal to the decision maker (now referred to as the "respondent") for their written response. Once all documents are received, the AIO will schedule a hearing and send a complete appeals package to all relevant parties no fewer than five (5) business days prior to the hearing to allow all parties to prepare.

11.5. Decision maker responsibility in responding to an appeal to the AIC, RAC, or GAAC

11.5.1. The decision maker (now "the respondent") must respond within ten (10) business days to the student's appeal in writing to the AIO and submit all relevant documentation and evidence that will be given to the student and the AIC, RAC, or GAAC panel. If, after the decision maker has submitted their response, new evidence becomes available, they must contact the AIO regarding the evidence as soon as possible. If the decision maker does not have the opportunity to submit such evidence in advance, they may bring it to the hearing, along with seven (7) copies for distribution as appropriate. The Panel will decide whether the evidence will be accepted.

11.6. Student responsibility in submitting an appeal to the SAC

11.6.1. Students must file the appeal form, in person, with the Senate Office within ten (10) business days of the issue of the Appeal decision letter. Forms and instructions for the filing of appeals can be found at the Senate website (http://www.ryerson.ca/senate/) and are available from the Senate Office.

11.6.2. The student must provide, in writing, a detailed explanation as to why the SAC should consider the case based on one or more of the four (4) grounds for appeals to SAC enumerated (see Policy 60, Section 15.1).

11.7. Senate Office responsibility in receipt of an appeal

11.7.1. The Secretary of Senate shall receive all appeals to the SAC.

11.7.2. In the case of appeals from the AIC, RAC, or GAAC, the Secretary of Senate will determine whether the appeal submission meets the grounds outlined in Policy 60, Section 15.1. If the decision is to proceed to a hearing, the procedures for scheduling a hearing will be followed. If, after reviewing the appeal, the Secretary of Senate believes that the grounds have not been met (as per Policy 60, Section 15.1) to warrant an appeal submission, a Senate Appeals Review Panel (SARP) will be convened. The SARP, comprised of two faculty members and a student from SAC, plus the Secretary of Senate (or designate), and the Director of AIO (or designate), both acting as a resource persons, will determine whether the student has satisfied the onus stipulated in Policy 60, Section 15.1. If SARP decides that the appeal is to be heard, they will also determine whether to hear the entire hearing over from the beginning). The decision of the SARP is final and may not be appealed.

11.7.3. The Secretary of Senate will write to the student within 10 business days of the review and advise whether the appeal to SAC will proceed or not. If the appeal is to proceed the Secretary of Senate will also advise whether the matter will be heard over from the beginning.

11.7.4. While SAC hearings are not normally a full re-hearing of the evidence presented at AIC plus new evidence, if any, an appellant may explain in their appeal letter as to why their hearing should be heard over from the beginning.

11.7.5. The Senate Office will forward the appeal to the AIC, RAC, or GAAC Panel Chair (if applicable) that upheld an original finding and/or penalty, and to the original decision maker(s) who made the finding of misconduct (or person who raised the suspicion of academic misconduct) for their response. The respondent(s) must reply to the appeal within ten (10) business days of receipt of the

appeal.

11.7.6. The Secretary of Senate will convene an SAC panel to hear the case.

11.7.7. The Panel Chair, in consultation with Secretary of Senate, shall also determine if further resource people should be required to attend the hearing.

11.7.8. The Senate Office will schedule a hearing and send a complete appeal package to all relevant parties.

11.8. SAC Hearings

11.8.1. An appeal to SAC, if accepted as meeting one or more of the stated grounds, is limited to a discussion of the grounds relevant to the decision or processes of the previous decision-making panel unless the Secretary of Senate has decided that the matter will be heard over from the beginning.

12. PENALTY HEARINGS

At a penalty hearing, as opposed to an appeal, the finding that academic misconduct occurred is not in dispute. Rather, the issue is the appropriate penalty given the facts.
The general rules and procedures are the same for penalty hearings as in appeals, with exceptions noted below.

12.1. The AIO or Senate Office will notify the student of the intent to schedule a penalty hearing. If appropriate, this notice will not be sent until after the ten (10) business days allowed for a student to submit an appeal. If the student submits an appeal, the penalty hearing will not be scheduled, and the penalty will be addressed as part of the appeal.

12.2. The student should file a response to the notice of penalty hearing form with the AIO or Senate Office within ten (10) business days of the notice.

12.3. If a student does not respond to the notice of penalty hearing, a hearing will still be scheduled. If a student is unable to attend due to extenuating circumstances, a hearing may be rescheduled once. If the student does not appear for the hearing, and has not requested a rescheduling, the panel will make its decision without input from the student.

12.4. The respondent at an AIC penalty hearing will normally, in cases arising by way of Progressive Discipline, be the Program Director or, if unavailable, the Department Chair/the Director of the School or a designate familiar with the case. In cases arising from a penalty recommendation by the original decision maker that decision maker shall be the respondent.

