

AGENDA
ACADEMIC PLANNING AND PRIORITIES COMMITTEE

April 18, 2012
9 am - Room A225/229

1. CALL to ORDER

2. ITEMS for ADOPTION

- 2.1. Agenda – 2012 04 18
- 2.2. Minutes – 2012 02 22 pg. 2

3. BUSINESS

- 9:05 am 3.1. Provost’s Report
- 9:20 am 3.2. Deans Program Report (Diane Reed).....Handout
- 9:40 am 3.3. Update from Joint Committee reviewing the program and course approval policies (Sylvie) pg. 5
- 10:15 am 3.4. Timeline for Program Prioritization for Education Plan (Sylvie)pg. 25
- 10:40 am 3.5. Report on Programs in Progress (Cheryl)Handout

4. ADJOURNMENT and NEXT MEETING

Next meeting: May 16, 2012 (9 am, Room A225/229)

5. INFORMATION ITEMS

- 5.1. APPC website: http://www.ufv.ca/senate/Senate_Standing_Committees/APPC.htm
- 5.2. Rules for the Conduct of Business on Standing Committees of Senatepg. 26

AGENDA
ACADEMIC PLANNING AND PRIORITIES COMMITTEE

February 22, 2012
9 am - Room A225/229

Present: E. Davis, M. Brosinski, S. Murray, O. Steyn, M. Bos-Chan, N. Abrahams, K. Isaac, G. Palmer, D. Griffiths, V. Dvoracek, S. Sheffield, J. Brandenburg, S. Pattridge, J. Hogan, D. Alary, K. Evans, Y. Dandurand, N. Weinberg

Regrets: O. Lian (on sabbatical), C. Marlor, D. Freschi, S. Hardman, M. Lau, C. Byron, W. Burton

Guests: C. Dahl, I. McAskill

Recorder: N. Hitchens

1. CALL to ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 9:05 am.

2. ITEMS for ADOPTION

2.1. Agenda – 2012 02 22

MOTION:

THAT APPC approve the 2012 02 22 agenda as presented.
M. Bos-Chan/M. Brosinski

CARRIED

2.2. Minutes – 2012 01 25

MOTION:

THAT APPC approve the 2012 01 25 minutes as presented.
G. Palmer/O. Steyn

CARRIED

3. BUSINESS

3.1. Provost's Report

Eric reported that the provincial budget does not look good for post-secondary education over the next few years. There is an Arts forum on citizenship today and an institutional learning outcomes forum on March 5.

3.2. "We are ripe for a great disruption in higher education"

There was a lively discussion occasioned by the article by Wentz on the current and future transformation of post-secondary education.

3.3. Draft Aboriginal Education Policy Framework and Developing Measurable Targets for Aboriginal Education

Eric attended “Developing a New Aboriginal Post-Secondary Education Policy Framework through Engagement and Dialogue” on February 3 and the Aboriginal Education Policy Framework was central to the session. The government and Minister are serious about this framework so we need to take the principles and goals of the document seriously.

Comments:

- UFV is committed to indigenizing the academy and this framework supports what we have done and what we plan to do in a thoughtful, well-rounded, way.
- UFV is developing an Indigenous degree.
- Should we be more systematic on course outlines? (e.g. Ask what thought has been given to indigenize the course?)
- Should we privilege aboriginal programs?
- This framework will not work unless the BC transfer credit system is indigenized. If students cannot get transfer credit, this would come to a halt.
- DQAB needs to be indigenized and recognize aboriginal ways of knowing.
- What are aboriginal ways of knowing? Why are there potential problems why these would not transfer? (e.g. If an expert master carver with no university training teaches a carving course, the course may not transfer to another university.)
- We need to be sensitive to aboriginal cultures in the classroom. (e.g. An assignment where a student had to critique an elder.)
- The Ministry gives us funding for aboriginal education so we need to identify measurable targets.
- It was suggested that there be a forum on aboriginal ways of knowing.

3.4. Program Prioritization Clarification from Arts Faculty Council

MOTION:

THAT APPC accept the change of the grid from 'Program Evaluation Grid' to 'Program Ranking Grid' to clarify that it is used for ranking of completed proposals for possible implementation and not used for approval of programs for conceptual development.

S. Patridge/S. Murray

CARRIED

MOTION:

THAT APPC accept the change to the first sentence (under quality of proposal) to “proposals must be recommended for approval to Senate by either UEC or GSC”.

S. Murray/G. Palmer

CARRIED

MOTION:

THAT APPC change the introductory paragraph to read: “The Academic Planning and Priorities Committee uses this grid as a guide for assessing potential new programs in terms of how well they exhibit UFV-established priorities, including those set out in the Strategic Plan. Given that programs must have already been recommended for approval by UEC or GSC before reaching this point, it is assumed that all the proposed programs at this stage are meritorious, that is, that they have met both

UFV Learning Outcomes and the standards set out in the proposal template. The goal at this stage is for APPC members to evaluate which of these meritorious program proposals should be ranked higher when considered for implementation. This grid is meant as a guide for discussion, to ensure that all important issues are considered. The budget analysis prepared by the Budget Committee should be considered in conjunction with this grid.”

N. Weinberg/G. Palmer

CARRIED

3.5. APPC Timelines for new program proposals – Subcommittee Volunteers

The joint APPC, UEC, and GSC committee that is currently reviewing the program and course approval policies will bring forward some thoughts on timelines for reviewing new program proposals.

