



**AGENDA**  
**ACADEMIC PLANNING AND PRIORITIES COMMITTEE**

November 12, 2014  
2:30 to 4:30 pm, Room A229/225

**1. CALL to ORDER**

**2. ITEMS for ADOPTION**

- 2.1. Agenda – 2014 11 12
- 2.2. Minutes – 2014 10 15 ..... pg. 2

**3. BUSINESS**

- 2:35 pm 3.1. Provost's Report
- 2:45 pm 3.2. Change to APPC's Terms of Reference – Eric ..... pg. 5
- 3:00 pm 3.3. Report from APPC's Adhoc Subcommittee on Prioritization – Sylvie ..... pg. 8
- 3:35 pm 3.4. Programming at UFV: Discussion with the Deans – Eric
- 4:10 pm 3.5. Concept Paper Revisions – Sylvie ..... pg. 18
- 4:20 pm 3.6. Revisions to the Expedited Program Approval Process – Sylvie ..... pg. 23

**4. ADJOURNMENT and NEXT MEETING**

Next Meeting: December 10, 2014, 2:30 – 4:30, A225/229

**5. INFORMATION ITEMS**

- 5.1. APPC website: <http://www.ufv.ca/senate/standing-committees/appc/>



**MINUTES - Draft**  
**ACADEMIC PLANNING AND PRIORITIES COMMITTEE**

October 15, 2014  
2:30 pm - Room A225/229

- Present: E. Davis (chair), G. Palmer, J. Hogan, R. McLeod, A. Hodges, N. Weinberg, M. Rhodes, C. Gingerich, J. English, J. MacLean, C. Bell, M. Brosinski, F. Kheradmand, M. Wideman, D. McGuire, V. Dvoracek, K. Isaac, S. Murray, A. Wiseman,
- Guest: P. Geller; M. LaFever, Associate Professor, Communications; S. Pattridge, Department Head, Communications; L. Thompson, Director, Continuing Education
- Regrets: M. Bos-Chan, C. Slavik, J. Todrick, Z. Dennison, S. Brar, D. Griffiths, A. Chan, S. Hardman, D. Alary,
- Recorder: J. Nagtegaal

**1. CALL to ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 2:35 pm.

**2. ITEMS for ADOPTION**

**2.1. Agenda – 2014 10 15**

**MOTION:**

THAT APPC approve the 2014 10 15 agenda as amended.

G. Palmer/R. McLeod

**CARRIED**

**2.2. Minutes – 2014 09 17**

**MOTION:**

THAT APPC approve the 2014 09 17 minutes as presented.

R. McLeod/C. Gingerich

**CARRIED**

**3. BUSINESS**

**3.1. Provost's Report**

- A Provost's Forum on Skills and Liberal Education was held the morning of October 15. The forum was very well attending with standing room only and great discussion with the panelists.
- Lenore Newman, Canada Research Chari, Food Security and Environment will be inducted into the Royal Society of Canada's College and New Scholars. Lenore also has an exhibit, Life in Agriburbia, at The Reach from November 8 – 30.
- BCAIU discussed the Flexible Learner Pathways MOU again and was looking at incorporating PLAR into the agreement in some way. This could allow students to transfer the PLAR credits from one institution to another.
- Budget Forums will be held on October 23 at the CEP campus and on October 24 at the Abbotsford campus.

- The Centre for Indo-Canadian Studies will be presenting an exhibition commemorating the 1984 anti-Sikh pogroms in India. The exhibition will be launched on October 27 with speakers and discussion. The exhibition will be available for viewing at the Centre until November 13.

### **3.2. New Program**

#### **3.2.1. Peace Studies major and minor**

The Peace and Conflict Studies major and minor are housed within the Bachelor of Arts, but include courses from across the university as well as an external partnership with the Justice Institute to offer three courses.

A broader discussion took place around if and when prioritization happens and by whom. There was also some discussion on how new programs can affect existing programs and how that is managed. These topics will be further discussed at a future meeting.

#### **MOTION**

THAT APPC recommends the approval of the new Peace and Conflict Studies major and minor for the Bachelor of Arts as recommended by UEC.

N. Weinberg/J. MacLean

9 approved, 1 abstained

#### **CARRIED**

#### **3.2.2. Bachelor of Professional Communication**

The Bachelor of Professional Communication is a possible 90-credit degree, with the option for students to complete a 120-credit degree if desired. The degree is quite heavily an applied degree, but it also has a theoretical component which would allow student to go on to further education.

It was noted that BC has not yet been mandated to create 90-credit degrees, but that the Ministry could be open to the idea; this proposal will gauge their interest in the idea.

#### **MOTION**

THAT APPC recommends the approval of the new 90-credit Bachelor of Professional Communication degree program as recommended by UEC.

M. Rhodes/J. Hogan

#### **CARRIED**

#### **3.2.3. Public Relations certificate (Continuing Education)**

The Public Relations certificate is a revenue generating program that was created in collaboration with the Communications department. The program meets the need in the Fraser Valley to provide employment-focused entry level skills in public relations theory, social media and digital citizenship, image management, public speaking, media relations, and writing.

#### **MOTION**

THAT APPC recommends the approval of the new Public Relations certificate program as recommended by UEC.

R. McLeod/J. Hogan

#### **CARRIED**

### **3.3. Program Changes**

#### **3.3.1. Bachelor of Science honours, major, and minor Declaration Requirements**

There are presently no specific requirements for declaration for the Bachelor of Science majors and minors. These changes are being proposed in order to ensure that students are likely to be successful in the major/minor, and as a means of enrollment management.

##### **MOTION:**

THAT APPC recommends the approval of the changes to the declaration policy for the Bachelor of Science Honours, majors, and minors as recommended by UEC, effective January 2015.

