

## SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE ON CURRICULUM

Regular Meeting  
Wednesday, September 15, 2021  
4:15 p.m.- 7:15 p.m.  
MS Teams Online

### AGENDA

1. Territorial Acknowledgement and Call to Order ..... Amy Jeon 4:15
2. Approval of Agenda
3. Approval of Minutes, June 16, 2021
4. Chair's Report
  - 4.1. Transition to CourseLeaf for Curricular Workflow..... Amy Jeon 4:25
  - 4.2. Notice of Election of Chair ..... Amy Jeon 4:35
5. Consent Agenda ..... Amy Jeon 4:40
6. Course Changes
  - 6.1. GDMA 1200 Typographic Design 2..... Amy Jeon 4:55
7. Program Changes
  - 7.1. Certificate in Welding Foundations..... Laura McDonald 5:05
  - 7.2. Citation in Welding Level A..... 5:10
  - 7.3. Citation in Welding Level B..... 5:15
8. New Business
  - 8.1. Pedagogical Merit Review Workflow Procedures  
..... Deepak Gupta, Layne Myhre 5:20
  - 8.2. Learning Resources Section of Course Outline ..... Leeann Waddington 5:35
  - 8.3. Policy AC10..... David Burns, Josephine Chan 5:50
  - 8.4. New Program Proposals: Centre for Entertainment Arts..... David Burns 6:05
9. Adjournment

## SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE ON CURRICULUM

### MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, June 16, 2021

4:15 p.m. – 7:15 p.m.

MS Teams Online

Voting Members Quorum 7 members		
Jen Adams Bogdan Bryja Gregory Harris Nadia Henwood Nick Bransford Anton Kietaibl	Parthiphan Krishnan Ron Murray Diane Purvey Sherilyn Sweeney Elizabeth Worobec	
		<b>Non-voting</b>
		David Burns - Chair Zena Mitchell Rajiv Jhangiani Melissa Krahn David Florkowski Leeann Waddington
Regrets	Senate Office	Guests
Harman Singh Lindsay Norris	Meredith Laird Rita Zamluk	Deepak Gupta Layne Myhre Mike Ford Jessica Bayntun Andhra Goundrey Sandy Vanderburgh Laura McDonald Josephine Chan

#### 1. Call to Order

The Chair opened the meeting with a Territorial Acknowledgement and called the meeting to order at 4:15 p.m.

#### 2. Approval of Agenda

The Chair reviewed the agenda. He added information item 8: Associate Vice-President, Program Development and Curriculum, and noted his intention to absent himself from this item. Dr. Purvey agreed to chair this portion of the meeting.

**Gregory Harris moved the agenda be confirmed as presented.**

**The motion carried.**

#### 3. Approval of Minutes, May 12, 2021

**Anton Kietaibl moved the minutes of May 12th be accepted as presented.**

**The motion carried.**

#### 4. Chair's Report

The Chair, David Burns, reported on the activities of the Subcommittee on Writing-Intensive Courses (SWIC) meeting. SWIC will not meet until the arbitration on the class sizes is completed in the summer or early fall.

The consideration of research in courses, an action item from the Whitepaper on Research and Scholarship, is also on hold to give Faculty Councils more time to provide feedback.

He reported that more detailed minutes will be produced for future meetings.

In the fall, he will continue to support the new Vice-Chair, Amy Jeon, to ensure a smooth transition.

He thanked committee members, Jen Adams and Anton Kietai, for their work on the committee. The current terms of both members ends August 31, 2021. Jen Adams will be renewing for another term starting on September 1, 2021.

The Committee expressed appreciation to the Chair for his exemplary leadership and support to committee members.

#### 5. Consent Agenda

The committee clarified that JRNL 4210 is not required for the Bachelor of Applied Journalism because this program is no longer active. It was also clarified that JRNL 4210 is not, in plain language, a new course, but is rather a reactivation of a previous course. The committee also clarified that ANTH 2142 is removing the prerequisite of ANTH 1300 because this course is both less academically necessary, and less easy to access, than ANTH 1100. It was noted that a discussion should be had, as the Courseleaf system is launched, as to how course requirements are recorded for courses included in programs as part of an optional list. The committee discussed the way in which the ASTA courses are block registered (thereby negating the use of prerequisite courses).

For ANTH 2142, the text entered in "required for credential" has been changed, but this change was not noted on the summary of changes on the Course Submissions spreadsheet. The existing course outline has a strange credential requirement. Response: The Chair will check and remove the field if needed. The committee approved the action.

**Nick Bransford moved that the Senate Standing Committee on Curriculum recommend that Senate approve the attached list of new, revised, and discontinued courses.**

**The motion carried.**

#### 6. Program Changes

##### 6.1. Certificate in Foundations in Design

Jessica Bayntun was present to answer questions. She reviewed the rationale for the changes in the program and explained that the changes are the first part of their (in progress) quality assurance plan. The committee suggested timely communication to inform students of the opportunity this revision presents, the way in which the Wilson School of Design delegates curricular approval to their curriculum committee, and the potential value of including sample interview questions in the Senate submission.

Nick Bransford moved that the Senate Standing Committee on Curriculum recommend that Senate approve the changes to the Certificate in Foundations in Design (FIND), effective September 1, 2022.

The motion carried.

## **7. New Business**

### **7.1. Department Name Change for Business Graduate Courses**

Mike Ford, Associate Dean, School of Business, thanked the Chair for his contribution to the committee and KPU community. He described the reason for changing the name of the newly formed department. He confirmed that the change in the name is the only change being made in the courses.

Business Graduate Programs is the correct name, not Business Graduate Program.

Diane Purvey moved that the Senate Standing Committee on Curriculum recommend that Senate approve the changes to attached list of course outlines to reflect the new Business Graduate Programs department name, effective September 1, 2022.

The motion carried.

### **7.2. Draft Policy and Procedure AC10 *Development and Change of Senate-Approved Programs***

Josephine Chan and David Burns introduced the policy and asked for comments.

The committee discussed: whether reference to micro-credentials should be made in the context section; the clarity of the use of “units of study” in the definitions section; the question of whether the forms should be included in the policy; the need to make clearer in the cover sheet the ways in which the policy makes the process more timely; the potential committee workload issues of having concept papers and full program proposals concurrently reviewed; the potential inclusion of curriculum maps in full program proposals; the role of both the Provost and Senate in deciding whether or not a program should proceed; the addition to the concept paper approval of the SSC Curriculum and Faculty APP committee; and whether it is wise to encourage Faculties to hold program changes until program reviews are completed.

Josephine Chan noted that AC10 is still on the policy blog and open for members’ comments.

### **7.3. Policy RS 6 *Animal Use and Ethics in Teaching and Research***

The Chair introduced Deepak Gupta, Layne Myhre, and Amy Jeon. Deepak Gupta reported on changes incorporated into the policy since the previous visit.

At the earlier visit, the Committee suggested including a transition piece for how to deal with current teaching and research that was underway before the policy was approved. Layne Myhre advised that wording has been added for the development of a transition plan. The section needs to go before the Animal Care Committee. He advised on the next steps being undertaken as we await certification by the Canadian Council on Animal Care (CCAC).

### **7.4. Policy AR 15 *Micro-credentials***

Rajiv Jhangiani overviewed the steps undertaken to develop the policy and the changes made to incorporate suggested revisions. He responded to questions regarding the procedures and the workflow. The committee discussed: whether revised definitions of micro-credentials would

clarify the relationship between them and Senate approval processes; whether the mandate, membership and procedure of the Senate Micro-Credential Committee [SMC] should be contained in the policy or left to an appendix; whether further information should be included to clarify the different kinds of micro-credential offerings; what international technical standards will be employed, and how they will be used; how policy revisions were considered during the development process; how the proposed system would address course duplication; and what would occur if the approval of a particular micro-credential were delayed. It was noted that discussion with the KFA on related workload issues is ongoing.

**Gregory Harris moved that the SMC membership and procedures be separated from the policy and put in an appendix to the policy.**

**The motion did not carry.**

**Gregory Harris moved that the approval of the policy be postponed until there is greater clarity or a LOU on how the institution can move forward on these issues.**

**The motion did not carry.**

**Diane Purvey moved that the Senate Standing Committee on Curriculum recommend that Senate recommend to the Board of Governors the approval of Policy and Procedure AC15 *Micro-credentials*.**

**The motion carried.**

The Chair, David Burns, reviewed the work of committee members and their impact on the lives of students during his tenures as a committee member and as committee chair. He expressed his admiration of the courage and tenacity of the members. He thanked the committee members for their work. He left the meeting.

Diane Purvey took the Chair.

## **8. Associate Vice-President, Program Development and Curriculum**

Diane Purvey, Chair, introduced Sandy Vanderburgh, Provost, to discuss the newly created position of Associate Vice-President, Program Development and Curriculum.

Sandy Vanderburgh described the need for the position to provide more support for program development, curriculum, and academic policy.

The Committee discussed the additional support staff that will be working with the AVP. What role will the AVP have with some of the standing committees such as SSCC and APP? Response: the person in the position will help develop those relationships once they are in the role.

Curriculum and curriculum development lies with faculty. To what degree will the position and their office be supportive of faculty and what safeguards will be in place to prevent moving towards a top-down approach to curriculum development? Response: The Provost will consider what controls to put in place and will also ensure this role will focus on presenting trends and Ministry-level changes to faculty and faculty committees for consideration.

## **9. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 7:15 p.m.

## SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE ON CURRICULUM

**Agenda Item: 4.1**

**Meeting Date: September 15, 2021**

**Presenter(s): Amy Jeon**

**Agenda Item**                      **Transition to CourseLeaf for Curricular Workflow Management**

Action Requested	Information
------------------	-------------

Recommended Resolution	N/A
------------------------	-----

**Committee Report**                      For Secretariat Use Only

KPU is in a process of transitioning the software that manages curricular documents and workflow. A Steering Committee and a Project Working Group from KPU are meeting regularly with the vendor, Leepfrog, to develop the customized software and to transfer KPU's current curricular records into the new system.

Several products are currently under development and will be introduced within the next several years:

**Context &  
Background**

Abbreviation	Type of software	Scheduled launch
CAT	Catalog/University Calendar	Already in use, launched 2020
CIM-Courses	CourseLeaf Curriculum - Courses	Spring, 2022
CLSS	CourseLeaf Section Scheduler	Spring, 2023
CIM - Programs	CourseLeaf Curriculum - Programs	Spring, 2024

Employees are requested to continue using the current workflow and storage systems until the CourseLeaf updates are launched.

All faculty members and any staff who work on curriculum will be provided CourseLeaf accounts and training in its use. Curriculum Committee Chairs and Curriculum Assistants within each of the Faculties will be provided additional training and will be able to assist other users once the software is launched. Members of Senate and Senate standing and subcommittees are encouraged to participate in the training when it is scheduled (May/June 2022).

**Key Messages**

1. New software to manage curriculum workflow is being designed and rolled out over the next few years.
2. Employees are asked to continue using the current workflows and forms for courses until spring, 2022.
3. All faculty members and support staff who work on curriculum will be provided accounts in the new software and training in its use.

**Submitted by** *Amy Jeon, Vice-Chair, Senate*

**Date submitted** *September 1, 2021*

## SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE ON CURRICULUM

**Agenda Item: 4.2**

**Meeting Date: September 15, 2021**

**Presenter(s): Amy Jeon**

### Agenda Item

### Notice of Election of Committee Chair

Action Requested	Information
------------------	-------------

Recommended Resolution	N/A.
------------------------	------

### Committee Report

For Secretariat Use Only

### Context & Background

The term of the Chair of the Senate Standing Committee on Curriculum ended on August 31, 2021. The Vice-Chair of Senate will serve as committee Chair until a new Chair is elected.

### Key Messages

1. All voting members of the committee are eligible to be elected as committee Chair.
2. The Chairs of Senate standing committees are usually elected for a three-year term beginning in September. The term of office will be from November 1, 2021 to August 31, 2024, or to the end of the member's term on Senate, whichever is shorter.
3. The nominations will be from the floor at the next meeting. If there is only one person nominated, then that person may be acclaimed. If more than one person is nominated, then there will be an election by ballot.
4. The University Registrar will conduct the election.

