A compendium of the process and procedures related to the Annual Undergraduate Curriculum Cycle
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PURPOSE

The purpose of this document is to aid in the Annual Undergraduate Curriculum Cycle at the University of Toronto Mississauga (UTM) by providing an overview of the processes and procedures involved and information about the undergraduate curriculum review and governance consideration. This handbook includes a description of the curriculum process from the perspective of the many individuals involved and how the process is intertwined with the governance process. For questions or concerns about the curriculum process at the University of Toronto Mississauga contact Melissa Berger, Program and Curriculum Officer in the Office of the Dean at melissa.berger@utoronto.ca. For questions about the governance process at the University of Toronto Mississauga, contact the Office of the Campus Council at council.utm@utoronto.ca.

1. COMMITTEES & MEMBERSHIP

1.1 COMMITTEES
The following UTM committees/council is representative of the curriculum process and all changes require review/approval at their levels:

1. Departmental/Institute Committees
2. Divisional Curriculum Committees (Sciences, Social Sciences, Humanities)
3. Academic Affairs Committee (AAC)

1.2 MEMBERSHIP

1. Membership of the Departmental/Institute Committees:
   a. Comprised of the faculty and Chair/Director
   b. Departmental Faculty

2. Membership of the Sciences, Social Sciences and Humanities Divisional Curriculum Committees are comprised of:
   a. The Chairs or Associate Chairs (or Chair’s designate) of the Departments/Institute at UTM (voting members);
   b. Undergraduate Advisors as voting members;
   c. Resource Librarian as a voting member;
   d. A representative(s) from the Office of the Registrar (non-voting assessors);
   e. The relevant Chair of the aforementioned Curriculum Committee, who is appointed by the Vice-Principal Academic & Dean (voting members);
   f. Representative from the Office of the Dean (Vice-Dean Undergraduate and/or Program and Curriculum Officer) may also attend the meetings of these Curriculum Committees (non-voting assessor).
Members are expected to attend the scheduled meetings arranged by the Chair of their Divisional Curriculum Committee to discuss the proposed changes to their curriculum, which includes changes/additions to courses/programs; new/deleted programs and other relevant curricular changes which will appear in the UTM Academic Calendar and online.

3. Membership of the **Academic Affairs Committee** is available online at: [http://utm.utoronto.ca/governance/campus-council-committees/academic-affairs-committee](http://utm.utoronto.ca/governance/campus-council-committees/academic-affairs-committee)

### 1.3 DIVISIONAL CURRICULUM CHAIRS

The Divisional Curriculum Chairs are selected and appointed by the Vice-Principal Academic and Dean in consultation with the Vice-Dean Undergraduate, the Program and Curriculum Officer at UTM prior to the start of the annual curriculum cycle in the fall. The Vice-Principal Academic and Dean will solicit faculty and/or Departmental/Institute Chairs/Director to participate in this process from the three divisions on campus: Sciences, Social Sciences & Humanities. Notification is sent out concerning the selection of the Divisional Curriculum Committee Chairs to the Chairs/Director at UTM as well as to the Registrar and Director of Governance closer to the start of the Annual Curriculum Cycle in the fall. See Section 6 for additional information about the role of the Divisional Curriculum Chairs.

### 2. CURRICULUM REVIEW TIMETABLE

As dates are subject to change from year to year the format of the timetable is consistent with the start and end of the curriculum cycle. Major and Minor changes are brought forward to the relevant Departmental and Divisional Curriculum Committees, but are presented as a whole to the Academic Affairs Committee in the form of a report produced by the Online Academic Calendar Database created and maintained by the Office of the Registrar (see Section 6.2 for more information). The following is representative of the typical timetable supplied by the Program and Curriculum Officer in the Office of the Dean to the Chairs/Director at UTM and Chairs of the Divisional Curriculum Committees.

**MINOR CHANGES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Departmental/Institute Committees Meet</td>
<td>Early September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divisional Curriculum Committee Meetings</td>
<td>September/October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Academic Calendar Database Opens</td>
<td>Early September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Academic Calendar Database Closes</td>
<td>Late October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalized Divisional Curriculum Reports DUE</td>
<td>Late October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Affairs Committee (AAC)</td>
<td>Mid-Late November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Academic Calendar Database Re-Opens for editorial, grammatical, typographical, etc. changes</td>
<td>Late November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Academic Calendar Database Closes for the Curriculum cycle</td>
<td>Mid December</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Major curricular changes will be distributed throughout the governance Calendar of Business\(^1\) while some major changes will be prepared in time to coincide with the Minor changes going forward to the Academic Affairs Committee for final approval, it is likely that most Major changes will be spread throughout the governance year. However, it should be noted that all Major changes that have been predetermined by the Office of the Dean to go through a particular governance year **must** have their calendar copy included in the Online Academic Calendar Database before the scheduled AAC meeting where the curriculum reports are going forward.

**MAJOR CHANGES** (See above and Section 5 for a detailed breakdown of the Major Changes timeline)

**IMPORTANT:** Calendar Copy and Rationale is required to be input in the Online Academic Calendar Database and presented to the Divisional Curriculum Committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Affairs Committee</th>
<th>Mid-Late November - End of March</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee on Academic Policy &amp; Programs Meeting</td>
<td>Date to be Determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Academic Board Meeting</td>
<td>Date to be Determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Executive Committee of the Governing Council</td>
<td>Date to be Determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Governing Council Meeting</td>
<td>Date to be Determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Quality Council Meeting</td>
<td>Date to be Determined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Additional levels of governance approval required (where appropriate)*

**NOTE:** All Major Changes must first be presented to the Vice-Principal Academic and Dean & Vice-Dean Undergraduate, see Sections 4.3 & 5 for more information. Various Major Curricular Changes require additional levels of governance approval from various Boards/Committees of the Governing Council as well as governmental approval in the form of the Quality Council. The stages at which certain Major Changes are deemed appropriate to move through the various levels of governance/governmental approval are determined by the Office of the Vice-Provost Academic Programs and the Program and Curriculum Officer. Notification of the required level of governance approvals will be provided to the proposers of the Major Changes by the Program and Curriculum Officer.

*The proposers are required to be present at the various levels of governance approval in order to speak to and answer any questions. This includes the UTM governance process in addition to the Boards/Committees of the Governing Council.*

Major Changes will be described in further detail in Section 4.3.

\(^1\)The UTM Campus Council and Standing Committees Consolidated Calendar of Business 2013-14: [http://www.utm.utoronto.ca/governance/sites/files/governance/public/shared/COB/UTM%20COB%20ver.%20Jan%202017%2C%202014.pdf](http://www.utm.utoronto.ca/governance/sites/files/governance/public/shared/COB/UTM%20COB%20ver.%20Jan%202017%2C%202014.pdf)
3. ONLINE ACADEMIC CALENDAR DATABASE + CURRICULUM REPORTS

The Office of the Registrar at UTM created the Online Academic Calendar Database as a resource for the updating of the UTM Academic Calendar from year-to-year. This tool is used during the annual curriculum cycle in which the Departments/Institute update their approved curricular changes (post Divisional Curriculum Committee meeting) using this mechanism.

In addition to the updating of the UTM Academic Calendar, the changes included in the Online Academic Calendar Database are compiled into the divisional reports, which are submitted to the Academic Affairs Committee for approval. The changes included in the database form the official governance document and as such, the Online Academic Calendar Database serves as a dual-purpose platform: to create the UTM Academic Calendar and to provide reporting for approval of curricular changes to the Academic Affairs Committee.

Both Minor and Major changes are included in the reports submitted to the Academic Affairs Committee and are discussed in further detail in Section 4 of this document.

4. TYPES OF CHANGES: MINOR VS. MAJOR

4.1 TYPES OF CHANGES
This section is meant to help identify what constitutes a Minor and Major curricular change and who is responsible for identifying these changes, types of proposals and governance routing that are required.

There are two distinct types of undergraduate curriculum changes at UTM, which are considered as Minor and Major. Minor changes are considered to be items such as changes to a course description or adding a new course, whereas Major changes are items such as adding or deleting programs. It is important to note that there are instances in which Minor changes can have effects that can constitute Major changes. These types of Minor-Major changes are identified by the Program and Curriculum Officer and as such the governance routing and level of proposal will be more detailed (see Section 4.3.iv for an example of this type of change).

4.2 MINOR CURRICULAR CHANGES
Minor curricular changes receive approval from the various Divisional Curriculum Committees (Sciences, Social Sciences, Humanities) and the Academic Affairs Committee in order to be implemented. These changes must be included in the Online Academic Calendar Database.

The following curricular changes must be reviewed by the Divisional Curriculum Committee and are considered to be in the classification of Minor changes:

- Adding New Courses
- Deleting Courses
• Renumbering/Reweighting of Courses
• Change to Course Description/Name
• Prerequisite Changes

If unsure about what constitutes a Minor Change, contact the Program and Curriculum Officer in the Office of the Dean.

It is critical that the changes entered into the Online Academic Calendar Database be free of errors and therefore care should be taken when editing; as well, all rationales related to all changes should be included in the Online Academic Calendar Database and need to be clear, concise and must relate to the change being made.

**IMPORTANT NOTE:** All Minor Changes are to be included in the Online Academic Calendar Database in time for its closure prior to the Academic Affairs Committee meeting in November, as the official UTM Academic Calendar will be pulled from this governance document.

**NOTE:** Grammatical, Editorial, Typographical, etc. changes are not required to be included in the Online Academic Calendar Database prior to its initial closure in time for the Academic Affairs Committee as the Database will re-open for this purpose after approval of the Minor Changes have been made.

Training on the use of the Online Academic Calendar Database is offered through the Office of the Registrar.

### 4.3 MAJOR CURRICULAR CHANGES

The University of Toronto is required to follow the processes and guidelines set out under the University of Toronto Quality Assurance Process known as the UTQAP. Proposals for all Major Changes now undergo a more rigorous analysis and approvals process. Under the UTQAP, proposals for Major Changes will be completed using templates specifically designed for each type of change, and because this new process is more involved and detailed than in the past the Office of the Dean can no longer accept newly proposed Major Changes during the start of the annual curriculum cycle in the fall. See Section 5 for a timeframe of Major Change submissions.

The following curricular changes must be approved by the Divisional Curriculum Committee prior to their inclusion in the Online Academic Calendar Database and for submission to the Academic Affairs Committee for approval (as well as for any other boards/committees of the Governing Council where deemed appropriate):

• New Programs
• Closure of Programs
• Major Modifications to Existing Programs
• Creation of Minors
• Creation of Transcript Notations*
• Creation of Diploma and Certificate Programs*
*If these Major Changes are not to be included in the UTM Academic Calendar it is not necessary to include them in the Online Academic Calendar Database. Contact the Program and Curriculum Officer for instruction on how to handle these types of Major Changes.