12.5. At SAC penalty hearings, the AIC, RAC, or GAAC Panel Chair forwarding the recommendation is the respondent, along with the recommending Program Director (if appropriate). If the hearing arises out of Progressive Discipline, the relevant Program Director, Chair/Director (or designate) and the AIC Panel Chair shall recommend the penalty and shall be co-respondents. In cases related to falsified admission documents where the Graduate Program or Graduate Admissions Office has recommended to the Secretary of Senate the Revocation of the Degree, Diploma, or Certificate the co-respondents will be the Manager of Admissions (or designate) and the Program Director. Co-respondents will submit a joint letter with their recommendation and rationale, although they can submit separate responses if they prefer.

12.6. In cases of Progressive Discipline (e.g. multiple DNs), after reviewing the evidence regarding the prior findings, the relevant Program Director, Chair/Director (or designate) must recommend an appropriate penalty (e.g. a DS or higher for an undergraduate, a DW or higher for a graduate). The AIO must then ensure that this recommendation is forwarded to the student so that they may address it in their letter of response to the respondent and panel. The Program Director will then be asked to submit a letter of response within ten (10) business days, including a clear rationale for their recommended penalty.

12.7. Any documents relevant to the recommended penalty must be submitted in advance of the hearing by both the student and the respondent.

12.8. A student who is facing a penalty hearing may:

12.8.1. Dispute the recommended penalty and proceed to a penalty hearing at AIC
12.8.2. Not dispute the recommended penalty. In such a case, the panel will make a decision without the appellant or respondent in attendance
12.8.3. Waive the penalty hearing at the AIC and go directly to a penalty hearing at SAC (where the recommended penalty is DW, Expulsion, or Revocation of Degree, Diploma, or Certificate)

12.9. If the AIC, RAC, or GAAC upholds the initial finding and/or recommends a penalty of DW, Expulsion, or Revocation of a Degree, Diploma, or Certificate and the student does not appeal to the SAC, there will be a further penalty hearing of the SAC. If the student does appeal to the SAC, then the SAC hearing will deal with both the finding and penalty.

12.10. The AIO or Senate Office will send by University email the decision letter written by the Panel Chair to the student and all other relevant parties within ten (10) business days of the hearing. If the student does not receive the decision within this time, they should contact the Senate Office.

12.11. Student responsibility for penalty hearings

12.11.1. A student who wishes to dispute the recommended penalty must file a penalty hearing form with the AIO, or Senate Office, in person, within ten (10) business days from the date of the letter notifying them of the recommended penalty.

12.11.2. Students are asked to address in their submission (and subsequently at the hearing) why they feel the recommended penalty is or is not appropriate. While students may choose to include information from the initial finding(s) that led to the penalty hearing being convened, the focus of the panel will be on the recommended penalty. Incomplete submissions will not be accepted.

12.11.3. If, after the decision maker has submitted their response, new evidence becomes available, the student must contact the AIO or Senate Office regarding the evidence as soon as possible. If the decision maker does not have the opportunity to submit such evidence in advance, they may bring it to the hearing, along with seven (7) copies.

12.11.4. The person submitting the new evidence should provide an explanation of why this information was not provided in advance of the hearing. The Panel will decide whether the evidence will be accepted. The most important criteria for the admission of new evidence are: its relevance to whether misconduct occurred; its relevance to the appropriateness of the penalty assigned/recommended; and/or its authenticity, which may need to be verified.

12.12. AIO or Senate Office responsibility in receipt of a response to the recommended penalty

12.12.1. The AIO or Senate Office (as appropriate) will forward a student's letter regarding the penalty to the decision maker (now referred to as "the respondent" for their written response).

12.12.2. Once all documents are received, a hearing will be scheduled and all parties will be sent a complete penalty hearing package, no fewer than five (5) business days prior to the hearing to allow all parties to prepare.

12.13. Decision maker responsibility in responding to a student's statement regarding the recommended penalty

12.13.1. The decision maker (now "the respondent") must respond within ten (10) business days to the student's statement in writing to the AIO or Senate Office and submit any documentation and evidence relevant to the recommended

penalty, which will be given to the student and the AIC or SAC panel.

12.13.2. If, after the decision maker has submitted their response, new evidence becomes available, they must contact the AIO or Senate Office regarding the evidence as soon as possible. If the decision maker does not have the opportunity to submit such evidence in advance, they may bring it to the hearing, along with seven (7) copies.

12.13.3. The person submitting the new evidence should provide an explanation of why this information was not provided in advance of the hearing. The Panel will decide whether the evidence will be accepted. The most important criteria for the admission of new evidence are: its relevance to whether misconduct occurred; its relevance to the appropriateness of the penalty assigned/recommended; and/or its authenticity, which may need to be verified.

12.14. AIC Decisions

12.14.1. The first penalty hearing will normally be heard by an AIC panel and will only be followed by a second hearing at SAC if the student appeals the decision of the AIC, or the penalty upheld/recommended by the AIC can only be assigned by SAC (see Policy 60, Section 7.2).

12.14.2. An AIC panel may:
- assign a DS (normally one (1) term to two (2) years) and specify when it should begin, and end
- assign a DA,
- assign a DA-S of up to two (2) years and specify when it should begin, and end
- uphold and forward to SAC a recommended penalty of DW, Expulsion or Revocation of a Degree, Diploma or Certificate
- recommend such a penalty even if not recommended by the initial decision maker and/or Program Director

12.15. RAC and GAAC Decisions

12.15.1. The first penalty hearing will normally be heard by an RAC or GAAC panel for undergraduates or graduate students, respectively, and will only be followed by a second hearing at SAC if the student appeals the decision of the RAC or GAAC, or the penalty upheld/recommended by the RAC or GAAC can only be assigned by SAC (see Policy 60, Section 7.2).

