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MINUTES
ACADEMIC PLANNING AND PRIORITIES COMMITTEE

June 12, 2013
9 am - Room A225/229


Regrets: M. Theron, C. Bell, A. Wiseman

Guests: P. Geller, I. McAskill, B. Kirkley – Bachelor of Media Arts representative

Recorder: J. Nagtegaal

1. CALL to ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 am.

Eric welcomed the new Executive Director of UFV International, David McGuire, to the committee. Eric also acknowledged this was the last meeting for C. Marlor, T. Coates, and Z. Dennison. The committee thanked them for their service over the past year.

2. ITEMS for ADOPTION

2.1. Agenda – 2013 06 12

MOTION:
THAT APPC approve the 2013 06 12 agenda with the amendment to move Item 3.3. to 3.1.
G. Palmer/C. Slavik
CARRIED

2.2. Minutes – 2013 05 15

MOTION:
THAT APPC approve the 2013 05 15 minutes as presented.
M. Bos-Chan/S. Pattridge
CARRIED

3. BUSINESS

3.1. New Programs for Approval: Bachelor of Media Arts

The Bachelor of Media Arts prepares students for creative production in digital media. Technical skills, both in digital media and in traditional artistic practice, are combined with media theory and communication skills to prepare graduates for a rapidly changing work environment. Students may
enroll in the general degree and craft a program to meet their individual interests, or may select one of the concentrations available.

The Bachelor of Media Arts is identified as a very high priority in the UFV Education Plan. It is also closely aligned with the goals of the Strategic Plan, which states that “UFV will be a leader of social, economic, and environmentally-responsible development in the Fraser Valley.” Providing training for the emerging digital industries fits very well in the economic development plans of all the municipalities in the University region, and has been supported by local mayors, planners, and businesses. The program provides a way for UFV to develop programs suited to the new information economy by deploying existing resources in a new configuration. It draws on a wide range of expertise from many disciplines, providing considerable flexibility to students in designing a program to serve their particular needs.

**MOTION:**
THAT APPC approve the new Bachelor of Media Arts as recommended by UEC.
M. Brosinski/C. Marlor
CARRIED

### 3.2. Provost’s Report

- New cabinet was sworn in on June 10. The new Minister of Education is Amrik Virk and the new Deputy Minister of Education is James Gorman
- There is growing emphasis on students completing their programs in a timely manner. Instead of funding universities on the amount of students enrolled, governments have been looking at funding institutions on their completion rates. Although this is not how funding is currently decided, this has the potential to impact universities funding in the future. UFV should ensure students have sufficient pathways to complete their program in a timely fashion.
- Peter Geller announced that Sylvie Murray will be starting as the new Program Coordinator on August 19, 2013.

### 3.3. Program Changes for Approval

#### 3.3.1. Bachelor of Science Entrance Requirements

Entrance into the Bachelor of Science program requires completion of one course from of a list of courses, with a minimum of C+. This list includes Geography 12, GEOG 101, or GEOG 102. Courses with Geology as the focus are missing from this list. UFV appears to be anomalous in this respect, as Geology courses are used as an entrance requirement at other post-secondary institutions in BC. Geology 12 is equivalent to Geography 12, in terms of scientific rigor, and GEOG 116 is equivalent to GEOG 102.

**MOTION:**
THAT APPC approve the addition of Geology 12 or GEOG 116 as an option to the Bachelor of Science program entrance requirements, effective September 2013.
S. Pattridge/M. Bos-Chan
CARRIED
3.3.2. Psychology Honours and Extended Studies certificate in Arts: Psychology Honours entrance and program requirements

Students are finding the requirement to have 132 credits is taking an extra year beyond the time taken for their regular degree. Elaine Newman of the Arts Advice Centre has reviewed this change and confirmed that a student can achieve the requirements for a BA with Honours in psychology in 120 credits. This change is also in keeping with other programs at UFV, and the recent change to the Honours Degree policy. Honours programs in other relevant universities are moving to the 120 credit model. The change in the number of credits in the degree will not affect the credibility of the degree or the quality of the students’ training and experience.

The entrance requirements have also changed. The psychology department found that the grade in PSYC 301 (Intermediate research methods and analysis) is a better predictor of success in the program than the grade in the lower-level statistics and methods courses (PSYC 110 and 202). In addition, students no longer must complete PSYC 408 prior to entering the Honours program and can take this course concurrently. The psychology department has found that students taking this course concurrently are just as successful as those taking it prior to Honours.

The Extended Studies certificate in Arts: Psychology Honours now specifies the requirement of 45 upper-level PSYC credits. Failure to include this previously was an error, and could result in students graduating with the certificate having substantially less courses than the usual Honours.