If unsure about what constitutes a Major Change, contact the Program and Curriculum Officer in the Office of the Dean.

Before discussing the various types of Major Changes (see sections 4.3.i-4.3.vi) and what is involved in the creation of the proposals it is important to note that the proposer(s) of all Major Changes are required to discuss and seek the support in advance of both the Vice-Principal Academic and Dean and Vice-Dean Undergraduate in order to move forward with the concept. Materials may be provided to the Vice-Dean Undergraduate and Program and Program and Curriculum Officer in advance who will then forward to the Vice-Principal Academic and Dean. Depending on the type of Major Change being proposed it may require approval from the Provostial Advisory Group (PAG) before being able to proceed with the proposal document.

When entering the Major Changes into the Online Academic Calendar database the proposer will be required to enter the portion of the change that is related to the Academic Calendar ONLY. The lengthy proposal will be submitted in addition to the Curriculum Reports and presented to the Academic Affairs Committee for approval (and any Boards/Committees of the Governing Council as deemed necessary).

NOTE: It is important when entering Major Changes into the Online Academic Calendar Database based on the proposed that it is highlighted in the rationale for the calendar entry “This change is in alignment with our proposal for INSERT PROPOSAL TYPE”. This is in order for committee members to be able to relate the calendar change to the respective proposal.

It is also very important to get in touch with the Program and Curriculum Officer immediately following the meeting with the Vice-Principal Academic and Dean & Vice-Dean Undergraduate to discuss the steps required and to obtain the necessary templates. The Program and Curriculum Officer will provide necessary and vital feedback throughout the draft and all required governance processes.

4.3. i NEW PROGRAMS
Definition of what constitutes a new program as explained by the UTQAP:

“...applies to new undergraduate degrees, undergraduate specialists and majors...To clarify, for the purposes of the Framework, a ‘new program’ is brand-new: that is to say, the program has substantially different program requirements and substantially different learning outcomes from those of any existing programs offered by the institution.”2 It is important to contact the Program and Curriculum Officer to obtain necessary instruction on how to proceed due to the possibility of program overlap and similarities.

The creation of New Programs at the University of Toronto undergoes rigorous analysis by the Office of the Dean and the Office of the Vice-Provost Academic Programs throughout the development of the proposal. Part of the process in developing New Program proposals is the requirement to complete an outline which identifies numerous aspects of this program creation which is discussed with the Office of the Dean and various stakeholders across the University including the Office of the Vice-Provost Academic Programs. Another critical piece in the creation of a New Program is the requirement to be externally reviewed. The review takes place prior to submission of the proposal to the relevant Divisional Curriculum Committee, Academic Affairs Committee, and the various Boards/Committees of the Governing Council. The external reviewer appraisal report along with the administrative responses from both the Vice-Principal Academic and Dean & the Vice-Provost Academic Programs are required to be included in the proposal document for governance submission at UTM and Governing Council.

An excerpt from the University of Toronto Quality Assurance Process (UTQAP) related to the creation on New Programs has been included as Appendix A. The document outlines in greater detail the process and procedures involved.

It is also very important to get in touch with the Program and Curriculum Officer immediately following the meeting with the Vice-Principal Academic and Dean & Vice-Dean Undergraduate to discuss the steps required and to obtain the necessary templates. The Program and Curriculum Officer will provide necessary and vital feedback throughout the draft and all required governance processes.

4.3. ii CLOSURE OF PROGRAMS
Definition of what constitutes a program closure as explained by the UTQAP:

“There are a number of possible reasons for closing a program including low enrolment, change in the disciplinary landscape, and poor quality of the academic offerings. These reasons may be articulated in external review reports or may be identified by members of the University community.”

The Closure of Programs at the University of Toronto undergoes rigorous analysis by the Office of the Dean and the Office of the Vice-Provost Academic Programs throughout the development of the proposal. Like all Major Changes, the Closure of Programs is expected to have immediate sign-off by these two offices prior to the development of the proposal. This type of Major Change is submitted for approval to the relevant Divisional Curriculum Committee, Academic Affairs Committee, and the various Boards/Committees of the Governing Council.

An excerpt from the University of Toronto Quality Assurance Process (UTQAP) related to the Closure of Programs has been included as Appendix B. The document outlines in greater detail the process and procedures involved.

---

It is also very important to get in touch with the Program and Curriculum Officer immediately following the meeting with the Vice-Principal Academic and Dean & Vice-Dean Undergraduate to discuss the steps required and to obtain the necessary templates. The Program and Curriculum Officer will provide necessary and vital feedback throughout the draft and all required governance processes.

4.3. iii MAJOR MODIFICATIONS TO EXISTING PROGRAMS
Definition of what constitutes a major modification as explained by the UTQAP:

“...ensure[s] program quality where major substantive changes are made to existing and previously approved programs.”

Major Modifications to existing programs range in scope from significant changes to requirements of existing programs, learning outcomes, creation of a major/specialist where another of the same designation already exists, undergraduate streams, combined programs, and new Minors where they constitute a new area of study. Due to the variance in how Major Modifications can be approached it is recommended that the Program and Curriculum Officer is contacted to discuss what type of Major Modification is being proposed and what the required steps are for approval prior to working on the proposal.

An excerpt from the University of Toronto Quality Assurance Process (UTQAP) related to Major Modifications to Existing Programs has been included as Appendix C. The document outlines in greater detail the process and procedures involved.

4.3. iv CREATION OF MINORS
The creation of New Minor programs that do not define a completely new area of study are not considered to be a Major Modification or New Program. Instead the creation of a new Minor Program where there is no existing specialist or major but the New Minor is designed to fit within the existing curriculum in the Department/Institute is considered to be a Minor-Major change. What is meant by a Minor-Major change is that the creation of this type of new Minor is major enough to warrant governance approval at the highest level at UTM – Academic Affairs Committee; but is not required to go forward to the Boards/Committees of the Governing Council for approval.

It is recommended that the proposer contact the Vice-Principal Academic and Dean, Vice-Dean Undergraduate and finally the Program and Curriculum Officer to discuss the New Minor concept prior to drafting a proposal.

---

4.3. v CREATION OF TRANSCRIPT NOTATIONS

Due to the levels of approval Transcript Notations must undergo and the amount of rigor that is involved in the creation of these proposals, they are considered Major Changes and therefore must be discussed in advance with the Vice-Principal Academic and Dean and Vice-Dean Undergraduate and finally the Program and Curriculum Officer prior to drafting a proposal. Transcript Notations can typically be implemented within two-three governance cycles depending on the amount of feedback and necessary changes required.

The process for the creation of Transcript Notations requires that the following principles are adhered to in the development of such proposals:

- Reflect academic work only
- Acknowledge academic work/achievement that is in addition to that required by the student’s program of study
- Recognize work that conforms to an agreed upon minimum commitment of time, effort, and performance
- Highlight the acquisition of skill/knowledge in discrete areas
- Refer to agreed upon categories of academic activity

It is important to note that due to the nature of these types of proposals the Office of the Dean is required to obtain the approval from the Provostial Advisory Group (PAG) prior to bringing proposals for Transcript Notations through for approval at the Academic Affairs Committee. Once approval has been obtained by the Academic Affairs Committee, the proposal for the Transcript Notation can be implemented.

4.3. vi CREATION OF DIPLOMA AND CERTIFICATE PROGRAMS

Due to the levels of approval which Diploma and Certificate Programs must undergo and the amount of rigor that is involved in the creation of the proposals they are considered Major Changes and therefore must be discussed in advance with the Vice-Principal Academic and Dean and Vice-Dean Undergraduate and finally the Program and Curriculum Officer prior to drafting a proposal.

There are four categories for the creation of Diploma and Certificate programs of which one must be selected. Based on the category in which the proposal falls the process for approval varies and therefore, it is critical that the proposer discuss with the Program and Curriculum Officer the initiative well in advance to determine the governance routing and detail required in the proposal. The categories are as follows:

1. Diploma Programs
2. Post-Secondary Certificate Programs
3. Diploma and Certificate Programs offered in conjunction with Degree Programs

---

5 Taken from the University of Toronto Guidelines on Academic Transcript Notations:
http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/AssetFactory.aspx?did=8136
4. Certificate Programs in Continuing Education

A breakdown of the requirements within these categories is available in the University of Toronto Policy on Diploma and Certificate Programs.

5. TIMELINE FOR MAJOR CHANGES - UTQAP

The University of Toronto is required to follow the processes and guidelines set out under the University of Toronto Quality Assurance Process known as the UTQAP. Proposals for all Major Changes now undergo a more rigorous analysis and approvals process. Under the UTQAP, proposals for Major Changes will be completed using templates specifically designed for each type of change, and because this new process is more involved and detailed than in the past the Office of the Dean can no longer accept newly proposed Major Changes during the start of the annual curriculum cycle in the fall. Instead drafts of such proposals must be submitted to the Program and Curriculum Officer no later than March. The Office of the Dean must be notified of a proposal concept no later than February in any given year.

The Timeline for Major Changes under the UTQAP rubric are as follows:

It is advised that once consensus about the creation/modification of a program(s) has been reached that the Program and Curriculum Officer is contacted for guidance on this process as soon as possible. The Program and Curriculum Officer will assist and provide necessary feedback and suggested revisions on outlines and proposals throughout the entire process.

JANUARY/FEBRUARY
Discussion at the Departmental /Institute level to finalize initiative and to begin development of Outline. Submission of Outline to the Program and Curriculum Officer for discussion with the Vice-Principal Academic and Dean, Vice-Dean Undergraduate & Provost Office (if necessary).

MARCH
Proposal development on all Major changes. Initial stages of proposal(s) due to the Program & Curriculum Officer by the end of March at the very latest.

APRIL
Continuation of proposal development. For New Major/Specialist Programs: External Reviewer(s) nomination(s) are to be submitted to the Program & Curriculum Officer to obtain approval from the Provost.

---

6 Taken from the University of Toronto Policy on Diploma and Certificate Programs: 
SUMMER MONTHS (MAY-AUGUST)
◊ External Review for New Specialist/Major Programs (organization + event)
* Continuation of proposal development for New Minors, Closure of Programs, Major Modifications, etc.

SEPTEMBER
Department/Institute Committees Meet
Divisional Curriculum Committees Meet (Sciences, Social Sciences, Humanities)

OCTOBER
* Continuation of proposal development for New Minors, Closure of Programs, Major Modifications, etc.

NOVEMBER
Academic Affairs Committee (AAC)
* Continuation of proposal development for New Minors, Closure of Programs, Major Modifications, etc.

DECEMBER/JANUARY/FEBRUARY
* Continuation of proposal development for New Minors, Closure of Programs, Major Modifications, etc.
Committee on Academic Policy & Programs (where necessary)
Academic Board (where necessary)
Executive Committee of the Governing Council (where necessary)
Governing Council (where necessary)

MARCH/APRIL/MAY
Quality Council (where necessary)
* Continuation of proposal development for New Minors, Closure of Programs, Major Modifications, etc.