12.15.2. An RAC or GAAC panel may:
- assign a DS (normally one term to two years) and specify when it should begin, and end (RAC only and not GAAC)

- assign a DA
- assign a DA-S of up to two years and specify when it should begin, and end (GAAC only and not RAC)
- uphold and forward to SAC a recommended penalty of DW, Expulsion or Revocation of a Degree, Diploma or Certificate
- recommend such a penalty even if not recommended by the initial decision maker and/or Program Director

12.16. SAC Decisions

12.16.1. The SAC panel for a penalty hearing may, in considering a recommendation of DS: determine that no disciplinary suspension is warranted (deny the recommendation for a DS); determine that a DS is warranted; confirm the recommended penalty; increase or reduce the recommended penalty and set the penalty from one (1) term to two (2) years.

12.16.2. The SAC panel for a penalty hearing may, in considering a recommendation of DA: determine that no DA is warranted (deny the recommendation for a DA); determine that a DA is warranted; determine that a DA-S is (or is not) warranted; confirm or increase or reduce the recommended DA-S for up to two (2) years.

12.16.3. The SAC panel for a penalty hearing may, in considering a recommendation of a DW: determine that no DW is warranted (deny the DW) and assign a lesser penalty (note that a DS cannot be assigned to graduate students); determine that a DW is warranted and set a period of at least two (2) years during which the student may not apply to any Ryerson program or certificate or take any continuing education courses at the University.

12.16.4. The SAC panel for a penalty hearing may, in considering a recommendation of Expulsion: determine that expulsion is not warranted and assign a lesser penalty; determine that Expulsion from the University is warranted.

12.16.5. The SAC panel for a penalty hearing may, in considering a recommendation of a Revocation of a Degree, Diploma, or Certificate: determine that a rescission is not warranted and assign a lesser penalty; determine that a Revocation of a Degree, Diploma, or Certificate is warranted.

13. SUBMISSION OF FALSIFIED DOCUMENTS

The University or eligible investigator (see Policy 60, Section 3.13) may at any point in the academic integrity process take appropriate steps to verify documents submitted.

13.1. Submission of Falsified Documents in the Admissions Process

The submission of any falsified documents (e.g. transcripts, essays, portfolios, and letters of recommendation or information considered in the admissions process) or omission/withholding of pertinent information/documents that would be considered in the admissions process will result in the following:

13.1.1. **For Undergraduate students** - The Undergraduate Admissions Office will notify the student that they will revoke any Undergraduate Offers of Admission. If determined after classes have begun, students may appeal to the RAC within ten (10) business days of issue of the revocation notice (see Policy 60, Section 13.4).

13.1.2. **For Graduate students** - The Graduate Admissions Office will notify the student that they will revoke any Graduate Offers of Admission. If determined after classes have begun students may appeal to the GAAC within ten (10) business days of issue of the revocation (see Policy 60, Section 13.4).

13.1.3. The Director of Admissions (or designate) will normally be the respondent in cases related to undergraduate students. The Vice-Provost and Dean YSGS (or designate) will normally be the respondent in cases related to graduate students. The relevant PD may be named as a co-respondent.

13.1.4. The RAC or GAAC panel may assign the recommended penalty or may in light of the evidence presented, confirm, increase, or reduce the penalty, or find that no misconduct occurred.

13.1.5. Additional penalties such as DW or Expulsion may only be assigned by SAC (see Policy 60 Section 7.2).

13.1.6. If submission of falsified admission documents is found after the granting of an undergraduate degree, diploma, or certificate the undergraduate Department/School/ Program or Undergraduate Admissions Office will recommend to the Secretary of Senate Revocation of the Degree, Diploma, or Certificate. There will be a penalty hearing conducted by the SAC. The student may give notice of appeal, and the hearing shall proceed (see Policy 60, Section 15). The decision of the SAC is final and may not be appealed.

13.1.7. If submission of falsified admissions documents is found after the granting of a graduate degree, diploma, or certificate, the Graduate Program or Graduate Admissions Office will recommend to the Secretary of Senate Revocation of the Degree, Diploma, or Certificate. There will be a penalty hearing conducted by the SAC. The student may give notice of appeal and the hearing shall proceed as in Policy 60, Section 15. The decision of the SAC is final and may not be appealed.

13.1.8. Students appealing a finding under Policy 60, Section 15 must ensure that all supporting documents for the appeal are received

by the Senate Office at least ten (10) business days prior to the hearing.

13.1.9. At the appeal hearing, students may be accompanied by both an advocate from the RSU and a support person. At SAC hearings, students may be accompanied by legal counsel. (Policy 60, Section 10).

13.1.10. In all of the above cases, the Association of Registrars of Universities and Colleges of Canada (ARUCC) may be notified if it is found that academic misconduct has occurred.