R. McLeod/C. Bell

##### **CARRIED**

#### **3.3.2. Bachelor of Business Administration Program and Entrance Requirements**

The entrance requirements for the Bachelor of Business Administration are being changed to streamline the process and to make the admissions policy more equitable between high school and post-secondary applicants. The Accounting Option within the Bachelor of Business Administration is being revised to incorporate the Chartered Professional Accountant (CPA) professional designation.

##### **MOTION:**

THAT APPC recommends the approval of the changes to the Bachelor of Business Administration entrance requirements as recommended by UEC, effective January 2015.

R. McLeod/G. Palmer

##### **CARRIED**

##### **MOTION:**

THAT APPC recommends the approval of the changes to the program requirements for the BBA Accounting option as recommended by UEC, effective January 2015.

R. McLeod/J. Hogan

##### **CARRIED**

#### **3.4. Report from APPC's Adhoc Subcommittee on Prioritization**

APPC has been discussing if and how prioritization should occur since the creation of the committee. A Program Assessment Grid was created, but it has not been as useful as it was expected to be. It was noted that programs come to APPC for approval quite late in the process and that it is hard for APPC to have constructive input so late in the process. It was suggested that the Concept Paper be revised to be more rigorous and include a better assessment of the program by explaining how the program would align with the university's mandate and priorities, as well as how it fits with other programs. It was also recommended that the more rigorous Concept Paper go to APPC for approval to allow for input before the majority of the work is completed.

This discussion will continue at a future meeting.

#### **4. ADJOURNMENT and NEXT MEETING**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:35pm pm.

#### **5. INFORMATION ITEMS**

**5.1.** Teacher Education Program Name Change (Teacher Education Department)

**5.2.** APPC website: <http://www.ufv.ca/senate/standing-committees/appc/>

## Janice Nagtegaal

---

**From:** Monique Castonguay  
**Sent:** October-15-14 10:38 AM  
**To:** Janice Nagtegaal  
**Cc:** Eric Davis  
**Subject:** Interim Revision to APPC terms

Hello Janice

Senate approved interim measures to the APPC terms of reference (the second term), as outlined below. When APPC conducts the formal review of its terms of reference and membership composition this year (due in January 2015 to SGC), please include the wording below if APPC wishes to formalize the revision. Feel free to call if you have questions.

*The proposed revisions to the terms of reference for APPC are for a short-term implementation until the formal review of APPC's terms of reference is conducted later in the year.*

*THAT Senate approve the revision to the Academic Planning and Priorities' (APPC) second term of reference to remove the requirement that APPC approve program changes, with the exception of revisions that occasion a change to the alignment of programs with institutional priorities which require APPC approval and recommendation to Senate.*

Monique



## ACADEMIC PLANNING AND PRIORITIES COMMITTEE

### TERMS OF REFERENCE

---

1. Advise Senate on the mission, goals, objectives, strategies, and priorities of the university.
2. Following consultation with relevant standing committees, as deemed appropriate by the Academic Planning and Priorities Committee, advise Senate on the establishment, ~~revision~~ or discontinuance of educational programs and other curricular changes requiring Senate approval **including program changes that occasion a change to the alignment of programs with institutional priorities.** \*
3. Following consultation with relevant standing committees, as deemed appropriate by the Academic Planning and Priorities Committee, advise Senate on the development of and priorities for the implementation of new programs leading to certificates, diplomas, and degrees.
4. Following consultation with relevant standing committees, as deemed appropriate by the Academic Planning and Priorities Committee, advise Senate on the establishment or discontinuance of academic faculties, schools, divisions, and departments of the university.
5. Following consultation with relevant standing committees, as deemed appropriate by the Academic Planning and Priorities Committee, advise Senate on the number of students that may be accommodated in the university and the development and review of policies and procedures for managing enrolments in educational programs and courses.
6. Following consultation with relevant standing committees, as deemed appropriate by the Academic Planning and Priorities Committee, advise Senate on the establishment, revision, or discontinuance of centres, institutes, chairs, professorships, and fellowships.
7. Following consultation with relevant standing committees, as deemed appropriate by the Academic Planning and Priorities Committee, review and advise Senate on policy and procedures related to affiliation, articulation, partnerships, and other contractual agreements with post-secondary institutions and other organizations.
8. Following consultation with relevant standing committees, as deemed appropriate by the Academic Planning and Priorities Committee, advise Senate on policies and processes for the development, review, implementation, and communication of educational plans that support the priorities of the university.
9. Following consultation with relevant standing committees, as deemed appropriate by the Academic Planning and Priorities Committee, advise the Budget Committee of Senate on the academic priorities for the allocation of funds.
10. Following consultation with relevant standing committees, as deemed appropriate by the Academic Planning and Priorities Committee, advise Senate on policy and procedures for the systematic review of courses, programs, and educational services.

11. Review the reports and recommendations of program reviews/evaluations and advise Senate on actions.
12. Establish such subcommittees as needed to fulfill the committee's responsibilities.
13. Other duties as assigned by Senate.
14. Provide annual written reports to Senate.

## **COMPOSITION**

---

### Chair:

- Provost & Vice-President, Academic (*ex officio*, voting)

### Vice-Chair

- A voting member of the committee, nominated and approved by the committee

### Voting Members:

- Vice-Chair of Senate
- Chairs or designate vice-chairs of the following standing committees of Senate: Budget, Undergraduate Education, Graduate Studies, and Research
- Seven faculty members, approved by Senate, at least four of whom shall be members of Senate \*\*
- Two staff members approved by Senate
- Two undergraduate students approved by Senate
- One graduate student approved by Senate
- Two deans or associate deans approved by Senate\*\*\*

### Ex Officio Non-Voting Members:

- Associate Vice-President, Employee Services (or designate)
- Associate Vice-President, Research, Engagement & Graduate Studies (or designate)
- Director, Teaching and Learning
- Executive Director, International Education
- Senior Advisor on Indigenous Affairs
- Director, Enrolment Management
- Associate Vice-President, Institutional Research and Planning
- University Librarian (or designated Librarian)
- University Secretary/Registrar (or designate)
- Program Development Coordinator

### Administrative Support:

- Office of the Provost and VP Academic

\* Red text indicates interim revision approved by Senate, October 10, 2014

\*\* Normally, there shall be at least one member from each of the faculties, selected to ensure that the composition of the committee reflects the diversity of disciplines at the university

\*\*\*Normally the designate shall be appointed for a one-year term to ensure continuity.