MOTION:
THAT APC approve the changes to the Psychology Honours and Extended Studies certificate in Arts: Psychology Honours entrance requirements as recommended by UEC, effective September 2014
S. Patridge/M. Bos-Chan
CARRIED

MOTION:
THAT APC approve the changes to the Psychology Honours and Extended Studies certificate in Arts: Psychology Honours program requirements as recommended by UEC, effective September 2014
S. Pattridge/Z. Dennison
CARRIED

3.4. Program Prioritization – Draft Briefing Note

Ian presented a draft briefing document on program prioritization. The program prioritization process is meant to be a collaborative process that encourages everyone to look at the effectiveness of their program and how it meets the strategic goals of the institution. This process could be done on an ongoing basis and would help identify programs that are not meeting the strategic goals of the institution as well as they could. It was noted that some areas of the document need clarification and the wording throughout should be considered carefully.
4. **ADJOURNMENT and NEXT MEETING**

E. Davis thanked everyone for their work on the committee.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:00 am.

2013/2014 Meeting Schedule:

**Wednesday, Week 3 from 2:30 – 4:30pm (please note the change in meeting time)**

- September 18, 2013
- October 16, 2013
- November 13, 2013
- December 11, 2013
- January 22, 2014
- February 19, 2014
- March 19, 2014
- April 16, 2014
- May 14, 2014
- June 11, 2014

5. **INFORMATION ITEMS**

5.1. APPC website: [http://www.ufv.ca/senate/standing-committees/appc/](http://www.ufv.ca/senate/standing-committees/appc/)
MEMO

TO: Eric Davis, Provost and VP Academic, Chair of APPC
FROM: Rosetta Khalideen
DATE: September 16, 2013
RE: School of Business Program Review

Attached are the following documents pertaining to the results of the review of the School of Business:

A. The Dean’s Summary Report
B. The University of the Fraser Valley, School of Business Program Review, prepared by the External Program Review Committee 2012-2013
C. The School of Business “Response to the External Review Committee Report”
D. The Dean’s Scope Letter
E. The School of Business Self-Study Document

I would like to recommend the following motion to the Academic Planning and Priorities Committee:

Motion:

That APPC accept the attached documentation related to the review of the School of Business as presented.
MEMO

To: Eric Davis, Chair, Academic Planning and Priorities Committee
From: Peter Geller, Vice-Provost & Associate Vice President, Academic
Date: 16 September 2013
Re: Program Discontinuation Policy/Guidelines

Motion

THAT APPC recommend the Program Discontinuance policy to Senate Governance Committee for consultation, along with the accompanying Guidelines for Program Discontinuance for information.

Background and Rationale

The proposal to discontinue a program at University of the Fraser Valley resulted in a discussion about the process involved. As the proposal worked its way through the review and approval bodies, including the Academic Planning and Priorities Committee (APPC), the Senate, and the Board, discussion arose about the lack of a specific policy or clearly defined process. It was recommended that the Joint Board-Senate Governance Committee investigate the question of a policy on discontinuing programs.

At its 15 October 2012 meeting, the Joint Board-Senate Governance Committee reviewed a discussion paper on Program Discontinuation (see revised version which is attached), and agreed that a defined framework and process would assist UFV’s governance bodies in making recommendations and decisions regarding the suspension or discontinuance of programs.

Further, the Joint Board-Senate Governance Committee agreed that as this was clearly an academic policy it would be appropriate to have APPC consider the issue of policy development for program discontinuance. A suggestion put forward was to create a small working group of APPC for this purpose that would include the Vice-Provost as a resource.

On December 12, 2012 APPC established a subcommittee to consider a policy on program discontinuance, consisting of J. MacLean, C. Marlor, Palmer, J. Todrick, C. Dahl, and P. Geller.

In February 2013, the subcommittee submitted a concise policy on program discontinuance to APPC, which was to be accompanied by more detailed guidelines. The subcommittee revised the draft Policy and developed draft Guidelines for Program Discontinuance. The Guidelines were provided for review and discussion of APPC at its April and May 2013 meetings. Based on the feedback from APPC, as well as the discussion of program prioritization at the June 2013 meeting, the subcommittee met in June and July 2013 to revise the Guidelines.

Given the need for a policy on program discontinuance, the subcommittee submits the policy along with the revised guidelines to APPC for decision.

Attachments
1. Program Discontinuance Policy
2. Guidelines for Program Discontinuance
POLICY TITLE  PROGRAM DISCONTINUANCE

AUTHORITY  Board
PRIMARY CONTACT  Provost and Vice-President, Academic
RELATED POLICIES  University Educational Directions and Planning (BPD-202)
                  Undergraduate Course and Program Approval policy (21)
                  Graduate Course and Program Approval policy (209)

PURPOSE

The Program Discontinuance Policy will ensure transparency and diligence when considering an academic program for discontinuation. This will include recognition of the role of Senate in advising the Board, and the Board seeking advice from Senate on the discontinuance of programs at the university.

POLICY

Decisions regarding the discontinuance of programs at UFV will rely on established guidelines and ensure that appropriate consultation (including with the relevant Faculty or College Council) takes place. Senate will receive a recommendation from the Academic Planning and Priorities Committee (APPC) and then advise the Board. Whenever possible, this will take place within the academic planning processes of the Educational Plan.

Typically, a program discontinuance will be initiated by the Dean of the relevant area. A request to consider program discontinuance may also come from the Provost of the University or from APPC.

In cases where a program will be discontinued, the University will honour its commitment to active program students, providing, where possible, pathways for completion.

This policy does not apply to adjustments in the number or location of course offerings as part of the ongoing management of program delivery.

For the purposes of this policy, discontinuance of specializations, options, and concentrations are treated as program revisions.