13.1.11. Any RAC or GAAC panel shall be constituted as per Policy 60, Section 12.1.2 or Section 12.1.3. Hearings and decision making of the RAC or GAAC are to follow the same guidelines as in any appeal to AIC.

13.2. Submission of Falsified Documents in a Discussion

13.2.1. If it is suspected that a falsified document has been submitted as part of an academic misconduct discussion, the decision maker should first determine (in consultation with the AIO) whether or not the document is essential to making a decision regarding misconduct.

13.2.2. If the decision maker determines that the suspected document is not essential to the decision, they may make a decision on the original suspicion of academic misconduct.

13.2.3. If the suspected document is essential to the matter being discussed, the decision maker should not make a decision until the authenticity of the document has been verified.

13.2.4. If the suspected document is found to be authentic, the discussion may be rescheduled and continue, or the decision maker may proceed to make a decision. The original suspicion must still be considered on its own merits.

13.2.5. If the document is found to be falsified, the student may have committed a distinct and separate act of academic misconduct by submitting it. The decision maker should then proceed to register a new suspicion of misconduct.

13.2.6. In assessing the authenticity of any document, it is important that the need for confidentiality and privacy be respected. In some cases decision makers may need to consult with others, including the individual who originally referred the case, to determine authenticity.

13.3. Submission of Falsified Documents or Written Statements in a Hearing

13.3.1. If it is suspected by a Chair or panel member, in advance of an appeal or hearing, that a document or written statement is falsified, they may wish to consult with the AIO regarding a fair process to verify the document's authenticity.

13.3.2. If it is suspected during a hearing that a document or written statement is falsified, the panel should consider whether the document is essential to the decision. If it is not, and if all members of the panel believe they can render their decision without considerations of the document or written statement in question, the panel can render its decision.

13.3.3. If it is found to be authentic and the panel has adjourned to determine authenticity, the panel should reconvene and render its decision.

13.3.4. If it is found to be falsified, the Chair of an appeal or penalty panel at any level may register in the usual way a new suspicion of academic misconduct for a falsified document or written statement submitted as part of any appeal or hearing.

RELATED POLICIES:

Policy 60:   Academic Integrity

Policy 61:   Non-Academic Misconduct

Policy 118: Scholarly, Research and Creative Activity (SRC) Integrity

RYERSON UNIVERSITY

POLICY OF SENATE

COURSE MANAGEMENT

* * * D R A F T * * * (May 7, 2019)

Policy Number: 166

Policy Approval Date:

Next Policy Review Date:

Responsible Office: Provost and Vice-President Academic

Contact Office:

_____

1. PURPOSE OF POLICY

The central purpose of the course management policy is to provide a framework of common understanding for students and faculty concerning the structures, processes, objectives, and requirements pertaining to the delivery of undergraduate, graduate, and continuing education (CE) courses at Ryerson University (the "University").

2. APPLICATION AND SCOPE

Learning and the pursuit of scholarship and research is a collaborative academic process in which faculty and students come together in an environment influenced by their disciplines, academic programs, the University, broader intellectual traditions, and the values and priorities of the community at large. It is through courses and course management that this is accomplished.

An academic course represents a discrete learning endeavour in which an intensive sharing of knowledge, expertise, experience, and perspective should occur. This policy applies to all undergraduate, graduate, and CE courses at the University.

Academic courses are highly varied in format, delivery, objectives, and structure. No course management policy can anticipate all possible circumstances and configurations.

3. DEFINITIONS

Constructive Feedback
Refers to any type of instructor response that serves to inform, guide, encourage, and/or instruct the student with respect to relevant coursework, research, or related aspects of their learning endeavour.

Chair/Director
Refers to the head of the department or school and includes Graduate Program Director and Program Director of Continuing Education at The G. Raymond Chang School of Continuing Education.

Continuing Education (CE)
Refers to the relevant, quality, educational programming geared to adult learners provided by the University.

Course Shell
"Shells" are the spaces in the online learning management system that are created for online course components and other collaborative projects. Shells can contain attached documents, learning materials, quizzes, assignments, discussions, and more. A "course shell" is associated with a specific course, in a specific term, at the University.

Department/School/Program
Refers to teaching departments, schools, graduate programs, and continuing education at The G. Raymond Chang School of Continuing Education.

Distance Education
Refers to online courses as well as a unique combination of in-class and online (e.g., blended) learning.

faculty (not capitalized)
Refers to the academic teaching staff of the University (see Policy 2: Undergraduate Curriculum Structure).

Faculty (capitalized)
Refers to the administrative unit (see Policy 2: Undergraduate Curriculum Structure).

Teaching Department
Refers to the academic unit that is responsible for the development, delivery, and administration of a course (see Policy 2 Undergraduate Curriculum Structure).

Test/Exam:
A test and an exam assess the knowledge of a student with a series of

questions that are graded for a result. For the purposes of this policy, test and exam have the same meaning.

4. VALUES AND PRINCIPLES

4.1 The values stipulated in the University's Senate Policy Framework are applicable and fundamental to this policy.

4.2 This policy recognizes the importance of diversity of learning and teaching styles and mode of course delivery, and in graduate courses advanced education, research, and scholarship, while

4.2.1 defining the types of information that both students and faculty need in order to optimize the learning value of any given course.