### Submitted by

*Meredith Laird, Administrative Assistant, University Senate*

### Date submitted

*September 1, 2021*



## SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE ON CURRICULUM

**Agenda Item: 5**

**Meeting Date:** *September 15, 2021*

**Presenter(s):** *Amy Jeon*

Agenda Item	Consent Agenda
Action Requested	Motion
Recommended Resolution	THAT the Senate Standing Committee on Curriculum recommend that Senate approve the attached list of new, revised, and discontinued courses.
Committee Report	For Secretariat Use Only
Attachments	2021 09 15 Course Submissions
Submitted by	<i>Amy Jeon, Chair, Senate Standing Committee on Curriculum</i>
Date submitted	<i>September 1, 2021</i>

**Senate Standing Committee on Curriculum**  
Consent Agenda  
September 15, 2021

Department	Course Subject Code	Course Number	Course Title	Implementation Date (Enter as text)	Category	Associated with a New or Changed Program?	If Yes, which program?	Which fields are changed?	Notes
Asian Studies	ASIA	1111	<a href="#">Religions of India</a>	1-Sep-2022	Revised	No		Course Format	
Asian Studies	ASIA	2120	<a href="#">Introduction to Chinese and Japanese Cinema</a>	1-Sep-2022	Revised	No		Course Format	
Language and Cultures	LANC	2120	<a href="#">Introduction to Chinese and Japanese Cinema</a>	1-Sep-2022	Revised	No		Course Format	
Asian Studies	ASIA	2252	<a href="#">Indian Society through Popular Film</a>	1-Sep-2022	Revised	No		<b>Course Format</b> <b>Pre Req-</b> Before- : 15 credits of 1100-level or higher  After- 6 credits from courses at the 1100 level or higher	
Language and Cultures	LANC	2252	<a href="#">Indian Society through Popular Film</a>	1-Sep-2022	Revised	No		<b>Course Format</b> <b>Pre Req-</b> Before- : 15 credits of 1100-level or higher  After- 6 credits from courses at the 1100 level or higher*	
Asian Studies	ASIA	3154	<a href="#">Chinese Cinema and Society</a>	1-Sep-2022	Revised	No		Course Format	
Language and Cultures	LANC	3154	<a href="#">Chinese Cinema and Society</a>	1-Sep-2022	Revised	No		Course Format	
Anthropology	ANTH	2300	<a href="#">Archaeological Methods</a>	1-Sep-2022	Revised	No		Course Format	
Anthropology	ANTH	2310	<a href="#">Archaeology of Death</a>	1-Sep-2022	Revised	No		Attributes - Quantitative status	
Anthropology	ANTH	3340	<a href="#">British Columbia Archaeology</a>	1-Sep-2022	Revised	No		Course Format	
Anthropology	ANTH	3361	<a href="#">Archaeological Field Studies</a>	1-Sep-2022	Revised	No		Course Format	
Fine Arts	FINA	1130	<a href="#">Ceramics I</a>	1-Sep-2022	Revised	No		Course Format	
Fine Arts	FINA	1131	<a href="#">Sculpture I</a>	1-Sep-2022	Revised	No		Course Format	
Fine Arts	FINA	1230	<a href="#">Ceramics II</a>	1-Sep-2022	Revised	No		Course Format	
Fine Arts	FINA	1231	<a href="#">Sculpture II</a>	1-Sep-2022	Revised	No		Course Format	
Fine Arts	FINA	1175	<a href="#">Form, Structure and Materials</a>	1-Sep-2022	Revised	No		Course Format	
Fine Arts	FINA	2330	<a href="#">Ceramics III</a>	1-Sep-2022	Revised	No		Course Format	
Fine Arts	FINA	2331	<a href="#">Sculpture III</a>	1-Sep-2022	Revised	No		Course Format	
Fine Arts	FINA	2430	<a href="#">Ceramics IV</a>	1-Sep-2022	Revised	No		Course Format	
Fine Arts	FINA	2431	<a href="#">Sculpture IV</a>	1-Sep-2022	Revised	No		Course Format	
Fine Arts	FINA	3131	<a href="#">Wall Works</a>	1-Sep-2022	Revised	No		Course Format	
Fine Arts	FINA	3133	<a href="#">Forming Stories</a>	1-Sep-2022	Revised	No		Course Format	

## SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE ON CURRICULUM

**Agenda Item: 6.1**

**Meeting Date: September 15, 2021**

**Presenter(s): Amy Jeon**

**Agenda Item**                      **Course Change: GDMA 1200 Typographic Design 2**

Action Requested	Motion
------------------	--------

Recommended Resolution	<b>THAT the Senate Standing Committee on Curriculum recommend that Senate approve the removal of discontinued course GDMA 1210 as a Corequisite of this course.</b>
------------------------	---

**Committee Report**                      For Secretariat Use Only

**Context &  
Background**

At its February 22, 2021 meeting, Senate approved a program change for the Bachelor of Design in Graphic Design for Marketing Program. One of the associated course changes was the discontinuance of GDMA 1210 Image Development 2. Upon reviewing the updated University Calendar, it was noted that this course is still listed as a corequisite to GDMA 1200, and that the tick box on the GDMA 1200 course outline to indicate this change had not been selected.

Since GDMA 1210 has been discontinued, it is requested to approve a revision to GDMA 1200 to correct this oversight.

**Attachments**                      [GDMA 1200](#) Typographic Design 2

**Submitted by**                      *Amy Jeon, Chair, Senate Standing Committee on Curriculum*

**Date submitted**                      *September 1, 2021*

## SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE ON CURRICULUM

**Agenda Item: 7.1**

**Meeting Date:** September 15, 2021

**Presenter(s):** Laura McDonald

**Agenda Item**                      **Program Change: Certificate in Welding Foundation**

Action Requested	Motion
------------------	--------

<b>Recommended Resolution</b>	<b>THAT the Senate Standing Committee on Curriculum recommend that Senate approve the revisions to the Certificate in Welding Foundation, effective September 1, 2022.</b>
-------------------------------	--

**Committee Report**                      For Secretariat Use Only

**Context &  
Background**

“Interview by an instructor” is currently one of the admission requirements of this program. Prospective students attend information sessions which cover all the information that would be shared by the instructor, so the program wishes to remove this requirement. The program currently does not provide prospective students with information about accessibility services, so it is desired to add standardized text provided by the Accessibility Services team.

**Key Messages**

1. Remove instructor interview from admission requirements.
2. Add information about Accessibility Services.

**Consultations**

Sandy Vanderburgh, (September XX, 2021)  
Stephen Yezerinac (September XX, 2021)  
David Burns (July 27, 2021)

**Attachments**

D7 Certificate in Welding Foundation

**Submitted by**

*Laura McDonald, Dean (Pro Tem), Faculty of Trades & Technology*

**Date submitted**

*August 31, 2021*

This form is to be used for:

- changes to any Senate-approved degree and non-degree programs at KPU
- addition of Honours designation to a Major program currently offered at KPU
- creation of a Minor degree for which a cognate Major program is currently offered at KPU

For more information on how to complete this form, please contact the Chair of the Senate Standing Committee on Curriculum (SSCC).

This completed form should be submitted to [Senate@kpu.ca](mailto:Senate@kpu.ca) by the submission deadline posted on the [Senate Standing Committee on Curriculum \(SSCC\) website](#) meeting along with any new, revised, or discontinued course outlines associated with the proposal submitted on the Consent Agenda for the same meeting. Faculties must have already formally approved the associated course outlines.

#### PROGRAM DETAILS

<b>Faculty:</b>	Faculty of Trades and Technology
<b>Program Name:</b>	Certificate in Welding Foundation
<b>Department:</b>	Faculty of Trades and Technology
<b>Effective date:</b>	September 1, 2022 Notes: <i>If you are requesting a change to <b>admission</b> requirements, Senate approval is required by September meeting of Senate of the preceding academic year (prior to the first application cycle for the academic year). If you are requesting a change to <b>declaration or curricular</b> requirements, approval is required no later than the April meeting of Senate of the preceding academic year.</i>
<b>Dean/Associate Dean:</b>	Brian Moukperian/Laura McDonald
<b>Chair/Coordinator:</b>	Chris Matskiw
<b>Submission Date:</b>	September 1, 2021

#### CONSULTATIONS

Consultations	Person Consulted	Consultation Date
<b>Office of the Provost:</b>	Sandy Vanderburgh	
<b>Vice Chair of Senate:</b>	David Burns	July 27, 2021
<b>Other(s)* (if applicable):</b>		

*\*For more complex consultations, please attach the Curriculum Consultation Forms. If you have any inquiries regarding the completion of the above Consultations section or the Curriculum Consultation Forms, please contact the Chair of the Senate Standing Committee on Curriculum.*

#### OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR PROPOSAL REVIEW

Review of Completed D-7 Form	Review Submission Date
Send to <a href="mailto:OREGCurrConsult@kpu.ca">OREGCurrConsult@kpu.ca</a> for review** Stephen Yezerinac	<b>September 7, 2021</b>

*\*\*Allow 2 weeks for the Office of the Registrar's proposal review (in advance of the SSCC submission deadline).*

*If the proposed changes introduce new courses, submit 2 weeks in advance of your Faculty's curriculum committee meeting.*

#### APPROVALS

	Proposal Approval Date
<b>Faculty Curriculum Committee:</b>	
<b>Faculty Council (if required):</b>	<i>(Not needed if the Faculty Curriculum Committee has delegated authority to</i>

	<i>approve program revisions on behalf of their Faculty Council.)</i>
<b>SSC on Curriculum:</b>	
<b>SSC on University Budget (if required):</b>	N/A
<b>SSC on Academic Planning and Priorities (if required):</b>	N/A
<b>Senate:</b>	

<b>Proposed Change(s):</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. "Interview by an instructor" is currently one of the admission requirements. The welding chair and faculty members would like to have this requirement removed as it does not add value to the quality of the student being admitted to the program and all requisite information is being shared during information sessions.</li> <li>2. The note regarding Accessibility Services was completely missing from this program description. Wording regarding accessing Accessibility Services was provided by the Accessibility Services team.</li> </ol>
<b>Rationale:</b>	<p>Removing "Interview by an instructor" will open the entrance requirements to a broader audience and remove an unnecessary roadblock. All requisite information for students is available in the university calendar and through attendance at an information session. As well, there is not a quantitative aspect to the interview.</p> <p>A note was added regarding Accessibility Services for prospective students potentially requiring an accommodation. Including this information will serve multiple purposes: direct students with disabilities who are seeking resources to the appropriate team; being more overt in encouraging students to access resources; showing that Trades programs/courses are open to students requiring accommodations. The updated wording was provided by the Accessibility Services team.</p>
<b>URL(s):</b>	<a href="https://calendar.kpu.ca/programs-az/trades-technology/welding/welding-foundation-certificate/#requirementstext">https://calendar.kpu.ca/programs-az/trades-technology/welding/welding-foundation-certificate/#requirementstext</a>

<b>Impact on Students:</b>	<p><b>Check all that apply:</b></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The changes alter the admission, declaration or continuance requirements  <i>If yes, provide both the current calendar entry and new calendar entry in full. (see below)</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The changes alter the curricular requirements  <i>If yes, provide both the current calendar entry and new calendar entry in full. (see below)</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The changes change the total number of required credits  <i>If yes, state the <b>current</b> number of total</i></p>
----------------------------	--

	<p>credits: _____  and <b>proposed</b> number of total  credits: _____</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The changes introduce new, revised or discontinued courses  <i>If yes, indicate the Faculty approval date and list the courses below.</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The changes alter the credential awarded  <i>If yes, indicate the proposed credential:</i>  _____</p>
<b>Transition Plan</b>	<p>This is an admission requirement. No transition plan is required for future applicants.</p>

<p><b>Current Requirements with Proposed Changes</b>  <i>Cut and paste the relevant section(s) in full from the current Calendar website. Use <u>track changes</u> to show the proposed changes.</i></p> <p><i>For a new Minor degree for which a cognate Major program is currently offered at KPU, insert the following text below "This is a new Minor degree program for which a cognate Major degree program already exists at KPU. There is no existing curriculum for the minor, and as per Policy AC11 there is no requirement for a Concept Paper or FPP."</i></p>	<p><b>New Requirements</b>  <i>Provide a clean copy to show how the new Calendar entry will appear. List courses in alpha/numeric order.</i></p>
<p><b>Admission Requirements</b></p> <p>The following program admission requirements apply:</p>	<p><b>Admission Requirements</b></p> <p>The following program admission requirements apply:</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• English: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ English 10 with a minimum grade of 'C' (or equivalent), or</li> <li>○ Composition 10 with a minimum grade of 'C' (or equivalent), or</li> <li>○ Creative Writing 10 with a minimum grade of 'C' (or equivalent), or</li> <li>○ Literary Studies 10 with a minimum grade of 'C' (or equivalent), or</li> <li>○ English First Peoples Writing 10 with a minimum grade of 'C' (or equivalent), or</li> <li>○ English First Peoples Literary Studies 10 with a minimum grade of 'C' (or equivalent), or</li> <li>○ Communications 11 with a minimum grade of 'C' (or equivalent), or</li> <li>○ KPU's Vocational Trades English Reading Assessment Part II with a minimum score of 50%.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• English: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ English 10 with a minimum grade of 'C' (or equivalent), or</li> <li>○ Composition 10 with a minimum grade of 'C' (or equivalent), or</li> <li>○ Creative Writing 10 with a minimum grade of 'C' (or equivalent), or</li> <li>○ Literary Studies 10 with a minimum grade of 'C' (or equivalent), or</li> <li>○ English First Peoples Writing 10 with a minimum grade of 'C' (or equivalent), or</li> <li>○ English First Peoples Literary Studies 10 with a minimum grade of 'C' (or equivalent), or</li> <li>○ Communications 11 with a minimum grade of 'C' (or equivalent), or</li> <li>○ KPU's Vocational Trades English Reading Assessment Part II with a minimum score of 50%.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>



- Mathematics:
  - Any Math 10 with a minimum grade of 'C' (or equivalent), or
  - KPU's Vocational Trades Mathematics Assessment with a minimum score of 20%.

• ~~Interview by an instructor~~

**Note:** International student Applications for Admission require approval of the Dean.

### **Accessibility Services (Accommodations)**

Students seeking accommodations for a disability should contact Accessibility Services to explore options to remove potential barriers to their learning experience. Prospective students and applicants are encouraged to reach out for support as early as possible as some services require advance planning. An Accessibility Advisor or Learning Specialist will review the course essential skills and abilities and determine what, if any, accommodations could support your education.

### **Curricular Requirements**

Our welding program is based on British Columbia Provincial modular training and is consistent with all other training providers in BC. It is designed to combine welding theory and practical skills. Hands-on shop experience is the basis on which skills are developed in the program. The program is designed to accommodate past experience; credit and/or advancement will be given to students who can demonstrate learned skills plus theoretical knowledge.

Students must achieve a minimum grade of B- in all required courses.

- Mathematics:
  - Any Math 10 with a minimum grade of 'C' (or equivalent), or
  - KPU's Vocational Trades Mathematics Assessment with a minimum score of 20%.

**Note:** International student Applications for Admission require approval of the Dean.

### **Accessibility Services (Accommodations)**

Students seeking accommodations for a disability should contact [Accessibility Services](#) to explore options to remove potential barriers to their learning experience. Prospective students and applicants are encouraged to reach out for support as early as possible as some services require advance planning. An Accessibility Advisor or Learning Specialist will review the course essential skills and abilities and determine what, if any, accommodations could support your education.

### **Curricular Requirements**

Our welding program is based on British Columbia Provincial modular training and is consistent with all other training providers in BC. It is designed to combine welding theory and practical skills. Hands-on shop experience is the basis on which skills are developed in the program. The program is designed to accommodate past experience; credit and/or advancement will be given to students who can demonstrate learned skills plus theoretical knowledge.

Students must achieve a minimum grade of B- in all required courses.