3.6. Program Evaluation Grid for New Programs and Prioritizing Existing Programs

As we begin to rate and prioritize new programs, we need to consider how to prioritize existing programs. The evaluation grid for new programs is a good starting point. Logically, new and existing programs should be rated similarly with added sections related to areas such as service courses, impact on current students and faculty, etc.

APPC would like to know what would trigger a review to prioritize existing programs and how those decisions would be made.

ACTION: Eric will speak to the Deans about setting criteria to rate existing programs and make some suggestions for discussion at APPC.

4. ADJOURNMENT and NEXT MEETING

The meeting was adjourned at 10:55 am. The next meeting is March 21, 2012 (9 am, Room A225/229).

5. INFORMATION ITEMS

5.1. APPC website: http://www.ufv.ca/senate/Senate_Standing_Committees/APPC.htm

MEMORANDUM

TO: Academic Planning and Priorities Committee

FROM: Sylvie Murray, on behalf of APPC subcommittee on course/program approval policies

DATE: April 5, 2012

RE: Program and Course Approval Policy

At its December 14, 2011 meeting, APPC reviewed the Undergraduate Program and Course Approval Policy which had been approved by the Undergraduate Education Committee (UEC) on September 30, 2011. APPC has a vested interest in these policies as its own function is determined by the processes they outline. APPC noted inconsistencies between the policy and an attached flow chart. It also raised questions related to Faculty Councils' and Deans' responsibilities in the decision-making process. The need for a parallel process to govern undergraduate and graduate course and program approval was also expressed.

A subcommittee consisting of the Chairs of UEC and Graduate Studies Committee (GSC), a representative from APPC, the Program Development Coordinator and two members from the original policy development committee was created to re-examine the policy, alongside with the graduate approval policy.

The subcommittee has now completed its work. The program and course approval policies are being presented to GSC and UEC (at their meetings of April 19 and 27, respectively) for review and recommendation to Senate for approval. The two policies are presented here for your review. If the committees involved wish to make further revisions to the policies the matter will go to the Senate Governance Committee for final review before being brought to Senate for approval (as per SGC draft minutes, March 27). We hope that the approval process can be completed before Senate adjourns for the year.

Changes to note include the following:

- The role of the deans has been changed from "approval" of the concept paper and program, to "review and recommendation" to Faculty Council
- The process has been clarified (who sends what to whom)
- The policy has been made more concise by the removal of any repetition

MOTION: That APPC accepts the revised undergraduate and graduate course and program approval policies as presented here.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Academic Planning and Priorities Committee

FROM: Sylvie Murray, on behalf of APPC subcommittee on course/program approval policies

DATE: April 12, 2012

RE: Program and Course Approval Policy

When Eric reviewed the material we submitted on the draft program and course approval policies for inclusion in the agenda package (for the APPC April 18 meeting) he raised two questions which are indeed important ones.

- 1) He pointed out APPC's responsibility to recommend (or not) new programs to Senate and suggested that the draft policies are not consistent with the terms of reference of the Senate's standing committees.
- 2) He also noted that these new drafts exclude APPC at the concept paper stage. He feels that APPC needs to be informed about new programs at the concept paper stage or planning may be compromised.

In response, we offer the following for APPC to consider, recognizing that Undergraduate Education (UEC), Graduate Studies (GSC) and Governance (GSC) will probably weigh in as well on these issues.

1) Consistency with terms of reference: The relevant clauses are the following:

For APPC:

“. . . advise Senate on the establishment, revision, or discontinuance of educational programs and other curricular changes requiring Senate approval.”

For UEC:

1. “Advise Senate on all matters related to the undergraduate educational programs of the university.” [note that this is from the current TOR; SGC has approved a revised version which reads: “1. Advise Senate on curricular matters related to the undergraduate educational programs of the university.” SGC's recommendation for revisions to the UEC Terms of reference will go to Senate along with the program and course approval policies.]

9. “Review and consult with the Budget Committee, and advise the Academic Planning & Priorities Committee on proposals for new courses, programs, or curricular changes that require Senate approval.” [SGC's revision of this clause reads: “Advise the Academic Planning and Priorities Committee on proposals for new undergraduate programs.”]

For GSC [same as UEC's 1 and 9]:

1. "Advise Senate on all matters related to postgraduate educational programs of the university."
8. "Review and consult with the Budget Committee, and advise the Academic Planning & Priorities Committee on proposals for new courses, programs, or curricular changes that require Senate approval."

There is inconsistency (or room for interpretation) in these terms of reference in regards to the roles of APPC and UEC/GSC in the program approval process.

- The subcommittee has taken the position that UEC & GSC are the main committees responsible for educational/curricular decisions, with the power to recommend the creation of new programs for approval by Senate (as per their TOR #1).
- The subcommittee recognizes APPC's role in this process (as per TOR #2) but suggests that its mandate (planning & prioritization) *should not supersede but complement* UEC's & GSC's responsibilities (educational).
- The subcommittee has also made a distinction between the creation of new programs and their implementation; the former driven by educational considerations; the latter subject to planning and administrative decisions.
- Appendix B, 1.9 & 1.10, of the draft policies reflect the above principles:
 - 1.9: "The Program Proposal is submitted to UEC for review and recommendation to Senate, and for information to Academic Planning and Priorities Committee."
 - 1.10: "Programs recommended by UEC will be reviewed and prioritized by the Academic Planning and Priorities Committee."