4.2.2 making clear to students and faculty the principles and procedures that have been adopted by the University that bear upon the operation of academic courses.

4.3 Students earn grades that reflect their ability to demonstrate their knowledge of the course material through the means of evaluation.

4.4 Where possible, assessments should be structured such that students' knowledge can be demonstrated incrementally.

4.5 Timely and constructive feedback in response to student work is an essential element in the learning process.

5. REGULATIONS

5.1 Department/ School/ Program/ Graduate Studies Policies, Procedures, and Student Handbooks

5.1.1 All departments, schools, programs at the Undergraduate level, Yeates School of Graduate Studies and The G. Raymond Chang School of Continuing Education (The Chang School), must have an online Student Handbook that contains the policies, procedures, and items outlined in Procedures Section 8.3. Departments with programs must include information specific to the program.

5.1.2 Policies and Procedures established by Department/ School/ Program (including Graduate Program) Councils must be made available to faculty.

5.1.3   For CE courses, the policies and procedures of the teaching department apply. For CE courses that do not have a teaching department, The Chang School is to develop policies and procedures.

5.2   Course Outlines

5.2.1   At the beginning of each course, including Distance Education courses, faculty will provide students with a course outline, either electronically on the online learning management system or in hard copy that includes, as a minimum, the information specified in Procedures Section 7. Outlines may be supplemented by more detailed topical or project information periodically during the course.

5.2.2   All University Senate policy information will be available to students through the online learning management system within each course shell and as well a link to the policy information provided in all course outlines. Policy information will be maintained by the Senate Office and is therefore not required to be incorporated into individual course outlines.

5.3   Assessments and Feedback on Student Performance

5.3.1   Different types of courses (e.g., lectures, labs, studios) have different types and numbers of assessments that may range from a number of smaller assessments spread over the term to as few as two exams (unless a variation exists see Policy Section 5.3.6).

5.3.2   In the majority of courses, individual work as a form of assessment should be the main priority. For further information on group work see Procedures Section 8.3.1.
Note: There is no restriction on the percentage of work dedicated to group work in Graduate Studies.

5.3.3   Timely (normally within ten business days unless an alternate date is warranted and indicated in the course outline) and constructive feedback in response to student work must be provided.

5.3.4   It is important that all work be graded and returned (where applicable) with reasonable promptness.

5.3.5   In the case of term work that faculty retain, the student must receive feedback on the content in addition to a numerical grade. This does not apply to final assessments.

5.3.6   Each course must have at least two individual assessments per term in the evaluation scheme. Where appropriate these assessments

should be of different types. It is strongly recommended that a single assessment not be worth more than 50% of a student's final grade, but in no case shall it be worth more than 65%. In cases where an Undergraduate or Continuing Education course does not lend itself to two individual assessments per term, this must be clearly stipulated in the course outline, and requires approval from the Academic Standards Committee as a "course variation". For Graduate courses that do not lend itself to two individual assessments per term, this must be clearly stipulated in the course outline, and requires approval from Graduate Program Council as a course variation.

5.3.7   To enable students to assess their progress in a course, at least 20% of a student's grade that is based on individual work must be returned to the student prior to the final deadline for dropping courses without academic penalty. Note: This does not apply to Graduate courses.

5.3.8   All tests/exams, including those online, are assumed to be closed book unless stipulated otherwise in the course outline.

5.3.9   Student assessment must comply with the provisions of Policy 159: Academic Accommodation of Students with Disabilities.

5.4   Make-up Assessments

5.4.1   Students who enrol in a class after there has been an assessment must be given the opportunity to make up that assessment.

5.4.2   Students who miss an assessment or equivalent (e.g. studio or presentation) or final exam with appropriate notification and the required documentation, may have a make-up scheduled. (See Procedures Section 4 for when a make-up need not be scheduled).

5.4.3   The make-up must take place as soon as it can be scheduled, preferably in the same semester, and where possible, before the last date to drop a course.

5.4.4   Where possible, the make-up shall occur prior to the submission of the final course grade.

5.4.5   Students who miss a final exam with appropriate notification and the required documentation and who cannot be given a make-up exam prior to the submission of final course grades, must petition their instructor to receive an INC grade (as outlined in Policy 46: Undergraduate Grading, Promotion, and Academic Standing and Policy 164: Graduate Status, Enrolment, and Evaluation) and a

make-up exam will be scheduled (normally within 2 weeks after the conclusion of that semester).

Note: If the course in which the student requests an INC is a prerequisite for a course being taken in the following term, the INC should be resolved as soon as possible within the first 2 weeks of the subsequent term. Students are allowed to stay in classes until the INC is resolved. If the INC results in an F grade, the department should drop the student from the course for which the prerequisite has not been achieved and fees refunded.

5.4.6 Make-ups must cover the same material as the original assessment but need not be of an identical format. Make-ups must be the same level of difficulty as the original.

5.4.7 Where a missed test, assignment, or other assessment is one of only two assessments in a course (e.g. there is one test and a final exam), or when the assessment is worth more than 30% of the final course grade, the provision of a make-up is required.