DEFINITIONS

Program: 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 Discontinuance: where the admission of new students into an ongoing program is discontinued permanently.

Program Suspension: where the admission of new students into an ongoing program is discontinued temporarily.

PROCEDURES/GUIDELINES

The Academic Planning and Priorities Committee of Senate will be responsible for developing and publishing Guidelines for the discontinuance of programs.
Guidelines for Program Discontinuance

Academic Planning and Priorities Committee, University of the Fraser Valley

Last Revised: July 17, 2013

1.0 Introduction

These Guidelines describe the process related to program discontinuance (including program suspension) to guide Deans and faculty through the process of determining if suspension or discontinuance of a program of study is in the best interests of stakeholders and the University. The guidelines then assist in the process of presenting the rationale and evidence in seeking institutional approvals.

The Academic Planning and Priorities Committee (APPC) of Senate is responsible for developing and publishing these Guidelines.

2.0 Definitions

Note: some of these definitions are contained in UFV Policy # XXX Program Discontinuance.

Closing of Applications: University no longer accepts applications from students applying to a program.

Program: A program as 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. Note: as per the Program Discontinuance Policy, for the purposes of these Guidelines discontinuance of specializations, options, and concentrations are treated as program revisions.

Program Discontinuance: where the admission of new students into an ongoing program is discontinued permanently.

Program Suspension: where the admission of new students into an ongoing program is discontinued temporarily.

Transition Plan: plan outlining how the program will ensure student transition through the existing program or transition to a new credential.

3.0 Principles

The following principles will guide the program suspension and program discontinuance process:

Program Rigour: Program discontinuance/suspension ensures academic relevance, currency, and response to student needs and the educational landscape.

Transparency: The review and approval process is consultative, based in peer review, and communicated clearly.
Accountability: the decision to discontinue a program is accountable for the stewardship of resources and the meeting of community expectations.

Compliance with Recognized University Processes: The consultation and approval process complies with Policy XXX Program Discontinuance.

Compliance with Collective Agreements: The discontinuance process respects the requirements of the Collective Agreement (Article 16).

4.0 Rationale

Through the process of program prioritization programs may be renewed, revised, and when necessary, recommended for discontinuation. The rationale for program discontinuation will be based on consultation, peer review and the provision of evidence that principles and criteria have been met. Such programs will typically evidence issues that would cause concern in one or more of the following categories:

- **Demand**: reflecting many factors including student demand, market demand (employment), international demand, institutional and community demand. Also considered here is the institutional dependence of other programs in service courses, for example and community dependence (which may give a strategic importance to the program activity for the university in the community).

- **Capacity**: determined by a broad assessment of program inputs (faculty/ staff, curriculum, students, capital equipment and facility infrastructure).

- **Program Output** – documenting quality and performance, including both key performance indicators and a summative assessment of how well the program contributes to the strategic directions of the university.

- **Financial Impact/viability**: providing a full accounting of both direct and indirect program revenue contributions and costs. The financial analysis may also consider indirect community impacts of its activity.

5.0 Process

The process includes the possibilities of a recommendation of restructuring a program, program suspension, and permanent discontinuance.

Typically, a proposal for program discontinuance will be initiated by the Dean of the relevant area. The request is initiated with a Proposal for Program Discontinuance form submitted to Faculty Council for discussion. The request should include evidence that the principles outlined above have been applied, and that areas for consideration have been sufficiently assessed (see section 6.0). The Dean, following discussion at Faculty Council, forwards the form to APPC with a recommendation and including a record of the Faculty Council deliberations.
A proposal to consider discontinuance may also come from the Provost of the University or from the Academic Planning and Priorities Committee of Senate. When initiated by the Provost the proposal will be submitted to the Academic Planning and Priorities Committee. APPC may initiate program suspension or discontinuance based on results from formal University review processes. In the case that the proposal moves forward, then the relevant Faculty Council will be provided an opportunity to provide input into the recommendation.

Relevant official data including, but not limited to, from Institutional Research, and Program Reviews, will be provided.

APPC consults as appropriate and forwards the recommendation along with supporting evidence, including the record of Faculty Council deliberations, to Senate for final discussion and decision about discontinuance or suspension pending a further decision regarding discontinuance. Senate will then advise the Board of its decision.

6.0 Areas for Consideration in Reviewing Proposals for Program Discontinuance

APPC will be guided by the program prioritization framework, and weigh and assess the impact of the following in making its recommendation to Senate regarding proposals for program discontinuance. Note: these are not numbered in order of priority.

A) Demand
   • Current student demand/level of student enrolment, including domestic and international students
   • Appropriate employment opportunities of graduates
   • Past student enrolments, including reasons for previous program suspension

B) Capacity and Financial Impact/Viability
   • Significant Lack of resources, including:
     ◦ Financial
     ◦ Personnel
     ◦ Physical facilities
   • Inefficient use of available resources

C) Program Output
   • Alignment with University Mandate, vision, mission, strategic directions, education plan, and Institutional Learning Outcomes
   • Opportunities for further study
   • Assessment of programs in relation to program goals or objectives (program reviews, if any)
   • Assessment of program reconstruction viability

D) Internal and External impacts of program discontinuance, including:
   • Internal
     ◦ Students and how they will be advised to complete their programs
Faculty and staff
- Research capacity and any ongoing research projects
- Financial and/or resource impacts
- Other programs, departments, faculties or interdisciplinary programs (will related programs be affected and in what ways?)