Code	Title	Credits	Code	Title	Credits
<u>WELD 1010</u>	Worksite Safety and Orientation	1	<u>WELD 1010</u>	Worksite Safety and Orientation	1
<u>WELD 1115</u>	Oxy Fuel Welding and Cutting	4	<u>WELD 1115</u>	Oxy Fuel Welding and Cutting	4
<u>WELD 1120</u>	Basic Shielded Metal Arc Welding	4	<u>WELD 1120</u>	Basic Shielded Metal Arc Welding	4
<u>WELD 1130</u>	Basic Gas Metal Arc Welding	4	<u>WELD 1130</u>	Basic Gas Metal Arc Welding	4
<u>WELD 1140</u>	Material Handling	1	<u>WELD 1140</u>	Material Handling	1
<u>WELD 1200</u>	Air Arc and Plasma Arc Cutting	1	<u>WELD 1200</u>	Air Arc and Plasma Arc Cutting	1
<u>WELD 1210</u>	Advanced Shielded Metal Arc Welding	4	<u>WELD 1210</u>	Advanced Shielded Metal Arc Welding	4
<u>WELD 1220</u>	Read Technical Drawings	1	<u>WELD 1220</u>	Read Technical Drawings	1
<u>WELD 1230</u>	Advanced Semi-Automated Welding	4	<u>WELD 1230</u>	Advanced Semi-Automated Welding	4
<u>WELD 1240</u>	Basic Metallurgy	1	<u>WELD 1240</u>	Basic Metallurgy	1
<u>WELD 1250</u>	Stationary Shop Equipment	2	<u>WELD 1250</u>	Stationary Shop Equipment	2
<b>Total Credits</b>		<b>27</b>	<b>Total Credits</b>		<b>27</b>

<p><b>Special Equipment</b></p> <p>Students will require appropriate personal safety clothing and CSA approved steel toed boots. Safety glasses, hearing protection, leather gloves, leather jacket or apron, welding helmet and cutting goggles are also required. A list of required tools, equipment or supplies will be provided by the instructor at the start of the program.</p>	<p><b>Special Equipment</b></p> <p>Students will require appropriate personal safety clothing and CSA approved steel toed boots. Safety glasses, hearing protection, leather gloves, leather jacket or apron, welding helmet and cutting goggles are also required. A list of required tools, equipment or supplies will be provided by the instructor at the start of the program.</p>
<p><b>Credential Awarded</b></p> <p>Upon successful completion of this program, students are eligible to receive a <b>Certificate in Welding Foundation</b>. KPU will report your in-school technical training completion information to the Industry Training Authority in order for the ITA to determine credit towards your designated apprenticeship.</p>	<p><b>Credential Awarded</b></p> <p>Upon successful completion of this program, students are eligible to receive a <b>Certificate in Welding Foundation</b>. KPU will report your in-school technical training completion information to the Industry Training Authority in order for the ITA to determine credit towards your designated apprenticeship.</p>

List any new, revised or discontinued courses associated with this program change			
Course Subject Code	Course Number	Descriptive Title, hyperlinked to course outline	New, Revised, or Discontinued

## SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE ON CURRICULUM

**Agenda Item: 7.2**

**Meeting Date:** September 15, 2021

**Presenter(s):** Laura McDonald

**Agenda Item**                      **Program Change: Citation in Welding Level A**

Action Requested	Motion
------------------	--------

<b>Recommended Resolution</b>	<b>THAT the Senate Standing Committee on Curriculum recommend that Senate approve the changes to the Citation in Welding Level A program, effective September 1, 2022.</b>
-------------------------------	--

**Committee Report**                      For Secretariat Use Only

**Context & Background**

“Interview by an instructor” is currently one of the admission requirements of this program. Prospective students attend information sessions which cover all the information that would be shared by the instructor, so the program wishes to remove this requirement. The program currently does not provide prospective students with information about accessibility services, so it is desired to add standardized text provided by the Accessibility Services team. The program currently lists a graduation requirement of 70%, although students receive letter grades for courses in this program, so it is preferable to change this to a “minimum grade of B in all required courses”.

**Key Messages**

1. Remove instructor interview from admission requirements.
2. Add information about Accessibility Services.
3. Change graduation requirements to reflect minimum letter grade rather than percentage.

**Consultations**

Sandy Vanderburgh (July, 2021)  
Stephen Yezerinac (September 7, 2021)  
David Burns (July 27, 2021)

**Attachments**                      D7 Citation in Welding Level A

**Submitted by**                      *Laura McDonald, Dean (Pro Tem), Faculty of Trades & Technology*

**Date submitted**                      *August 31, 2021*

This form is to be used for:

- changes to any Senate-approved degree and non-degree programs at KPU
- addition of Honours designation to a Major program currently offered at KPU
- creation of a Minor degree for which a cognate Major program is currently offered at KPU

For more information on how to complete this form, please contact the Chair of the Senate Standing Committee on Curriculum (SSCC).

This completed form should be submitted to [Senate@kpu.ca](mailto:Senate@kpu.ca) by the submission deadline posted on the [Senate Standing Committee on Curriculum \(SSCC\) website](#) meeting along with any new, revised, or discontinued course outlines associated with the proposal submitted on the Consent Agenda for the same meeting. Faculties must have already formally approved the associated course outlines.

#### PROGRAM DETAILS

<b>Faculty:</b>	Faculty of Trades and Technology
<b>Program Name:</b>	Citation in Welding Level A
<b>Department:</b>	Faculty of Trades and Technology
<b>Effective date:</b>	September 1, 2022 Notes: <i>If you are requesting a change to <b>admission</b> requirements, Senate approval is required by September meeting of Senate of the preceding academic year (prior to the first application cycle for the academic year). If you are requesting a change to <b>declaration or curricular</b> requirements, approval is required no later than the April meeting of Senate of the preceding academic year.</i>
<b>Dean/Associate Dean:</b>	Brian Moukperian/Laura McDonald
<b>Chair/Coordinator:</b>	Chris Matskiw
<b>Submission Date:</b>	September 1, 2021

#### CONSULTATIONS

Consultations	Person Consulted	Consultation Date
<b>Office of the Provost:</b>	Sandy Vanderburgh	
<b>Vice Chair of Senate:</b>	David Burns	July 27, 2021
<b>Other(s)* (if applicable):</b>		

*\*For more complex consultations, please attach the Curriculum Consultation Forms. If you have any inquiries regarding the completion of the above Consultations section or the Curriculum Consultation Forms, please contact the Chair of the Senate Standing Committee on Curriculum.*

#### OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR PROPOSAL REVIEW

Review of Completed D-7 Form	Review Submission Date
Send to <a href="mailto:OREGCurrConsult@kpu.ca">OREGCurrConsult@kpu.ca</a> for review** Stephen Yezerinac	September 7, 2021

*\*\*Allow 2 weeks for the Office of the Registrar's proposal review (in advance of the SSCC submission deadline).  
If the proposed changes introduce new courses, submit 2 weeks in advance of your Faculty's curriculum committee meeting.*

#### APPROVALS

	Proposal Approval Date
<b>Faculty Curriculum Committee:</b>	
<b>Faculty Council (if required):</b>	<i>(Not needed if the Faculty Curriculum Committee has delegated authority to</i>

	<i>approve program revisions on behalf of their Faculty Council.)</i>
<b>SSC on Curriculum:</b>	
<b>SSC on University Budget (if required):</b>	N/A
<b>SSC on Academic Planning and Priorities (if required):</b>	N/A
<b>Senate:</b>	

<b>Proposed Change(s):</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. "Interview by an instructor" is currently one of the admission requirements. The welding chair and faculty members would like to have this requirement removed as it does not add value to the quality of the student being admitted to the program and all requisite information is being shared during information sessions.</li> <li>2. The note regarding Accessibility Services was completely missing from this program description. Wording regarding accessing Accessibility Services was provided by the Accessibility Services team.</li> <li>3. This program currently lists a graduation requirement of 70% in all applicable courses, and this needs to be changed to minimum grade of B- in all required courses.</li> </ol>
<b>Rationale:</b>	<p>Removing "Interview by an instructor" will open the entrance requirements to a broader audience and remove an unnecessary roadblock. All requisite information for students is available in the university calendar and through attendance at an information session. As well, there is not a quantitative aspect to the interview.</p> <p>A note was added regarding Accessibility Services for prospective students potentially requiring an accommodation. Including this information will serve multiple purposes: direct students with disabilities who are seeking resources to the appropriate team; being more overt in encouraging students to access resources; showing that Trades programs/courses are open to students requiring accommodations. The updated wording was provided by the Accessibility Services team.</p> <p>As this program uses a letter grade system, listing the graduation requirement as 70% did not make sense. The 70% threshold is only relevant in reporting student final grades to the Industry Training Authority (ITA). The graduation requirement has been updated per consultation with the OREG to reflect a minimum grade of B- in all required courses.</p>
<b>URL(s):</b>	<a href="https://calendar.kpu.ca/programs-az/trades-technology/welding/welding-level-a-citation/">https://calendar.kpu.ca/programs-az/trades-technology/welding/welding-level-a-citation/</a>

<b>Impact on Students:</b>	<b>Check all that apply:</b>  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The changes alter the admission, declaration or continuance requirements
----------------------------	--

	<p><i>If yes, provide both the current calendar entry and new calendar entry in full. (see below)</i></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The changes alter the curricular requirements  <i>If yes, provide both the current calendar entry and new calendar entry in full. (see below)</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The changes change the total number of required credits  <i>If yes, state the <b>current</b> number of total credits: _____</i>  <i>and <b>proposed</b> number of total credits: _____</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The changes introduce new, revised or discontinued courses  <i>If yes, indicate the Faculty approval date and list the courses below.</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The changes alter the credential awarded  <i>If yes, indicate the proposed credential:</i>          _____</p>
<b>Transition Plan</b>	<p>This is an admission requirement. No transition plan is required for future applicants.</p>

**Current Requirements with Proposed Changes**

*Cut and paste the relevant section(s) in full from the current Calendar website. Use track changes to show the proposed changes.*

*For a new Minor degree for which a cognate Major program is currently offered at KPU, insert the following text below "This is a new Minor degree program for which a cognate Major degree program already exists at KPU. There is no existing curriculum for the minor, and as per Policy AC11 there is no requirement for a Concept Paper or FPP."*

**New Requirements**

*Provide a clean copy to show how the new Calendar entry will appear. List courses in alpha/numeric order.*



### Admission Requirements

The following program admission requirements apply:

- Adequate reading comprehension and math skills as assessed by KPU
- Satisfactory physical health
- Completion of level B training plus completion of [WELD 2160](#), Basic Gas Tungsten Arc Welding module, if not completed during Level B training, or successful Level B challenge through ITA

- ~~Interview by an instructor~~

~~Students with mental or physical impairments who may require program accommodations, should contact the Program Coordinator at 604.598.6122 to discuss required skills and competencies, and Accessibility Services to ensure appropriate accommodations can be arranged.~~

#### Accessibility Services (Accommodation)

Students seeking accommodations for a disability should contact Accessibility Services to explore options to remove potential barriers to their learning experience. Prospective students and applicants are encouraged to reach out for support as early as possible as some services require advance planning. An Accessibility Advisor or Learning Specialist will review the course essential skills and abilities and determine what, if any, accommodations could support your education.

### Admission Requirements

The following program admission requirements apply:

- Adequate reading comprehension and math skills as assessed by KPU
- Satisfactory physical health
- Completion of level B training plus completion of [WELD 2160](#), Basic Gas Tungsten Arc Welding module, if not completed during Level B training, or successful Level B challenge through ITA

#### Accessibility Services (Accommodations)

Students seeking accommodations for a disability should contact [Accessibility Services](#) to explore options to remove potential barriers to their learning experience. Prospective students and applicants are encouraged to reach out for support as early as possible as some services require advance planning. An Accessibility Advisor or Learning Specialist will review the course essential skills and abilities and determine what, if any, accommodations could support your education.

### Curricular Requirements

Our welding program is based on British Columbia Provincial modular training. It is consistent with all other training providers in BC. It is designed to combine welding theory and practical skills.

Hands-on shop experience is the basis on which skills are developed in the program. The program is designed to accommodate past experience; credit and/or advancement will be given to students who can demonstrate learned skills plus theoretical knowledge.

**Note:** ~~Students must achieve a minimum grade of 70%, which translates to B-, in practical exams and assignments.~~  
Students must achieve a minimum grade of B- in all required courses.

### Curricular Requirements

Our welding program is based on British Columbia Provincial modular training. It is consistent with all other training providers in BC. It is designed to combine welding theory and practical skills.

Hands-on shop experience is the basis on which skills are developed in the program. The program is designed to accommodate past experience; credit and/or advancement will be given to students who can demonstrate learned skills plus theoretical knowledge.

**Note:** Students must achieve a minimum grade of B- in all required courses.

Code	Title	Credits	Code	Title	Credits
<u>WELD 2200</u>	Shielded Metal Arc Alloy Welding	2.5	<u>WELD 2200</u>	Shielded Metal Arc Alloy Welding	2.5
<u>WELD 2210</u>	Advanced Alloy Metallurgy	1	<u>WELD 2210</u>	Advanced Alloy Metallurgy	1
<u>WELD 2220</u>	Gas Tungsten Arc Alloy Welding	3	<u>WELD 2220</u>	Gas Tungsten Arc Alloy Welding	3
<u>WELD 2230</u>	Plate and Pipe	1	<u>WELD 2230</u>	Plate and Pipe	1
<b>Total Credits</b>		<b>7.5</b>	<b>Total Credits</b>		<b>7.5</b>

<p><b>Special Equipment</b></p> <p>Students will require appropriate personal safety clothing and CSA approved steel toed boots. Safety glasses, hearing protection, leather gloves, leather jacket or apron, welding helmet and cutting goggles are also required. A list of required tools, equipment or supplies will be provided by the instructor at the start of the program.</p>	<p><b>Special Equipment</b></p> <p>Students will require appropriate personal safety clothing and CSA approved steel toed boots. Safety glasses, hearing protection, leather gloves, leather jacket or apron, welding helmet and cutting goggles are also required. A list of required tools, equipment or supplies will be provided by the instructor at the start of the program.</p>
<p><b>Credential Awarded</b></p> <p>Upon successful completion of this program, students are eligible to receive a <b>Citation in Welding Level A</b> and the Level 'A' training endorsement in their Log Book.</p> <p>KPU will report your in-school technical training completion information to the Industry Training Authority (ITA) in order for the ITA to determine credit towards your designated apprenticeship.</p>	<p><b>Credential Awarded</b></p> <p>Upon successful completion of this program, students are eligible to receive a <b>Citation in Welding Level A</b> and the Level 'A' training endorsement in their Log Book.</p> <p>KPU will report your in-school technical training completion information to the Industry Training Authority (ITA) in order for the ITA to determine credit towards your designated apprenticeship.</p>

List any new, revised or discontinued courses associated with this program change			
Course Subject Code	Course Number	Descriptive Title, hyperlinked to course outline	New, Revised, or Discontinued

## SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE ON CURRICULUM

**Agenda Item: 7.3**

**Meeting Date:** September 15, 2021

**Presenter(s):** Laura McDonald

**Agenda Item**                      **Program Change: Citation in Welding Level B**

Action Requested	Motion
------------------	--------

<b>Recommended Resolution</b>	<b>THAT the Senate Standing Committee on Curriculum recommend that Senate approve the changes to the Citation in Welding Level B program, effective September 1, 2022.</b>
-------------------------------	--

**Committee Report**                      For Secretariat Use Only

**Context &  
Background**

“Interview by an instructor” is currently one of the admission requirements of this program. Prospective students attend information sessions which cover all the information that would be shared by the instructor, so the program wishes to remove this requirement. The program currently does not provide prospective students with information about accessibility services, so it is desired to add standardized text provided by the Accessibility Services team. The program currently lists a graduation requirement of 70%, although students receive letter grades for courses in this program, so it is preferable to change this to a “minimum grade of B in all required courses”.