The question (and solution) might revolve around the *timing* of the different committees' intervention in the process: *when* does APPC "advise Senate on the establishment, revision, or discontinuance of educational programs"?

- We suggest that this should occur at the planning and prioritizing stage (once or twice a year, and in conjunction with the drafting/revision of the Education Plan); not as part of the approval process itself.

If what we propose in these draft policies is considered unacceptable, one alternative would be to replace 1.9/1.10 by the following:

- 1.9: "The Program Proposal, along with the Program Budget, are submitted to UEC for review and recommendation to APPC."
- 1.10: APPC will review [and possibly prioritize at this stage?] the Program Proposals and submit them [on a monthly, annual, semi-annual basis? only some programs, not all?] to Senate for approval.

UEC and GSC would thus be reduced to subcommittees of APPC as far as program approval goes, and perhaps in other functions as well, including "proposals for new courses" as per their respective TOR #9 and #8.

2) **Role of APPC at the concept paper stage:** Eric's second question is easier to tackle (I hope), and has been discussed somewhat at APPC in November (although not conclusively perhaps). If I recall well, APPC then leaned towards being informed of program ideas in their early stages, but not being asked for a formal approval (or rejection), for lack of detailed information about the exact nature, cost, etc... of the full program proposals that eventually develop out of the initial concept papers.

Still there is indeed an omission in the current drafts, which do not spell out the need for APPC to be informed of concept papers. (It might have been assumed under 1.5: "the Concept Paper is included in the Faculty's submission to the Education Plan." But since APPC has yet to decide on its role in the adoption/revision of the Education Plan, the assumption is problematic.)

The matter can be resolved by adding to or after 1.4, the following text in italics:

- 1.4 The Concept Paper is presented to the Dean for review and recommendation to Faculty Council. *It is also presented to APPC for information.*

POLICY NUMBER **110.29**

APPROVAL DATE 12.09.11 draft

LAST AMENDMENT MM-DD-YYYY

REVIEW DATE MM-DD-YYYY

POLICY TITLE: UNDERGRADUATE COURSE AND PROGRAM APPROVAL POLICY

AUTHORITY Senate

PRIMARY CONTACT Provost and Vice-President, Academic

RELATED POLICIES

PURPOSE/PHILOSOPHY

UFV employs a process to scrutinize new and existing courses and programs to ensure that they meet both UFV and legislated standards and requirements.

POLICY

All new courses and programs and changes to existing courses and programs will undergo an approval process.

Approval will be guided by interests as articulated in the Strategic Plan and the Education Plan. The internal process includes various consultations and approvals by academic units, support areas, administrators, the Senate and its committees, and the Board of Governors.

This policy provides the guidelines and procedures pertaining to UFV's internal program and course approval processes.

Senate may delegate the authority to approve new courses and course changes to a Senate standing committee.

DEFINITIONS

Academic Unit: An academic unit includes but is not limited to faculties, schools, libraries, programs, centres, departments, and institutes.

Campus-Wide Consultation : The Campus-Wide Consultation process provides an opportunity for other academic units and service areas (e.g., Admissions & Records, Library, Student Services) to review and provide feedback about the course or program submission; it precedes consultation with faculty councils.

Official Course Outline: A legal document used for calendar copy, articulation, and other official documentation purposes, the Official Course Outline establishes the parameters for the course syllabus that instructors develop and provide to students.

Lower-level Course: A course that is a first- or second-year course; lower-level courses are generally numbered in the 100s and 200s.

Major Course Change: A modification to a course that affects the nature or focus of a course, options for students, or budget.

Minor Course Change: A modification to a course that has no effect on the nature or focus of a course, options for students, or budget.

Program: For the purposes of this policy, “program” refers to a collection of courses and associated requirements offered as a credential or an option within a credential. This includes, but is not limited to a certificate, diploma, minor, extended minor, major, honours, degree, specialization, option, or concentration.

Program Budget Analysis: A summary of the budget implications of a proposed new program or revisions to an existing program. It is to be attached to all new and revised Program Proposals when the proposal is submitted to Senate and its standing committees for approval. The Budget Analysis Template is available from the Office of the Program Development Coordinator.

Program Committee: A committee created to oversee the implementation and administration of a program and its courses. A Program Committee is approved by the Dean(s).

Program Proposal: The detailed description for a new program prepared on the Template for the Development of Program Proposals.

Program Working Group: A group of people formed in consultation with the Dean(s) (or the Provost) to proceed in the development of a course or program proposal for consideration in the approval process. This group may become the **Program Committee**, which will provide oversight of the program and its courses. The final composition of the group is approved by the Dean. Guidelines for the composition of Program Working Groups are found in the program and course approval resources provided by the Office of the Program Development Coordinator.

Recommendation: Providing advice, positive or negative, to inform approval decisions by subsequent committees.

Undergraduate Course: Any course numbered below 600, including continuing studies, vocational, and developmental courses.

Undergraduate Education Committee (UEC): A Senate standing committee that provides Senate with advice on all matters related to the undergraduate educational programs of the university, including policies, practices, and criteria for admission, evaluation, and promotion of undergraduate students.