- External:
  - University reputation
  - Accreditation
  - Other educational or community institutions and organizations

E) Impact of Program Development
- The need to discontinue as part of implementing a new credential

7.0 Communication Plan

Once the decision has been made by Senate, a Communication Plan will outline the process, providing all relevant timelines. The communication plan will have an internal and an external component.

8.0 Transition Plan

A transition plan should outline how students currently in the program will be assisted to complete the program or transition to another program. Once the current students have been advised of the program discontinuance, UFV advisors will have a significant role in advising students in a timely manner.
Program Discontinuation: Discussion of Potential Policy Development

A recent proposal to discontinue a program at University of the Fraser Valley has resulted in discussion about the desirability of a policy and/or clearly defined process for discontinuing programs at UFV. In the context of this discussion, a review of policies and approaches to closing programs at other universities was undertaken. This review included universities in B.C (Simon Fraser University, Thompson Rivers University, University of Victoria, Vancouver Island University), Alberta (Grant MacEwan University, University of Alberta), Saskatchewan (University of Saskatchewan) and Ontario (Laurier University, University of Windsor). Examples are provided in Appendix A.

Based on this review, the following paper considers a number of issues for consideration. It includes a discussion of options in terms of policy development and then examines a number of elements to consider in both policies and procedures for closing programs.

A. Policy or Procedures?

First, it is observed that most, but not all universities have published policies on closing programs. Where policies existed they could be “stand alone” or included in a policy on program development and changes. In some cases, only guidelines or procedures were available (a good example of this is the University of Saskatchewan’s “Information Guide for Course and Program Deletions” which resides with the Academic Programs Committee of the University Council, U of S’s senate body).

Options

- Create a new policy on program discontinuance
- Consider revising existing policy (Undergraduate Program and Course Approval Policy and Graduate Program and Course Approval Policy) to include reference to program discontinuance
- Develop guidelines/procedures, which could reside with the relevant committee of Senate (Academic Planning and Priorities Committee)

Considerations: The advantage of a policy is that it will be clearly communicated to the university community, through the University Secretariat Policy page. Guidelines may be less visible, although as Senate Committees become established their reference documents will become better known.

Given the considerable work just undertaken on the Undergraduate Program and Course Approval policy which focused on the approval of new and revised programs, there could be some hesitation in re-opening this policy.

If it is decided to proceed with a new policy on program discontinuance, consideration should be given to developing a concise policy which clearly underlines the purpose and scope; more detailed procedural elements could be separated out into a guidelines or procedures document that would accompany the policy. This approach has the advantage of the policy development and review process
not getting mired down by a detailed discussion of procedures; as well, once the policy is approved the procedures can be revised without having to undergo a full-blown policy review process.

B. Elements of Policies and Procedures on Closing Programs

Based on the review of other universities, the following areas are suggested for consideration. As noted above, the policy could set out the purpose and scope, leaving the more procedural details for a separate Guidelines or Procedures document.

Responsibilities

Board and Senate

The legislative requirements should be outlined. Under the University Act, Senate must advise the Board, and the Board must seek advice from Senate on “the establishment, revision or discontinuance of courses and programs at the special purpose, teaching university.”

An important consideration in this regard is the Board of Governors Policy Direction on University Educational Directions and Planning (BPD-202). This states that the Education Plan, which will reflect the strategic goals and be developed in consultation and with approval of the Senate, will include discontinuance of courses and programs. “Approval by the Board of Governors of the Education Plan will also be considered approval for the development or discontinuance of courses and programs included within the Plan.”

Senate Committees

In terms of Senate advising the Board, Senate would wish to seek out review and recommendation from relevant Standing Committees. Based on its Terms of Reference, the Academic Planning and Priorities Committee would be asked to review and provide a recommendation to Senate.

Faculty Councils

In terms of the role of Faculty Councils, the Terms of Reference for the Structure and Function of Faculties and College Councils as approved by the UFV Senate includes the following under the section on Mandate:

- receive recommendations related to academic programs, including but not limited to the development of new programs, program changes, new courses, and discontinuation of courses;

The University Act states the following in relation to Faculty Councils:

- subject to this Act and to the approval of the senate, to make rules for the government, direction and management of the faculty and its affairs and business
generally, to deal with all matters assigned to it by the board or the senate.

Consideration should be given to further defining the role of Faculty Councils in terms of program discontinuance. It would be consistent with both the University Act and the Terms of Reference for the Structure and Function of Faculties and College Councils that Faculty Councils be consulted. An argument could be made that Faculty Councils have a review and recommend function (as distinct from approval role) which would be consistent with understandings of collegial governance.

Board/Employer

If there are any faculty or staff reductions as a result of “a change in UFV priorities such as deleting or adding a program” the Collective Agreement (Article 16: Layoff and Recall) sets out a procedure which includes providing notice to and meeting with the Faculty and Staff Association. This could be covered by the policy containing a statement to the effect that program discontinuance will be in compliance with the relevant provisions of the Collective Agreement.