**To:** APPC  
**From:** Sylvie Murray, John English, Peter Geller, Samantha Pattridge, John Todrick  
**Date:** June 5, 2014  
**Re:** End of year Report, Adhoc subcommittee on prioritization

---

**Background:**

Program prioritization has been an issue of intermittent discussion at APPC since 2011 (see Appendix I for the minutes of discussions related to prioritization between 2011 and October 2013).

- In Fall 2011 a list of criteria based on UFV's strategic directions was designed after lengthy deliberations and approved; the assumption then was that a "Program Evaluation/Ranking Grid" would be applied to *new* program proposals;
- In April 2013, the committee discussed using this grid (and testing it) on *current* programs;
- In June 2013, Ian McAskill (then Advisor to the Provost, Office of Integrated Planning) presented a draft briefing note on program prioritization that highlighted the possibility of it being done through "a *collaborative* process that encourages everyone to look at the *effectiveness of their program and how it meets the strategic goals of the institution*" (the emphasis is ours).
- In October 2013, as part of APPC's review of the Provost's introduction to the Education Plan Update, the statement that "Program prioritization and program mix discussions have been ongoing for the past two years, especially at Deans' Council and the Academic Planning and Priorities Committee" led to questioning the status of APPC's discussions on prioritization. This subcommittee was formed as a result. (See <http://www.ufv.ca/media/assets/senate/2013-Update-to-the-Education-Plan.pdf>, p. 15).

**2013-14 Subcommittee's mandate and plan:**

At its October meeting, APPC suggested that the subcommittee "look at the existing tools that have been created for new programs to see if they can be adapted to use for existing programs (specifically the inclusion of Trades programs, diplomas, and certificates)."

In keeping with this mandate, and given that the tool (i.e., Grid) created for new programs had yet to be used almost two years after its creation, the subcommittee submitted in November a plan of action that included three phases (see Appendix II for full version of the memo outlining our plan):

- Fall 2013: review and refine the Program Ranking adopted in 2011; use the Grid to assign priority level to new programs as they come to APPC; and continue to revise the grid, if needed, as it is being used.
- Jan-June 2014: develop a method to assess existing programs, including tools needed for priority assessment of existing programs.
- Fall 2014: Undertake an assessment of all existing programs at UFV or, alternatively, assess select programs. We further noted that this would feed education planning as we prepare for a new 5-year Ed Plan.

### **Work accomplished:**

We accomplished the first goal on schedule, and the revised (and renamed) *New Program Assessment Grid* was approved at the May 2014 APPC meeting and is now ready to use. The subcommittee reviewed the grid, tested it on four different programs, evaluated the results, and made changes to the grid. As the grid is used, it may require further refinement and consideration of its applicability for all program/credential types.

In relation to existing programs: we began this phase of our work in January by meeting with Deans Caucus and, subsequently, three Deans joined our “expanded subcommittee.” We met three times and our discussions touched on a wide range of issues related to prioritization and strategic planning (including the proposed discontinuance policy and the Ed plan process) as well as on specific aspects of program assessment, including metrics and criteria. The Deans shared with us work they had done on metrics and criteria.

Our conversations were useful in fostering a better understanding of the respective roles and responsibilities of Deans and APPC in the context of our system of governance. The relationship between the administrative and governance sides of the house is not simple in universities, and our attempt to capture the essence of that relationship was presented in a *brief discussion of the concept of “effective oversight”* included in the March report. (See Appendix III, March 12 report)

Overall, as reported in March, our deliberations did not lead to a recommendation about “a method to assess existing programs”. Indeed, *we expressed our strong preference not to proceed in the direction of a full program prioritization process (PPP) for existing programs*, and APPC generally accepted this conclusion.

We also considered the implications of focusing instead on targeted program assessments without delineating exactly the circumstances that would trigger such an assessment (the circumstances we cited revolved around a program displaying sub-standard performance and/or external factors compelling UFV to choose among worthy programs). This discussion was inconclusive.

Given the above, we will not proceed, unless directed otherwise, to the last phase of the plan that we had set out last November which was *to undertake, in Fall 2014, an assessment of all or select existing programs at UFV using some kind of prioritization/assessment method*.

### **About “priorities” and “prioritization”:**

Although there was support for not engaging in a thorough Program Prioritization Process (PPP), questions were raised at the March 19 APPC meeting about whether the subcommittee’s conclusions were in line with APPC’s Terms of Reference (TOR) and exercise of its responsibility. These are important considerations that deserve an answer, and the answer partly lies in establishing a clearer distinction between advising on “priorities” (which is in APPC’s purview) and “prioritization” (which is not APPC’s mandate, at least according to our interpretation of the TOR).