Major changes will be distributed throughout the Governance Calendar of Business.

◊ The External Review must be conducted during the Summer months in order to proceed through Governance that same Fall.
6. THE DIVISIONAL CURRICULUM COMMITTEE CHAIRS – ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

It is important to note that the Divisional Curriculum Committees are committees of the Vice-Principal Academic and Dean and as such will recommend for approval to the Academic Affairs Committee all of the curricular changes proposed (Minor and Major).

The Divisional Curriculum Chairs are selected and appointed by the Vice-Principal Academic and Dean prior to the start of the annual curriculum cycle in the fall. The Vice-Principal Academic and Dean will solicit faculty and/or Departmental/Institute Chairs/Director to participate in this process from the three divisions on campus: Sciences, Social Sciences & Humanities. Notification is sent out concerning the selection of the Divisional Curriculum Subcommittee Chairs to the Chairs/Director at UTM as well as to the Registrar and Director of Governance at UTM.

6.1 DIVISIONAL CURRICULUM COMMITTEE MEETINGS

It is the responsibility of the appointed Divisional Curriculum Committee Chair to schedule (or assign someone from their Department/Institute to schedule) the meetings for the members of the committee (see Section 1.2 for the membership) to discuss the curriculum changes from each Department/Institute. It is important that the representatives from each Department/Institute who are proposing changes (both Minor and Major) are in attendance at these meetings to bring forward for discussion and approval all of their proposed changes.

IMPORTANT NOTE: If any proposed changes have resource implications either through funding or library resources it is essential that the proposers contact the Office of the Dean and Chief Librarian immediately to discuss those implications. In addition, if a Department/Institute’s changes affect another Department which is outside of their Divisional Curriculum Committee, it is the responsibility of the Divisional Curriculum Committee Chair to contact those involved and ensure that these changes have been communicated and feedback has been received before proceeding further e.g. changes within the Sciences affecting the Social Sciences, etc.

Also, if Major changes are being presented at the Divisional Curriculum Committee meetings that have not yet been discussed with the Office of the Dean it is important that you notify the Program and Curriculum Officer immediately following the meeting.

6.1.2 CONDUCT OF THE DIVISIONAL CURRICULUM COMMITTEE MEETINGS

The Chair of the Divisional Curriculum Committee will call and conduct the meetings to discuss curricular items in the fall.

The Divisional Curriculum Committees are responsible for the following:

- The Humanities, Sciences, and Social Sciences Curriculum Committees shall;
• Consider the content, quality, and requirements of the academic programs and courses of study that lead to degrees, diplomas, certificates, and credit and non-credit courses over which UTM has authority;

• They shall conduct the initial review of proposals for new academic programs, the closure of any academic programs, major and minor modifications to existing programs, and any proposed course changes;

• They shall recommend these for approval to the Academic Affairs Committee.

• The membership of the committees consists of the department Chairs and/or the Directors of Interdisciplinary units and Institutes or their designate, Undergraduate Advisors, a Resource Librarian, a Representative from the Office of the Dean, and a Representative from the Office of the Registrar. The Chairs of the Committees are appointed by the Vice-Principal Academic and Dean.

6.1.3 FREQUENCY OF DIVISIONAL CURRICULUM COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Depending on the volume and various types of changes it is possible that the Divisional Curriculum Committees may meet 2-4 times. The average number of meetings is typically 3, but again this is dependent on the volume of changes and types. It is best practice to schedule more meetings than are required and cancel those that are not needed.

It is also best practice to begin scheduling the Divisional Curriculum Committee meetings in advance of the start of the curriculum cycle in the fall.

6.2 READINESS OF THE CURRICULUM REPORTS

In order to ensure that the Curriculum Reports going forward to the Academic Affairs Committee are ready for governance consideration, the Chairs of the Divisional Curriculum Committees are asked to verify whether the following have been reviewed, and amended (where appropriate) throughout the relevant report for that committee (i.e. Sciences, Social Sciences, Humanities):

1. **Rationales:** If any are missing or communicate little to inform the Academic Affairs Committee members about the reason for the change, ensure that this has been corrected/addressed. Many are descriptions of the changes rather than the academic rationales, which illuminate why the curricular change is warranted.

   Often the rationales are very cryptic or poorly worded i.e. “Addition of Course ABC”. Some others are merely carried over from one departmental program change to another, with a statement such as “This reflects an expansion of core courses in 2nd and 3rd year”, without properly describing the specific nature of the change or the reasons why it makes programmatic sense.
2. It is important to make sure that the items are included in the appropriate sections i.e. if a course is renumbered, it must appear in the “renumbered courses” section, not within “other changes”.

3. **Number of hours of instruction**: This should be consistent, using “lecture hours; practicum hours; tutorial hours” format, not just indicating “number of hours”.

4. **Formatting issues**: Ensure that if “point #1” is referred to, that the point being referred is indeed numbered, not just bulleted.

5. **Typos and grammatical errors**: It is essential that these are checked and eliminated. After the online Academic Calendar Database closes there will still be opportunity for typos to be corrected by staff in the Office of the Registrar.

When entering the Major Changes into the Online Academic Calendar database the proposer will be required to enter the portion of the change that related to the Academic Calendar ONLY. The lengthy proposal will be submitted in addition to the Curriculum Reports presented to the Academic Affairs Committee (and any Boards/Committees of the Governing Council as deemed necessary) for approval.

**IMPORTANT NOTE**: When entering Major Changes into the Online Academic Calendar Database based on the proposal, it is important that the rationale is highlighted in the calendar entry as: “This change is in alignment with our proposal for INSERT PROPOSAL TYPE”. This is in order for committee members to be able to relate the calendar change to the respective proposal.

### 6.3 POST DIVISIONAL CURRICULUM COMMITTEE LEVEL – STEPS TO TAKE

After the final Divisional Curriculum Committee meetings have taken place it is important for the Chair of each Curriculum Committee to review the compiled Curriculum Report (see Section 6.2) and complete the following steps:

1. Access and Review the Curriculum Report for the relevant committee
2. Ensure that all changes with possible resource implications have been discussed with the Office of the Dean and that Library implications have been discussed with the Chief Librarian.
3. Contact both the Program and Curriculum Officer at UTM via email to indicate that the Curriculum Report is ready for submission to the Academic Affairs Committee

### 6.3.1 REPORT TO THE ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE (AAC)

At the curricular meeting of the Academic Affairs Committee meeting (usually in November), it is the responsibility of the Senior Assessor (the Vice-Principal Academic and Dean at UTM) to present the divisional curriculum report and move it for approval. The Chair of the Divisional Curriculum Committee need no longer present an oral report to the Academic Affairs Committee. Instead, the Chair of the Divisional Curriculum Committee is required to complete the *University of Toronto Mississauga Divisional Curriculum Committee Report Template*. This report is to be submitted to the Program and Curriculum Officer, who will provide it to the Senior Assessor for the composition of a short
comprehensive report highlighting the changes proposed. The Program & Curriculum Officer will provide this template. The report will include the following:

- Highlight any changes in courses (moving from full to half, deletions, additions) that have wide-ranging effects: for example relating to a course that is a prerequisite for many other courses, etc.
- Incorporate information about the sections of the Curriculum Report that received a lot of discussion at the Divisional Curriculum Committee level
- If there are sections of the report that you do not feel comfortable with in terms of answering specific questions, invite the appropriate departmental representative to be present at the Academic Affairs Committee meeting where these changes will be discussed.

* Please contact the Program & Curriculum Officer for details/information/questions

### 6.3.1.1 PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE CURRICULUM REPORT FROM THE ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Assuming amendments, if any, are friendly to you as Divisional Curriculum Committee Chair, the Academic Affairs Committee will be asked to vote to approve the curriculum changes as presented in the Curriculum reports. If the Academic Affairs Committee disagrees with a major recommendation of a Curriculum Committee, it sends the item back to the Committee for re-consideration, along with a statement of their non-concurrence. Due to time constraints, this step would normally be handled via electronic communication with Committee members. Once the item has had re-consideration at the Committee level, it is brought back before the Academic Affairs Committee for approval. Since sending back an item is not ideal, it is highly recommended that the Chair of the Curriculum Committee invite appropriate Departmental representation to the AAC meeting, especially with respect to Major or controversial changes, so that all questions can be fully answered and the experts on a particular change are at the decision-making table.

### 6.3.1.2 NOTE ON ADDITIONAL DEPARTMENTAL REPRESENTATIVES

It is strongly recommended that the Divisional Curriculum Committee Chairs invite and encourage departmental representatives to attend the Academic Affairs Committee meetings as appropriate to answer program specific questions with respect to Major Changes and/or substantive Minor Changes.

### 7. PROPOSERS OF MINOR AND MAJOR CHANGES – ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

It is the responsibility of the proposers of Minor changes to make clear to their Departmental/Institute Chair/Director what their change is related to and the reason for the change(s) in order for the Chair/Director to communicate these changes to the Divisional Curriculum Committee(s) and the
Academic Affairs Committee (if necessary). For a definition of what constitutes a Minor Change see Section 4.2.

It is the responsibility of the proposers of Major changes to first contact the Vice-Principal Academic and Dean and Vice-Dean Undergraduate to discuss their proposed Major change in order to obtain the necessary sign-off. It is then strongly recommended that the Program and Curriculum Officer is contacted to inquire about what the next steps are and to obtain all necessary documentation and procedures. For a definition of what constitutes a Major Change see Section 4.3.

It is the responsibility of the proposers of Minor and Major changes to signal to the Office of the Dean that there are resource implications associated with their changes. The Office of the Dean will review the proposal and determine whether or not to allow the change to move forward with the resources requested. If there are library-based resources required in the proposal, it is the responsibility of the proposer to contact the Chief Librarian to review the request and to determine whether or not to allow the change to proceed.

Who to contact in the Office of the Dean:

- Vice-Dean Undergraduate – Substantive Minor Changes, Major Changes and Resource Implications
- Assistant Dean – Resource Implications
- Program and Curriculum Officer – All items related to the curriculum process including but not limited to: Policies, Procedures, Minor and Major Changes, etc.

Who to contact in the Library:

- Chief Librarian – Any Library Resource Implications

8. OFFICE OF THE DEAN – ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The annual curriculum cycle is set by the Office of the Dean in conjunction with the Office of the Campus Council at UTM and the Provost’s Office. Notification is sent to the Departmental/Institute Chairs/Director and Divisional Curriculum Committee Chairs concerning the general curriculum schedule of meetings and events (i.e. opening and closing of the Online Academic Calendar Database) at the start of the curriculum cycle signaling that the process has begun (see Section 2).