**Key Messages**

1. Remove instructor interview from admission requirements.
2. Add information about Accessibility Services.
3. Change graduation requirements to reflect minimum letter grade rather than percentage.

**Consultations**

Sandy Vanderburgh, (July, 2021)  
Stephen Yezerinac (September 7, 2021)  
David Burns (June 27, 2021)

**Attachments**

D7 Citation in Welding Level B

**Submitted by**

*Laura McDonald, Dean (Pro Tem), Faculty of Trades & Technology*

**Date submitted**

*August 31, 2021*

This form is to be used for:

- changes to any Senate-approved degree and non-degree programs at KPU
- addition of Honours designation to a Major program currently offered at KPU
- creation of a Minor degree for which a cognate Major program is currently offered at KPU

For more information on how to complete this form, please contact the Chair of the Senate Standing Committee on Curriculum (SSCC).

This completed form should be submitted to [Senate@kpu.ca](mailto:Senate@kpu.ca) by the submission deadline posted on the [Senate Standing Committee on Curriculum \(SSCC\) website](#) meeting along with any new, revised, or discontinued course outlines associated with the proposal submitted on the Consent Agenda for the same meeting. Faculties must have already formally approved the associated course outlines.

#### PROGRAM DETAILS

<b>Faculty:</b>	Faculty of Trades and Technology
<b>Program Name:</b>	Citation in Welding Level B
<b>Department:</b>	Faculty of Trades and Technology
<b>Effective date:</b>	September 1, 2022 Notes: <i>If you are requesting a change to <b>admission</b> requirements, Senate approval is required by September meeting of Senate of the preceding academic year (prior to the first application cycle for the academic year). If you are requesting a change to <b>declaration or curricular</b> requirements, approval is required no later than the April meeting of Senate of the preceding academic year.</i>
<b>Dean/Associate Dean:</b>	Brian Moukperian/Laura McDonald
<b>Chair/Coordinator:</b>	Chris Matskiw
<b>Submission Date:</b>	September 1, 2021

#### CONSULTATIONS

Consultations	Person Consulted	Consultation Date
<b>Office of the Provost:</b>	Sandy Vanderburgh	
<b>Vice Chair of Senate:</b>	David Burns	July 27, 2021
<b>Other(s)* (if applicable):</b>		

*\*For more complex consultations, please attach the Curriculum Consultation Forms. If you have any inquiries regarding the completion of the above Consultations section or the Curriculum Consultation Forms, please contact the Chair of the Senate Standing Committee on Curriculum.*

#### OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR PROPOSAL REVIEW

Review of Completed D-7 Form	Review Submission Date
Send to <a href="mailto:OREGCurrConsult@kpu.ca">OREGCurrConsult@kpu.ca</a> for review** Stephen Yezerinac	September 7 2021

*\*\*Allow 2 weeks for the Office of the Registrar's proposal review (in advance of the SSCC submission deadline).  
If the proposed changes introduce new courses, submit 2 weeks in advance of your Faculty's curriculum committee meeting.*

#### APPROVALS

	Proposal Approval Date
<b>Faculty Curriculum Committee:</b>	
<b>Faculty Council (if required):</b>	<i>(Not needed if the Faculty Curriculum Committee has delegated authority to</i>

	<i>approve program revisions on behalf of their Faculty Council.)</i>
<b>SSC on Curriculum:</b>	
<b>SSC on University Budget (if required):</b>	N/A
<b>SSC on Academic Planning and Priorities (if required):</b>	N/A
<b>Senate:</b>	

<b>Proposed Change(s):</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. "Interview by an instructor" is currently one of the admission requirements. The welding chair and faculty members would like to have this requirement removed as it does not add value to the quality of the student being admitted to the program and all requisite information is being shared during information sessions.</li> <li>2. The note regarding Accessibility Services was completely missing from this program description. Wording regarding accessing Accessibility Services was provided by the Accessibility Services team.</li> <li>3. This program currently lists a graduation requirement of 70% in all applicable courses, and this needs to be changed to a minimum grade of B- in all required courses.</li> </ol>
<b>Rationale:</b>	<p>Removing "Interview by an instructor" will open the entrance requirements to a broader audience and remove an unnecessary roadblock. All requisite information for students is available in the university calendar and through attendance at an information session. As well, there is not a quantitative aspect to the interview.</p> <p>A note was added regarding Accessibility Services for prospective students potentially requiring an accommodation. Including this information will serve multiple purposes: direct students with disabilities who are seeking resources to the appropriate team; being more overt in encouraging students to access resources; showing that Trades programs/courses are open to students requiring accommodations. The updated wording was provided by the Accessibility Services team.</p> <p>As this program uses a letter grade system, listing the graduation requirement as 70% did not make sense. The 70% threshold is only relevant in reporting student final grades to the Industry Training Authority (ITA). The graduation requirement has been updated per consultation with the OREG to reflect a minimum grade of B- in all required courses.</p>
<b>URL(s):</b>	<a href="https://calendar.kpu.ca/programs-az/trades-technology/welding/welding-level-b-citation/">https://calendar.kpu.ca/programs-az/trades-technology/welding/welding-level-b-citation/</a>

<b>Impact on Students:</b>	<b>Check all that apply:</b>  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The changes alter the admission, declaration or continuance requirements
----------------------------	--

	<p><i>If yes, provide both the current calendar entry and new calendar entry in full. (see below)</i></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The changes alter the curricular requirements  <i>If yes, provide both the current calendar entry and new calendar entry in full. (see below)</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The changes change the total number of required credits  <i>If yes, state the <b>current</b> number of total credits: _____</i>  <i>and <b>proposed</b> number of total credits: _____</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The changes introduce new, revised or discontinued courses  <i>If yes, indicate the Faculty approval date and list the courses below.</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The changes alter the credential awarded  <i>If yes, indicate the proposed credential:</i>          _____</p>
<p><b>Transition Plan</b></p>	<p>This is an admission requirement. No transition plan is required for future applicants.</p>

<p><b>Current Requirements with Proposed Changes</b></p> <p><i>Cut and paste the relevant section(s) in full from the current Calendar website. Use <u>track changes</u> to show the proposed changes.</i></p> <p><i>For a new Minor degree for which a cognate Major program is currently offered at KPU, insert the following text below "This is a new Minor degree program for which a cognate Major degree program already exists at KPU. There is no existing curriculum for the minor, and as per Policy AC11 there is no requirement for a Concept Paper or FPP."</i></p>	<p><b>New Requirements</b></p> <p><i>Provide a clean copy to show how the new Calendar entry will appear. List courses in alpha/numeric order.</i></p>
<p><b>Admission Requirements</b></p> <p>The following program admission requirements apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate reading comprehension and math skills as assessed by KPU</li> <li>• Satisfactory physical health</li> <li>• Completion of Level 'C' training or successful Level 'C' challenge though ITA</li> <li>• <del>Interview by an instructor</del></li> </ul> <p><del>Students with mental or physical impairments who may require program or practicum accommodations, should contact the Program Chair at 604.598.6148 to discuss required skills and competencies, and a Accessibility Services to ensure appropriate accommodations can be arranged.</del></p> <p><b><u>Accessibility Services (Accommodations)</u></b></p> <p><u>Students seeking accommodations for a disability should contact Accessibility Services to explore options to remove potential barriers to their learning experience. Prospective students and applicants are encouraged to reach out for support as early as possible as some services require advance planning. An Accessibility Advisor or Learning Specialist will review the course essential skills and abilities and determine what, if any, accommodations could support your education.</u></p>	<p><b>Admission Requirements</b></p> <p>The following program admission requirements apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate reading comprehension and math skills as assessed by KPU</li> <li>• Satisfactory physical health</li> <li>• Completion of Level 'C' training or successful Level 'C' challenge though ITA</li> </ul> <p><b>Accessibility Services (Accommodations)</b></p> <p>Students seeking accommodations for a disability should contact <a href="#">Accessibility Services</a> to explore options to remove potential barriers to their learning experience. Prospective students and applicants are encouraged to reach out for support as early as possible as some services require advance planning. An Accessibility Advisor or Learning Specialist will review the course essential skills and abilities and determine what, if any, accommodations could support your education.</p>



<p><b>ITA Requirements</b></p> <p>The Industry Training Authority (ITA) requires students in the Welding Level B program to meet the following pre-requisites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welder C Certificate of Qualification, <b>or</b></li> <li>• Welder Foundation Certificate of Completion + 1,000 work-based training hours (hours verified by ITA before Welder B registration accepted), <b>or</b></li> <li>• Welder Apprenticeship Levels 1 and 2 + 1,000 work-based training hours</li> </ul>	<p><b>ITA Requirements</b></p> <p>The Industry Training Authority (ITA) requires students in the Welding Level B program to meet the following pre-requisites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welder C Certificate of Qualification, <b>or</b></li> <li>• Welder Foundation Certificate of Completion + 1,000 work-based training hours (hours verified by ITA before Welder B registration accepted), <b>or</b></li> <li>• Welder Apprenticeship Levels 1 and 2 + 1,000 work-based training hours</li> </ul>
<p><b>Curricular Requirements</b></p> <p>Our welding program is based on British Columbia Provincial modular training and is consistent with all other training providers in BC. It is designed to combine welding theory and practical skills.</p> <p>Hands-on shop experience is the basis on which skills are developed in the program. The program is designed to accommodate past experience; credit and/or advancement will be given to students who can demonstrate learned skills plus theoretical knowledge.</p>	<p><b>Curricular Requirements</b></p> <p>Our welding program is based on British Columbia Provincial modular training and is consistent with all other training providers in BC. It is designed to combine welding theory and practical skills.</p> <p>Hands-on shop experience is the basis on which skills are developed in the program. The program is designed to accommodate past experience; credit and/or advancement will be given to students who can demonstrate learned skills plus theoretical knowledge.</p>

Code	Title	Credits	Code	Title	Credits
<u>WELD 2100</u>	Shielded Metal Arc Pipe Welding	5	<u>WELD 2100</u>	Shielded Metal Arc Pipe Welding	5
<u>WELD 2110</u>	Welding Standards and Testing	1	<u>WELD 2110</u>	Welding Standards and Testing	1
<u>WELD 2130</u>	Piping Drawings	1	<u>WELD 2130</u>	Piping Drawings	1
<u>WELD 2150</u>	Alloy Metallurgy	1	<u>WELD 2150</u>	Alloy Metallurgy	1
Select at least one of the following:		2	Select at least one of the following:		2
<u>WELD 2120</u>	Gas Metal Arc Alloy Welding		<u>WELD 2120</u>	Gas Metal Arc Alloy Welding	
<u>WELD 2140</u>	Advanced Flux Core Arc Welding		<u>WELD 2140</u>	Advanced Flux Core Arc Welding	
<u>WELD 2160</u>	Basic Gas Tungsten Arc Welding		<u>WELD 2160</u>	Basic Gas Tungsten Arc Welding	
Total Credits		10	Total Credits		10
<b>Note:</b> <del>Students must achieve a minimum grade of 70%, which translates to B-, in practical exams and assignments.</del> <a href="#">Students must achieve a minimum grade of B- in all required courses.</a>			<b>Note:</b> Students must achieve a minimum grade of B- in all required courses.		

<p><b>Special Equipment</b></p> <p>Students will require appropriate personal safety clothing and CSA approved steel toed boots. Safety glasses, hearing protection, leather gloves, leather jacket or apron, welding helmet and cutting goggles are also required. A list of required tools, equipment or supplies will be provided by the instructor at the start of the program.</p>	<p><b>Special Equipment</b></p> <p>Students will require appropriate personal safety clothing and CSA approved steel toed boots. Safety glasses, hearing protection, leather gloves, leather jacket or apron, welding helmet and cutting goggles are also required. A list of required tools, equipment or supplies will be provided by the instructor at the start of the program.</p>
<p><b>Credential Awarded</b></p> <p>Upon successful completion of this program, students are eligible to receive a <b>Citation in Welding Level 'B'</b> and the Level 'B' training endorsement in their Log Book.</p> <p>KPU will report your in-school technical training completion information to the Industry Training Authority (ITA) in order for the ITA to determine credit towards your designated apprenticeship.</p>	<p><b>Credential Awarded</b></p> <p>Upon successful completion of this program, students are eligible to receive a <b>Citation in Welding Level 'B'</b> and the Level 'B' training endorsement in their Log Book.</p> <p>KPU will report your in-school technical training completion information to the Industry Training Authority (ITA) in order for the ITA to determine credit towards your designated apprenticeship.</p>

List any new, revised or discontinued courses associated with this program change			
Course Subject Code	Course Number	Descriptive Title, hyperlinked to course outline	New, Revised, or Discontinued

## SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE ON CURRICULUM

**Agenda Item: 8.1**

**Meeting Date: September 15, 2021**

**Presenter(s): Deepak Gupta and Layne Myhre**

**Agenda Item**

**Pedagogical Merit Review Workflow Procedures**

Action Requested	Motion
Recommended Resolution	<p><b>THAT the Senate Standing Committee on Curriculum recommend that Senate approve the addition of the following fields to the Course Outline template, effective immediately:</b></p> <p><b>Does this course require the use of vertebrate or cephalopod animals?</b></p> <p><b>( )Y ( )N</b></p> <p><b>If yes, please provide:</b></p> <p><b>a) Date of the Pedagogical Merit review _____, and</b></p> <p><b>b) Expiry date of the certification from the Animal Care Committee:</b></p> <p>_____</p>

**Committee Report**

For Secretariat Use Only

On June 2, 2021, the President approved Policy and Procedure RS6 *Animal Use and Ethics in Teaching and Research*.