APPC’s Terms of Reference clearly emphasize our responsibility to advise on priorities of the university (par. 1), particularly in relation to educational programs. We are called to do so in the cases of discontinuance of educational programs (par. 2); implementation of new programs (par. 3); enrolment management (par. 5); educational planning (par. 8); and so on. In all of these cases, we discharge our responsibilities by *reviewing* recommendations prepared by others, mostly administrators (except in the case of new programs), although broad-based consultation is built into the processes linked to educational programming. To be sure, APPC can

improve on how it performs its reviewing responsibilities. But the relevant point here is that: *To review and advise on priorities is not synonymous with prioritizing programs, new or existing.* The former is advisory, and proper to the sphere of governance to which APPC belongs; the latter, we have come to conclude, is administrative in nature, primarily because it requires information that is not appropriately shared in a public forum like APPC.

Difficulty in determining an institutional definition of “prioritization” is not unique to UFV. Consider the following, from a public report produced by the University of Saskatchewan’s PPP Taskforce (this report was produced before USask’s recent turmoil):

*The use of the word “priority” has, we think, created some confusion when we have tried to explain the nature and objectives of our process to members of the campus community. The term “priority” does, of course, have resonance in relation to the university’s integrated planning process and the formulation of strategic directions for the institution. One of the criteria (Criterion 9) was focused specifically on university priorities in this sense. Units were asked explicitly in the template to describe how the program is aligned with the strategic directions of the university, and links were provided to the strategic directions and the three integrated plans to assist with answering these questions.*

As further noted in the report:

*Given the budgetary impetus behind the [PPP at USask], however, even if 100% of the programs were found to be strongly aligned with the strategic directions, the university would still need to make decisions about where it should be disinvesting and reinvesting, and it is “priority” in this sense that has been the focus of the deliberations of the task force.*

#### **Prioritization as an administrative function:**

The University of Guelph and the University of Saskatchewan have engaged in full-scale prioritization of both their academic and non-academic programs. An examination of the public reports made available after these reviews may provide suggestions about why the “expanded subcommittee” has been unable to provide firm direction on prioritization — a prioritization of all programs (at least, as put in practice at these two institutions):

- was mandated by a senior administrative directive;
- required a time commitment and carried expectations of confidentiality that is not typical, even possible, of a Senate committee (The excerpts from the USask and Guelph PPP reports in Appendix IV on the confidentiality requirements expected of Taskforce members are revealing of this aspect);
- may have involved Senate and its committees in a review and advisory role, but the systematic and comparative analysis of programs was done by an appointed Taskforce.

#### **Conclusion:**

The subcommittee feels that the discussions in which we have engaged over the past year have clarified for us the nature of the prioritization process and the respective roles of APPC and administration in that process.

## **APPENDIX I**

APPC on Program Prioritization, 2011-Oct 2013 (excerpts from minutes)

**December 14, 2011**

### **3.2. Program Criteria**

Cheryl outlined the revisions made to the draft program criteria since the last APPC meeting and outlined the comments received by the Arts Faculty Council. APPC considered the changes, made further revisions, and is satisfied the amended program criteria can be adopted for the year.

The question of criteria weighting was considered. In the end, APPC felt weighting was implied by the number of criterion. The criteria will be reviewed in a year and, over the year, APPC will have an informed discussion on criteria weighting.

#### **MOTION:**

THAT APPC adopt the program criteria, as amended, with the understanding that the program criteria and allocation of weighting will be reviewed within twelve months.

**February 22, 2012**

### **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.

**April 17, 2013**

### **3.7. Program Prioritization**

At the March APPC meeting, part of the discussion in 'Reviewing APPC's Progress' was around prioritizing the current UFV programs. Four test options for the program prioritization process were presented:

1. use completely fictitious programs and data,
2. use real programs, but make them anonymous,
3. use actual programs and numbers, or
4. look at the program mix before we go into the details.

Using actual programs and numbers would be best as they are real programs and would be able to be assessed on all levels without missing any information. It was also thought that looking at the overall program mix would be a good exercise to do, although it wouldn't be in place of the other options.

**June 12, 2013**

### **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.

Draft Briefing note is included in agenda package, pp. 55-67

**October 16, 2013 (p. 2)**

### **3.6 2013 Education Plan Update**

The 2013 Update to the 2011 – 2015 Education Plan was presented.... There was some discussion around program prioritization and how APPC can continue these discussions. The committee has discussed this topic over the past few years but needs to find a way to move the discussion forward. An adhoc subcommittee should be created to look at what the next steps are for program prioritization. It was suggested that the subcommittee look at the existing tools that have been created for new programs to see if they can be adapted to use for existing programs (specifically the inclusion of Trades programs, diplomas, and certificates).



# MEMO

## APPENDIX II

**To:** APPC  
**From:** Sylvie Murray, Program Development Coordinator  
**CC:** John English, Samantha Pattridge, John Todrick, Ian McAskill  
**Date:** November 4, 2013  
**Re:** Adhoc subcommittee on prioritization's report

---

On October 16, APPC formed an adhoc subcommittee to discuss how we can move the discussion of program prioritization forward. It was recommended that the members (John English, Samantha Pattridge, John Todrick and Sylvie Murray) consult with Ian McAskill.

We reviewed the work done by APPC between December 2011 and June 2013 (see Appendix I). On the basis of that work and as a result of our discussions over two meetings (October 23 and October 30), we present the following report and preliminary recommendations:

### **Assumptions that govern our discussions:**

The purpose of prioritization is to enable reallocation of resources to support strategic directions, either from existing to new programs, or among existing programs, within or among faculties. While APPC and Senate can assess programs' fit with strategic directions, and exercise oversight over administrative decisions, the UFV's Executive, and Board, are responsible for making decisions about allocation of resources.