Scope/Definition

Some policies outline the scope of what is covered under the policy; as an example, that the policy only applies to programs that result in a credential, so that it does not apply to minors as this is not a “program”. This could also be handled by providing a definition of what constitutes a “program” at UFV.

Initiating Program Discontinuance

A number of the policies and procedures define who can initiate the closure of a program. From the review of the policies this includes:

- administration (the President and/or Provost)
- the Faculty which has administrative responsibility over the program, and sometimes the department or program area was noted
- in a few cases the Senate committee responsible for reviewing program discontinuance proposals was noted. Its authority may be limited to requesting an examination of the viability of a program, which would include a response from the Dean as in the example from the University of Saskatchewan.

Steps in the Process: Suspension and Closure

Several institutions have a two-step process, beginning with a suspension of the program. A suspension may occur with intent to re-open (such as following a major program redevelopment) or intent to close. In Alberta, largely responding to government requirements, both the suspension and termination stages require proposals that move through the stages of the academic approval process and then go the Ministry for final decision. (As an aside, there is not an agreed upon terminology for “suspension” and “discontinuance,” even within BC institutions.)
A decision for UFV to make is whether to clearly lay out the difference between a program suspension and a program discontinuance.

Proposal

From this review, the proposal to discontinue a program could include the following:

- Rationale
- Implications
- Plan to accommodate current students
- Plan for reallocation of resources, if applicable
- If there is a category of program suspension: rationale for suspension instead of closure; specification of the length of the suspension

In some institutions detailed guidelines or a template are provided, outlining the requirements for the proposal.

Assessment Criteria

In order to assess the proposal to discontinue a program, clear criteria need to be identified, and this is usually included in policy and may be further elaborated upon in guidelines and procedures. Some institutions provide forms and templates to the Senate committee that reviews and recommends the proposal to Senate.

In some universities, a set of guiding principles are first laid out (will be fair and objective; will meet standards of openness and accountability).

The following outlines the elements identified by the universities surveyed in terms of making the decision of whether or not to discontinue a program:

- Availability of resources (financial, human) and use of these resources, including effectiveness of use; impact on physical facilities
- Student demand (continually low student enrolment). In one example (U of Windsor), the policy stipulates that "Where any undergraduate program does not have more than five students for three successive years and not more than ten for five successive years, the program should be deleted."
- Graduate outcomes, including employment and further study
- Academic value; this could include a quality assessment
- Curricular issues; may include closing one program as part of implementation of a new credential
- Lack of appropriate educational environment and/or supports
- Cross-institutional impacts, such as on other programs, departments, Faculties
- External impact (reputation)
- Availability of same or similar program from other providers
- Impact on development/alumni projects
- Impact on research
- Results of consultations (with employers, industry, professional associations, advisory committee)
- Alignment with university mandate, mission, strategic plan, academic plan; alignment with provincial government priorities.

**Communication Plan**

A final consideration is a plan or clearly set out responsibilities for communicating to affected faculty members, staff, students, including outlining the responsibility of the Registrar, the Dean’s Office, etc. once the program discontinuation is approved.

*Peter Geller*
*Vice-Provost and Associate Vice-President Academic*
*1 November 2012*
Appendix A: Examples of Program Discontinuation Guidelines at Canadian Institutions

1. Suspension of Admissions and Program Termination, Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies, Simon Fraser University <http://www.sfu.ca/content/sfu/senate/senate-committees/scus/_jcr_content/main_content/download_10/file.res/SuspensionofProgramTermination.pdf>

2. Program Reductions and Eliminations Policy, Thompson Rivers University <http://www.tru.ca/__shared/assets/Program_Reductions_and_Eliminations5618.pdf>


4. Suspension, Cancellation, or Discontinuance of Programs Procedure, Vancouver Island University <http://www.viu.ca/upa/SAPolicy/31.15.004.PDF>
TO: Dr. Eric Davis, Academic Planning and Priorities Committee Chair

FROM: Samantha Pattridge, Undergraduate Education Committee Chair

DATE: June 28, 2013

RE: Discontinuation of Geography major Geographic Information Systems concentration

At its June 21, 2013 meeting, UEC voted to approve the discontinuation of the Geography major Geographic Information Systems concentration. UEC recommends that this be approved by APPC and Senate.

MOTION:
THAT APPC approve the discontinuation of the Geography major Geographic Information Systems concentration as recommended by UEC, effective September 2013.

RATIONALE:

The Geography major Geographic Information Systems (GIS) concentration, formerly called Geographic Visualization, was first introduced in 2008. Since that time, the department has developed and successfully run a certificate program in GIS. The certificate requires an additional course in Computing Science, a project course in GIS (GEOG 458), and both GEOG 453 and GEOG 454. The concentration, in comparison, requires only one of GEOG 453 and 458. It also requires GEOG 354, which is a course that has no GIS content and is a remainder from the time when the concentration was designed to provide specialization in Geographic Visualization instead of GIS specifically.

In the years in which the GIS concentration has existed, only a couple of students have graduated with it while not also completing a certificate in GIS. Thus, this concentration provides a relatively redundant credential. Further, as a certificate in GIS has greater marketability than a concentration, students should be encouraged to complete the certificate over the concentration.