**Context &  
Background**

KPU's educators and researchers have been undertaking teaching involving animals, and a limited extent, research involving animals. To comply with Tri-agency requirements on use of animals in research, these researchers have collaborated with researchers from other institutions or have been students of those institutions which had certification, as allowed by the Canadian Council on Animal Care (CCAC). The continuing need for animal-based teaching and research at KPU as evidenced by academic requirements and external obligations and commitments has necessitated the need for a new Animal Use and Ethics in Teaching and Research policy framework. Having a policy framework is a precursor for KPU to attain and maintaining the Good Animal Practice certificate from CCAC. KPU will also be able to catch up with other post-secondary institutions across Canada in meeting a Tri-agency endorsed Canadian standard.

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Should a Course include using animals as defined under policy R66, the Course Outline needs to go through the Pedagogical Merit review.</li> <li>2. No Course Outline with animal use should be approved until the ACC has confirmed Pedagogical Merit.</li> <li>3. It is recommended for a couple of questions to be added to Course Outlines that indicates a course involves animal use, with a follow-up box to indicate whether Pedagogical Merit review had yet occurred.</li> </ol>
<b>Key Messages</b>	<p>"Does this course require the use of animals? Please check one <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No"</p> <p>"Please indicate approval date of any pedagogical merit review for this course and expiry date of any certification from Animal Care Committee (ACC): _____"</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. If an Outline is submitted to SSCC with the "animal use" box checked but no certification of Merit Review, it would be directed to the ORS and ACC rather than being sent to Senate.</li> </ol>
<b>Consultations</b>	<p>Layne Myhre, Chair Animal Care Committee</p> <p>Amy Jeon, Vice Chair, Senate</p>
<b>Attachments</b>	<p>Policy RS6 <a href="#">Animal Use and Ethics in Teaching and Research</a> / <a href="#">Procedure</a> (effective: June 2, 2021)</p>
<b>Submitted by</b>	<p><i>Deepak Gupta, AVP, Research, Innovation, and Graduate Studies</i></p>
<b>Date submitted</b>	<p><i>September 2, 2021</i></p>

## SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE ON CURRICULUM

**Agenda Item: 8.2**

**Meeting Date:** September 15, 2021

**Presenter(s):** Leeann Waddington

### Agenda Item

### Learning Resources Section of Course Outline

Action Requested	Discussion
------------------	------------

Recommended Resolution	N/A
------------------------	-----

### Committee Report

For Secretariat Use Only

As the CIM project team works to design the initial draft of our new electronic course outline system for testing later this fall, we are considering the purpose and function of each component. Course outlines will eventually be more accessible to students than previously and we want to ensure that the information provided adds value and does not create unnecessary confusion.

### Context & Background

The learning resources section is the course developer's recommendation for text book and other course materials, however it is non-binding and individual faculty can determine for their course section to use the suggested resource, open educational resources or an alternate. The course outline is not the definitive source for text book, this is facilitated through scheduling and/or bookstore processes. In addition, as educational approaches change we may identify other necessary tools that students should be aware of in advance of their class such as safety or other equipment, technology or software needs that extend beyond textbooks.

### Key Messages

1. The data currently in this field may not be up to date and reflective of the actual learning resources for every section of a given course
2. Student early access to course outlines could result in them obtaining learning materials that will not be needed in their registered section.
3. This information may be important to faculty when planning delivery of their course.
4. Non-text-based resources may be inadequately captured

5. The new system allows us to have more than one text box to capture this information and provides us an opportunity to consider the best approach to meet the needs in the future.

**Submitted by** *Leeann Waddington, Director of Learning Technology and Educational Development*

**Date submitted** *September 3, 2021*

## SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE ON CURRICULUM

Agenda Item: 8.2

Meeting Date: September 15, 2021

Presenter: David Burns

Agenda Item      Draft Policy and Procedure AC10 *Development and Change of Senate-Approved Programs*

Action Requested	Motion
------------------	--------

Recommended Resolution	THAT the Senate Standing Committee on Curriculum recommend that Senate recommend to the Board of Governors the approval of Policy and Procedure AC10 <i>Development and Change of Senate-Approved Programs</i> .
------------------------	--

Senate Standing  
Committee Report

For Senate Office Use Only

Context &  
Background

### Background

In fall 2020 and spring 2021, David Burns (then, Vice-Chair, Senate) and Josephine Chan (Special Assistant to the Provost) conducted two sets of comprehensive pre-development consultation visits in preparation for the rewriting of Policy and Procedure AC10, now coming forward under the new title *Development and Change of Senate-Approved Programs*. Both sets of consultations included discussion of general priorities for revision and specific issues raised by Faculty Councils, committees and stakeholder groups across KPU.

### 6-Week Public Posting Period

Draft Policy and Procedure AC10 were posted on the [KPU Policy Blog](#) for a 6-week public posting period from May 14 to June 24, 2021. During this time period, the Senate Standing Committee on Policy, Curriculum, and Academic Planning and Priorities were also consulted for feedback. Responses to the blog comments have been posted on the Blog, and are attached herewith for ease of reference along with responses to the comments from Senate Standing Committees.

In response to the comments received during the public posting period, some revisions were made to the draft Policy and Procedure (see attached).

### Highlights of Proposed Changes:

1. The process for the development of new programs has been shortened by allowing a number of previously linear steps to proceed concurrently. The Concept Paper and Full Program Proposal may, for instance, under some circumstances proceed together (rather than one after the other). Senate



Standing Committees, to take another example, can all deliberate concurrently and need not wait for one committee to conclude its review before the next begins.

2. The role of the Provost's office has been increased to foster integrated decision making and coordination, particularly with support systems outside of academic units.
3. The policy has been made more concise and clear so that future disagreements about its meaning are more focused.
4. Stress-testing thought experiments, or scenarios, are included to encourage consideration of the implications of the proposed policy for future crises.

#### **Key Messages**

1. Draft Policy and Procedure AC10 were posted on the [KPU Policy Blog](#) for a 6-week public posting period from May 14 to June 24, 2021.
2. All comments received during the 6-week public posting period have been responded to by the Policy Developer (attached).
3. The final draft Policy and Procedure AC10 will also be presented to the Senate Standing Committee on Curriculum (September 15) and Academic Planning and Priorities (September 24) for recommendation to Senate.

#### **Consultations**

1. Senate Standing Committee on Policy (June 2, 2021)
2. Senate Standing Committee on Academic Planning & Priorities (June 4, 2021)
3. Senate Standing Committee on Curriculum (June 16, 2021)

#### **Attachments**

1. Draft Policy AC10 *Development and Change of Senate-Approved Programs*
2. Draft Procedure AC10 *Development and Change of Senate-Approved Programs*
3. Draft Appendix A – Requirements for Proposals for Suspension and Discontinuance
4. Stress Testing Thought Experiments
5. Draft AC10 Policy Blog Comments and Responses
6. Draft AC10 Feedback from Senate Standing Committees (June 2021)
7. Draft Policy AC10 Timeline

#### **Submitted by**

*David Burns, Department of Educational Studies, Faculty of Arts  
(Policy Developer)*

#### **Date submitted**

*August 25, 2021*

**Policy History****Policy No.**

AC10

**Approving Jurisdiction:**

Board of Governors, with Senate advice

**Administrative Responsibility:**

Provost and Vice President Academic

**Effective Date:**

September 1, 2022

## Development and Change of Senate-Approved Programs Policy

### A. CONTEXT AND PURPOSE

KPU is a special purpose, teaching university under the University Act. The University Act (RSBC 1996), Chapter 468, section 35.2 (6) (b) and (6) (d) addresses the issue of program establishment, revision or suspension and prioritization as follows:

“The senate of a special purpose, teaching university must advise the board, and the board must seek advice from the senate, on the development of educational policy for the following matters:

(b) the establishment, revision or discontinuance of courses and programs at the special purpose teaching university;

(d) the priorities for implementation of new programs and courses leading to certificates, diplomas or degrees;”

### B. SCOPE AND LIMITS

This Policy and its related Procedures apply to proposals for new Senate-approved programs (program development) as well as the revision, suspension or discontinuance of all Senate-approved programs (program change). Micro-credentials are outside the scope of this policy and are governed by policy AC 15.

### C. STATEMENT OF POLICY PRINCIPLES

1. The University has strategic and academic plans against which program development and change should be evaluated.
2. Program development and change should be undertaken by the governance system transparently and through meaningfully shared decision-making among stakeholders.
3. The program development and change process is integrated, through the Office of the Provost and Vice President, Academic, with the University’s support services (such as Marketing, the Office of the Registrar, etc.) to enable not only timely passage of academic programming but also effective coordination with the service areas needed to make new and changed programs successful.

4. The Office of the Provost and Vice President Academic coordinates and empowers program development and, together with the Proponent, is jointly responsible for new program proposals.
5. Development and change proposals should include consideration of the impact of the given proposal on students and the University community and should provide plans to solve or mitigate negative impacts.
6. Development and change proposals may be brought forward by a Dean, Director, or the Provost and Vice President Academic, or by a Department, School, or Faculty (or a committee of one of these bodies), and will be submitted for consideration to the governing bodies as outlined in the procedures.
7. Program development and change will be communicated to all interested stakeholders, including government as appropriate.
8. Students enrolled in a discontinued program will be provided with every opportunity to complete the program per the timelines outlined in Policy AR16 *Requirements for Graduation*.
9. Proposals for program change should be approved by Senate concurrently with all needed changes to the implicated courses.

## **D. DEFINITIONS**

Refer to Section A of AC10 *Development and Change of Senate-Approved Programs* Procedure for a list of definitions in support of this Policy.

## **E. RELATED POLICIES & LEGISLATION**

AC3 *Program Review*

AC14 *KPU Credential Framework (beginning September 1, 2023)*

AR16 *Requirements for Graduation (current until August 31, 2023)*

GV9 *Establishment and/or Discontinuance of Faculties and Departments*

University Act [RSBC 1996], Chapter 468, section 35.2 (6) (b), (6) (d)

## **F. RELATED PROCEDURES**

Refer to the AC10 *Development and Change of Senate-Approved Programs* Procedure

Policy History
<b>Policy No.</b> AC10
<b>Approving Jurisdiction:</b> Board of Governors, with Senate advice
<b>Administrative Responsibility:</b> Provost and Vice-President, Academic
<b>Effective Date:</b> September 1, 2022

## Development and Change of Senate-Approved Programs Procedure

### A. DEFINITIONS

1. **Department:** An educational administrative sub-unit of a Faculty and/or School within a university dealing with a particular field of knowledge.
2. **Faculty:** An educational administrative division constituted by the Board of the University.
3. **Intake Cancellation:** Closing an intake of admission for a single intake cycle. Intake cancellation is an emergency action subject to regulation in AC10's procedures.
4. **Program:** A defined set of courses of instruction that lead to a credential approved by KPU Senate. A program also consists of a) a unit of study, under the governance of Senate, that results in the granting of a degree or a non-degree credential or b) a unit of study that constitutes the designation of major or minor, or c) a unit of study that constitutes a department.
5. **Program Discontinuance:** Permanent closure of a program which includes removal from future University Calendars and cessation of admission or declaration to the designated program.
6. **Program Suspension:** A temporary cessation of a program whereby students will not be admitted to or declare into a program for a defined period of time.
7. **Program Revision:** Any changes to a program that alter admission, declaration, curricular or credential requirements.
8. **School:** An educational administrative division that may be constituted by the Board of the University to function in the full capacity of a Faculty. Alternatively, a School may be an educational administrative unit which functions within a Faculty, similar to a Department.

9. **Concept Paper:** The first of two documents normally written to propose a new Senate approved program. The Concept Paper seeks to address such questions as the strategic suitability of a program and the potential demand it addresses.
10. **Full Program Proposal:** The second of two documents normally written to propose a new Senate approved program. The Full Program Proposal contains, among other information, the proposed program's curriculum.
11. **Stage 1 Review:** The review conducted by the Ministry of Advanced Education, Skills and Training at the Concept Paper stage.

## **B. PROCEDURES**

### **1. Proposing New Programs**

- a. A Proponent, after consulting with their Department and their Dean, propose development of a new program to the Provost [or designate] with a Concept Paper.
- b. The Provost, after consulting with other senior leaders and services areas as the Provost deems necessary, determines whether development of the new program should proceed. If so, the Provost will name a designate to coordinate the program development process and will authorize the Office of Planning and Accountability to produce a Feasibility Report to be included in the Concept Paper.
- c. The Provost determines, on receipt of the Feasibility Report, whether the proposal is viable.
  - i. For new degrees: if the program is judged to be viable the Proponent and Provost's designate together author, if required by the Ministry, a Stage 1 Review. The Concept Paper and Stage 1 Review may, if authorized by the Provost, proceed concurrently with the Full Program Proposal.
  - ii. For new non-degrees: if a program is judged to be viable the process proceeds to step *d*.
  - iii. For new minor degrees or honours degrees, in fields of study for which KPU already has a major program: the Provost will, if the program is deemed viable, indicate whether the program should be proposed through a Program Revision or Full Program Proposal (step *f*).
- d. The Proponent and Provost's designate seek the approval of the Concept Paper by the relevant Faculty Council and Senate (on the advice of the Senate Standing Committee on Academic Planning and Priorities, Senate Standing Committee on Curriculum and, if the program is at the graduate level, the Senate Standing Committee on Research and Graduate Studies).
- e. The Senate forwards endorsed Concept Paper (and, if applicable, Stage 1 Review) to the Board of Governors for approval. Stage 1 Reviews are also submitted to the Ministry for approval to proceed to the Full Program Proposal Stage.