**We recommend** that APPC's work on prioritization proceed as such:

#### 1) 2013-2014:

- Fall 2013: review and refine Program Ranking Grid adopted in 2011 (to take into account updated priorities, e.g., agriculture, and Deans' input), and test assignment of priority level (high, moderate, low priority; not recommended) on new programs recently reviewed by APPC. These programs are:
  - Hospitality & Event Management – post-degree certificate (Feb 2013)
  - Bachelor of Media Arts (June 2013)
  - French Major (Oct 2013)
  - Engineering Physics (Nov 2013) – diploma
- Assignment of priority level to new programs will continue in winter/fall 2014 as new program proposals come to APPC and grid for new programs will continue to be revised, if needed. The

following programs are expected to come through APPC in the winter 2014 and fall 2014 semesters

- Peace & Conflict Studies Major (BA)
  - Indigenous Studies Major (BA)
  - Theatre Major (BA)
  - Bachelor of Professional Communication
  - Bachelor of Environmental Studies
  - Bachelor of Agriculture
  - Bachelor of Education
  - Applied Statistics Minor
  - Master of Professional Accountancy & Corporate Financial Management
  - Master of Migration and Citizenship
- Jan-June 2014: develop a method to assess existing programs, including tools needed for priority assessment of existing programs
    - Test on programs that have recently gone through program reviews?
    - Is the Program Review model currently used at UFV providing the information needed for this purpose? Other tools, data needed?
    - Who will do the assessment? (a subcommittee of APPC? Deans?)
    - What model of prioritization should we use: 5 quintiles (see Guelph Task Force Report); a “rating” not a “ranking” (as recommended by Ian: “ranking implies the ordering of programs in relation to each other, and that kind of comparative simply invites institutional discord. A rating, simply high, mid, or low is as fine a gradation as necessary” (p. 7, draft submitted to APPC, June 2013); other (VIU’s?)
  - Fall 2014: Undertake an assessment of all existing programs at UFV. An alternative approach is to assess select programs. There are pros and cons to the two different approaches. Academic programs include academic support areas such as the library, career centre, writing center, math center, ETS, PLAR office (all areas that report to the Academic V-P).
  - This would feed education planning, through the 5-year Ed Plan and annual updates.

### APPENDIX III

**To:** APPC  
**From:** Sylvie Murray  
**CC:** John English, Peter Geller, Samantha Pattridge, John Todrick  
**Date:** March 12, 2014  
**Re:** Report, Adhoc subcommittee on prioritization

---

On January 6, our committee met with Deans caucus to initiate a conversation about the Deans' and APPC's role in relation to prioritization of existing programs. Three representatives from Deans Caucus (Jacqueline Nolte, Sue Bridgen and Rosetta Khalideen) joined us for further discussion. We have had three meetings of our "Program Prioritization subcommittee—expanded" to date, and have another scheduled for April 2.

We now seek APPC's input on the directions that our discussion is taking.

1) "effective oversight": One of our key topic of discussion has been to clarify the responsibility of institutions of governance in relation to administrative academic decision making, and how APPC is to exercise its responsibility. We propose the following as a way to clarify our role:

Under our university's shared model of governance, APPC's role is to review administrative decisions to ensure due diligence has guided administrative academic decision making. For instance: Is the decision to enhance one area (perhaps at the expense of another) in line with institutional values, priorities, constraints, etc.? Have a range of relevant quantitative and qualitative assessment measures been used to arrive at a particular decision? Have all alternatives been considered and has appropriate consultation taken place? The exercise of oversight is not contingent on APPC being provided with a *predetermined* set of data (because relevant data may change depending on the circumstances, and some data is confidential); however, administrative decisions submitted to APPC, as relevant under its terms of reference, should be presented with a clear rationale and sufficient information for APPC to exercise its role within UFV's academic governance structure.

2) Would we engage in a thorough assessment (or "prioritization") of academic programs in the way that other institutions have (especially when faced with severe budget cutbacks)? If we reaffirm the decision not to, when would APPC be called to review administrative academic decisions in relation to academic programs?

We revisited the question of whether UFV should engage in a thorough assessment of all its programs through a systematic "Program Prioritization" process, and there is a strong preference not to proceed in this direction.<sup>1</sup> However, we think that it is important to discuss a) the circumstances (or triggers) that would occasion APPC to scrutinize *targeted program assessment* and b) the circumstances that would lead to, or call for, APPC weighing in on *cross-faculty strategic choices*.

---

<sup>1</sup> See the report produced by the University of Guelph's Program Prioritization Task Force in September 2013 for an example of what these PP exercises entail. [http://media.zuza.com/2/5/25b4df43-8622-49a0-9a01-fcedf0d09731/Program\\_Prioritization\\_Process\\_Task\\_Force\\_Report1.pdf](http://media.zuza.com/2/5/25b4df43-8622-49a0-9a01-fcedf0d09731/Program_Prioritization_Process_Task_Force_Report1.pdf). For a critique of Program Prioritization that articulates its disadvantages, see Leo Groarke and Beverley Hamilton, "Doing the PPP: A skeptical perspective," *University Affairs* (13 January 2014) <<http://www.academicmatters.ca/2014/01/doing-the-ppp-a-skeptical-perspective/>>

### APPENDIX III

a) Targeted program assessments (outside of our current 5-year program review cycle) could occur in the following circumstances:

- a program has low demand (student, job market, regional) over a sustained period (5 year)
- a program capacity has decreased to the point that it is not running effectively (e.g., it is difficult to attract and retain qualified faculty? its facilities or equipment demands are not sustainable)
- a program is not delivering in terms of quality and performance (e.g. an accreditation review provides evidence of serious problem; students' completion rate is low, etc...)

Note that these examples would not necessarily lead to, or meet the criteria for, program discontinuance (hence, would not fall under the policy currently in development).

b) A second set of circumstances might be triggered by factors beyond an individual program's poor performance. For instance, a new provincial or Board mandate that compels UFV to make a difficult choice among a number of worthy existing and/or proposed programs (either to expand or downsize or both). If we agree not to engage in a thorough assessment of all programs, how then would we make such a difficult decision?