Upper-level Course: A course that is a third- or fourth-year course; upper-level courses are usually numbered in the 300s and 400s.

PROCEDURES

1. The process to approve programs and courses shall include a series of structured consultations and approvals that give the UFV community opportunity to examine a program or course in terms of the quality of the curriculum, consistency of standards, attention to student needs, and adherence to UFV’s Strategic Plan and mandate.
2. Changes made to the procedures and guidelines of this policy require the approval of Senate.
3. A *new course* requires the approval of Senate according to the process outlined in [Appendix A](#).
4. Course changes will be classified as either *minor* or *major*.
5. A *minor* course change is to be approved by Faculty Council and submitted to UEC as an information item and for inclusion in the Calendar. The process for making *minor* changes to an undergraduate-level course and descriptions of *minor* changes are presented in [Appendix A](#).
6. A *major* course change requires the approval of Senate upon recommendation by UEC according to the process outlined in [Appendix A](#).

7. A *new* program requires the approval of Senate according to the process outlined in [Appendix B](#).
8. All *changes* to programs require the approval of Senate according to the process outlined in [Appendix B](#).
9. The Office of the Program Development Coordinator will be responsible for developing and reviewing the program and course approval templates and guidelines in consultation with UEC. UEC will approve the templates and guidelines and any subsequent revisions.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Undergraduate Course Approval Process

Appendix B: Undergraduate Program Approval Process

DRAFT

APPENDIX A: UNDERGRADUATE COURSE APPROVAL PROCESS

This appendix includes

- 1) the process for developing and obtaining approval for a new undergraduate course;
- 2) the process for making *major* changes to an existing undergraduate course; and
- 3) the process for making *minor* changes to an existing undergraduate course.

1. Approval Process for New Courses

- 1.1. The process for introducing a *new* course, generally, begins with the department/school or Program Working Group or Program Committee, which develops the Course Outline and prepares a memo that outlines the rationale and any financial implications of the new course using the Memo Template.
- 1.2. Upon department/school or Program Working Group/Committee approval, the Course Outline and Memo are submitted to the Dean or designate for approval.
- 1.3. Upon Dean's approval, the Course Outline and Memo are submitted to the UEC Assistant for Campus-Wide Consultation for a period of one to four weeks.
- 1.4. Following the Campus-Wide Consultation, the department/school or committee sends the Course Outline and Memo to Faculty Council(s) for approval. Course developers must also respond to all comments submitted during the Campus-Wide Consultation process and include this response in the submission to Faculty Council(s).
- 1.5. Upon approval by Faculty Council(s), the Course Outline and Memo are submitted to UEC for review and recommendation to Senate.
- 1.6. Upon Senate approval, the UEC Assistant makes all necessary calendar changes and posts the new Course Outline on the web.

2. Approval Process for Major Changes to Existing Course

The following are considered to be *major* course changes:

- a change for which new resources are required to deliver the course
- course deletions
- a change to a course title that reflects a change in the nature or focus of the course
- changes to the calendar description of a course that reflect a change in the nature or focus of the course
- changes that move a lower-level course to an upper-level course and vice versa
- change to the total number of credits for a course
- change to the hours assigned to components (e.g., total student contact hours, lecture hours, seminar hours) and/or length of a course
- change to the prerequisites or co-requisites for a course that restricts options for students or affects the students or programs of other academic units
- changes to learning outcomes that change the nature or focus of the course
- changes to the course content that change the nature or focus of the course
- change in the maximum enrolment for a course if it affects the quota for an educational program within the academic unit or students or programs of other academic units
- changing or adding a delivery method for a course when the extra cost of the added delivery method will not be absorbed by the academic unit delivering the course

- changes that affect the students or programs of other academic units
- 2.1. The process for making *major* changes to an existing course, generally, begins with the department/school, Program Working Group, or Program Committee, which revises the Course Outline and prepares a memo that outlines the rationale and any financial implications of the course changes using the Memo Template. If there is no department/school responsible for the course, a committee representing the relevant discipline(s) will be struck.
 - 2.2. Upon department/school or Program Working Group/Committee approval, the Course Outline and Memo are submitted to the Dean(s) or designate for approval.
 - 2.3. Upon Dean's approval, the Course Outline and Memo are submitted to the UEC Assistant for Campus-Wide Consultation for a period of one to four weeks.
 - 2.4. Following the Campus-Wide Consultation, the department/school or committee sends the Course Outline and Memo to Faculty Council(s) for approval. Course developers must also respond to all comments submitted during the Campus-Wide Consultation process and include this response in the submission to Faculty Council(s).
 - 2.5. Upon approval by Faculty Council(s), the Course Outline and Memo are submitted to the UEC Assistant for dissemination to the Senate standing committees (i.e., UEC, Senate Budget Committee) for review and recommendation to Senate.
 - 2.6. Upon Senate approval, the UEC Assistant makes all necessary calendar changes and posts the revised Course Outline on the web.