- f. The Proponent drafts the Full Program Proposal and requests Curriculum Consultation Forms from other academic areas.
- g. The Proponent, supported by the Provost (or designate), consults with relevant service areas and collects impact assessments. The procedure for the collection of service area feedback and support can be determined by the Provost and is outside the scope of Senate policy.
- h. The Provost and Proponent jointly seek the approval of the Full Program Proposal from the relevant Faculty Council, which forwards the endorsed proposal to Senate for approval.
- i. Senate's standing committees on Curriculum and University Budget review the Full Program Proposal and provide advice to Senate. If the program is at the graduate level, the SSC Research and Graduate Studies also provides advice.
- j. The Senate forwards endorsed program proposals to the Board of Governors for approval, and to the Ministry for ministerial consent. Any budgetary adjustment associated with an approved proposal will be made in the next annual budget development cycle for the university.
- k. The Proponent, Dean and Provost (or designate) continue to collaborate in the preparing of the program for implementation.

## **2. Revising Programs**

- a. Program revisions at KPU begin either 1) as actions arising from an approved Quality Assurance Plan developed through the program review process or 2) in response to specific issue whose solution cannot be delayed until a Program Review.
- b. A Proponent acting in response to either (1) or (2) consults with their Dean and the Office of the Provost to determine what documents and processes will be required by the Ministry of Advanced Education, Skills and Training. The timeline for approval may vary based on the approval process requested by the Ministry.
- c. In addition to the processes required by the Ministry, the Proponent prepares a Program Change Form.
- d. The Proponent seeks approval from their respective Faculty Council, which then forwards the proposal to the Senate Standing Committee on Curriculum. If the program is at the graduate level, the SSC Research and Graduate Studies also provides advice.
- e. The Senate Standing Committee on Curriculum reviews the proposal and forwards to Senate for approval. Any budgetary adjustment associated with an approved proposal will be made in the next annual budget development cycle for the university.

## **3. Cancelling Intakes, Suspending Programs, and Discontinuing Programs**

- a. Cancelling Intakes
  - i. A Dean, in consultation with the Provost, may cancel up to three intakes if:
    - 1) the number of students applying for the intake is too small to meet the program's learning outcomes or to maintain the sustainability of the program, or

- 2) access to key learning activities or resources has been compromised, or
    - 3) funding on which the program relies has been lost.
  - ii. Any further cancellation of intakes requires the approval of Senate on the advice of the Senate Standing Committee on Academic Planning and Priorities.
- b. Suspending and Discontinuing Programs
- i. A Department, Faculty, Dean or Provost may propose that a program be suspended for a defined period of time, or that it be permanently discontinued. Such proposals must include the information included in Appendix A and will be adjudicated through the following approval process:
    - 1) The Proponent sends the proposal to the relevant Faculty Council which, if it endorses the proposal, forwards it to the Senate Standing Committee on Academic Planning and Priorities [SSC APP] and the Senate Standing Committee on the University Budget [SSC UB].
    - 2) The above-named committees (including the Faculty Council) provide their advice to Senate, which considers either approval (for suspensions) or recommendation to the Board of Governors for approval (for discontinuances). Any budgetary adjustment associated with an approved discontinuance proposal will be made in the next annual budget development cycle for the university. In some cases, KPU may also require consultation with, or approval from, external bodies such as accrediting organizations, government. Program Advisory Committees should be consulted when appropriate.
    - 3) A proposal that discontinues the only program in a Department or Faculty may concurrently discontinue the given Department or Faculty if this consequence is explicitly stated in the approved proposal.

## **C. RELATED POLICY**

*AC3 Program Review*

*AC14 KPU Credential Framework*

*AR16 Requirements for Graduation*

*GV9 Establishment and/or Discontinuance of Faculties and Departments*

*University Act [RSBC 1996], Chapter 468, section 35.2 (6) (b), (6) (d)*

## Appendix A – Requirements for Proposals for Suspension or Discontinuance

### **A proposal to suspend a program must include the following information:**

- i. All impacted credentials and specific discipline or field of study;
- ii. Location(s) of the program;
- iii. Faculty, Department, or School offering the program;
- iv. Proposed date for suspension, a notification period for students, faculty and staff, and a date for review of the suspension;
- v. Reasons for suspension, such as:
  - 1) Insufficient resources
  - 2) Lack of enrolment demand
  - 3) Curricular issues
  - 4) Inability to provide appropriate institutional support
- vi. Plan for suspension, including:
  - 1) Proposed review date to reinstate or discontinue the suspended program
  - 2) Steps that will be taken to consult with faculty and staff
  - 3) Steps that will be taken to consult with students
  - 4) Steps that will be taken to ensure students in the program have the opportunity to complete the program
  - 5) Steps that will be taken to ensure consultation with other impacted departments, Faculties, and units;
  - 6) Steps to compensate for damage to medium term enrolment (particularly for limited intake and cohort programs)
- vii. Draft Calendar entry detailing suspension of admissions / declaration to the program;
- viii. Name, title, phone number and email address of the institutional contact in case more information is required (normally, the Dean of the Faculty in which the program is housed);
- ix. Endorsement by the Provost.

### **A proposal to discontinue a program must include the following:**

- i. All impacted credentials and specific discipline or field of study;
- ii. Location(s) of the program;
- iii. Faculty, Department, or School offering the program;
- iv. Anticipated final date of discontinuance;
- v. Reasons for discontinuance of the program, such as:
  - 1) Insufficient financial resources
  - 2) Lack of enrolment demand
  - 3) Curricular issues relating to the decline in quality or the inability to meet required program outcomes
  - 4) Inability to provide appropriate institutional support





- vi. Plan for phasing-out of program, including:
  - 1) Steps taken to consult with faculty and staff regarding phasing out
  - 2) Steps taken to consult with students regarding phasing out
  - 3) Steps taken to ensure students in the program have the opportunity to complete the program
  - 4) Steps taken to consult with other impacted departments, Faculties, and units;
  - 5) Impact on and/or reorganization of curriculum in cognate disciplines
  - 6) Timeline of activities
- vii. Name, title, phone number and email address of the institutional contact person in case more information is required (normally, the Dean of the Faculty in which the program is housed).
- viii. Potential legal implications as a result of the program discontinuance;
- ix. Endorsement by the Provost.


# Stress Testing Thought Experiments

## AC10 Policy and Procedure

EACH OF THE FOLLOWING CASES IS A CARICATURE OR EXAGGERATION INTENDED TO TEST THE WAYS IN WHICH THE PROPOSED POLICY AND PROCEDURES WOULD REACT TO EXTREME CASES.


### *Case 1 – Manufactured enrolment crisis*

A Dean/Provost decides that a particular program needs to be discontinued but does not wish to face the arguments for and against that proposal. This person, instead, wishes to *cause* the program to be empty by cancelling the intakes each term and then, years later, pretending the program was failing to fill its classes.

 Under the proposed policy and procedures, this Dean would be limited to cancelling three intakes and then would be forced either to initiate formal protocols of suspension or discontinuance (in which case they would be obliged to publicly state their arguments as required under procedure 3.b) or to request further cancellations (obliging public argument under 3.a.ii).


### *Case 2 – Not facing facts*

A program is disinterested in addressing the problems it faces in its program and so refuses to engage seriously with efforts to either reform program quality or bring program cost into a viable range.

 Under the proposed policy and procedures, this program could have a suspension or discontinuance proposed by its Faculty Council (as is also the case in the existing policy). This act would, if the proposal stated so explicitly, also close the Department itself if the program was the only program in the Department (as per procedure 3.b.i.4)). A more automatic version of this language was included in the previous policy. The Senate receives the decisions of the Faculty Council and standing committees as *advice* and so the policy does not prevent Senate from enacting a decision that conflicted with the decision of the Faculty Council in question.

### *Case 3 – Program by ambush*

A program is proposed by a proponent who does not seek to collect feedback from other areas of the University community and instead develops their proposal in isolation.

 In addition to the normal requirement for the collection of curriculum consultation (which is submitted to Senate as part of the proposal) the proposed policy and procedure also requires participation by the Provost's office at the beginning of the process. The Provost or, more likely, a designate of the Provost, will be responsible for the early expansion of consultation to all relevant service areas. The way in which this consultation is constructed is intentionally left to the Provost to determine so that administrative bodies – such as Academic Council – may be employed to create and sustain administrative processes to operate in tandem with the general Senate approval process.

### *Case 4 – I have the power*

A new senior executive claims to have the authority, through some loophole observed in policy, to fast-track discontinuance.

- ☑ The proposed policy and procedures have reduced dramatically the language used to describe the suspension and discontinuance processes (procedure 3.b). This will reduce the scope for the assertion of extreme interpretations of policies. Standing committees clearly provide advice to Senate, and Senate either approves a suspension or recommends a discontinuance to the Board.

#### *Case 5 – Government want that program yesterday*

A new government indicates that KPU is the most appropriate institution for a new and urgently needed program. How long will it take?

- ☑ The new policy and procedures reduce time it takes to approve a program by replacing linear approval steps with concurrent approval steps and, in particular, by allowing a program already supported by government to be approved dramatically faster than is currently the case. In cases deemed appropriate under Ministry regulation, as indicated by the Provost, the two phases (Concept and Full Program) can occur at the same time.

#### *Case 6 – I have a doomed but time-intensive idea*

A faculty member has an academically valuable idea for a program that won't work – either because government won't support it or because KPU can't fund the cost associated with it.

- ☑ Under the proposed policy and procedure this idea would be reviewed for viability by the Provost early in the process, both as a concept (at the first stage) and then after the Feasibility Report. If, by chance, the Dean and Provost fail to see that this proposal won't, in full form, be supportable, this should arise in the broader administrative consultations undertaken early in the proposed process.

#### *Case 7 – Early warning for faculty*

A program is running at a cost, or at a size, unsustainable for the University but no one will tell the faculty in the program.

- ☒ The proposed policy will not address this issue. AC10 can only address what happens *when the governance system is triggered* by a proposal. The only remedy to this lack of information and clarity is the provision of information and clarity, bidirectionally, between Deans / Provost and faculty. This is a day-to-day culture of conversation that can be fostered only in committees of the Faculty Councils and Departments.

#### *Case 8 – Check and balances*

A group of faculty feel like the University *has it out* for them and that the decision to close their program down was made secretly long ago and that the Senate won't stand up to protect them when the proposal is finally public. They feel like there is no check on these kinds of decisions.

- ☒ The proposed policy is clearer about the ways in which a program can experience cancellation, suspension or discontinuance, but the check and balance on proposals has always been, and will continue to be, the body politic itself. The only remedy to the feeling that the system doesn't have the right checks on proposals is to run for Senate and become one of those checks.

## Policies and Procedures

### AC10 Development and Change of Senate-Approved Programs

Posted on: May 14th, 2021 by Josephine Chan [4 Comments](#)

#### Background

In fall 2020 and spring 2021, David Burns (Vice-Chair, Senate) and Josephine Chan (Special Assistant to the Provost) conducted two sets of comprehensive pre-development consultation tour in preparation for the rewriting of Policy and Procedure AC10, now coming forward under the new title *Development and Change of Senate-Approved Programs*. Both sets of consultations included discussion of general priorities for revision and specific issues raised by Faculty Councils, committees and stakeholder groups across KPU. A draft policy and procedure, incorporating suggestions from the spring 2021 consultation tour, are attached.

#### Highlights of Proposed Changes:

1. The process for the development of new programs has been shortened.
2. The role of the Provost's office has been increased to foster integrated decision making and coordination, particularly with support systems outside of academic units.
3. The policy has been made more concise and clear so that future disagreements about its meaning are more focused.
4. Stress-testing thought experiments, or scenarios, are included to encourage consideration of the implications of the proposed policy for future crises.
5. Responses included in the "Consultation Feedback Log (February – April 2021) with responses" document are included to each recorded piece of feedback received during the spring 2021 consultation tour. While these were collected by Ms. Chan, the responses represent the perspective of the Vice-Chair.

#### Consultation

From February to April 2021, the Senate Standing Committees on Academic Planning and Priorities, Policy, and Curriculum, administrative leaders, and various Faculty Councils and Faculty Curriculum Committees have provided their input and suggestions on the drafts. (Please see "Consultation Feedback Log (February – April 2021) with responses" document attached.)

Comments are welcomed during this 6-week public posting period, and will close on **June 24, 2021 at 11:59pm PST**. The Policy Developer will review all comments and provide responses on this post.

#### Consultation

1. [Draft Policy AC10 Development and Change of Senate-Approved Programs](#)
2. [Draft Procedure AC10 Development and Change of Senate-Approved Programs](#)
3. [Draft Appendix A – Requirements for Proposals for Suspension and Discontinuance](#)
4. [Stress Testing Thought Experiments](#)
5. [Consultation Feedback Log \(February – April 2021\) with responses](#)
6. [Draft AC10 Policy Timeline](#)

Tags: [Academic](#), [Governance](#), [Program Development](#), [Senate-Approved Programs](#)

[Edit this entry.](#)

#### >> Problem submitting comments?

If you experience technical difficulties in submitting your comments, please try again with Internet Explorer.

Otherwise, please send comments directly to Josephine Chan (Josephine.Chan@kpu.ca) who can post on your behalf.

#### Recent Posts

[AC1 Program Advisory Committee](#)

[AC10 Development and Change of Senate-Approved Programs](#)

[RS6 Animal Use and Ethics in Teaching and Research](#)

[BP7 University Space](#)

[AC15 Micro-credentials](#)

#### Recent Comments

Josephine Chan on [AC10 Development and Change of Senate-Approved Programs](#)

Josephine Chan on [AC10 Development and Change of Senate-Approved Programs](#)

ecunnin@kwt.priv on [AC10 Development and Change of Senate-Approved Programs](#)

gharris@kwt.priv on [AC10 Development and Change of Senate-Approved Programs](#)

Josephine Chan on [AC1 Program Advisory Committee](#)

#### Archives

[May 2021](#)

[March 2021](#)

[February 2021](#)

[January 2021](#)

[October 2020](#)

[February 2020](#)

[January 2020](#)

[December 2019](#)

[November 2019](#)

[October 2019](#)

[September 2019](#)

[May 2019](#)

[March 2019](#)

[October 2018](#)

[May 2018](#)

[March 2018](#)

[November 2017](#)

## 4 Responses

ecunnin@kwt.priv says:

June 22, 2021 at 10:03 pm (Edit)



These comments and questions from the KFA are focused to advance our understanding of the meaning of particular aspects of the Revised AC10 and of how some of the proposed procedures for cancelling intakes or suspension or discontinuance of programs may impact the security of employment of faculty at KPU.