The committee will continue its discussion on April 2. In the meantime, we invite your thoughts on these questions.

#### APPENDIX IV

On time commitment and confidentiality:

From the USask report: “Over the course of its mandate, members of the task force demonstrated an extremely strong commitment to the prioritization project. During the preparatory phase from March to August 2013, the task force met for approximately 50 hours in developing the template, scoring rubric and other materials. During the review period from September 4, 2013 to November 30, 2013, the task force met for an additional 90 hours, and individual members spent many more hours reviewing the templates.” (p.10/133)

From the USask report, on confidentiality:

Though the deliberations about programs were confidential, the task force attempted to be as open as possible about other aspects of its work (2/133)

Confidentiality of deliberations: During this time, the task force also adopted a policy on conflicts of interest. According to this policy, members would be regarded as having a conflict of interest in relation to rating programs associated with their home academic unit or units, and programs associated with academic units in which their spouses or partners have academic appointments. Under this policy, task force members could also declare a genuine conflict of interest in relation to other programs. Members absented themselves during discussion and categorization of programs for which they had a conflict of interest.

The task force established ground rules for its deliberations, which emphasized the responsibility of each member to prepare for and attend meetings, to contribute to the discussion, and to make a conscientious effort to prioritize each program. Though the task force acknowledged the value of openness and transparency concerning the process and the criteria for the review, the ground rules included a commitment to strict confidentiality concerning the deliberations about the programs themselves. This commitment to confidentiality permitted the task force to have candid discussions and to make difficult decisions. (9/133)

Over the course of its mandate, members of the task force demonstrated an extremely strong commitment to the prioritization project. During the preparatory phase from March to August 2013, the task force met for approximately 50 hours in developing the template, scoring rubric and other materials. During the review period from September 4, 2013 to November 30, 2013, the task force met for an additional 90 hours, and individual members spent many more hours reviewing the templates. 10/133

From Guelph:

## **5.0 Confidentiality**

Confidentiality is mandatory, both during this process, and for all time after it has concluded. If there is any doubt at any time about what is permissible within the bounds of confidentiality, members must speak with the Task Force Chairs before acting. All Task Force business must be kept strictly confidential. This includes a prohibition of discussion at any time, with anyone other than another committee member about anything that takes place in the smaller committee or larger Task Force meetings.

Task Force members may be questioned or lobbied by others about the process or outcomes of the process. While the process is transparent, the discussions, decisions and outcomes are not to be shared by Task Force members with individuals outside of the Task Force. Members of the University Community must be reminded to visit the website for updates.

Task Force members each agree to hold in complete confidence all information (ie., notes, comments, ratings, discussions) provided to them or created by the Task Force and they each will not use, discuss or disclose any information to any person, group or entity on their own initiative. They each agree that all communication on behalf of the committee will be through the Chair and/or Vice-Chair or Provost.

Task Force members each agree to protect and not to share with any other person written material (in either print or electronic form) received or created in conjunction with PPP. This is especially important for scores and comments developed by the Committees or Task Force.

If questions arise around content contained in the PIR form, please direct the questions to the Task Force Chairs. All queries or questions posed to Dean's or PIR form authors etc. will be done by the Task Force chairs.

Task Force members agree to keep all materials safe and acknowledge that these materials cannot be stored in meeting rooms for security purposes.



# MEMO

To: APPC  
From: Sylvie Murray, Program Development Coordinator  
Date: 05/11/2014  
Re: Revised Concept Paper Guidelines

---

## **Background:**

The revised Concept Paper Guidelines is attached for discussion at APPC. This draft was created with input from faculty members and Deans who have been actively involved in development of new programs, APPC Assistant Janice Nagtegaal and the Provost's Executive Assistant Nicole Hitchens. The existing Concept Paper is also attached for your information.

According to policy 21 (Undergraduate Course and Program Approvals), approval authority over these Guidelines (for undergraduate programs) resides with the UEC Chair, Vice-Chair, and Assistant, in consultation with the Office of the Vice-Provost.

Deans Caucus was consulted on November 3, 2014. The following will also be consulted:

- Director of Teaching and Learning
- Senior Advisor Indigenous Affairs
- Executive Director, UFV international
- Senate Budget Committee
- Graduate Studies Committee

**ACTION:** The revised Concept Paper Guidelines is provided for discussion and feedback.



## Concept Paper Guidelines – 2014 REVISION

*The concept paper serves as a general indication of a Program Working Group’s thinking on key issues related to a proposed program. It should be used for all new programs, including degrees (ex: Bachelor of Media Arts), specializations within an existing degree (ex: Major in Computing Science), diplomas (ex: Automation & Control Systems Technician Diploma) and certificates.<sup>1</sup>*

*In accordance with the Procedures for Undergraduate Course and Program Approval (Appendix to Policy 21), the Concept Paper is developed, on the approved template, by a Program Working Group (PWG), in consultation with the Program Development Office, appropriate academic units, and the Dean of the area.*

*Once developed, the concept paper is presented to the relevant Faculty/College Council for discussion and to the Dean for approval. Upon approval by the Dean, and before its inclusion in the Education Plan, the Concept Paper is presented to the Academic Planning and Priorities Committee (APPC). APPC will verify that the program proposed in the Concept Paper is consistent with institutional priorities before recommending it for inclusion in the Education Plan. Only upon inclusion of the program concept in the Education Plan, as approved by the Board of Governors, should a Program Working Group proceed with developing the Program Proposal.*