3. Approval Process for Minor Changes to Existing Course

The following are considered to be *minor* course changes:

- a change to an existing course that has no impact on programs or students of other academic units
 - a change for which all associated costs will be covered by the academic unit
 - a change to a course title for the purpose of correction or clarification
 - change(s) to the calendar description of a course for the purpose of correction or clarification
 - change of a course level from 1st to 2nd year (or 2nd to 1st year) and from 3rd to 4th year (or 4th to 3rd)
 - change to the prerequisites or co-requisites for a course that expands options for students
 - change to the frequency of a course offering
 - changes to learning outcomes that do not change the nature or focus of the course
 - changes in course content that do not change the nature or focus of the course
 - changing or adding a delivery method for a course that does not affect the cost of delivering the course
- 3.1. The process for making minor changes to an existing course, generally, begins with the department/school or Program Committee, which revises the Course Outline and prepares a memo that outlines the rationale and any financial implications of the course changes using the Memo Template.

- 3.2. Upon department/school or Program Committee approval, the Course Outline and Memo are submitted to the Dean(s) or designate for approval.
- 3.3. Upon Dean's approval, the Course Outline and Memo are submitted to Faculty Council(s) for approval.
- 3.4. Upon approval at Faculty Council(s), the revised Course Outline and Memo are submitted to the UEC Assistant who will make all necessary calendar changes, post the revised Course Outline on the web, and forward the changes as information items to Senate and standing committees as required.

DRAFT

APPENDIX B: UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM APPROVAL PROCESS

This appendix includes

- 1) the process for developing and obtaining approval for a new undergraduate program; and
- 2) the process for making changes to an existing undergraduate program.

1. New Program Approval Process

- 1.1. The process for introducing a new program, generally, begins when a Program Working Group presents its vision of the program to the Dean(s) of the appropriate academic unit(s).
- 1.2. In the event that an appropriate Program Working Group does not exist and/or to ensure faculty representation on the Program Working Group, the Dean(s) will strike a Program Working Group. A Program Working Group must consist of a minimum of three people with teaching or research expertise in the subject area. If a new program is entirely discipline-based, at least one additional member from another discipline with teaching or research expertise in the subject area or related area should be added. The composition of a Program Working Group must be approved by the Dean before it submits any proposals to any approval body.
- 1.3. With the assistance of the Program Development Coordinator and in consultation with appropriate academic units and Dean(s), the Program Working Group will develop and approve a Concept Paper.
- 1.4. The Concept Paper is presented to the Dean for review and recommendation to Faculty Council.
- 1.5. Upon approval at Faculty Council(s), the program proposed in the Concept Paper is included in the Faculty's submission to the Education Plan, and the Program Working Group will develop the Program Proposal.
- 1.6. The Program Proposal and draft calendar copy are submitted on the appropriate template to the Undergraduate Education Committee (UEC) Assistant for Campus-Wide Consultation for a minimum of four weeks. Developers must respond to all comments submitted during the Campus-Wide Consultation process and include this response in the submission to Faculty Council(s).
- 1.7. Upon completion of the Campus-Wide Consultation, the Program Working Group submits the Program Proposal, accompanied by responses to comments submitted during Campus-Wide Consultation, to the appropriate Faculty Council(s) for approval.
- 1.8. Upon approval of the program by the Faculty Council(s), the development of the program budget is overseen by the Dean(s) and the Program Development Coordinator.
- 1.9. The Program Proposal is submitted to UEC for review and recommendation to Senate, and for information to Academic Planning and Priorities Committee (APPC). The Program Budget is sent to the Senate Budget Committee for review and recommendation to Senate and for information to APPC.
- 1.10. Programs recommended by UEC will be reviewed and prioritized by the Academic Planning and Priorities Committee.
- 1.11. Upon Senate approval, the Program Proposal is sent to the Program Development Coordinator for review and submission through the Office of the Provost and Vice-President, Academic to external agencies (e.g., Ministry or accreditation bodies) for approval.

2. Changes to an Existing Program Approval Process

- 2.1. The process for changing a program, generally, begins with the relevant academic unit or Program Committee, in consultation with the Dean(s) responsible. The changes and the rationale for the changes are outlined. NOTE: If the program changes require the approval of the Ministry, a full Program Proposal must be prepared and go through the process outlined for new programs.
- 2.2. Upon approval by the department/school or Program Committee, the proposed changes and rationale are submitted to the UEC Assistant for Campus-Wide Consultation for feedback from the support areas and other academic units for a minimum of four weeks. Developers must respond to all comments submitted during the Campus-Wide Consultation process and include this response in the submission to Faculty Council(s) and UEC.
- 2.3. After Campus-Wide Consultation, the revised program, accompanied by responses to comments submitted in the Campus-Wide Consultation, is submitted for approval to the appropriate Faculty Council(s).
- 2.4. Upon approval by the Faculty Council(s), the development of the program budget is overseen by the Dean(s) and the Program Development Coordinator.
- 2.5. The outline of changes and Program Budget Analysis are sent to the UEC Assistant for dissemination to the appropriate Senate standing committees (i.e., UEC and Senate Budget Committee) for review and recommendation to Senate.

POLICY NUMBER **110.XX**
 APPROVAL DATE 12.09.11 draft
 LAST AMENDMENT MM-DD-YYYY
 REVIEW DATE MM-DD-YYYY

POLICY TITLE: GRADUATE COURSE AND PROGRAM APPROVAL POLICY

AUTHORITY Senate
 PRIMARY CONTACT Provost and Vice-President, Academic
 RELATED POLICIES

PURPOSE/PHILOSOPHY

UFV employs a process to scrutinize new and existing courses and programs to ensure that they meet both UFV and legislated standards and requirements.

POLICY

All new courses and programs and changes to existing courses and programs will undergo an approval process.