5.4.8 The consequences for a student missing a scheduled make-up assessment are provided in Procedures Section 5.

5.5   Return of Work/Grades

5.5.1 All grades (including final exams/papers) must be posted electronically via the online learning management system or made available to students through the return of their work. Course outlines must inform students of the method to be used for advising them of their grades.

5.5.2 Where graded work is returned to students, this must be done in a confidential manner, as determined by the department/ school/ program.

5.5.3 Final exams, and in some cases final papers, are not returned, but are retained for a period of one year after the end of the term. Departments/schools/programs must develop procedures to ensure that the retention and disposal of exams/papers respects the privacy of students' work. Work that is not returned must have the opportunity to be reviewed by the student in a supervised environment.

5.5.4 As there may be other considerations in the releasing of final grades, only the Registrar may release official course grades.

5.6 Change to an Announced Evaluation Scheme

5.6.1 During the term it is sometimes necessary or desirable to revise the plan of student evaluation contained in the course outline. When this is the case, Procedures Section 3 will apply.

5.6.2 In the case of emergencies, such as faculty illness, the Chair/Director of the teaching department (or a designated course coordinator) is responsible for restructuring the evaluation scheme, if required, in such a way as to maintain the course integrity while not creating undue disadvantage for students.

6. PERIOD OF PROHIBITION OF ASSESSMENTS (excludes graduate level courses)

6.1 For students in undergraduate courses, the last week of classes before the examination period is to be free of all undergraduate tests, examinations, submission of assignments, or other assessments. Exceptions to this period of prohibition are specified in Procedures Section 6.

6.2 In unusual circumstances, there may be a justifiable exception from the period of prohibition on assessments, if approved by the Chair/Director.

RELATED PROCEDURES:

Course Management

RELATED POLICIES:

Policy 2: Undergraduate Curriculum Structure

Policy 46: Undergraduate Grading, Promotion, and Academic Standing

Policy 60: Academic Integrity

Policy 159: Academic Accommodation of Students with Disabilities

Policy 164: Graduate Status, Enrolment, and Evaluation

RESCINDED POLICIES:

Policy 145: Undergraduate Course Management

Policy 151: Yeates School of Graduate Studies Course Management

RYERSON UNIVERSITY

POLICY OF SENATE

PROCEDURES: COURSE MANAGEMENT

* * * D R A F T * * * (May 7, 2019)

_____

1.   PURPOSE OF PROCEDURES

The Course Management Procedures (the "Procedures") outline the processes to be followed in carrying out Policy 166: Course Management and the roles and responsibilities of Chairs/Directors, departments / schools / programs, and faculty.

2.   ASSESSMENTS AND FEEDBACK ON STUDENT PERFORMANCE

Where the test, exam, assignment, or other assessment requires students to build directly on the proficiencies developed through earlier work, they must have the benefit of feedback on the earlier work before the subsequent due date.

If a student defers any assessment such that a grade is not available for that component until the final deadline for dropping courses has passed, this is not grounds to request a late drop on course management grounds.

3.   CHANGES TO AN ANNOUNCED EVALUATION SCHEME

3.1. If, during the term, it becomes necessary or desirable to revise the plan of student evaluation contained in the course outline, faculty will:

3.1.1. discuss the changes with the class as soon as possible

3.1.2. make such revisions as early as possible in the course

3.1.3. confirm the changes both orally in class and in writing via a handout, email, or a posting to the course website

3.1.4. post a revised outline on the course website, if one is used; and submit the revised outline to the department/school/program

3.2. When a change to an announced evaluation scheme involves only the extension of a deadline, a minimum of five business days' notice is normally required. In the case of other changes (e.g., in the number, mix, and/or weighting of methods of evaluation), students will be given as much notice as possible in order to reasonably adjust their course work plans.

3.3. Once students have begun work on a particular component of the evaluation scheme, changes will be made to that component only under extraordinary circumstances. When such changes must be made, students will, if at all possible, be given the opportunity to complete the evaluation(s) as initially set out and with the same course weight, if they so wish.

3.4. When changes are made to the plan of student evaluation or to the nature of a particular assignment/test to address the needs of an individual student or of a group within the class, the nature of the changes will be outlined in writing, normally by email, with a copy retained by the student(s) and faculty.

3.5. Normal periods of notification may be waived in the case of emergencies such as faculty illness (see Policy Section 5.6).

4. ALTERNATIVES TO MAKE-UP ASSESSMENTS

4.1. Only if it is not possible to schedule a make-up may the weight of the missed work be combined with that of the final exam or another single assessment. If the missed work was a final exam, the weight of the final exam may not be redistributed to other work and must be rescheduled. (See also Procedures Section 5 for further details).

4.2. Where the value of a missed test, exam, assignment, or other assessment totals less than 30% of the final course grade, the instructor and student may agree to transfer the grades to other course assessments. Where the value of missed work totals less than 10% of the final course grade, the provision of a make-up is at the discretion of faculty.

4.3. Where a missed test, assignment, exam, or other assessment is part of a number of assessments given throughout the term, and where it can be shown that the objective of the missed work is assessed in some other way, the faculty and affected student may agree, in writing, to distribute the weight of the missed work to the final exam, or to another 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 65% of the student's final grade. Where there is no agreement, the matter shall be referred to the Chair/Director for resolution.
Note: This may exclude some graduate courses if approval is received by the Graduate Program Council (See Policy Section 5.3.5).