8.1 Vice-Principal Academic and Dean
The Vice-Principal Academic and Dean is responsible for reviewing initial proposals for Major changes and will provide the necessary sign-off in order for the proposer to begin drafting their document. The
Vice-Principal Academic and Dean must endorse the Major changes coming forward. For what constitutes a Major Change see Section 4.3.

The Vice-Principal Academic and Dean is responsible for reviewing resource implications associated with Minor and Major changes in consultation with the Vice-Dean Undergraduate & Assistant Dean and will determine whether or not funding is available to support the requested change.

8.2 Vice-Dean Undergraduate
The Vice-Dean Undergraduate is responsible for reviewing initial proposals for Major changes and will in consultation with the Vice-Principal Academic and Dean provide the necessary sign-off for the proposer to begin drafting their document. For what constitutes a Major Change see Section 4.3.

The Vice-Dean Undergraduate is responsible for reviewing resource implications associated with Minor and Major changes in consultation with the Vice-Principal Academic and Dean & Assistant Dean and will determine whether or not funding is available to support the requested change and communicate this back to the proposer(s).

The Vice-Dean Undergraduate is responsible for reviewing all substantive Minor Changes and Major changes coming forward in the prescribed template in consultation with the Program and Curriculum Officer. These Major changes must have the endorsement from the Vice-Principal Academic and Dean and Vice-Dean Undergraduate before they are presented to governance for approval.

8.3 Assistant Dean
The Assistant Dean is responsible for reviewing resource implications associated with Minor and Major changes in consultation with the Vice-Principal Academic and Dean & Vice-Dean Undergraduate and will determine whether or not funding is available to support the requested change and communicate this back to the proposer(s).

8.4 Program and Curriculum Officer
The Program and Curriculum Officer is responsible for all aspects of the curriculum review process related to both Minor and Major changes which also includes the following: (For a definition of constitutes a Minor and Major change, see Section 4.)

- The Program and Curriculum Officer will disseminate information related to the curriculum review process to the Chairs/Director and the Divisional Curriculum Chairs, assist with any questions or concerns related to the various changes, and provide the proposers with the prescribed governance routing.
• Responsible for the review of all drafts for Major Changes and will provide feedback and recommended changes concerning these types of proposals in consultation with the Vice-Dean Undergraduate and the Provost's Office.

• Will identify any potential issues or concerns with respect to Minor and Major curricular changes and will bring these to the attention of the proposer(s), Vice-Dean Undergraduate, the Provost’s Office, and the Office of the Registrar where necessary.

• Provides the Office of the Campus Council at UTM and the Provost’s Office with all Major Changes for review and approval.

• The Program and Curriculum Officer is the main point of contact throughout the curriculum process.

9. OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR – ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The Office of the Registrar is responsible for the maintenance, opening and closing of the Online Academic Calendar in consultation with the Program and Curriculum Officer at UTM (see Section 6).

The Office of the Registrar is responsible for assigning a representative to attend the Divisional Curriculum Subcommittee meetings to take part in the discussions about the proposed changes, to ensure that there is no conflict in the UTM Academic Calendar based on the proposed changes, to discuss changes that may impact the University of Toronto Mississauga and the greater community, and to provide important advice on the proposed changes. The Office of the Registrar representative(s) are non-voting assessors.

The Office of the Registrar is the home to the UTM Academic Calendar and as such works in conjunction with the Office of the Dean during the annual curriculum cycle.

The Office of the Registrar is responsible for contacting the Program and Curriculum Officer related to any questions or requests to include changes to the Academic Calendar post-curriculum review. The Program and Curriculum Officer will review the request(s) and determine with the Vice-Principal Academic and Dean whether the late request is permissible or will have to wait until the next curriculum cycle. Late requests are not common practice and the Office of the Dean requests that all curriculum changes are added during the normal curriculum cycle or in time for the last UTM governance meetings.

NOTE: This is only related to Minor changes.
10. OFFICE OF THE CAMPUS COUNCIL – ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The Office of the Campus Council is responsible for the agenda of the Academic Affairs Committee meetings, where the proposals for all curriculum matters are discussed, considered and approved, and works closely with the Program and Curriculum Officer in determining the governance routing at UTM.

The Office of the Campus Council ensures that due process has been followed in the consideration of these items and that the members of the Academic Affairs Committee have all of the information they require in order to make an informed decision in consultation with the Program and Curriculum Office and the Vice-Principal Academic and Dean.
CONTACT

OFFICE OF THE DEAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vice-Principal Academic and Dean</td>
<td>Professor Amy Mullin</td>
<td><a href="mailto:amy.mullin@utoronto.ca">amy.mullin@utoronto.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-Dean Undergraduate</td>
<td>Professor Kelly Hannah-Moffat</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hannah.moffat@utoronto.ca">hannah.moffat@utoronto.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Dean</td>
<td>Lynn Snowden</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lynn.snowden@utoronto.ca">lynn.snowden@utoronto.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program and Curriculum Officer</td>
<td>Melissa Berger</td>
<td><a href="mailto:melissa.berger@utoronto.ca">melissa.berger@utoronto.ca</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Contact the Program and Curriculum Officer in the Office of the Dean for more information or if there are any questions or concerns about the curriculum process.

UTM GOVERNANCE

| Office of the Campus Council | council.utm@utoronto.ca |

DISCLAIMER

- Information that is found throughout this document is subject to change at anytime.
- Timeframes are approximate and subject to change.
CURRICULUM CHECKLIST

This checklist has been created to assist with the curriculum process to ensure that you have identified the following items related to your change(s). Remember, these must be approved before you are able to obtain the necessary governance approvals for the implementation of your curriculum change(s).

MINOR AND MAJOR CHANGES:

☐ Have you contacted the Vice-Principal Academic and Dean & Vice-Dean Undergraduate concerning your proposed **Major Change**?
  - o Have you obtained the necessary sign-off to continue?
  - o Have you contacted the Program and Curriculum Officer to get more information on how to proceed?

☐ Have you contacted the Office of the Dean with respect to your **Resource Implications**?

☐ Have you contacted the Chief Librarian with respect to your **Library Resource Implications**?

☐ Are you in need of additional **Staffing** in order to support the proposed change? If yes, have you contacted the Office of the Dean?

☐ Are there **Space** requirements in your proposed? If yes, have you contacted the Office of the Dean?

☐ Do you require **TA support** for your proposed change? If yes, have you contacted the Office of the Dean?

☐ Do you require **Sessional Lecturers** for your proposed change? If yes, have you contacted the Office of the Dean?
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1 Quality Assurance Context

1.1 Overview

The University of Toronto is committed “to being an internationally significant research university, with undergraduate, graduate, and professional programs of excellent quality.” Hence, the University welcomes the opportunity provided by the Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents’ Quality Assurance Framework (QAF) assigning the responsibility for academic standards, quality assurance and program improvement, in the first instance, to universities themselves. The University of Toronto’s approach to quality assurance is built on two primary indicators of academic excellence: (1) the quality of the scholarship and research of faculty and (2) the success with which that scholarship and research is brought to bear on the achievement of Degree Level Expectations. These indicators are assessed by determining how our scholarship, research and programs compare to those of our international peer institutions and how well our programs meet their Degree Level Expectations. Reviews provide the opportunity to celebrate successes, identify areas where we can do better, and vigorously pursue improvements.

The Policy for Approval and Review of Academic Programs and Units governs the approval of proposed new programs and the review of existing programs at the University of Toronto. The University of Toronto Quality Assurance Process (UTQAP) outlines the protocols for the assessment and approval of new programs, review of existing programs, modifications to existing programs, and closures of programs. Complementing this document, the University has developed a series of standardized templates to support the quality assurance process. These and a wide range of explanatory materials and best practice exemplars are available on the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs’ UTQAP website. The Policy for Approval and Review of Academic Programs and Units was approved by the Governing Council of the University of Toronto on June 24, 2010. The UTQAP was brought forward for information at that time and was subsequently ratified by the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (the Quality Council) on March 31, 2011. The current version of the UTQAP contains a number of small revisions to ensure greater clarity and to bring the document in line with evolving practice across the province following the first full year under the Quality Assurance Framework. It was approved by the Quality Council on September 21, 2012.

The University of Toronto’s responsibilities for quality assurance extend to new and continuing undergraduate and graduate degree and diploma programs whether offered in full or in part by the UofT, or conjointly with any institutions federated or affiliated with the University. These responsibilities also extend to programs offered in partnership, collaboration or other such arrangement with other postsecondary institutions including colleges, universities, and institutes.

The Quality Council ensures that Ontario continues to maintain a rigorous quality assurance framework. It ratifies each institution’s Quality Assurance Process [IQAP] and is responsible for approving any subsequent revisions to that IQAP. It also is responsible for conducting an audit of university processes through a panel of auditors that reports to a committee of the Council. The panel’s role is to examine each institution’s compliance with its own Quality Assurance Process. The Quality Council approves and monitors the audit reports.

The University of Toronto Quality Assurance Process (UTQAP) encompasses four elements:

- **The New Degree Program Approval Protocol** applies to new undergraduate degrees, undergraduate specialists and majors, graduate programs and degrees, graduate diplomas, and collaborative graduate programs. The Quality Council has provided the following statement regarding the definition of new programs: ‘To clarify, for the purposes of the Framework, a ‘new program’ is brand-new: that is to say, the program has substantially different program requirements and substantially different learning outcomes from those of any existing approved programs offered by the institution.'
New programs and degrees are externally reviewed as part of the process leading to approval by institutional governance. Proposals for graduate diplomas and collaborative programs do not require external appraisal. Once approved by University governance, these new program proposals are assessed by the Appraisal Committee of the Quality Council. This Council has the authority to approve or decline all new program proposals.

- **The Major Modification Protocol** is used to ensure program quality where major substantive changes are made to existing and previously approved programs. Major modifications are approved through University governance processes and are reported annually to the Quality Council.

- **The Program Closure Protocol** articulates a process for closing programs. There are a number of possible reasons for closing a program including low enrolment, changes in the disciplinary landscape, and poor quality of the academic program. These reasons may be articulated in external review reports or may be identified by members of the University community. Program closures are approved through University governance processes and are reported annually to the Quality Council.

- **The Cyclical Program Review Protocol** ensures the quality of existing undergraduate and graduate degree programs and for-credit graduate diplomas. The review of an academic program may be a part of a review of the academic unit(s) in which the program resides.

In addition to the protocols described in the UTQAP, the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs’ UTQAP website:

- a) provides templates that establish formats for new program proposals, major modifications, program closures, self-studies and external review reports;

- b) describes best practices and establishes criteria for administrative processes such as the selection of reviewers and scheduling of appraisals of new and existing programs and units;

- c) provides guidance on the conduct of self-studies;

- d) identifies responsibilities for the collection, aggregation and distribution of standardized data and outcome measures required for self-studies;

- e) sets out the University’s cycle for the conduct of undergraduate and graduate program reviews; and

- f) establishes contact information for support and assistance.