Approval will be guided by interests as articulated in the Strategic Plan and the Education Plan. The internal process includes various consultations and approvals by academic units, support areas, administrators, the Senate and its committees, and the Board of Governors.

This policy provides the guidelines and procedures pertaining to UFV’s internal program and course approval processes.

Senate may delegate the authority to approve new courses and course changes to a Senate standing committee.

DEFINITIONS

Academic Unit: An academic unit includes but is not limited to faculties, schools, libraries, programs, centres, departments, and institutes.

Campus-Wide Consultation: The Campus-Wide Consultation process provides an opportunity for other academic units and service areas (e.g., Admissions & Records, Library, Student Services) to review and provide feedback about the course or program submission; it precedes consultation with faculty councils.

Official Course Outline: A legal document used for calendar copy, articulation, and other official documentation purposes, the Official Course Outline establishes the parameters for the course syllabus that instructors develop and provide to students.

Graduate Program: Any program that requires at least one graduate level course.

Graduate Program Committee: A committee created to oversee the implementation and administration of a graduate program and its courses. A Graduate Program Committee is approved by the Dean(s) and AVP Research & Graduate Studies.

Graduate Studies Committee (GSC): A Senate standing committee that provides Senate with advice on all matters related to the postgraduate educational programs of the university, including policies, practices, and criteria for admission, evaluation, and promotion of postgraduate students.

Graduate-level Course: A course numbered 600 or higher.

Major Course Change: A modification to a course that affects the nature or focus of a course, options for students, or budget.

Minor Course Change: A modification to a course that has no effect on the nature or focus of a course, options for students, or budget.

Program: For the purposes of this policy, “program” refers to a collection of courses and associated requirements offered as a credential or an option within a credential.

Program Budget Analysis: A summary of the budget implications of a proposed new program or revisions to an existing program. It is to be attached to all new and revised Program Proposals when the proposal is submitted to Senate and its standing committees for approval. The Budget Analysis Template is available from the Office of the Program Development Coordinator.

Program Proposal: The detailed description for a new program prepared on the Template for the Development of Program Proposals

Program Working Group: A group of people formed in consultation with the Dean(s) and the AVP Research & Graduate Studies to proceed in the development of a course or program proposal for consideration in the approval process. This group may become the **Graduate Program Committee**, which will provide oversight of the program and its courses. The final composition of the group is approved by the Dean(s) and AVP Research & Graduate Studies. Guidelines for the composition of Program Working Groups are found in the program and course approval resources provided by the Office of the Program Development Coordinator.

Recommendation: Providing advice, positive or negative, to inform approval decisions by subsequent committees.

PROCEDURES

1. The process to approve programs and courses shall include a series of structured consultations and approvals that give the UFV community opportunity to examine a program or course in terms of the quality of the curriculum, consistency of standards, attention to student needs, and adherence to UFV’s Strategic Plan and mandate.
2. Changes made to the procedures and guidelines of this policy require the approval of Senate.
3. A *new course* requires the approval of Senate according to the process outlined in [Appendix A](#).
4. Course changes will be classified as either *minor* or *major*.
5. A *minor* course change is to be approved by Faculty Council and submitted to the GSC as an information item and for inclusion in the Calendar. The process for making *minor* changes to a graduate-level course and descriptions of *minor* changes are presented in [Appendix A](#).
6. A *major* course change requires the approval of Senate upon recommendation by GSC according to the process outlined in [Appendix A](#).
7. A *new program* requires the approval of Senate according to the process outlined in [Appendix B](#).
8. All *changes* to programs require the approval of Senate according to the process outlined in [Appendix B](#).
9. The Office of the Program Development Coordinator will be responsible for developing and reviewing the program and course approval templates and guidelines in consultation with GSC. GSC will approve the templates and guidelines and any subsequent revisions.

APPENDICES

[Appendix A: Graduate Course Approval Process](#)

[Appendix B: Graduate Program Approval Process](#)

DRAFT

APPENDIX A: GRADUATE COURSE APPROVAL PROCESS

This appendix includes

- 1) the process for developing and obtaining approval for a new graduate course;
- 2) the process for making *major* changes to an existing graduate course;
- 3) the process for making *minor* changes to an existing graduate course; and

1. Approval Process for New Course

- 1.1. The process for introducing a *new* course, generally, begins with the Graduate Program Committee, which in consultation with the department(s)/school(s) involved develops the Course Outline, and prepares a memo that outlines the rationale and any financial implications of the new course using the Memo Template.
- 1.2. Upon Graduate Program Committee approval, the Course Outline and Memo are submitted to the Dean or designate for approval.
- 1.3. Upon Dean's approval, the Course Outline and Memo are submitted to the GSC Assistant for Campus-Wide Consultation for a period of one to four weeks.
- 1.4. Following the Campus-Wide Consultation, the Graduate Program Committee sends the Course Outline and Memo to Faculty Council(s) for approval. Course developers must also respond to all comments submitted during the Campus-Wide Consultation process and include this response in the submission to Faculty Council(s)
- 1.5. Upon approval by Faculty Council(s), the Course Outline and Memo are submitted to GSC for review and recommendation to Senate.
- 1.6. Upon Senate approval, the GSC Assistant makes all necessary calendar changes and posts the new Course Outline on the web.