4.4. Where it is not possible to schedule the missed work or test (e.g., 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 to another 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 65% of the student's final grade. If it will, an alternate assignment should be considered on a case by case basis.

Note: This may exclude some graduate courses if approval is received from the Graduate Program Council (See Policy Section 5.3.6).

5. MISSING A MAKE-UP

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

5.2. If a student misses a scheduled make-up test, assignment, or other assessment, with the appropriate notification and the required documentation, the grade may be distributed over other course assessments even if that makes the grade on the final exam worth more than 65% of the final grade in the course. In cases where the regular final exam is not cumulative, and where missed work means that previous work has not been assessed, a comprehensive final exam may be administered. If there is no appropriate notification and/or the required documentation, a grade of zero (0) will be assigned.

5.3. If a student misses a scheduled make-up for a final exam, the grade should not be re-distributed except in exceptional circumstances. If the make-up for a final exam has been missed for exceptional circumstances that need to be strong and compelling and is supported with evidence, a student may make a request to their faculty that a second make-up exam be considered. Faculty may make this decision in consultation with the Chair/Director. If a second make-up exam is not granted, a grade of zero (0) will be assigned.

6. EXCEPTIONS/CLARIFICATIONS TO PERIOD OF PROHIBITION ON ASSESSMENTS (excludes graduate level courses)

If the structure of a course requires a justifiable exception from the period of prohibition on testing stipulated in Policy 166 Section 6, or to the following rules, the Chair/Director must approve that exception. Note: This Section does not apply to Graduate students.

6.1. Section 6 does not apply to courses taught intensively, at a distance, or otherwise outside the usual scheduled hours per week mode.

6.2. It is recognized that, in certain types of courses, it may not be possible to avoid tests or other in-class assessments in the last week of classes without creating undue problems in other areas of course management. Where absolutely necessary, a single assessment may be exempted from the above restrictions where it meets ALL of the following criteria:

6.2.1. it is a logical continuation of a regular, ongoing series of term assessments (e.g., weekly or bi-weekly field placement, lab, or studio assignment); and

6.2.2. it is held in the normal class/lab/field placement slot; and

6.2.3. it is worth no more than 15% of the final course grade.

6.3. Any assessment given in lieu of a final exam, which cannot itself be made due prior to the last week of class, may be distributed during the final week of class, and may be due during the final exam period.

6.4. If an assignment involves a presentation component, and it is necessary for this presentation to be made in the last week of the semester, any written component of that assignment must be due the week prior to the last week of the class or during the final exam period and the presentation cannot itself be worth more than 15% of the final course grade.

7. COURSE OUTLINES – REQUIRED INFORMATION

NOTE: In lieu of repeating general department/school/program information in each course outline, faculty may refer to the Student Handbook. Course outlines shall contain:

7.1. **General**

7.1.1. course name and number; semester and year; prerequisites; and anti-requisites, if any

7.1.2. faculty's name; office location; scheduled consultation hours; office telephone number; email address; faculty/course website(s), if available;

7.1.2.1. if any of these factors are unknown when the course outline is prepared, the information will be provided in writing (as a handout or via the course website) at the beginning of the course.

7.1.2.2. Student consultation hours must be posted or disseminated by other means.

7.1.2.3. Continuing Education students must be provided with an appropriate email address that is monitored regularly for the course.

7.1.3. the method of posting grades and method of returning academic work in a manner that respects the privacy of students

7.1.4. any instruction on student use of email for faculty contact, as well as any preference for means of student contact

7.2. **Course Description**

7.2.1. calendar course description

7.2.2. an explanation of the academic focus and scope of the course, the objectives and/or intended learning outcomes, and topics with their approximate sequence and schedule

7.2.3. texts, reading lists, and other course materials or equipment

7.2.4. a description of the teaching method(s) that will be used (e.g., lecture, laboratory, studio, cases, problem-based learning, seminar, field work, oral presentations, or combinations of these)

7.2.5. a schedule of any field trips or required activities outside of class time

7.3. **Other Course Issues**

7.3.1. specific requirements on any Information Technology (IT) requirements for courses utilizing IT in course work, assignments, or exams

7.3.2. specific requirements for field placements, if appropriate

7.3.3. policies on the appropriate use of cellular phones, laptop computers, and other electronic devices in the classroom

7.4. **Variations within a Course**

In cases where there are multiple sections of the same course with consequent variations in course delivery methods, grading, and/or methods of evaluation, etc., students must be provided with at least a brief section/faculty-specific description in addition to the generic course outline.

7.5. **Department/ School/ Program/ Graduate Studies Policies and Procedures**

7.5.1. Information must be given on all relevant department/ school /program policies which have been identified in Procedures Section 8.3. Where relevant information is available through Student Handbooks and/or websites, course outlines will provide direction to these.

7.5.2. Students must be reminded that they are required to adhere to all relevant university policies found in their online course shell and/or on the following URL: http://ryerson.ca/senate/course-outline-policies .

7.5.3. For courses involving research with human subjects/participants, the guidelines of the Research Ethics board must be clearly referenced.