### 1.2 Institutional authority

The Vice-President and Provost is the chief academic officer and chief budget officer at the University of Toronto. The Provost, with the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs, is responsible for the oversight of the University of Toronto Quality Assurance Process and ensuring that the UTQAP is applied in a manner that conforms to the UofT’s quality assurance principles and to Quality Council requirements.

Within the Office of the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs, the Director, Academic Programs and Policy is the contact between the institution and the Quality Council.

*New Degree Program Proposals:* The Office of the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs responds to divisional queries and facilitates proposal development with respect to
institutional academic, planning and budget, student life, governance and approval aspects of proposals.

**Major Modifications to Existing Programs:** The Office of the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs consults with divisions on the development of proposals for major modifications to existing programs. The Office receives copies of approved program modifications and compiles an annual report of all divisional modifications.

**Program Closures:** The Office of the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs responds to divisional queries and facilitates the development of proposals for the closure of programs. The Office includes program closures in the annual report to the Quality Council.

**Cyclical Reviews:** The Office of the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs is responsible for ensuring that cyclical reviews of academic programs and/or units are undertaken. Where quality concerns are raised in the cyclical review, the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs monitors the timely implementation of improvements.

The Office of the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs maintains a UTQAP website that includes information pertaining to the Quality Assurance process, all related templates and materials, program approval and review schedules, and contact information.
2 New Degree Program Approval Protocol

The primary responsibility for the design and quality assurance of new undergraduate and graduate degree programs lies with the University and its governing bodies. Academic divisions are responsible for curriculum design, the identification of program objectives, the development of learning outcomes and degree level expectations, and the assembly of human, instructional and physical resources. The approval protocol helps to ensure that programs are aligned with the objectives of the academic division and of the University as specified within the Statement of Institutional Purpose and thereby advance the mission of the University and the academic division.

2.1 Purpose and application

The New Degree Program Approval Protocol sets out the steps to be taken at the University to assemble and provide the information required in support of new program proposals. The purpose of the Protocol is to ensure that the procedures followed for the assessment of proposed new academic degree programs is in accordance with the University Policy for Approval and Review of Academic Programs and Units and the provincial Quality Assurance Framework.

The New Degree Program Approval Protocol applies to the development of new undergraduate or graduate degrees, undergraduate specialists and majors within approved degrees and to graduate degree programs, graduate collaborative programs, and diplomas, offered in full or in part by the UofT or by the UofT jointly or conjointly with institutions federated or affiliated with the University:

- New Degree Program Proposals are assessed within the division and by the Office of the Provost as part of the program development process prior to external appraisal and submission to University governance. The program proposal must address the purpose and content of the new program and the capacity of the unit to deliver a high quality program.
- The Dean is responsible for commissioning the external appraisal of proposed new programs with the approval of the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs.
- Programs that are inter- and multidisciplinary must identify a permanent lead administrative division and identify a commissioning officer for future cyclical program reviews.
- Programs that are inter-institutional and offered jointly, conjointly and/or in affiliation with other higher education institutions (colleges and universities) through formal agreements are assessed as entities distinct from the larger institutions within which they are included. Where a program is held jointly with an Ontario institution that does not have an IQAP that has been ratified by the Quality Council, the UTQAP will serve as the guiding document and University of Toronto will be the lead institution. Where a program is held jointly with an Ontario institution that does have an IQAP that has been ratified by the Quality Council, a lead institution will be selected. Program proposals specify how future reviews will be conducted.

2.2 Overview of the program approval process

The steps required to develop and approve proposals for new undergraduate degrees, undergraduate specialists or majors within existing degrees, graduate programs and degrees, graduate diplomas, and graduate collaborative programs, are indicated in Figures 1a (standard approval) and 1b (expedited approval). New undergraduate degrees, undergraduate specialists or majors, graduate degrees and programs are subject to the full standard approval process which includes an external appraisal. New graduate diplomas and collaborative graduate programs may be brought forward under an expedited process which requires the submission of a proposal to the Quality Council but does not require an external appraisal.
### Figure 1a: Standard process for approval of new undergraduate and graduate degrees and programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. INTERNAL UNIVERSITY PROCESS</th>
<th>Division: Proposal initiation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provost’s Office (2.4.2):</strong></td>
<td>All programs (at outline stage) are brought to the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs who responds to divisional queries and facilitates proposal development through consultation with other Vice-Provostial portfolios.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Vice-Provost, Academic Programs and/or Vice-Provost, Graduate Education considers:** | - Program rationale including consistency with the unit’s academic plan  
  - Appropriateness of the name and degree designation  
  - Program description, requirements, content and standards; program objectives; learning outcomes; faculty and teaching staff requirements and supervisory capacity  
  - Impact on the nature and quality of the division’s programs of study  
  - Impact on other divisions and need for inter-divisional and inter-institutional consultation and agreements/contracts |
| **Vice-President, University Operations considers:** | - Resource implications, including, but not limited to, staffing, libraries and computing facilities, enrolment/admissions, revenue/costs, financial aid  
  - Enrolment planning, revenue and expense projections  
  - BIU eligibility  
  - Space allocations and operating costs; capital project approvals |
| **Vice-President, University Relations** | - MTCU program approvals process and submission requirements |
| **Vice-Provost, Students and/or Vice-Provost, Graduate Education considers:** | - Impact on student affairs and services; registrarial and information systems; awards and admissions |
| **Vice-Provost, Faculty and Academic Life considers:** | - Faculty implications |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broad consultation: with faculty, students, other academic divisions, and external stakeholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Division: Proposal development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean’s Office and Provost’s Office signoff (2.4.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division: External appraisal commissioned (2.4.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division and Provost’s Office: Internal response to appraisal (2.4.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divisional Governance Approval (2.4.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost’s Office: Submits proposal for University Governance Approval (2.4.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New specialists and majors are approved at the level of AP&amp;P. New undergraduate degrees, graduate degrees and programs are recommended by AP&amp;P to Academic Board and confirmed by the Executive Committee of Governing Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost’s Office: Submits proposal to the Quality Council (2.4.8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2. QUALITY COUNCIL APPROVAL PROCESS | Appraisal Committee Review and Recommendation (2.5.2)  
(normal within 45 days of receipt of the institution’s submission) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality Council Approval to commence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. MTCU PROCESS</th>
<th>University: Submission to MTCU if new degree or new graduate degree or program (2.7.1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| 4. FOLLOW-UP PROCESS | Ongoing program monitoring by the University (2.7.3)  
Cyclical Review within 8 years of first enrolment |
## Figure 1b: Expedited process for approval of new graduate diplomas and graduate collaborative programs

### 1. INTERNAL UNIVERSITY PROCESS

#### Division: Proposal initiation

**Provost’s Office (2.4.2):**
All programs (at the outline stage) are brought to the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs who responds to divisional queries and facilitates proposal development through consultation with other Vice-Provostial portfolios.

**Vice-Provost, Academic Programs and/or Vice-Provost, Graduate Education considers:**
- Program rationale including its consistency with the unit’s academic plan.
- Appropriateness of the name and degree designation.
- Program description, requirements, content and standards; program objectives; learning outcomes; faculty and teaching staff requirements and supervisory capacity.
- Impact on the nature and quality of the division’s programs of study.
- Impact on other divisions and need for inter-divisional and inter-institutional consultation and agreements/contracts.

**Vice-President, University Operations considers:**
- Resource implications, including, but not limited to, such areas as staffing, space, libraries and computing facilities, enrolment/admissions, revenue/costs, financial aid.
- Enrolment planning; revenue and expense projections.
- BIU eligibility.
- Space allocations and operating costs; capital project approvals.

**Vice-President, University Relations**
- MTCU program approvals process and submission requirements

**Vice-Provost, Students and/or Vice-Provost, Graduate Education considers:**
- Impact on student affairs and services; registrarial and information systems; awards and admissions.

**Vice-Provost, Faculty and Academic Life considers:**
- Faculty implications.

#### Division: Proposal development

**Broad consultation:** with faculty, students, other academic divisions, and external stakeholders

**Dean’s Office and Provost’s Office signoff (2.4.3)**

**Divisional Governance Approval (2.4.7)**

**Provost’s Office: Submits proposal to University Governance Approval: AP&P (2.4.7)**

**Provost’s Office: Submits proposal to the Quality Council (2.4.8)**

### 2. QUALITY COUNCIL APPROVAL PROCESS

**Expedited Approval Process: Appraisal Committee Review and Recommendation**
(normally within 45 days of receipt of the institution’s submission)

**Quality Council Approval to commence**

### 3. MTCU PROCESS

**University: Submission to MTCU if new diploma**

### 4. FOLLOW-UP PROCESS

**Ongoing program monitoring by the University**
**Cyclical Review within 8 years of first enrolment**
2.3 Evaluation criteria identified in the Quality Assurance Framework

Proposals for new graduate or undergraduate degree programs are evaluated against the following criteria set by the Quality Assurance Framework. Academic divisions are responsible for the development of a New Program Proposal that addresses the evaluation criteria below together with any further divisional requirements which the academic division chooses to apply (see UTQAP New Program Templates).

2.3.1 Objectives

a) Consistency of the program with the institution’s mission and unit’s academic plans.

b) Clarity and appropriateness of the program’s requirements and associated learning outcomes in addressing the academic division’s undergraduate or graduate Degree Level Expectations.

c) Appropriateness of degree or diploma nomenclature.

2.3.2 Admission requirements

a) Appropriateness of the program’s admission requirements for the learning outcomes established for completion of the program.

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

2.3.3 Structure

a) Appropriateness of the program's structure and regulations to meet specified program learning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations.

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

2.3.4 Program content

a) Ways in which the curriculum addresses the current state of the discipline or area of study.

b) Identification of any unique curriculum or program innovations or creative components.

c) For research-focused graduate programs, clear indication of the nature and suitability of the major research requirements for degree completion.

d) Evidence that each graduate student in the program is required to take all of the course requirements from among graduate level courses.

2.3.5 Mode of delivery

a) Appropriateness of the proposed mode(s) of delivery (distance learning, compressed part-time, online, mixed-mode or non-standard forms of delivery, flex-time options) to meet the intended program learning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations.
2.3.6 Assessment of teaching and learning

a) Appropriateness of the proposed methods for the assessment of student achievement of the intended program learning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations.

b) Completeness of plans for documenting and demonstrating the level of performance of students, consistent with the academic division’s statement of its Degree Level Expectations.

2.3.7 Resources for all programs

a) 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 program.

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

c) Evidence that there are adequate resources to sustain the quality of scholarship and research activities of undergraduate and graduate students, including library support, information technology support, and laboratory access.

d) A budget outline including proposed enrolment, proposed tuition, and indication of whether the proposed program will be cost-recovery.