2. Approval Process for Major Changes to Existing Course

The following are considered to be *major* course changes:

- a change for which new resources are required to deliver the course
- course deletions
- a change to a course title that reflects a change in the nature or focus of the course
- changes to the calendar description of a course that reflect a change in the nature or focus of the course
- change to the total number of credits for a course
- change to the hours assigned to components (e.g., total student contact hours, lecture hours, seminar hours) and/or length of a course
- change to the prerequisites or co-requisites for a course that restricts options for students or affects the students or programs of other academic units
- changes to learning outcomes that change the nature or focus of the course
- changes to the course content that change the nature or focus of the course
- change in the maximum enrolment for a course if it affects the quota for an educational program within the academic unit or students or programs of other academic units
- changing or adding a delivery method for a course when the extra cost of the added delivery method will not be absorbed by the academic unit delivering the course

- changes that affect the students or programs of other academic units
- 2.1. The process for making *major* changes to an existing course, generally, begins with the Graduate Program Committee, which in consultation with the department(s)/school(s) involved revises the Course Outline and prepares a memo that outlines the rationale and any financial implications of the course changes using the Memo Template.
 - 2.2. Upon Graduate Program Committee approval, The Course Outline and Memo are submitted to the Dean(s) or designate for approval.
 - 2.3. Upon Dean's approval, the Course Outline and Memo are submitted to the GSC Assistant for Campus-Wide Consultation for a period of one to four weeks.
 - 2.4. Following the Campus-Wide Consultation, the Graduate Program Committee sends the Course Outline and Memo to Faculty Council(s) for approval. Course developers must also respond to all comments submitted during the Campus-Wide Consultation process and include this response in the submission to Faculty Council(s).
 - 2.5. Upon approval by Faculty Council(s), the Course Outline and Memo are submitted to the GSC Assistant for dissemination to the Senate standing committees (i.e., GSC, Senate Budget Committee) for review and recommendation to Senate.
 - 2.6. Upon Senate approval, the GSC Assistant makes all necessary calendar changes and posts the revised Course Outline on the web.
3. **Approval Process for Minor Changes to Existing Course**

The following are considered to be *minor* course changes:

- a change to an existing course that has no impact on programs or students of other academic units
 - a change for which all associated costs will be covered by the academic unit
 - a change to a course title for the purpose of correction or clarification
 - change(s) to the calendar description of a course for the purpose of correction or clarification
 - change to the prerequisites or co-requisites for a course that expands options for students
 - change to the frequency of a course offering
 - changes to learning outcomes that do not change the nature or focus of the course
 - changes in course content that do not change the nature or focus of the course
 - changing or adding a delivery method for a course that does not affect the cost of delivering the course
- 3.1. The process for making *minor* changes to an existing course, generally, begins with the Graduate Program Committee, which revises the Course Outline and prepares a memo that outlines the rationale and any financial implications of the course changes using the Memo Template.
 - 3.2. Upon Graduate Program Committee approval, the Course Outline and Memo are submitted to the Dean(s) or designate for approval.
 - 3.3. Upon Dean's approval, the Course Outline and Memo are submitted to Faculty Council(s) for approval.

- 3.4. Upon approval at Faculty Council(s), the revised Course Outline and Memo are submitted to the GSC Assistant who will make all necessary calendar changes, post the revised Course Outline on the web, and forward the changes as information items to Senate and standing committees as required.

APPENDIX B: GRADUATE PROGRAM APPROVAL PROCESS

This appendix includes

- 1) the process for developing and obtaining approval for a new graduate program; and
- 2) the process for making changes to an existing graduate program;

1. New Program Approval Process

- 1.1. The process for introducing a new program, generally, begins when a Program Working Group presents its vision of the program to the Dean(s) of the appropriate academic unit(s) and the AVP Research & Graduate Studies.
- 1.2. In the event that an appropriate Program Working Group does not exist and/or to ensure faculty representation on the Program Working Group, the Dean(s) and the AVP Research & Graduate Studies will strike a Program Working Group. The composition of a Program Working Group must be approved by the Dean(s) and AVP Research & Graduate Studies before it submits any proposals to any approval body.
- 1.3. With the assistance of the Program Development Coordinator and in consultation with appropriate academic units, Dean(s), and the AVP Research & Graduate Studies, the Program Working Group will develop and approve a Concept Paper.
- 1.4. The Concept Paper is presented to the Dean and the AVP Research & Graduate Studies for review and recommendation to Faculty Council.
- 1.5. Upon approval at Faculty Council(s), the program proposed in the Concept Paper is included in the Faculty's submission to the Education Plan, and the Program Working Group will develop the Program Proposal.
- 1.6. The Program Proposal and draft calendar copy are submitted on the appropriate template to the GSC Assistant for Campus-Wide Consultation for a minimum of four weeks. Developers must respond to all comments submitted during the Campus-Wide Consultation process and include this response in the submission to Faculty Council(s).
- 1.7. Upon completion of the Campus-Wide Consultation, the Program Working Group submits the Program Proposal, accompanied by responses to comments submitted during Campus-Wide Consultation, to the appropriate Faculty Council(s) for approval.
- 1.8. Upon approval of the program by the Faculty Council(s), the development of the program budget is overseen by the Dean(s), AVP Research & Graduate Studies, and the Program Development Coordinator.
- 1.9. The Program Proposal is submitted to GSC for review and recommendation to Senate, and for information to Academic Planning and Priorities Committee. The Program Budget is sent to the Senate Budget Committee for review and recommendation to Senate, and for information to the Academic Planning and Priorities Committee.
- 1.10. Programs recommended by GSC will be reviewed and prioritized by the Academic Planning and Priorities Committee.
- 1.11. Upon Senate approval, the Program Proposal is sent to the Program Development Coordinator for review and submission through the Office of the Provost and Vice-President, Academic to external agencies (e.g., Ministry or accreditation bodies) for approval.

