



SENATE STANDING COMMITTEES ON ACADEMIC PLANNING AND PRIORITIES AND ON UNIVERSITY BUDGET

REGULAR MEETING
Friday, May 8, 2020,
9:00 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.
MS Teams

AGENDA

Senate Standing Committee on Academic Planning and Priorities

1. Call to OrderNatasha Campbell 9:00
2. Approval of Agenda
3. Approval of Minutes, March 6, 2020
4. *AC6 Recognition of Prior Learning* Policy and ProcedureDiane Purvey, Zena Mitchell 9:10
5. Items for Discussion
- 5.1. Report Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning..... Rajiv Jhangiani 9:20
6. Adjournment to Joint Committee Meeting..... 9:30

Joint Committee

7. Call to OrderNatasha Campbell 9:45
8. Approval of Agenda
9. Approval of Minutes, January 10, 2020
10. Chairs' Report..... Natasha Campbell, David Burns 9:50
11. New Business
- 11.1.KPU Finance Report Joe Sass 10:00
- 11.2.International Students Carole St Laurent 10:20
- 11.3.Senate Budget Assessment ProcessDavid Burns 10:30
- 11.4.Senate Effectiveness SurveyDavid Burns 10:40
12. Items for DiscussionNatasha Campbell 10:45
13. Adjournment

Senate Standing Committee on University Budget

14. Call to OrderDavid Burns 10:50
15. Approval of Agenda
16. Approval of Minutes, January 10, 2020

17. Notice of Election of Chair	
18. Items for Discussion	11:00
19. Adjournment	



SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING AND PRIORITIES

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

Friday, March 6, 2019

9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Surrey Campus Boardroom, Cedar 2110

Present: (Quorum: 6 voting members)		Ex-Officio / Non-voting
Natasha Campbell (Chair) David Florkowski Andhra Goundrey Andre Iwanchuk Ann-Marie McLellan	Michelle Molnar Allyson Rozell Catherine Schwichtenberg Randal Thiessen	David Burns Rajiv Jhangiani Lori McElroy Zena Mitchell
		Ex-Officio / Voting
		Alan Davis
Regrets:	Senate Office	Guests:
Kristan Ash Steve Cardwell Deepak Gupta Ranpal Sandhu Sandy Vanderburgh Tom Westgate	Meredith Laird	Josephine Chan Faith Auton-Cuff Diane Purvey

1. Call to Order

Natasha Campbell, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

2. Approval of Agenda

Andhra Goundrey moved the agenda be accepted as circulated.

The motion carried.

3. Chair's Report

No report.

4. Items for Discussion

4.1. AC6 Recognition of Prior Learning

Zena Mitchell informed the committee that this policy is old and has not been updated in 16 years. The working group included a variety of stakeholders who considered how the uses of the PLAR policy have changed since it was written. Broadening the scope of the policy might better serve learners by combining the old version of PLA and the Transfer Credit policy. Changes were made to the parts of the policy addressing assessment methods, including examination-based and competency-based assessments. The revision includes information about assessing portfolios, including digital portfolios and the removal of language on micro-credentials, which are currently offered at other institutions. A notable addition in the Procedures is the recognition of industry-certifications, such as Red Seal certifications, as well as the allowance for PLAR credit awarded by another institution. The current 10 year time limit on awarding of prior

credit could change to allow older prior credit to be permitted. The fee structure for students will reflect the work that is performed by assessors and will not vary based on student residency. Changes to this policy will also affect Policy AC4 concerning “GPA-neutral” and “credit awarded” grade notations on the transcript. The draft policy will be revised to specify that assessments will be performed by KPU faculty members.

The committee discussed how PLAR might be used towards admission requirements if PLAR was awarded at another institution, as well as what would be considered under transfer credits. Advanced Entry is a specific case in which assessment might be made at the point of admission rather than following the student’s admission to the University. The committee discussed whether credentials from external licensing agencies might be accepted or used for Advanced Entry, and discussed credentials obtained at unaccredited institutions.

The committee discussed changing the waiting period between unsuccessful attempts at a course from 6-months to 8-months.