1) Definitions: Intake Cancellation What is envisioned as "an emergency situation?" What are examples of such emergencies? It is understood that Deans ought to have limited discretionary power to deal with unforeseen circumstances. As the proposed Policy Principles #2 states: "Program development and change should be undertaken by the governance system transparently and through meaningfully shared decision-making among stakeholders, it would seem that should situations arise that might be leading toward a program intake cancellation could and should be discussed with program chairs and faculty in advance of most emergency situations. This point also shows gaps as outlined in the Scenarios Case #7: early warnings. Such a policy/step for meaningful consultation

with faculty as well as other stakeholders could be developed to provide assurances that the declaration of the emergency situation and cancellation of intake was the most viable solution. See 10) below for possible consideration.

2) Proponent, proponent meaning: Both are used in Policy, & they seem to have different meanings. Who is the proponent in 1) Proposing New Programs and in 2) Revising Programs? In 3.a.b.1), is Proponent limited to Dept., Faculty (as a unit), Dean &/or Provost?

3) Cancelling Intakes: Deans may cancel up to 3 intakes. We suggest inclusion of some parameters around duration/period between suspensions. Otherwise, for programs with annual intakes, this could mean intake is cancelled for a three-year period: Intended?

4) In the current AC10 Policy, Deans are limited to low enrollment as the sole cause to cancel an intake. In the proposed Policy, Deans may cancel an intake if:

a) the intake is too small to meet the program's learning outcomes or to maintain the sustainability of the program, or  
b) access to key learning activities or resources has been compromised, or c) funding on which the program relies has been lost." Question: What was the stimulus or possible scenarios for expanding the discretionary rationale for decision making?

5) Under the three points provided as a rationale for a Dean to cancel up to three intakes, Point 1) contains two disparate ideas, suggest to split these into two.

6) How will the Dean determine if the number of students applying for the intake is too small to meet the program's learning outcomes of students in a program? How is this pedagogical aspect determined/measured/evaluated? What consultation of faculty is suggested/required?

-How is sustainability defined here? Financially? What metrics are used for determining this key aspect?

7) What does "access to key learning activities or resources has been compromised" mean? How would this be determined? COVID compromised this aspect for many applied programs. Would such intakes be cancelled in similar circumstances?

8) What does funding has been lost translate to? As Universities in BC receive base funding, does this statement refer to the ability of the program to generate revenue from tuition in relation to program costs? If so, in support of transparency and operational requirements, there needs to be diverse institutional metrics developed to assess financial sustainability, particularly for learning programs that cost more to deliver per student.

9) The current AC 10 policy states "If the discontinued program is the only program in the department, the department may also close as a result." The new policy expands this to "A proposal that discontinues the only program in a Department or Faculty may concurrently discontinue the given Department or Faculty if this consequence is explicitly stated in the approved proposal." What is the rationale for including the Faculty in the discontinuance? GV9 is referenced in the Related documents. It would seem that the procedures for Faculty and Departmental discontinuance are the Policy domain of GV9 and not AC 10. If this is a link between AC 10 and activating GV9, it ought to be made clear in the Procedures.

10) There is a key change in the requirements for consultation for program suspension or discontinuance from current to proposed procedure: The current AC 10 Procedure B. 2. b states that "[p]roposals to suspend or to discontinue a program must present an appropriate rationale. Proposals must provide sufficient information to allow the university community to understand the rationale for and consequences of suspension or discontinuance in keeping with KPU's values of transparent and accountable governance." Why has this been removed in the proposed Policy? Perhaps the spirit of Policy Principle #2, this sentence could be included in the proposed Statement of Policy Principles.

11) In the current AC10 Procedures, a proposal to discontinue a program will be considered by the following bodies:

- External accreditation or regulatory bodies
- appropriate Departmental, School and/or Faculty committees
- appropriate Senate Standing Committee(s) as determined by the Provost
- Senate for recommendation to the Board for approval

Board of Governors for approval

- In some circumstances, the university may be required to consult with the Ministry responsible for post-secondary education prior to the discontinuance of programs

The proposed procedures require approval by only Faculty Council, Senate Standing Committee on Academic Planning and Priorities, Senate Standing Committee on the University Budget, and Senate. What is the rationale for removing oversight from the other governing bodies in the original procedures such as external accreditation or regulatory bodies, the Board of Governors, and the Ministry of Advanced Ed?

11) APPENDIX vi. Plan for suspension including: The steps here are nearly identical in current procedures. The following has been added to proposed: "Steps to compensate for damage to medium term enrolment (particularly for limited intake and cohort programs). What does this mean? Can you please provide a description of what such additional steps might look like?

If you are still reading, you have remarkable endurance. And likely care deeply about the programs at KPU. Thanks for your time and consideration. The KFA looks forward to reading the next iteration of the Revised AC10.

[May 2017](#)

[January 2017](#)

[October 2016](#)

[September 2016](#)

[May 2016](#)

[March 2016](#)

[February 2016](#)

[January 2016](#)

[September 2015](#)

[June 2015](#)

[May 2015](#)

[March 2015](#)

[December 2014](#)

[November 2014](#)

[October 2014](#)

[September 2014](#)

[June 2014](#)

[March 2014](#)

[January 2014](#)

[November 2013](#)

[September 2013](#)

[August 2013](#)

[January 2013](#)

[November 2012](#)

[October 2012](#)

---

## Categories

[Administration](#)

[Board](#)

[Senate](#)

[Uncategorized](#)

---

## Meta

[Site Admin](#)

[Log out](#)

[Entries RSS](#)

[Comments RSS](#)

[WordPress.org](#)

---

Josephine Chan says:

June 28, 2021 at 9:04 am (Edit)

***Posted on behalf of Dr. David Burns (Policy Developer):***



1) Definitions: Intake Cancellation What is envisioned as “an emergency situation?” What are examples of such emergencies?

**(I split this question up so the numbers are now different in my response than in the original)**  
**Over course of consultation on this policy one thing on which essentially everyone agreed was that this power needs to be defined and limited. The definition is included here to establish the norm that this tool is only for urgent situations in which we could not reasonably have followed a more open process (on the assumption that democratic systems should default to open discussion and voting and only permit executive action on otherwise deliberative questions when it isn't reasonably possible). The specific contexts imagined are listed in 3.a.i.**

2) It is understood that Deans ought to have limited discretionary power to deal with unforeseen circumstances. As the proposed Policy Principles #2 states: “Program development and change should be undertaken by the governance system transparently and through meaningfully shared decision-making among stakeholders, it would seem that should situations arise that might be leading toward a program intake cancellation could and should be discussed with program chairs and faculty in advance of most emergency situations. This point also shows gaps as outlined in the Scenarios Case #7: early warnings. Such a policy/step for meaningful consultation with faculty as well as other stakeholders could be developed to provide assurances that the declaration of the emergency situation and cancellation of intake was the most viable solution. See 10) below for possible consideration.

**This is not an unreasonable point but I am held back by two considerations. First, and most importantly, the proposed policy represents a compromise among stakeholders that converts an unlimited decanal authority into a limited decanal authority. I don't think I could build the support needed for further reduction of this power.**

**Second, on the merits, I view “substantive” consultation as consultation that, if it doesn't involve actual voting, does at least allow for faculty ideas to change the course of a decision. It is, otherwise, just consultation theatre of the kind I find deleterious to good governance and faculty agency. Meaningful consultation (as opposed to consultation writ large) implies a certain ability to impact or, perhaps in its strongest form, consent. We cannot in this case require (as opposed to encourage) meaningful consultation and still have a discretionary emergency authority. If it is the case that the authority is abused in some way the proposed policy will provide Senate with the first ability it has had to prevent further intake cancellations after the stated limit. The democratic remedy, as with almost all emergency authority, is in post-hoc accountability.**

**At the level of “Deans should consult” I would say that is unassailably true. Good Deans, and faculty that foster good relationships with their Deans, have the kind of collaborative dialogue that makes these sorts of conversations natural and obvious.**

3) Proponent, proponent meaning: Both are used in Policy, & they seem to have different meanings. Who is the proponent in 1) Proposing New Programs and in 2) Revising Programs? In 3.a.b.1), is Proponent limited to Dept., Faculty (as a unit), Dean &/or Provost?

**You are giving me too much credit, here – that is a pure typo. I have corrected all to upper case. The substantive question is good, as well, though. The policy specifies where the process starts, not by whom it is started. In practice we only receive these from academic faculty and administration because the voting all takes place at academic bodies but, in theory, a Faculty Council could decide to take a proposal from any source and why they do so is entirely up to them.**

4) Cancelling Intakes: Deans may cancel up to 3 intakes. We suggest inclusion of some parameters around duration/ period between suspensions. Otherwise, for programs with annual intakes, this could mean intake is cancelled for a three-year period: Intended?

**Good catch – this is one of the trade-offs that were discussed in the consultation tour. I actually had done what you are suggesting here and have since changed it twice based on feedback. If you list the number of intakes this creates an inequity (you are right) in the sense that the program can have its intakes cancelled for a seemingly inappropriately long time, but if you change it back you have the other end of the trade off – you only get one shot to fix things. Other programs, with different intake frequencies, might have more opportunities to try different recruitment solutions. So, yes, this is intended, but we genuinely could pick either way to address the issue. Rather than ping-pong back and forth as I receive (self-evidently reasonable) suggestions on this I took the one I think is more broadly supported – but this is something I look forward to the committees deciding when this starts getting voted on. Anyone reading this as part of a package for approval (I am projecting into the future here) please consider this point KFA is making and amend the motion if necessary. We will really only know when people vote.**

5) In the current AC10 Policy, Deans are limited to low enrollment as the sole cause to cancel an intake. In the proposed Policy, Deans may cancel an intake if:

a) the intake is too small to meet the program's learning outcomes or to maintain the sustainability of the program, or b) access to key learning activities or resources has been compromised, or c) funding on which the program relies has been lost.” Question: What was the stimulus or possible scenarios for expanding the discretionary rationale for decision making?

**Terrific question and I'm glad this came up. This is partly a response to learning from recent experience – Covid meant that, for some programs, (B) happened. KPU has also, since AC10 was last revised, created new and expensive programming that we approved on the understanding that because it was receiving targeted funding from government it would not compromise our ability to offer our existing programming. A loss of targeted funding for an unusually expensive niche program, combined with an inability to at least temporarily halt that program, risks compromising our core pre-existing programming.**



6) Under the three points provided as a rationale for a Dean to cancel up to three intakes, Point 1) contains two disparate ideas, suggest to split these into two.

**Point 1 is two consequences to a single underlying problem – insufficient registrants.**

7) How will the Dean determine if the number of students applying for the intake is too small to meet the program's learning outcomes of students in a program? How is this pedagogical aspect determined/measured/evaluated? What consultation of faculty is suggested/required?  
-How is sustainability defined here? Financially? What metrics are used for determining this key aspect?

**This is a discretionary power because the answers to those questions are context-sensitive and I think we need to hire Deans, and evaluate their tenure, on their ability to judge these contexts.**

**This is, though, an area in which my opinion is of little importance. In some of this policy I am using my own vision for the document and good public policy to propose technical language that I personally think will work. In other areas, like this one, I am trying to channel what I heard at the Faculty Councils and Standing Committees. Again, to anyone reading this at committee, please do weigh in here and amend as you see fit. This is a trade-off and the KFA questions here are not unreasonable.**

8) What does "access to key learning activities or resources has been compromised" mean? How would this be determined? COVID compromised this aspect for many applied programs. Would such intakes be cancelled in similar circumstances?

**Exactly – if we can't offer students what we told them we would offer we need at least the theoretical ability to cancel an intake to fix things. If we lost our license to practice acupuncture on site, for instance (I don't know if this is a thing but for the sake of argument...), we should consider cancelling an intake of the acupuncture program and their either getting the license addressed or formally proposing suspension through Senate. This is, as above, something that ultimately goes up to Deans and the Provost.**

9) What does funding has been lost translate to? As Universities in BC receive base funding, does this statement refer to the ability of the program to generate revenue from tuition in relation to program costs? If so, in support of transparency and operational requirements, there needs to be diverse institutional metrics developed to assess financial sustainability, particularly for learning programs that cost more to deliver per student.

**We do receive base funding but we do not only receive base funding. There is also targeted funding for particular kinds of programming – so funding loss refers most directly (though not exclusively) to those mechanisms.**

**Diverse metrics are good but, as the question implies, we also need good normative arguments about how to use scarce resources. These can only really get adjudicated through governance.**

10) The current AC 10 policy states "If the discontinued program is the only program in the department, the department may also close as a result." The new policy expands this to "A proposal that discontinues the only program in a Department or Faculty may concurrently discontinue the given Department or Faculty if this consequence is explicitly stated in the approved proposal." What is the rationale for including the Faculty in the discontinuance? GV9 is referenced in the Related documents. It would seem that the procedures for Faculty and Departmental discontinuance are the Policy domain of GV9 and not AC 10. If this is a link between AC 10 and activating GV9, it ought to be made clear in the Procedures.

**I added in reference to the Faculty because I wanted to avoid a kind of backdoor Faculty closure. With the previous wording it was possible to close all the programs offered in a Faculty and thereby de facto close the Faculty without any votes (by virtue of emptying the Faculty of faculty). This is a low probability outcome but it seemed like a loophole worth closing. This new wording makes it so that a vote must be taken that includes the conscious proposal to close the Faculty.**

**The overlap question is a good one. GV9 directs the reader to this policy for situations in which we are also discontinuing a program. AC10 is, therefore, the home for proposals that touch programming and concurrent closure. This makes sense, to my mind, because the academic governance exists to govern the programming.**

11) There is a key change in the requirements for consultation for program suspension or discontinuance from current to proposed procedure: The current AC 10 Procedure B. 2. b states that "[p]roposals to suspend or to discontinue a program must present an appropriate rationale. Proposals must provide sufficient information to allow the university community to understand the rationale for and consequences of suspension or discontinuance in keeping with KPU's values of transparent and accountable governance." Why has this been removed in the proposed Policy? Perhaps the spirit of Policy Principle #2, this sentence could be included in the proposed Statement of Policy Principles.