2.3.8 Resources for graduate programs only

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

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

c) Evidence of how supervisory loads will be distributed, and the qualifications and appointment status of supervisors.

2.3.9 Resources for undergraduate programs only

a) Evidence of and planning for adequate numbers and quality of faculty and staff to achieve the goals of the program.

b) Planning and 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).

e) The role of adjunct and part-time faculty.
2.3.10 Quality and other indicators

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

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

2.4 Initial institutional process

2.4.1 Institutional authority and Quality Council contact

The Provost with the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs is responsible for the oversight of the University of Toronto Quality Assurance Process and ensuring that the UTQAP is applied in a manner that conforms to the University’s quality assurance principles and Quality Council requirements. The Office of the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs responds to divisional queries and facilitates proposal development with regard to institutional academic, planning and budget, student life, governance and approval aspects of proposals.

Within the Office of the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs, the Director, Academic Programs and Policy is the contact between the institution and the Quality Council.

2.4.2 New Program Proposal development and submission to the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs

New programs are initiated within academic divisions. The Office of the Dean of the academic division submits the initial proposal outline to the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs who is responsible for providing feedback regarding the program including input from the Provost and other Vice-Provosts, as appropriate.

Once the program has been approved for development, the division works with the Office of the Provost to develop the New Program Proposal.

The Dean ensures appropriate compliance with the evaluation criteria (Section 2.3) and ensures that appropriate consultation is conducted with the Office of the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs early in the process of proposal development. The Dean ensures that appropriate consultation is conducted with faculty and students, other university divisions and external institutions. The Dean commissions the external appraisal of a new program as required with the approval of the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs.

The Office of the Provost reviews and approves draft proposals as identified in Figures 1a and 1b.

2.4.3 Program proposal

The Vice-Provost, Academic Programs confirms that the New Program Proposal is complete and includes information on all the evaluation criteria (Section 2.4.2), so that the submission process can continue.

2.4.4 External appraisal

An external appraisal is required for new undergraduate and graduate degrees, new undergraduate specialists and majors, and new graduate degree program proposals only. The following process is required in the selection and appointment of external reviewers who review a New Program Proposal.
• The external appraisal of a New Program Proposal is commissioned by the Dean of the relevant academic division with the approval of the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs. There must be at least one reviewer for a new undergraduate program and two for a new graduate program.
• The reviewers should be active and respected in their disciplines, and will normally be associate or full professors, or the equivalent, with program management or senior academic administrative experience. They must be at arm’s length from the program under appraisal. (See the UTQAP website for a definition of arm’s length, suggestions on the selection of reviewers, and a reviewer nomination form)
• The external appraisal of a new graduate program proposal must incorporate an on-site visit. The external appraisal of a new undergraduate program proposal is normally conducted on-site, but may be conducted by desk audit, video-conference or an equivalent method if the external reviewer is satisfied that the off-site option is acceptable. (The UTQAP website includes sample instructions to reviewers.)
• The external reviewers provide a joint report that appraises the standards and quality of the proposed program.

2.4.5 Appraisal Report

The reviewers provide a joint report evaluating the standards and quality of the proposed program and make recommendations for any essential or desirable modifications to it. This is normally presented within two weeks of the site visit. As part of the process, reviewers are invited to acknowledge any clearly innovative aspects of the proposed program.

2.4.6 Administrative Responses

An Administrative Response to the New Program Proposal and Appraisal Report is required from the Dean of the proposing academic division following consultation with the academic unit proposing the program.

2.4.7 University of Toronto approval

The New Program Proposal, the External Appraisal Report and the internal Administrative Responses proceed through the divisional and university governance processes.

Divisional governance

Each academic division is responsible for delineating governance approval processes for new undergraduate and graduate programs/diplomas. The Vice-Provost, Academic Programs is responsible for reviewing these processes and ensuring compliance with University and UTQAP processes. Each division outlines its process on its own council website. A summary of divisional governance processes is available on the website of the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs.

University-wide governance

Proposals are submitted to university governance through the Provost's Office, which recommends items to the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs and Academic Board through their Senior Assessors.

Upon approval of a new program by divisional council, the New Program Proposal, Appraisal Report, and Administrative Responses are submitted to the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs by the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs. The Committee on Academic Policy and Programs approves proposals for new undergraduate programs and recommends proposals for new undergraduate degrees and graduate programs to Academic Board for final approval.
2.4.8 Quality Council Secretariat

Upon approval by University governance, the Office of the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs submits the New Program Proposal, together with all required reports and documents, to the Quality Council.

2.4.9 Announcement of new programs

Following the submission of the New Program Proposal to the Quality Council, the academic unit may announce its intention to offer the program, provided that clear indication is given that approval by the Quality Council is pending and provided that no offers of admission will be made until and unless the program is approved by the Council.

2.5 Initial Quality Council appraisal process

2.5.1 Secretariat check

The Quality Council Secretariat will confirm that the New Program Proposal and associated reports and internal responses to them (as set out in Section 2.4 above) are complete. If there is missing information or defects of substance, the Secretariat will return the New Program Proposal for revision or amendment and resubmission. Otherwise the proposal and accompanying documents will be forwarded directly to the Quality Council Appraisal Committee.

2.5.2 Appraisal Committee reviews and recommends

The Quality Council’s Appraisal Committee reviews and appraises the complete file. This committee may seek further information, in which case it provides reasons for its requests. In rare instances, the Appraisal Committee may invite further input from an external expert, either through a desk audit or site visit. If no further information is required, the Appraisal Committee, through the Quality Council, will propose its recommendation, including a brief explanation of its reasons. This assessment includes one of the following recommendations:

a) Approval to commence;

b) Approval to commence, with report; (This typically refers to some provision or facility not currently in place but planned for later implementation, often two to three years in the future. The “with report” condition implies no lack of quality in the program, does not hold up the implementation of the new program, and is not subject to public reference, whether on the web or elsewhere.)

c) Deferral for up to one year during which time the university may address identified issues and report back; or

d) Against approval.

This step will normally be completed within forty-five days of receipt of the University’s submission, provided that the submission is complete and in good order, and that no further information or external expert advice is required. Where additional information is required by the Appraisal Committee, one of the four possible recommendations (see above) to the Council will be made within a further thirty days of its receipt.
2.6 Quality Council appraisal process continuation

2.6.1 Institution may consult/appeal to Committee

When the recommendation is one of b), c) or d) in 2.5.2 above, the University may, within sixty days, make an appeal to, or request a meeting with, the Appraisal Committee for reconsideration. Normally, the grounds for seeking reconsideration are that the University will be providing new information; that there were errors of fact in the Appraisal Committee’s commentary; or that there were errors of process. Following such communication, the Appraisal Committee revisits and may revise its assessment. It will convey its final recommendation to the Quality Council.

2.6.2 Institution may appeal to Council. Council decides

Having received and considered the Appraisal Committee’s final assessment and recommendation and any additional comments from the University on the assessment, and having heard any requested appeal from the University on matters of fact or procedure, the Council makes one of the following decisions:

a) Approved to commence;

b) Approved to commence, with report;

c) Deferred for up to one year, affording the University an opportunity to amend and resubmit its Proposal; or

d) That the Program Proposal is declined.

When the Quality Council chooses option c), then the Appraisal Committee suspends the assessment process until the University has resubmitted its Proposal. After this, the Appraisal Committee reactivates its appraisal process (see Section 2.5.2 above). When the Appraisal Committee does not receive a response within the specified period, it considers the Proposal to have been withdrawn.

2.6.3 Council reports decision

The Quality Council conveys its decision to the University through the designated institutional contact, and reports it for information to the Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents (OCAV) and to the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities (MTCU). Information about decisions on approval to commence for new programs, together with a brief description of the programs, are posted on the websites of the Quality Council and the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs. Only at this point may the University make offers of admission to the program.

2.6.4 Waiting period before resubmission

To allow time for revisions to proposals, any institution declined permission to proceed at this stage of the process, or following a denied appeal of the decision, will normally wait until one year has elapsed from the date of the Quality Council’s decision before resubmitting a revised version of its proposal. The same waiting period normally applies when a university does not resubmit a deferred program proposal within the specified period.
2.6.5 Subsequent appraisal with report

When the University has been given approval to commence a program with report, the Appraisal Committee reviews the subsequently submitted report, conducts whatever consultation it requires, and then makes one of the following recommendations to the Council. That:

a) The program be approved to continue without condition.

b) The program may continue accepting admissions, but the Council requires additional follow-up and a report within a specified period, prior to the conduct of the initial cyclical review. On the Council’s receipt of that required report, the procedure returns to this same step in the appraisal process (i.e., Section 2.6.6).

c) The program be required to suspend admissions for a minimum of two years. The Quality Council will then specify the conditions to be met in the interim in order for admissions to the program to resume.

d) The University may appeal, to the Quality Council, the proposed recommendation of the Appraisal Committee to suspend admissions to the program (Section 2.6.5c) on the same terms as are set out in Section 2.6.2 above (i.e., the University will be providing new information; and/or there were errors of fact in the Appraisal Committee’s commentary; and/or there were errors of process).

2.6.6 Council hears appeal based on report. Council decides

Having received and considered the Appraisal Committee’s recommendation, and the University’s appeal, if any, the Quality Council may decide:

a) To approve the program without condition, or

b) To approve the program continuing admissions with a further report, or

c) To require the program to suspend admissions for a minimum of two years. This decision is final. The Quality Council conveys its decision to the University, and reports it to OCAV and to MTCU for information.

2.7 Subsequent process

2.7.1 Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities (MTCU) funding approval for new undergraduate degrees and graduate degrees and programs

The Minister approves funding (BIUs) for new degree and diploma programs. The approval process occurs several times per year. Proposals are submitted to MTCU by the University once Quality Council approval has been received.

2.7.2 Implementation window

After a new program has been approved to commence, the program must begin within 36 months of that date of approval; otherwise the approval will lapse.

2.7.3 On-going monitoring of new programs

It is the responsibility of the Dean, in consultation with the head of the relevant academic units, to monitor student enrolment and success in the program, as well as resource allocation and program administration. As part of the annual academic review process, the Office of the Vice-President and Provost works with Deans’ Offices to review the quality and performance of all program offerings and address any areas of concern.
2.7.4 First cyclical review

The first cyclical review for any new program must be conducted no more than 8 years after the date of the program’s initial enrolment and normally in accordance with the UofT program review schedule. The Dean is responsible for conveying to the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs the inclusion of the program in the University’s review schedule.