Please see the attached document for additional details.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Campus Wide Consultation (CWC)

FROM: Michelle Rhodes, Geography Department Head

DATE: September 23, 2013

SUBJECT: For Approval (BA, Geography major)
- Removal of the Geographic Information Systems Concentration


Rationale for the Removal of Concentration in Geographic Information Systems (GIS)
The concentration in Geographic Information Systems (GIS) (once also referred to as the concentration in “Geographic Visualization”) was first introduced in 2008. Since that time, the department has developed and successfully run a certificate program in GIS. The certificate requires an additional course in Computing Science, a project course in GIS (GEOG 458), and both GEOG 453 and GEOG 454. The concentration, in comparison, requires only one of GEOG 453 and 458, and also requires GEOG 354—a course that has no GIS content and is a remainder from the time when the concentration was designed to provide specialization in Geographic Visualization instead of GIS specifically.

In the years in which we have had the concentration in GIS on the books, only 1-2 students have graduated with it while not also completing a certificate in GIS. Thus, this concentration provides a relatively redundant credential. Further, as a certificate in GIS has greater marketability than a concentration, it is our wish to encourage students to complete the certificate over the concentration.

Rationale for the Removal of the Concentration in GIS
There are no foreseeable costs associated with this change.

2. Removal of Geographic Information Systems concentration
2.1 Geographic Information Systems concentration - Remove
Lower-level requirements: 26 credits
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GEOG 101</td>
<td>Weather and Climate</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOG 102</td>
<td>Evolution of the Earth's Surface</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or GEOG 116</td>
<td>Introduction to Geology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOG 140</td>
<td>Human Geography</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOG 201</td>
<td>Introduction to Climatology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or GEOG 202</td>
<td>Introduction to Geomorphology</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOG 241</td>
<td>Social Geography</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or GEOG 242</td>
<td>Economic Geography</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOG 252</td>
<td>Explanation in Geography: Quantitative Methods</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOG 253</td>
<td>Introduction to Geographic Information Systems</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1: One of STAT 104, STAT 106, or PSYC 110 is required for GEOG 252; students should plan accordingly.
Note 2: As of September 2013, STAT 104 or STAT 106 will be required.

Upper-level requirements: 30-33 credits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GEOG 353</td>
<td>GIS Applications</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOG 354</td>
<td>Approaches in Human Geography</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One course:</td>
<td>Physical geography (GEOG 302, 303, 304, 307,</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>308, 315, 317, 335, 402, 410, 417, 419)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One course:</td>
<td>Human geography (GEOG 311, 312, 314, 323, 340,</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>343, 344, 345, 346, 360, 362, 364, 411, 412, 421,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>440, 443, 447, 460, 464, 466)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOG 433</td>
<td>Geography of Selected Regions</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOG 453</td>
<td>Remote Sensing of the Environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or GEOG 454</td>
<td>Geospatial Data Analysis and Modeling</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One of:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOG 396</td>
<td>Global Development Studies: Canada Internship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOG 398</td>
<td>Global Development Studies: International Internship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOG 452</td>
<td>Field Methods and Techniques</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOG 470</td>
<td>Field Studies in Geography</td>
<td>4-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One course:</td>
<td>Geography 300/400-level course</td>
<td>2-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Feedback from Consultation:

Program Change - BA Geography Removal of the GIS concentration

I don't have any major issue with removal of this concentration, but first wanted to ask if you considered just changing the required courses (to solve the problem of the lack of GIS content)?

I do think it is redundant to have both a certificate and a concentration with almost the same courses, and then allow people to graduate with both options. So if it seems the certificate is the most desirable option, then that might be the best plan.

Elaine Harris

I have read this proposal and I have no concerns. Because the Arts Advice Centre approves students' declaration and graduation from this program, I can validate that this concentration is rarely declared and completed. The GIS Certificate is what students are choosing to complete alongside of their BA degrees.

Rhonda
At its August 29, 2013 meeting, the Senate Budget Committee reviewed the Geography Program proposed changes and confirms there are no budgetary implications.
September 12, 2013

Memo to: Eric Davis, Chair, Senate APPC
From: Samantha Pattridge on behalf of Adrienne Chan, John English, and Noham Weinberg
Re: Expedited Program Approval Process

A previous version of the proposal was presented to APPC and discussed on March 20, 2013. It was then suggested that the document should be presented in the form of a policy.

The subcommittee members (Adrienne Chan, John English, Samantha Pattridge, Noham Weinberg) met and discussed the document. We agreed that it was logical to include the Expedited Program Approval Process as a part of the existing Policy 21 – Undergraduate Course and Program Approval. A draft of the Policy with proposed amendments is attached. These amendments include:

1. A reference to the expedited process in the modified item 7 of Procedures/Guidelines on page 2.
2. A reference to the expedited process as Appendix C in the list of Appendices on page 5.
3. A new Appendix C describing the expedited process on pages 10-12.

Since Policy 21 falls under the auspices of the Undergraduate Education Committee, we propose the following motion.