4.2. AC14 Credential Framework

Zena Mitchell introduced the draft policy and answered questions of the committee. She informed members that this item has returned for discussion following the consultation, blog posting and a set of revisions. A summary of the changes made are available in blog. She informed the committee that a rich discussion about the Indigenous Content Requirement took place among the stakeholder groups, as they considered what the requirement might involve and the difficulty in implementing this component of the policy. The revisions included removing references to micro-credentials and badges, which will also affect policy AC6. She advised that it may be premature to include the removal of an upper credit limit, while retaining a minimum credit limit to meet Ministry requirements. Josephine Chan informed the committee that changes were made in response to blog comments and feedback received from Senate standing committees in June of 2019. She confirmed that no items were added to the draft policy, only removed.

The committee discussed what constitutes a substantive change and whether there is a distinction between addition and removal of content in the policy, as well as how revisions can change the intent of the policy.

The committee discussed the proposed changes to the definition of quantitative attribute status to include qualitative inquiry and whether the University might create a requirement for a qualitative/reasoning/critical thinking attribute. The committee discussed what constitutes essential, universal learning outcomes and critical thinking skills for the 21st century, and the possibility of referring this question to Teaching and Learning to inform baccalaureate degree requirements. The committee was informed that the Faculty of Arts has worked on the BA Framework for a period of time and is finding it difficult to move forward without agreeing definitions of these terms.

The committee discussed the creation of degree requirements language for use by all Faculties.

4.3. Vice-Provost Teaching and Learning

The Vice-Provost submitted a written report and highlighted upcoming events, as well as funding opportunities and deadlines.

5. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 10:09 a.m.



SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING AND PRIORITIES

Agenda Item: 4

Meeting Date: May 8, 2020

Presenter: Dr. Diane Purvey, Zena Mitchell

Agenda Item: *AC6 Recognition of Prior Learning Policy and Procedure*

Action Requested:	<input type="checkbox"/> Motion to Approve <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Discussion <input type="checkbox"/> Information
Recommended Resolution:	N/A

Senate Standing
Committee Report:

For Senate Office Use Only

Context &
Background:

Current **Policy AC6** [Credit for Prior Learning](#) is outdated and has not been updated since December 2004. Upon the completion of a thorough policy review, it is being proposed for a comprehensive policy revision along with the following:

- proposed name change to **Policy AC6 Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL)**
- amalgamation with current **Policy and Procedure AR12** [Transfer Credit and Advanced Standing / Procedures](#)

The purpose of the policy revision and the amalgamation with AR12 is to provide clear distinction on the definitions, academic standards, assessment methods, and grading and recognition between transfer credit and Prior Learning Assessment and Recognition (PLAR).

As a result of the blog comments and the various consultations during the 6-week public commenting period that ended on March 18 (including SSC Policy on March 4, and SSCAPP on March 6), a number of revisions have been made to the draft Procedure.

The details to the revisions are included in the *AC6 Blog Response* document, which has been posted on [AC6's comment section on the KPU Policy Blog](#). For ease of reference, the *AC6 Blog Response* document is also attached in this submission.

Key Message

1. Draft Policy and Procedure AC6 have received approval from the Provost (Policy Sponsor) to proceed to the final policy approval process by Senate.

2. The details to the revisions are included in the *AC6 Blog Response* document, which has also been posted on [AC6's comment section on the KPU Policy Blog](#).
3. Once approved by Senate, new Policy AC6 *Recognition of Prior Learning* will take effect on September 1, 2020. Policy AR12 will also be subsumed by the new Policy AC6 on September 1, 2020.

Implications / Risks: KPU risks losing out on a greater number of potential mature and mid-career learners if we do not update our practices related to the recognition of prior learning in a meaningful way that better aligns with Vision 2023 and Academic Plan 2023.