*What is expected of the Concept Paper is explained below.*

**Maximum Length:** *five to eight pages (plus appendices, if required).*

### 1. Basic Information

- a. Credential to be awarded  
*For instance, “Bachelor of Arts, Major in Theatre” or “Bachelor of Agricultural Science, Major in Horticulture” or “Automation and Control Systems Technician Diploma”.*
- b. Number of credits; if relevant, completion time in years or semesters  
*Note that all programs are expected to be structured to ensure timely completion by students (e.g., 4 years for a 120-credit degree program, or 2 years for a 60-credit diploma program). Completion time needs to be indicated only if it is a defining feature of the proposed program, for instance:*
  - *for a program primarily aimed at international students, a minimum length of time might be advisable to facilitate immigration;*
  - *some programs may be conceived to be delivered exclusively, or primarily, in an accelerated format;*
  - *programs that build on an earlier credential, in a laddering model, would have a shorter completion time than suggested by the number of credits (“two semesters, post-Certificate”).*
- c. Administrative responsibility  
*Name the Faculty or College that will have administrative responsibility for the program. In the case that a program draws resources from more than one Faculty/College beyond the provision of service courses, the Deans involved will decide who will assume administrative responsibility for the program and whether administrative responsibility will be shared by more than one Faculty/College. The Faculty/College and Dean that has administrative responsibility will have approval authority at the relevant stages of the program approval process.*

---

<sup>1</sup> With the exclusion of programs seeking approval through the expedited program approval process.



d. Goals

*Provide a brief statement describing the goals of the new program in terms of preparing students for employment, professional and/or further educational opportunities.*

## 2. Alignment with Institutional Priorities and Existing Programming

a. Program Learning outcomes (and alignment with ILOs)

*Even though the learning outcomes presented in the concept paper are likely to be refined as the curriculum structure and content take shape, they should inform the design of a program at the outset. Given the employment, professional, educational goals to be met by the program, what skills, knowledge, and attributes will graduates of this program possess upon completion of the program? (Phrase your program outcomes as "Upon completion of this program, graduates will be able to: ...").*

*You are also asked to articulate how the program outcomes align with UFV's Institutional Learning Outcomes since the ILOs reflect essential skills and knowledge that every graduate should acquire at UFV.*

b. Contribution to UFV's mandate and strategic priorities

*Consult UFV's key planning documents (Strategic Directions, current Education Plan Update, Strategic Enrollment Management Plan--all available on the UFV Senate [website](#)) and explain which institutional priority/ies your program will support. Also consider and discuss how the program will employ high-impact practices to ensure student success.*

c. Related programs in the institution or other British Columbia post-secondary institutions. Indicate rationale for duplication, if any.

*Is this a program that is completely new to UFV, or does it build on, or complement, existing programs? If relevant, explain its relationship to existing programs and provide a justification if it duplicates, significantly overlaps, or is likely to replace an existing program over time. Also provide a list of similar programs at other institutions in British Columbia and, if duplication exists, explain how the proposed program will be competitive in the BC post-secondary environment.*

## 3. Audience, demand and capacity

a. Audience

*What type or group of students will your program attract? For instance, high-school graduates; mid-career professionals; students laddering from a previous program; international students; students currently attracted to a cognate program.*

b. Student demand

*Provide evidence of student demand and anticipated annual enrolments for the program.*

c. Employment for graduates and/or opportunities for further study.

*What will graduates of this program do? What areas/sectors of employment and/or occupational categories will the skills and learning acquired in this program prepare them for? What are the current and anticipated labour market conditions and career outlooks in the relevant sectors and occupations? What further educational opportunities will the program prepare students for?*



d. Existing capacity and/or possible resource needs

*Will this program draw on existing resources and/or is it likely to need additional resources? Consider faculty and staff, labs, space, technical support, etc. A detailed budget analysis will be produced in the program development stage; but you and your Dean should have a general idea that the proposed program is financially viable and sustainable.*

**4. Program Working Group membership**

*List the members of the PWG and the reasons for their selection. Include brief biographies and credentials of PWG members. The PWG should consist of a minimum of three faculty members 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 included. Note that only approved PWGs should develop and present Concept Papers for inclusion in the Education Plan.*

**5. Anticipated start date and development/review & approval/implementation timetable**

*By requesting inclusion of a concept paper in the Education Plan, you are notifying the institution of your commitment to develop the proposed program, and to do so in a timely fashion in order to allow for budget and enrolment planning. The Program Development Office will work with the Dean and the Program Working Group to set a realistic date when the program will be launched. This will include a reasonable timetable for development of the full program proposal, internal and external review and approval, and implementation (the latter, for instance, should take into account advertising and inclusion in the Academic Calendar after approval).*

*Significant delays in meeting key landmarks (for instance, entering the review and approval stage of the process) could lead to being asked to submit a revised timetable or withdraw the program from the planning process. Education Plan updates will include status reports on programs in development.*



### **Concept Paper Requirements - CURRENT**

The Concept Paper serves as a general indication of the Program Working Group's thinking on key issues related to their proposed program. It provides the basis for approval of a Program Working Group as well as the basis for inclusion in the Education Plan.

Approval of a concept paper means only that a group has a mandate to continue to develop a Program Proposal, not that it will ultimately be approved by Senate.

The concept paper is not required to be a definitive statement of the curriculum of a new program, but rather a general indication of the thinking of the development group on some key issues.

It should include the following elements, and any other issues the group wishes to include, and should not exceed five pages in length.

- a. Name of program
- b. Purpose / goals of the program
- c. Credential to be awarded
- d. Program Length or number of credits (or range)
- e. Audience (type of student served) and benefits to this audience
- f. Relationship to local communities and their needs
- g. Relationship to UFV Strategic Plan, including possibilities for Indigenous and international content
- h. Relationship to existing programs at UFV
- i. Anticipated links to further study, and to employment (type of graduate or professional school; kinds of careers a graduate would be prepared for)
- j. Delivery methods
- k. Possible resource needs (labs, faculty, space, technical support)
- l. Suggested Program Working Group members and the reasons for their selection. Include brief biographies and credentials.