**MOTION:** That APPC request that the UEC discuss the amended Policy 21 and recommend it to the Senate for approval.

We also note that Policy 209 – Graduate Course and Program Approval may also need to be amended in a similar way to allow for an expedited approval of graduate programs.
UFV employs a process to scrutinize new and existing courses and programs to ensure that they meet both UFV and legislated standards and requirements.

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.

**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.

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

**Minor Program Change:** Any change which is not major, as described above.

**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/GUIDELINES

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, mandate, and Institutional Learning Outcomes.

2. Changes made to the procedures and guidelines of this policy require the approval of Senate.

3. A new course requires the approval of UEC, or Senate upon recommendation by UEC, 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 UEC, or 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. In exceptional cases, the approval can be obtained through the expedited process outlined in
Appendix C. No proposal can be put through the expedited process more than once.

8. The process for major and minor program changes is outlined in Appendix B. Major changes require the approval of Senate. Minor changes are approved by UEC, and sent to Senate for information.

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.
Reference: Section 35.2 (6) (b) of the University Act
APPENDICES

Appendix A: Undergraduate Course Approval Process

Appendix B: Undergraduate Program Approval Process

Appendix C: Expedited Undergraduate Program Approval Process
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 for information and to the Campus-Wide Consultation for a period of one to four weeks.

1.3. 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).

1.4. Upon approval by Faculty Council(s) and Dean(s), the Course Outline and Memo are submitted to UEC for approval, then to Senate for information if approved. If there are significant budgetary Implications, the Dean(s) may submit the Course Outline and Memo to the Budget Committee for review and recommendation to Senate. In such case, UEC will recommend its decision to Senate rather than approve the Course Outline.

1.5. Upon UEC or 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 an 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) for information and to the Campus-Wide Consultation for a period of one to four weeks.

2.3. 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).

2.4. Upon approval by Faculty Council(s) and Dean(s), the Course Outline and Memo are submitted to UEC for approval, then to Senate for information if approved. If there are significant budgetary implications, the Dean(s) may submit the Course Outline and Memo to the Budget Committee for review and recommendation to Senate. In such case, UEC will recommend its decision to Senate rather than approve the Course Outline.

2.5. Upon UEC or 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 an 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) for information and to Faculty Council(s) for approval.

3.3. Upon approval by Faculty Council(s) and Dean(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.

APPENDIX B: UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM APPROVAL PROCESS

This appendix includes
1) the process for developing and obtaining approval for a new undergraduate program;
2) the process for making major changes to an existing undergraduate program; and
3) the process for making minor changes to an existing undergraduate program.

1. Approval Process for New Programs

1.1. The process for introducing a new program, generally, begins when a Program Working Group presents its notice of intent to develop 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 a Concept Paper.

1.4. The Concept Paper is presented to Faculty Council(s) for discussion.

1.5. After discussion at Faculty Council(s), the Concept Paper is presented to the Dean(s) for review and approval. In the case of a multi-disciplinary program involving more than one Faculty, approval is required from the Dean(s) who will have administrative responsibility for the program. If the Dean(s) do(es) not recommend approval, that decision can be appealed to the Provost or Vice- Provost.

1.6. Upon approval by the Dean(s), the program proposed in the Concept Paper is included in the Faculty’s (or Faculties’) submission to the Education Plan. Only upon inclusion of the program concept in the Education Plan, as approved by the Board, should a Program Working Group proceed with developing the Program Proposal.

1.7. The Program Proposal and draft calendar copy are submitted on the appropriate template to the Campus-Wide Consultation, including the Dean(s), 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).
1.8. 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. For multidisciplinary programs, the proposal is submitted to the Faculty(ies) that will have administrative responsibility for the program.

1.9. Upon approval of the program by the Faculty Council(s), it is forwarded to the Dean(s) for approval.

1.10. Upon approval by the Dean(s), the development of the program budget is overseen by the Dean(s) and the Program Development Coordinator.

1.11. The Program Proposal and responses to comments submitted in the Campus-Wide Consultation are submitted to UEC for review and recommendation to APPC. Simultaneously, the Program Budget is sent to the Senate Budget Committee for review and recommendation to APPC.

1.12. APPC will review the recommendations from UEC and the Budget Committee, determine if the proposed program is in line with UFV’s institutional priorities, and make its recommendation to Senate. Programs will be prioritized by the Academic Planning and Priorities Committee.

1.13. 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. Normally, only proposals that are included in the Education Plan’s implementation list are sent for external approval.

2. Approval Process for Major Changes to an Existing Program

The following are considered to be major program changes:

- any program revision that requires new resources beyond those provided by the academic units responsible for the program
- new fields of specialization, such as a concentration
- change to the duration, philosophy or direction of a program
- change to the majority of courses in an approved program
- change in requirements for admission, residency, or continuance
- change in admission quotas
- change which triggers an external review

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 Campus-Wide Consultation, including the Dean(s), 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 of the program change by the Faculty Council(s), it is forwarded to the Dean(s) for approval.

2.5. Upon approval by the Dean(s), the development of the program budget is overseen by the Dean(s) and the Program Development Coordinator.

2.6. The program change and responses to comments submitted in the Campus-Wide Consultation are submitted to UEC for review and recommendation to APPC. Simultaneously, the program change budget is sent to the Senate Budget Committee for review and recommendation to APPC.