2.8 Quality Council audit process

At least one of the undergraduate programs and one of the graduate programs selected for the sample for each institutional audit (See Quality Assurance Framework Section 5.2.2) will be a New Program or a Major Modification to an Existing Program approved within the period since the conduct of the previous audit. The audit cannot reverse the approval of a program to commence.
i Statement of Institutional Purpose, 1992

ii In 2010, the Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents (OCAV) through the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (OUCQA or the "Quality Council") approved the Quality Assurance Framework for quality assurance of undergraduate and graduate programs in Ontario effective as of September 2010. The Council operates at arm’s length from government to ensure its independence.

http://www.provost.utoronto.ca/Assets/Provost+Digital+Assets/QAF.pdf

iii While the QAF requires a minimum of 2/3 courses be at the graduate level, the University of Toronto requires all courses be at the graduate level.

iv Proposals for new graduate diplomas and collaborative programs undergo an Expedited Approvals process (Figure 1b) without the requirement of an external appraisal (i.e., sections 2.4.4 – 2.4.6 do not apply to these proposals).

v See the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs’ UTQAP website for a schedule of reviews.

vi While the QAF requires a minimum of 2/3 courses be at the graduate level, the University of Toronto requires all courses be at the graduate level.

vii http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Governing_Council/bac/APP_1.htm

viii The Governing Council Elections Guidelines establish the manner and procedure to be used in the election of Teaching Staff, Administrative Staff, and Students to the Governing Council and Teaching Staff and Librarians to the Academic Board, including the establishment of constituencies within these categories.

http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/elections.htm
APPENDIX B – UTQAP EXTRACT ON CLOSURE OF PROGRAMS
1 Quality Assurance Context

1.1 Overview

The University of Toronto is committed “to being an internationally significant research university, with undergraduate, graduate, and professional programs of excellent quality.” Hence, the University welcomes the opportunity provided by the Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents’ Quality Assurance Framework (QAF) assigning the responsibility for academic standards, quality assurance and program improvement, in the first instance, to universities themselves. The University of Toronto’s approach to quality assurance is built on two primary indicators of academic excellence: (1) the quality of the scholarship and research of faculty and (2) the success with which that scholarship and research is brought to bear on the achievement of Degree Level Expectations. These indicators are assessed by determining how our scholarship, research and programs compare to those of our international peer institutions and how well our programs meet their Degree Level Expectations. Reviews provide the opportunity to celebrate successes, identify areas where we can do better, and vigorously pursue improvements.

The Policy for Approval and Review of Academic Programs and Units governs the approval of proposed new programs and the review of existing programs at the University of Toronto. The University of Toronto Quality Assurance Process (UTQAP) outlines the protocols for the assessment and approval of new programs, review of existing programs, modifications to existing programs, and closures of programs. Complementing this document, the University has developed a series of standardized templates to support the quality assurance process. These and a wide range of explanatory materials and best practice exemplars are available on the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs’ UTQAP website. The Policy for Approval and Review of Academic Programs and Units was approved by the Governing Council of the University of Toronto on June 24, 2010. The UTQAP was brought forward for information at that time and was subsequently ratified by the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (the Quality Council) on March 31, 2011. The current version of the UTQAP contains a number of small revisions to ensure greater clarity and to bring the document in line with evolving practice across the province following the first full year under the Quality Assurance Framework. It was approved by the Quality Council on September 21, 2012.

The University of Toronto’s responsibilities for quality assurance extend to new and continuing undergraduate and graduate degree and diploma programs whether offered in full or in part by the UofT, or conjointly with any institutions federated or affiliated with the University. These responsibilities also extend to programs offered in partnership, collaboration or other such arrangement with other postsecondary institutions including colleges, universities, and institutes.

The Quality Council ensures that Ontario continues to maintain a rigorous quality assurance framework. It ratifies each institution’s Quality Assurance Process [IQAP] and is responsible for approving any subsequent revisions to that IQAP. It also is responsible for conducting an audit of university processes through a panel of auditors that reports to a committee of the Council. The panel’s role is to examine each institution’s compliance with its own Quality Assurance Process. The Quality Council approves and monitors the audit reports.

The University of Toronto Quality Assurance Process (UTQAP) encompasses four elements:

- **The New Degree Program Approval Protocol** applies to new undergraduate degrees, undergraduate specialists and majors, graduate programs and degrees, graduate diplomas, and collaborative graduate programs. The Quality Council has provided the following statement regarding the definition of new programs: To clarify, for the purposes of the Framework, a ‘new program’ is brand-new: that is to say, the program has substantially different program requirements and substantially different learning outcomes from those of any existing approved programs offered by the institution.
New programs and degrees are externally reviewed as part of the process leading to approval by institutional governance. Proposals for graduate diplomas and collaborative programs do not require external appraisal. Once approved by University governance, these new program proposals are assessed by the Appraisal Committee of the Quality Council. This Council has the authority to approve or decline all new program proposals.

- **The Major Modification Protocol** is used to ensure program quality where major substantive changes are made to existing and previously approved programs. Major modifications are approved through University governance processes and are reported annually to the Quality Council.

- **The Program Closure Protocol** articulates a process for closing programs. There are a number of possible reasons for closing a program including low enrolment, changes in the disciplinary landscape, and poor quality of the academic program. These reasons may be articulated in external review reports or may be identified by members of the University community. Program closures are approved through University governance processes and are reported annually to the Quality Council.

- **The Cyclical Program Review Protocol** ensures the quality of existing undergraduate and graduate degree programs and for-credit graduate diplomas. The review of an academic program may be a part of a review of the academic unit(s) in which the program resides.

In addition to the protocols described in the UTQAP, the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs’ UTQAP website:

- provides templates that establish formats for new program proposals, major modifications, program closures, self-studies and external review reports;

- describes best practices and establishes criteria for administrative processes such as the selection of reviewers and scheduling of appraisals of new and existing programs and units;

- provides guidance on the conduct of self-studies;

- identifies responsibilities for the collection, aggregation and distribution of standardized data and outcome measures required for self-studies;

- sets out the University’s cycle for the conduct of undergraduate and graduate program reviews; and

- establishes contact information for support and assistance.

### 1.2 Institutional authority

The Vice-President and Provost is the chief academic officer and chief budget officer at the University of Toronto. The Provost, with the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs, is responsible for the oversight of the University of Toronto Quality Assurance Process and ensuring that the UTQAP is applied in a manner that conforms to the UofT’s quality assurance principles and to Quality Council requirements.

Within the Office of the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs, the Director, Academic Programs and Policy is the contact between the institution and the Quality Council.

*New Degree Program Proposals*: The Office of the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs responds to divisional queries and facilitates proposal development with respect to
institutional academic, planning and budget, student life, governance and approval aspects of proposals.

Major Modifications to Existing Programs: The Office of the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs consults with divisions on the development of proposals for major modifications to existing programs. The Office receives copies of approved program modifications and compiles an annual report of all divisional modifications.

Program Closures: The Office of the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs responds to divisional queries and facilitates the development of proposals for the closure of programs. The Office includes program closures in the annual report to the Quality Council.

Cyclical Reviews: The Office of the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs is responsible for ensuring that cyclical reviews of academic programs and/or units are undertaken. Where quality concerns are raised in the cyclical review, the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs monitors the timely implementation of improvements.

The Office of the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs maintains a UTQAP website that includes information pertaining to the Quality Assurance process, all related templates and materials, program approval and review schedules, and contact information.
4. Program Closure

There are a number of possible reasons for closing a program including low enrolment, a changing disciplinary landscape, and poor quality of the academic program. These reasons may be articulated in external review reports or may be identified by members of the University community.

4.1 Proposal

The proposal for a program closure will include the following criteria together with any additional requirements which the academic division chooses to apply (see the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs’ UTQAP website):

- Rationale for the closure including alignment with the unit’s academic plan.
- Impact on the nature and quality of the division’s program of study.
- Impact of closure on other units including inter-divisional and inter-institutional agreements/contracts.
- Impact on and accommodation of any students currently enrolled in the program.

4.2 Institutional process and approvals

Proposals for the closure of degrees and degree programs are brought forward along the same governance path as proposals for new programs. Once the Provost’s Office has signed off on a proposed closure, the closure is taken forward for approval to the divisional council. Program closures for all components of an undergraduate program are approved by the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs; closures of degrees and all graduate programs are approved by the Academic Board, as recommended by the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs.

The closure of one component within an existing undergraduate program or of a minor is considered a major modification and follows the same governance path as proposals for major modifications.

4.3 Annual report to the Quality Council

Program closures are reported annually to the Quality Council by the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs.
**Figure 3: Process for approvals of program closures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. INTERNAL UNIVERSITY PROCESS</th>
<th>Division: Proposal initiation for program closure (4.1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provost’s Office:</strong> All proposals for undergraduate and graduate program closures come to the Provost’s Office for preliminary discussion. Graduate programs receive special attention from the Vice-Provost, Graduate Education and Dean of the School of Graduate Studies. These discussions can cover areas such as:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Rationale for the closure including alignment with the unit’s academic plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Impact on the nature and quality of the division's program of study.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Impact of closure on other units including inter-divisional and inter-institutional agreements/contracts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Impact on and accommodation of any students currently enrolled in the program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Division: Proposal development</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Broad consultation:</strong> with faculty, students, other academic divisions, and external stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provost’s Office signoff for undergraduate and graduate program closures</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Divisional Governance Approval (4.2)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provost’s Office:</strong> Submits proposal for University Governance Approval: AP&amp;P and/or Academic Board as appropriate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provost’s Office:</strong> Reports closure to Quality Council (part of annual report) (4.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2. MTCU PROCESS | University: Reports closure of degrees to MTCU as part of annual report |
i Statement of Institutional Purpose, 1992
ii In 2010, the Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents (OCAV) through the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (OUCQA or the "Quality Council") approved the Quality Assurance Framework for quality assurance of undergraduate and graduate programs in Ontario effective as of September 2010. The Council operates at arm’s length from government to ensure its independence. [http://www.provost.utoronto.ca/Assets/Provost+Digital+Assets/QAF.pdf]
iii While the QAF requires a minimum of 2/3 courses be at the graduate level, the University of Toronto requires all courses be at the graduate level.
iv Proposals for new graduate diplomas and collaborative programs undergo an Expedited Approvals process (Figure 1b) without the requirement of an external appraisal (i.e., sections 2.4.4 – 2.4.6 do not apply to these proposals). v See the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs’ UTQAP website for a schedule of reviews.
vi While the QAF requires a minimum of 2/3 courses be at the graduate level, the University of Toronto requires all courses be at the graduate level.
vii [http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Governing_Council/bac/APP_1.htm]
viii The Governing Council Elections Guidelines establish the manner and procedure to be used in the election of Teaching Staff, Administrative Staff, and Students to the Governing Council and Teaching Staff and Librarians to the Academic Board, including the establishment of constituencies within these categories. [http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/elections.htm]
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The University of Toronto is committed “to being an internationally significant research university, with undergraduate, graduate, and professional programs of excellent quality.” Hence, the University welcomes the opportunity provided by the Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents’ Quality Assurance Framework (QAF) assigning the responsibility for academic standards, quality assurance and program improvement, in the first instance, to universities themselves. The University of Toronto’s approach to quality assurance is built on two primary indicators of academic excellence: (1) the quality of the scholarship and research of faculty and (2) the success with which that scholarship and research is brought to bear on the achievement of Degree Level Expectations. These indicators are assessed by determining how our scholarship, research and programs compare to those of our international peer institutions and how well our programs meet their Degree Level Expectations. Reviews provide the opportunity to celebrate successes, identify areas where we can do better, and vigorously pursue improvements.