7.6. **Evaluation**

7.6.1. a list and tentative schedule of all tests, exams, assignments, and other assessments, and general description of these. More specific information on each assessment will be provided by the course faculty as early in the course as possible. Exam format, length, and permitted aids will be communicated to students in advance of the exam.

7.6.2. the weighting of each test, exam, assignment, and/or other assessment

7.6.3. if the course does not lend itself to two independent assessments, this must be clearly stated

7.6.4. the inclusion of pop tests or other unscheduled assessments as part of the grading scheme, if applicable

7.6.5. an indication of approximately when each piece of graded work will be returned to students, bearing in mind the requirements of Policy 166 Section 5.3.7

7.6.6. if a course does not lend itself to early feedback, this must be clearly stipulated

7.6.7. policies on deadlines for the acceptance of assignments and/or take-home examinations, and any penalties that will be applied when such deadlines are not met

8. RESPONSIBILITIES

8.1. **Faculty**

8.1.1. prepare course outlines for their courses that adhere to Policy 166: Course Management and these Procedures and provide these course outlines to students

8.1.2. submit copies of all course outlines in the format requested, to their department/school/program at the beginning of each term; and revised course outlines when changes are made during the term

8.1.3. follow the requirements (see Policy 166 Section 6 and Procedures Section 3) when it becomes necessary or desirable to revise the plan of student evaluation contained in the course outline

8.1.4. assess only the work of officially registered students (i.e. the work of non-registered students is not to be assessed)

8.1.5. follow procedures established by the department/school/program for the confidential return of students' graded work

8.1.6.   maintain a grade calculation sheet for each class they teach

8.1.7.   forward a copy of all grade calculations sheets to the department /school/ program at the end of the term, to be retained for at least one year

8.1.8.   retain all final assessments for a period of one year after the end of the term

8.1.9.   forward all final assessments to the department/ school/ program (or make them otherwise accessible) if they are not returning the following term, or if they will be away for an extended period of time

8.1.10. dispose of records no longer required at the end of the required holding period in the manner established by the department/ school/ program

8.2. **Chairs/Directors**:

8.2.1.   ensure that faculty submit course outlines and ensure that the information in the course outlines is in keeping with University and department/ school/ program policies/ guidelines

8.2.2.   restructure, if required, the evaluation scheme for a course, in the case of emergencies such as faculty illness

8.2.3.   access course shells on the Learning Management System in case of emergency and/or the need to reassign the course to another faculty

8.2.4.   ensure that faculty submit detailed grade calculations for every course

8.3. **Departments/ Schools/ Programs/ Graduate Studies:**

NOTE: For CE courses, the policies and procedures of the teaching department/school apply; for CE courses that do not have a home teaching department, The Chang School is to develop policies and guidelines.

8.3.1.   establish guidelines regarding **Group Work,** including**:**

8.3.1.1.   the maximum value of group work allowed in their courses
8.3.1.2.   procedures to ensure that students are afforded sufficient individual assessment

8.3.1.2.1. group work for which a student does not receive an individual assessment must not constitute more than 30% of a course grade

Note: There is no restriction on the percentage of work dedicated to group work in Graduate Studies.

8.3.1.3. fair, appropriate, and timely procedures for students who encounter difficulty with their working group

8.3.2. establish the amount and types of **course variation** that are appropriate among different sections of the same course. Course descriptions and overall objectives must be consistent and there should be comparable assignment structures and grading schemes in all sections of the same course

8.3.3. determine what policies, if any, are appropriate regarding the use of **class attendance** as a basis for grades

8.3.3.1. if attendance grades are permitted, criteria must be established and included in the course outline

8.3.4. determine what policies, if any, are appropriate regarding the use of **class participation** as a basis for grades

8.3.4.1. if participation grades are permitted, criteria must be established and included in the course outline

8.3.5. develop procedures for the confidential return of students' graded work

8.3.6. develop procedures for the disposal of examination papers, final papers, and other assessments/work not returned to student, in a manner that protects the privacy of students' work

8.3.7. distribute to faculty the policies and procedures established under this provision (Procedures Section 8.3)

8.3.8. develop an online Student Handbook for each program for which the Department/School/Program is responsible (Note: Yeates School of Graduate Studies has one (1) main Student Handbook, individual Programs may have their own handbook) that must contain the following:

8.3.8.1. the policies and procedures outlined under this provision (Procedures Section 8.3)

8.3.8.2. a statement confirming that students with disabilities will be accommodated as per Senate Policy 159, including reference to Academic Accommodation Support

8.3.9   determine what other areas relevant to the department/ school/ program should be included in the course outline, ensuring that these are in conformity with overall University policy

RELATED POLICIES:

Policy 46: Undergraduate Grading, Promotion, and Academic Standing

Policy 60: Academic Integrity

Policy 134: Undergraduate Academic Consideration and Appeals

Policy 152: Graduate Student Academic Consideration and Appeals

Policy 164: Graduate Status, Enrolment, and Evaluation

RESCINDED POLICIES:

Policy 145: Undergraduate Course Management

Policy 151: Yeates School of Graduate Studies Course Management

RELATED DOCUMENT:

INC Form