2.7. APPC will receive the recommendations from UEC and the Budget Committee, review them as deemed appropriate, and make its recommendation to Senate.

3. Approval Process for Minor Changes to an Existing Program

The following are considered to be minor program changes:

- any change which is not major, as described above
- addition of new course options, where the new options have no budgetary implications
- deletion or substitution of a required course

3.1. 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.

3.2. Upon approval by the department/school or Program Committee, minor changes are submitted to the Campus-Wide Consultation for a period of one to 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.

3.3. 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).

3.4. Upon approval of the program change by the Faculty Council(s), it is forwarded to the Dean(s) for approval, then to UEC.

3.5. Changes deemed to be minor are approved by UEC, and sent to Senate for information.

APPENDIX C: EXPEDITED UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM APPROVAL PROCESS

This appendix includes

1) The criteria for applying the expedited program approval process;
2) The screening process and the composition of the Program Screening Committee;
3) The expedited process for developing and obtaining approval for a new undergraduate program.

1. Criteria for applying the expedited program approval process
1.1 The expedited program approval process may be requested for a new undergraduate program if at least one of the following circumstances applies:

a. There is funding available from an external source, with time constraints.

b. There is a sudden emergent need in the community for a narrow, focused theme, and there is a funding source.

c. There is a request for a partnership with a time constraint, and there is a funding source.

d. There is a clearly demonstrable opportunity for revenue generation to meet a specific demand, with time constraints.

e. There is an opportunity for capital or infrastructure injection, with time constraints.

In addition,

1.2. The program must be sustainable.

1.3. The program must be consistent with the strategic goals of UFV.

1.4. The program must be consistent with program priorities of UFV.

1.5. There are minimal adverse implications for other faculties, programs, and services.

2. Screening process and composition of the Program Screening Subcommittee

2.1. Every year, the Academic Planning and Priorities Committee will create its Program Screening Subcommittee (PSS) for a one-year term. The subcommittee will be composed of the Chair or Vice-Chair of the Academic Planning and Priorities Committee, the Chair or Vice-Chair of the Senate Budget Committee, the Chair or Vice-Chair of the Undergraduate Education Committee, and the Chair or Vice-Chair of the Graduate Studies Committee. Three members of PSS will constitute the quorum.

2.2. If in the Dean’s opinion there is a need for expedited consideration of a program proposal, and under the assumption that the criteria outlined above are met, PSS will receive the Dean’s request to expedite consideration of a program proposal and within 1-2 weeks will make one of the following three recommendations:

a. To expedite consideration of the proposal and proceed as described below.

b. To skip the concept paper step and proceed directly to the regular full proposal phase as described in Appendix B.

c. To follow the regular program approval process as described in Appendix B.

2.3 If not satisfied with PSS’s recommendation, the Dean can appeal the decision to the Academic Planning and Priorities Committee, whose decision on that matter is final.

3. Expedited Program Approval Process

3.1. The process begins when the Dean appoints the Program Working Group. In consultation with the Dean and the Program Development Coordinator, the Program Working Group develops a Concept Paper. The Dean then submits a request for expedited consideration of the program proposal to PSS. The request must clearly state how the criteria are met and must be accompanied by the Concept Paper and Statement of Budget Implications.

3.2. PSS considers the request and makes a recommendation within 1-2 weeks.
3.3. If the decision of PSS is to expedite program consideration, then the Concept Paper and Statement of Budget Implications are presented simultaneously and independently to the Faculty Council(s), Academic Planning and Priorities Committee, Undergraduate Education Committee, and Senate Budget Committee for approval of the program for the expedited process. If any of these committees objects to the expedited consideration of the proposal, the full proposal will be approved in a regular process as described in Appendix B.

3.4. In the case of approval for expedited consideration, each of these committees provides its feedback to the Program Working Group and appoints two representatives to the eight-member ad hoc Program Evaluation Committee (PEC). The PEC should be ready to receive the full proposal by the end of the sixth week after the Dean’s submission of the request for expedited consideration.

3.5. At the same time (within weeks 3-6), the Concept Paper and Statement of Budget Implications are presented to the Deans’ Council for consultation.

3.6. The Program Working Group incorporates the feedback from Deans’ Council and the Program Development Coordinator into the Full Program Proposal, and the Dean submits the Full Proposal to PEC.

3.7. PEC makes its recommendation to Senate.

3.8. Upon Senate approval, if necessary, 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.
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 committees 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.

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.

1.6. Standing committees will elect a vice-chair annually from its membership who will chair meetings in the absence of the chair and in the event that the chair wishes to be an active participant in discussions. If the chair or vice-chair is absent from a meeting, the committee may appoint an acting vice-chair for that meeting.

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 of a standing committee who misses two consecutive meetings per year, without prior arrangement with the chair, shall receive written notice from the chair. Any member of a standing committee who misses three consecutive regular meetings per year, without prior arrangement with the Chair, and who has received written notice, shall have his/her membership on the standing committee reviewed by the Senate Governance Committee.

5. Amendments to the terms of reference

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

Addition of rule 1.4. approved at Senate 2013 06 21