# MEMO

**To:** APPC  
**From:** Sylvie Murray, Program Development Coordinator  
**Date:** November 5, 2014  
**Re:** Revised Procedures for Expedited Process

---

## **Background:**

Procedures for the Expedited Program Approval Process were put in place last June and, since then, concerns have been raised about their complexity and the length of time that it will take for a program to be approved under these procedures.

It is indeed a very cumbersome process that will entail administrative support not normally required by our regular approval process (e.g., support for the Program Evaluation Committee and Program Screening Subcommittee) and would take 4-6 months to be completed, at best. Current procedures can be viewed at: <http://www.ufv.ca/senate/standing-committees/appc/expedited-program-approval-process/>

In response to these concerns we suggest a simplified set of procedures that would have the following advantages:

- parallel the existing process, therefore would be easier to understand and administer;
- would not include a Concept Paper, and Budget Analysis Templates A & B, but only the program proposal template and a memo, therefore reducing paperwork;
- could be completed in a maximum of four months. We would also like to allow review of proposals to take place over the summer months, if this can be accommodated by UEC and APPC.

Revised procedures are illustrated in the attached Guidelines.

## **Approval Authority:**

As per policy 21, procedures in support of the expedited process are under the authority of APPC, in consultation with the Office of the Vice-Provost. Any procedures developed will consider the roles of other Senate Standing Committees in the course and program approval process. Guidelines and templates will be administered by the Chair, Vice-Chair, and Assistant of APPC by unanimous decision.

**Consultation:**

The revised procedures have been developed by Janice Nagtegaal, APPC Assistant, and Sylvie Murray, Program Development Coordinator, Office of the Vice-Provost. The following consultation is proposed:

- October 27: UEC Short Programs Subcommittee. It is part of the Subcommittee's mandate to "review policies 21 (including Expedited Process) in light of short programs and suggest revisions if necessary). The Director of Continuing Education and Dean of Applied and Technical Studies are members of this subcommittee. The subcommittee strongly recommend approval of this revised set of procedures.
- November 6, 2014: APPC Chair Eric Davis, APPC Vice-Chair Christine Slavik and Vice-Provost Peter Geller – for discussion and feedback
- November 12, 2014: APPC -- for discussion and feedback
- November 18, 2014: Senate Governance Committee -- for information
- November 20, 2014: Senate Budget Committee – for discussion and feedback
- November 21, 2014: UEC – for discussion and feedback
- December 10, 2014: APPC, for decision, followed by revision and approval of guidelines and templates by Chair, Vice-Chair and Assistant of APPC.

Guidelines for Expedited Approval Process

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p><b>Timeline</b></p> <p>Although a request for expedited consideration may be submitted at any time, delays may be caused if the proposal reaches the Senate committees during the summer months.</p> <p>Once developed and endorsed by Faculty/College Council (step 1), and approved for review through the expedited process (step 2), program could be reviewed and approved (as per Part II) within 2 months.</p> <p>Committee meeting schedule (as per UFV meeting schedule):</p> <p>UEC and SBC -- week 4 (e.g. October 23-24)</p> <p>APPC – week 3 (e.g. Nov 12)</p> <p>Senate -- week 2 (e.g. Dec 5)</p> <p>Board approval (in principle, pending Senate approval) at any point after CWC.</p> | <p><b>Part I: Determination of whether a program meets the criteria for Expedited Approval Process</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Dean of the program area appoints a Program Working Group (PWG) to develop the program and new courses or major revisions to existing courses, if needed. The PWG will ensure that affected academic units are consulted. The full program proposal, calendar copy, and Official Course Outlines [hereafter referred to as the proposal package] are submitted to the Program Development Office and the UEC Screening Subcommittee to ensure that they are complete. The proposal package is then submitted to the Faculty/College Council for endorsement.</li> </ol> <p>Simultaneously, the Dean analyzes the budgetary implications of the proposed program with the Budget office. The Dean and Budget office submit a Memo to the Vice-Provost explaining how the proposed program meets the criteria for expedited process.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. The Vice-Provost will make one of the following recommendations:             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The proposed program meets the criteria for expedited process and can proceed through the rest of the expedited screening process.</li> <li>b. The proposed program does not meet the criteria for expedited process, therefore cannot proceed through the rest of the expedited screening process.</li> </ol> <p>The Vice-Provost’s recommendation will be submitted to the APPC chair and vice-chair for confirmation.</p> <p>The Dean may appeal a negative recommendation (b. above) to the Academic Planning and Priorities Committee standing subcommittee, whose decision is final.</p> </li> </ol> <p><b>Part II: Review of Program Proposal under the Expedited Approval Process</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. The proposal package is submitted to Campus Wide Consultation (CWC) for a period of one week, the PWG responds to CWC comments and makes any necessary change (using track changes).</li> <li>4. The Board of Governors’ approval of the proposed program is required and can be requested at any point after Campus Wide Consultation is completed.</li> <li>5. The PWG submits the proposal package along with CWC consultation comments and responses to UEC Screening Subcommittee who will review it prior to submission to UEC (the Screening Subcommittee may recommend that UEC vote on the proposal by e-mail). Analysis of the proposed program’s budgetary implications is submitted to the Senate Budget Committee (Senate Budget Committee may exempt specific Departments from review under the expedited process). APPC will receive UEC’s and, when applicable, SBC’s recommendation and will make a recommendation to Senate. APPC may delegate review of proposals submitted through this process to a standing subcommittee comprised of the Chair of APPC, the Vice-Chair, and three faculty members, where possible from different Faculty/College.</li> <li>6. If external approval is required, the Program Proposal is sent to the Office of the Provost and Vice-President, Academic for external submission (typically, through posting on the Post-secondary Institution Proposal System for 30 days).</li> </ol> |
|---|---|