The Policy for Approval and Review of Academic Programs and Units governs the approval of proposed new programs and the review of existing programs at the University of Toronto. The University of Toronto Quality Assurance Process (UTQAP) outlines the protocols for the assessment and approval of new programs, review of existing programs, modifications to existing programs, and closures of programs. Complementing this document, the University has developed a series of standardized templates to support the quality assurance process. These and a wide range of explanatory materials and best practice exemplars are available on the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs’ UTQAP website. The Policy for Approval and Review of Academic Programs and Units was approved by the Governing Council of the University of Toronto on June 24, 2010. The UTQAP was brought forward for information at that time and was subsequently ratified by the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (the Quality Council) on March 31, 2011. The current version of the UTQAP contains a number of small revisions to ensure greater clarity and to bring the document in line with evolving practice across the province following the first full year under the Quality Assurance Framework. It was approved by the Quality Council on September 21, 2012.

The University of Toronto’s responsibilities for quality assurance extend to new and continuing undergraduate and graduate degree and diploma programs whether offered in full or in part by the UofT, or conjointly with any institutions federated or affiliated with the University. These responsibilities also extend to programs offered in partnership, collaboration or other such arrangement with other postsecondary institutions including colleges, universities, and institutes.

The Quality Council ensures that Ontario continues to maintain a rigorous quality assurance framework. It ratifies each institution’s Quality Assurance Process [IQAP] and is responsible for approving any subsequent revisions to that IQAP. It also is responsible for conducting an audit of university processes through a panel of auditors that reports to a committee of the Council. The panel’s role is to examine each institution’s compliance with its own Quality Assurance Process. The Quality Council approves and monitors the audit reports.

The University of Toronto Quality Assurance Process (UTQAP) encompasses four elements:

- **The New Degree Program Approval Protocol** applies to new undergraduate degrees, undergraduate specialists and majors, graduate programs and degrees, graduate diplomas, and collaborative graduate programs. The Quality Council has provided the following statement regarding the definition of new programs: ‘To clarify, for the purposes of the Framework, a ‘new program’ is brand-new: that is to say, the program has substantially different program requirements and substantially different learning outcomes from those of any existing approved programs offered by the institution.'
New programs and degrees are externally reviewed as part of the process leading to approval by institutional governance. Proposals for graduate diplomas and collaborative programs do not require external appraisal. Once approved by University governance, these new program proposals are assessed by the Appraisal Committee of the Quality Council. This Council has the authority to approve or decline all new program proposals.

- **The Major Modification Protocol** is used to ensure program quality where major substantive changes are made to existing and previously approved programs. Major modifications are approved through University governance processes and are reported annually to the Quality Council.

- **The Program Closure Protocol** articulates a process for closing programs. There are a number of possible reasons for closing a program including low enrolment, changes in the disciplinary landscape, and poor quality of the academic program. These reasons may be articulated in external review reports or may be identified by members of the University community. Program closures are approved through University governance processes and are reported annually to the Quality Council.

- **The Cyclical Program Review Protocol** ensures the quality of existing undergraduate and graduate degree programs and for-credit graduate diplomas. The review of an academic program may be a part of a review of the academic unit(s) in which the program resides.

In addition to the protocols described in the UTQAP, the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs’ UTQAP website:

a) provides templates that establish formats for new program proposals, major modifications, program closures, self-studies and external review reports;

b) describes best practices and establishes criteria for administrative processes such as the selection of reviewers and scheduling of appraisals of new and existing programs and units;

c) provides guidance on the conduct of self-studies;

d) identifies responsibilities for the collection, aggregation and distribution of standardized data and outcome measures required for self-studies;

e) sets out the University’s cycle for the conduct of undergraduate and graduate program reviews; and

f) establishes contact information for support and assistance.

1.2 Institutional authority

The Vice-President and Provost is the chief academic officer and chief budget officer at the University of Toronto. The Provost, with the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs, is responsible for the oversight of the University of Toronto Quality Assurance Process and ensuring that the UTQAP is applied in a manner that conforms to the UofT’s quality assurance principles and to Quality Council requirements.

Within the Office of the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs, the Director, Academic Programs and Policy is the contact between the institution and the Quality Council.

*New Degree Program Proposals*: The Office of the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs responds to divisional queries and facilitates proposal development with respect to
institutional academic, planning and budget, student life, governance and approval aspects of proposals.

Major Modifications to Existing Programs: The Office of the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs consults with divisions on the development of proposals for major modifications to existing programs. The Office receives copies of approved program modifications and compiles an annual report of all divisional modifications.

Program Closures: The Office of the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs responds to divisional queries and facilitates the development of proposals for the closure of programs. The Office includes program closures in the annual report to the Quality Council.

Cyclical Reviews: The Office of the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs is responsible for ensuring that cyclical reviews of academic programs and/or units are undertaken. Where quality concerns are raised in the cyclical review, the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs monitors the timely implementation of improvements.

The Office of the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs maintains a UTQAP website that includes information pertaining to the Quality Assurance process, all related templates and materials, program approval and review schedules, and contact information.
3 Major Modifications to Existing Programs Protocol

3.1 Definition

A major modification to an existing program is a restructuring of a program, a merger of existing programs or a renewal of a program in order to keep it current with its academic discipline. At the University of Toronto major modifications include one or more of the following program changes:

A) Significant changes to program requirements:

- Creation of a new program of specialization where another with the same designation already exists (e.g., a new specialist program where a major with the same designation already exists)
- Addition of a new major or specialist that does not differ substantially in program requirements or learning outcomes from an existing program
- Merger of two or more existing programs
- Creation of a minor where there is no existing program of specialization
- The creation of new bridging options for college diploma graduates
- The introduction or deletion of a thesis requirement, co-op requirement or placement at the undergraduate or graduate level
- The creation or deletion of a field within an existing graduate program
- The creation or deletion of a stream within an existing undergraduate program

B) Significant changes to the learning outcomes:

- Changes to program content that affect the learning outcomes, but do not meet the threshold for a “new program”

C) Significant changes to the faculty engaged in delivering the program and/or to the essential physical resources as may occur, for example, where there have been changes to the existing mode(s) of delivery (e.g., different campus, online delivery, inter-institutional collaboration):

- A change to the language of the program
- The establishment of an existing degree program at another institution or location
- Change in mode of delivery of a program such as from classroom to online or full-time to part-time

Major modifications to existing programs do not require submission of a proposal to the Quality Council. The University may request that the Quality Council review a major modification proposal. Normally this will occur through the Expedited Approval Process without the requirement of an external review process.

Minor modifications are changes to courses and curriculum that do not change the nature or essence of a program or the learning outcomes.
The University of Toronto considers minor modifications to include:

- Creation of a new minor within an existing program
- Changes to admission requirements
- Creation of a new course

Minor changes require approval by divisional governance processes only.

In cases where it is unclear whether a proposed change in a program is a new program, a major modification, or a minor modification, a determination will be made by the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs in consultation with the divisional Dean and the academic unit.

3.2 Proposal

The proposal for a major modification includes the following together with any additional requirements which the academic division chooses to apply (see the appropriate template on the UTQAP website):

- Rationale for the major modification and consistency with the unit’s academic plan.
- Outline of the major changes to the program description, requirements, and program learning outcomes.
- Description of any impact that the major modification may have on students or other divisions; description of consultation with those affected.
- Description of any resulting resource implications, including, but not limited to, such areas as staffing, space, libraries and computing facilities, enrolment/admissions, and revenue/costs.

3.3 Institutional process and approvals

Major modifications to academic programs are initiated within academic divisions. The division’s Dean’s Office is responsible for the development of a major modification proposal and coordination and consultation with the Office of the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs. The Vice-Provost, Academic Programs is responsible for providing feedback regarding the major modification that includes the input of the Provost and other Vice-Provosts, as appropriate. In particular, major modifications for graduate programs receive special attention from the Vice-Provost Graduate Education.

The University of Toronto is responsible for approvals of major modifications to existing programs. Such modifications are normally submitted by the Dean’s office for approval by divisional governance.

3.4 Annual report to the Quality Council

The Vice-Provost, Academic Programs files an annual report to the Quality Council which provides a summary of major program modifications that were approved through the University’s internal approval process in the past year.

3.5 Subsequent University process

Cyclical review of the program according to the pre-existing cycle within 8 years.
Figure 2: Process for approval of Major Modifications of undergraduate and graduate programs

1. INTERNAL UNIVERSITY PROCESS

| Divisional Dean’s Office: Proposal development (3.2) |
|---|---|
| Includes consultation with faculty, students, other academic divisions, and external stakeholders as appropriate |

Consultation with the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs
Major modifications of graduate programs will receive special attention from the Vice-Provost, Graduate Education.

Dean’s Office signoff on major modification

| Divisional Governance Approval (3.3) |
|---|---|

Division: Reports approval to the Office of the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs

Provost’s Office: Submits proposal to Quality Council as part of Annual Report (3.4)

2. FOLLOW-UP PROCESS

| Ongoing program monitoring by the University through Cyclical Program Review (3.5) |
|---|---|
i Statement of Institutional Purpose, 1992

ii In 2010, the Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents (OCAV) through the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (OUCQA or the “Quality Council”) approved the Quality Assurance Framework for quality assurance of undergraduate and graduate programs in Ontario effective as of September 2010. The Council operates at arm’s length from government to ensure its independence.

http://www.provost.utoronto.ca/Assets/Provost+Digital+Assets/QAF.pdf

iii While the QAF requires a minimum of 2/3 courses be at the graduate level, the University of Toronto requires all courses be at the graduate level.

iv Proposals for new graduate diplomas and collaborative programs undergo an Expedited Approvals process (Figure 1b) without the requirement of an external appraisal (i.e., sections 2.4.4 – 2.4.6 do not apply to these proposals).

v See the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs’ UTQAP website for a schedule of reviews.

vi While the QAF requires a minimum of 2/3 courses be at the graduate level, the University of Toronto requires all courses be at the graduate level.

vii http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Governing_Council/bac/APP_1.htm

viii The Governing Council Elections Guidelines establish the manner and procedure to be used in the election of Teaching Staff, Administrative Staff, and Students to the Governing Council and Teaching Staff and Librarians to the Academic Board, including the establishment of constituencies within these categories.

http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/elections.htm