**Yes, this did indeed change – the idea being that this is a principle and not a procedure. It is clearly a value we should all esteem and for that reason is well suited to the Policy Principles.**

12) In the current AC10 Procedures, a proposal to discontinue a program will be considered by the following bodies:

- External accreditation or regulatory bodies
- appropriate Departmental, School and/or Faculty committees
- appropriate Senate Standing Committee(s) as determined by the Provost
- Senate for recommendation to the Board for approval

Board of Governors for approval

- In some circumstances, the university may be required to consult with the Ministry responsible for post-secondary education prior to the discontinuance of programs

The proposed procedures require approval by only Faculty Council, Senate Standing Committee on Academic Planning and Priorities, Senate Standing Committee on the University Budget, and Senate. What is the rationale for removing oversight from the other governing bodies in the original procedures such as external accreditation or regulatory bodies, the Board of Governors, and the Ministry of Advanced Ed?

**I actually did not remove the BoG requirement – it is listed in 3.b.2. Everything else in the list is outside of KPU and therefore can't be compelled by our policy to do anything so the "will consider" didn't seem appropriate. I have added back in non-compulsory language so this is more clear for people. Thanks.**

13) APPENDIX vi. Plan for suspension including: The steps here are nearly identical in current procedures. The following has been added to proposed: "Steps to compensate for damage to medium term enrolment (particularly for limited intake and cohort programs). What does this mean? Can you please provide a description of what such additional steps might look like?"

**One of the things I heard at the FCs was that there is a general fear that these short term solutions would cause lasting impact. This wording doesn't specify how they answer, but the hope is that it does force both proponents and committee members to consider a bit more about how to plan for a healthy reopening. You can imagine, for instance, that a proposal to suspend a cohort program would include a small transition plan to identify how the gap in the semester progression could be made up with students brought in via PLA or some other mechanism.**

If you are still reading, you have remarkable endurance. And likely care deeply about the programs at KPU.

**You and me both, thanks for your time.**

---

gharris@kwt.priv says:

June 21, 2021 at 7:33 pm (Edit)



I applaud the manner in which this draft policy was developed with broad pre-development consultations taking place. This allowed grass roots input from stakeholders during the formative stages that was conducive to a bottom-up policy development process as opposed to a top-down process.

The stress-test is an excellent inclusion that considers the ramifications of hypothetical scenarios. Such tests should be made a standard component of future policy development.

I have a few comments and suggestions:

1. Include definitions for some of the terms used in the procedures like Concept Paper, Full Program Proposal (FPP) and Stage 1 Review.
2. Make it explicitly clear how the revision will serve curriculum development by providing a timely and responsive approval process (since this appears to be the key objective of the revision).
3. There is currently no safeguard to minimize the potential risk of the Provost shutting-down a new program initiative based simply on personal opinion. There may be benefit in having the program approved by the Faculty AP&P C'tee at an early stage to provide/demonstrate some momentum and support.
4. Under Procedures 1d, I believe there is merit in having SSCC provide feedback on the Concept Paper specifically in regard to the major components of the curriculum. The Feasibility Assess Form and Stage 1 Review requires a curriculum outline including a general description, no. of program credits, subject area concentrations, learning outcomes and analysis of potential duplication with other programs. By providing input at this stage, major issues could be avoided before the FPP stage, that might not be caught by either Faculty Council or Senate.
5. Permitting the concurrent development of both Concept Paper and FPP has significant time-saving potential but I suggest that it is not reasonable to expect c'tees to review in detail all relevant documents for both at one meeting, especially if there is a heavy agenda. C'tee members will not be able to do justice to their role. I recommend separating the two sets of documents into successive meetings.

Thank you for considering this feedback.

Greg

---

Josephine Chan says:

June 28, 2021 at 8:55 am (Edit)



**Posted on behalf of Dr. David Burns (Policy Developer):**

I applaud the manner in which this draft policy was developed with broad pre-development consultations taking place. This allowed grass roots input from stakeholders during the formative stages that was conducive to a bottom-up policy development process as opposed to a top-down process.

The stress-test is an excellent inclusion that considers the ramifications of hypothetical scenarios. Such tests should be made a standard component of future policy development.

I have a few comments and suggestions:

1. Include definitions for some of the terms used in the procedures like Concept Paper, Full Program Proposal (FPP) and Stage 1 Review.

**I have done so – good point.**



2. Make it explicitly clear how the revision will serve curriculum development by providing a timely and responsive approval process (since this appears to be the key objective of the revision).

**This is one of the objectives, for sure – I have added language to the cover sheet to foreground this.**

3. There is currently no safeguard to minimize the potential risk of the Provost shutting-down a new program initiative based simply on personal opinion. There may be benefit in having the program approved by the Faculty AP&P C'tee at an early stage to provide/demonstrate some momentum and support.

**I respond to this in the standing committee feedback document but the wording here is a bit different so I will respond again to address this difference. The concern here looks like the possibility of arbitrary Provost behaviour shutting things down. Curriculum is always something both the Provost and the faculty need to create together – neither can go it alone and both can veto. If the Provost does this in ways that aren't broadly supported there is nothing to stop people from asking committees to support a proposal – but adding that in as a formal step doesn't seem like an effective balance of benefits. This will come to SSCC in the fall, though, so perhaps an amendment on this would carry.**

4. Under Procedures 1d, I believe there is merit in having SSCC provide feedback on the Concept Paper specifically in regard to the major components of the curriculum. The Feasibility Assess Form and Stage 1 Review requires a curriculum outline including a general description, no. of program credits, subject area concentrations, learning outcomes and analysis of potential duplication with other programs. By providing input at this stage, major issues could be avoided before the FPP stage, that might not be caught by either Faculty Council or Senate.

**I respond in the other document to this as well but, in short, yes. I disagreed with this, as you know, but your point about those other documents is quite reasonable and I have made the requested change.**

5. Permitting the concurrent development of both Concept Paper and FPP has significant time-saving potential but I suggest that it is not reasonable to expect c'tees to review in detail all relevant documents for both at one meeting, especially if there is a heavy agenda. C'tee members will not be able to do justice to their role. I recommend separating the two sets of documents into successive meetings.

**This one is in the other document but is worded here differently – particularly around workload at committees – so I will respond a bit differently here. The workload is significant, to be sure, but the committees are meant to read different parts of the packages. SSCC should not be commenting on the budget, SSCUB should not be reading the curricula in depth, and so on. I also had SSCC outside of the concept until another comment asked it be included.**

## **Draft AC10 Development and Change of Senate-Approved Programs**

### **Feedback from Senate Standing Committees (June 2021)**

#### **SSC on Policy (June 2, 2021)**

- Under the section “Related Policy”, there are references to AR16 and AC14. There is a crossover of implementation timelines/policy effective dates between the three sets of policies:
  - Revised AC10 (*beginning September 1, 2022*)
  - AC14 (*beginning September 1, 2023*)
  - AR16 (*current until August 31, 2023*)

Response: This is a good point, I have added these parenthetical notes to the named section so that readers are not confused as to the relevant policy at one time or another.

#### **SSC on Academic Planning and Priorities (June 4, 2021)**

- No feedback.

#### **SSCC (June 16, 2021)**

##### **Draft Policy:**

- In the Policy document under Section A., “Context and Purpose”, considering the pending approval of AC15 *Micro-credentials*, is it worth considering adding a separate point that includes/covers Micro-credentials?
- Response: This is a fair point. Given how new the language around MCs is, and how much about them is still being determined, it makes sense to make an exclusionary comment on this first page of the policy. I put it just below Section A in the Scope section (B).

##### **Draft Procedure:**

- In Section A., “Definitions”: For the definition of “program”, the second sentence reads oddly. It begins by “a defined set of courses of instruction...” and then it continues to “a program or units of study also consists of a unity of study...”. It reads as though it goes from plural to singular. Can that be updated for clarity? Suggestion: what about “A program also consists of...”?
- Response: This language was brought over from the previous version. I see no reason this (admittedly) confusing plural clause needs to be there. I have deleted it so the sentence reads more clearly.
- There are references to a number of documents such as Concept Paper, Full Program Proposal, and Stage 1 Review. Would it be worthwhile to define them in Section A., “Definitions”?
- Response: These documents (CP and FPP) are set by the Senate Office, Vice-Chair and Provost’s Office, so we don’t want to extensively define what is in them – which would constrain normal revisions – but defining them does make sense. I have added both. The Stage 1 Review is entirely out of our hands, but a quick definition will help the reader. Done.
- The Procedure does not indicate explicitly how the proposed and revised process is expedited compared to the current Procedure/workflow. Can we summarize what has changed and how this may help expedite the process in the introduction? Or, is it worthwhile to have an appendix added to the Policy, which compares the existing and proposed Procedures/workflows?

- Response: This is a good point – this is a significant motivator of the new draft but isn't flagged like it should be. I think the best place is in the Senate cover sheet, which now includes this.
- If both concept and FPP are to come through concurrently, would it be more ideal to have the FPP come through committees one month after the concept? That would also provide the proponent with opportunities to make changes to the FPP if there are concerns to the concept at the committee level, before they are presented to Senate and/or proceed to the FPP stage.
- Response: This is a broader policy design choice about the tradeoff between speed and risk. I chose the speed in this instance because no one will ever be *forced* to bring both together. The group taking the risk, therefore, is free not to take it. If I stipulate a one-month delay, however, they lose discretion over the level of risk they are willing to tolerate. They have, I conclude, more freedom of action with the text as written and are in a better position than I judge their risk tolerance.
- Can SSCAPP be involved earlier in the process (specifically in B.1.c.) to provide a level of endorsement/support, in conjunction with the Provost's decision-making process? This may reduce the risk of the Provost turning ideas down when there is a support from those involved prior to B.1.c.
- Response: Yes, SSCAPP could be involved earlier and this would reduce the risk of the Provost turning something down. But we would then have the same question posed about the Provost being involved earlier to reduce the risk of SSCAPP turning something down. In the end, though, the number of proposals turned down by SSCAPP has been zero in the last four years. The executive team, however, have rejected at least one and, informally, presumably more.
- Would like to strongly advocate for SSCC's involvement early in the process at the Concept phase (specifically in B.1.d), in order for the committee to provide a broad institutional level of input and "checks and balances" before the FPP is developed. This can potentially avoid major revisions down the road (which impact time and resources spent later on in the process.)
- Response: I disagree with this position on the grounds that the Concept Paper contains no curricula. I do concede, however, that in the course of discussing this point it was correctly noted that the secondary documents (like the Feasibility Study) do have curricular references and implications. I concede! I have added SSCC to the named section. We will need to be studious in ensuring the committee provides broad curricular guidance, however, and not feedback on non-curricular issues outside of the mandate of SSCC.
- Revision of programs and the linkage to program review: can we include, perhaps in the D-7 form, a rationale that stipulates why the timing, need, and implications for when the revisions are coming through. The committee (SSCC) should have a broader understanding on when program revisions are necessary, relative to the timing to the program review schedule (e.g. can the revisions wait until its next program review cycle is completed?) We also need to think about how we can bring nimbleness to this process.

Response: This is a good issue to raise but is ill-suited for the D7. The Senate system is not well equipped to adjudicate claims about implementation timing and adding this to the D7 would cause this to be a constant question in committee. It makes more sense to have the Provost's Office consider this (at least in a preliminary way) in the first step.

**Policy Sponsor:** Provost and Vice President Academic

**Approving Jurisdiction:** Board of Governors, with Senate Advice

**Policy Developer:** Dr. David Burns, Vice Chair of Senate

Step(s)	Action(s)	Date(s)	Submission Deadline
1.	Solicit feedback from stakeholder group(s) on draft policy and procedure. Finalize draft policy and procedure.  Review best practices, consult with stakeholder groups, draft Policy and Procedures <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Senate Standing Committees, Faculty Councils, Faculty Curriculum Committees, Deans Council, Research and Graduate Studies, Office of the Provost, Office of Planning and Accountability, Office of External Affairs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>September 2020 – January 2021 (Round 1)</li> <li>March 1 – April 21, 2021(Round 2)</li> </ul>	
2.	Provost	For approval to proceed to PUE.	April 22 - May 6, 2021
3.	PUE	For approval to proceed to public posting.	May 13, 2021
4.	KPU Policy Blog (6-week public posting)	6-week public posting period on KPU Policy Blog. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SSC Policy</li> <li>SSCAPP</li> <li>SSCC</li> </ul>	May 14 – June 24, 2021
		June 2, 2021	May 21, 2021
		June 4, 2021	May 21, 2021
		June 16, 2021	June 2, 2021
5.	Finalize draft policy and procedure.	Respond to blog comment(s), if any. Finalize draft Policy and Procedure and incorporate feedback where appropriate.	June – July 2021
6.	Provost (Sponsor)	For approval to proceed to PUE.	August 2021
7.	PUE	For approval to proceed to final approval process.	August 2021
8.	Final Approval Process (Senate)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SSC Policy</li> <li>SSCC</li> <li>SSCAPP</li> <li>Senate (for approval and recommendation to the Board for approval)</li> </ul>	September 8, 2021 September 15, 2021 September 24, 2021 September 27, 2021
			August 30, 2021 September 1, 2021 September 10, 2021 September 17, 2021
9.	Final Approval Process (Board)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Board Governance Committee</li> <li>Board of Governors (for approval)</li> </ul>	November 10, 2021 December 1, 2021
			October 29, 2021 November 19, 2021

## SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE ON CURRICULUM

**Agenda Item: 8.4**

**Meeting Date:** September 15, 2021

**Presenter(s):** David Burns

**Agenda Item**                      **New Program Proposals: Centre for Entertainment Arts**

Action Requested	Information
------------------	-------------

Recommended Resolution	N/A
------------------------	-----

**Committee Report**                      For Secretariat Use Only

**Context &  
Background**

A proposal for KPU to adopt and adapt curricula licensed from the Centre for Entertainment Arts (CEA) is currently under review within the Faculty of Arts and is scheduled to be presented to this committee and to Senate in October.

Due to the volume of documents related to the proposal, the current draft documents are being made available for members of the committee to review in advance of the item coming to the committee next month.

**Attachments**

<https://kpuemp.sharepoint.com/sites/committees/senate/SitePages/Home.aspx>

**Submitted by**

*Meredith Laird, Administrative Assistant, University Senate*

**Date submitted**

*September 3, 2021*