2. Approval Process for Changes to an Existing Program

- 2.1. The process for changing a program, generally, begins with the Graduate Program Committee in consultation with the relevant academic units, the Dean(s) responsible and the AVP

Research & Graduate Studies. The changes and the rationale for the changes are outlined.

NOTE: If the program changes require the approval of the Ministry, a full Program Proposal must be prepared and go through the process outlined for new programs.

- 2.2. Upon approval by the Graduate Program Committee, the proposed changes and rationale are submitted to the GSC Assistant for Campus-Wide Consultation for feedback from the support areas and other academic units for a minimum of four weeks. Developers must respond to all comments submitted during the Campus-Wide Consultation process and include this response in the submission to Faculty Council(s) and GSC.
- 2.3. After Campus-Wide Consultation, the revised program, accompanied by responses to comments submitted in the Campus-Wide Consultation, is submitted for approval to the appropriate Faculty Council(s).
- 2.4. Upon approval by the Faculty Council(s), the development of the program budget is overseen by the Dean(s), AVP Research & Graduate Studies and the Program Development Coordinator.
- 2.5. The outline of changes and Program Budget Analysis are sent to the GSC Assistant for dissemination to the appropriate Senate standing committees (i.e, GSC and Senate Budget Committee) for review and recommendation to Senate.

APPC Subcommittee Notes on timing of prioritization

At its March 13 meeting, the APPC subcommittee considered the timing of prioritization of programs in the context of APPC 's involvement with the Education Plan. Following are brief notes of our thoughts:

Cheryl indicated we need to **grandfather the items on the existing Education Plan**, but then we will need to transfer to the new system, moving concept papers and proposals into the appropriate place within the new structure.

Sylvie fleshed out a proposed timeline for APPC to advise on institutional priorities in the context of Education and Budget planning. While we realize that it might be too late now to fully engage APPC in the planning process for 2013/14, here are the steps that we think should be followed for APPC to play its role in in the creation of the Education Plan and Budget for 2013/14:

April/May 2012 – Prioritization of new programs at APPC must be complete

May/June 2012 – Senate approval of prioritized list for Ed Plan

July/August 2012 – Provost drafts Ed Plan

September 2012 – Ed Plan comes back to APPC

October 2012 – APPC recommends Ed Plan for Senate approval

November 2012 – Budget planning begins for 2013/14

Noham suggested we have **two streams**: one for budget “heavy weights” such as full program proposals, which would go through the entire approval process, and one for smaller items such as certificates, which can be ranked more often than once a year.

Additions from March 27, 2012

APPC has an implementation role, not an approval role per se. APPC is informing the Provost and recommending the Ed Plan based on what it sees are the institutional priorities.



Standing Committees of Senate Rules for the Conduct of Business

1. Procedures for meetings

- 1.1. The business of the Senate standing committees shall be conducted by informal discussion. Decisions made by standing committees will be made by motions which are voted upon and recorded in the minutes. Motions will be decided only by in-person votes at a meeting. In-person meetings may include teleconferencing or videoconferencing, at the discretion of the chair. Minutes of the meetings shall be provided to Senate for information.
- 1.2. Quorum for decisions and motions is a minimum of fifty (50) per cent of voting membership.
- 1.3. The chairs of standing committee in which the chair is nominated by the committee and approved by Senate will be no longer than one year and will end on July 31. The terms for the chairs approved in the 2010-11 academic year will, however, end on July 31, 2012.
- 1.4. Chairs of standing committees may speak at Senate on items from standing committees to Senate.
- 1.5. Chairs of standing committees with membership on other standing committees of Senate who wish to appoint a designate shall notify the Chair of the host committee in advance.

2. Meeting Schedule

- 2.1. Meetings shall be held monthly in the fall and winter semesters unless cancelled by the chair, with a minimum of three meetings per year. If needed, the chair may call a meeting, with at least seven days' notice.

3. Terms of office

- 3.1. The terms of the Senate members on the Senate standing committees shall be the balance of the member's term on Senate, to a maximum of three years, except in the case of students, whose terms shall be a maximum of three years, subject to being re-elected to Senate.
- 3.2. Non-Senate members on the standing committees shall have two-year terms. This does not apply to ex-officio members. Membership on the standing committees may be renewed, to a maximum of six consecutive years.

4. Attendance

- 4.1. Regular attendance is expected of all members of the Senate standing committees.
- 4.2. Any member, not including ex-officio, who misses three consecutive regular meetings per year, without prior arrangement with the Chair, will be deemed to have resigned from the committee, and will be replaced. When members have missed two meetings, the Chair will notify the member in writing that he or she is in danger of losing his or her place on the committee.

5. Amendments to the terms of reference

- 5.1. Changes to the standing committees' terms of reference shall be taken to the Senate Governance Committee for review and, if appropriate, recommended to Senate for approval.