Consultations: The following stakeholder groups have been consulted during the policy development process:

- President
- Provost and Vice President Academic
- Polytechnic University Executive
- Recognition of Prior Learning Working Group
 - Diane Purvey, *Dean, Faculty of Arts*
 - Zena Mitchell, *University Registrar*
 - Andhra Goundrey, *Pro Tem Dean, Wilson School of Design*
 - Nadia Henwood, *Associate Registrar, Admissions and Enrolment Services*
 - Christina Heinrick, *faculty, CADD*
 - Naomi Ben-Yehuda, *Degree Advisor, Faculty of Arts*
 - Josephine Chan, *Special Assistant to the Provost on Policy and Academic Affairs*
- Associate Vice Provost, Open Education
- Teaching and Learning Commons
- Director, Financial Operations

Attachments:

1. Draft Policy AC6 Recognition of Prior Learning
2. Draft Procedure AC6 Recognition of Prior Learning
3. AC6 Blog Response
4. AC6 Policy Development and Approval Timeline

Submitted by: *Dr. Diane Purvey, Dean, Faculty of Arts*
Zena Mitchell, University Registrar

Date submitted: *April 22, 2020*

Policy History
Policy No. AC6
Approving Jurisdiction: Senate
Administrative Responsibility: Provost and Vice President Academic
Effective Date:

Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) Policy

A. CONTEXT AND PURPOSE

Kwantlen Polytechnic University (KPU) is a special purpose, teaching university under the University Act. The University Act states that the senate of a special purpose, teaching university has the power and duty to “set policies on curriculum evaluation for determining whether courses or programs, or course credit, from another university or body are equivalent to courses or programs, or course credit, at the special purpose, teaching university” (35.2 (5) (k) (i)).

KPU recognizes that students attain significant learning at a post- secondary level from formal academic learning, as well as work, training and other experiences outside the formal post-secondary education system. Those who have gained such learning may be assessed and receive credit for that learning to pursue further education within KPU through the Recognition of Prior Learning process (RPL).

RPL at KPU includes two evaluation processes: transfer credit and prior learning assessment and recognition (PLAR). KPU will continue to enter into formal articulation agreements with recognized post-secondary institutions to facilitate credit transfer for courses of similar content, learning outcomes and evaluation standards. The assessment of equivalency will rely on the judgment of faculty as subject matter experts. KPU uses PLAR to assess for knowledge and skills acquired through previous informal and non-formal learning, work and life experiences, and formal learning that is ineligible for transfer credit when determining equivalency for KPU credit.

B. SCOPE AND LIMITS

This policy applies to applicants and/or students of KPU’s Senate approved programs. This policy does not apply to students enrolling in courses or programs outside the jurisdiction of Senate.

C. STATEMENT OF POLICY PRINCIPLES

1. In support of student success, KPU is committed to providing access to lifelong, meaningful education through the recognition of prior learning (RPL).
2. KPU recognizes that learners bring life and work experiences deserving of formal recognition.

3. KPU recognizes the mobility of learners and is committed to supporting the accessibility and portability of credits through the RPL process.
4. RPL eliminates duplication of learning, in turn reducing financial barriers for students and time to completion of studies.
5. Awarding of credit is consistent with identified learning outcomes, relative to a particular course or program.
6. KPU is committed to fair, consistent and transparent assessment methods in providing RPL.
7. In all RPL arrangements the academic integrity of KPU's courses and programs must be protected and preserved.

D. DEFINITIONS

Refer to Section A in the related Procedures for definitions which will enhance the reader's interpretation of this Policy.

E. RELATED POLICIES & LEGISLATION

AR2 Admission

AR16 Requirements for Graduation

F. RELATED PROCEDURES

AC6 Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) Procedure

Policy History
Policy No. AC6
Approving Jurisdiction: Senate
Administrative Responsibility: Provost and Vice President Academic
Effective Date:

Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) Procedures

A. DEFINITIONS

- Academic Advisor:** University staff that are available to guide students in selecting and planning effective programs of study for credential completion, career training and university transfer through individual appointments, as well as to provide referrals to other members of the university community.
- Academic Levels:** KPU offers four levels of academic programming: preparatory, vocational, undergraduate, and graduate. Undergraduate coursework recognizes upper and lower level courses as follows:
 - Lower Level: undergraduate coursework numbered 1100 to 2999.
 - Upper Level: undergraduate coursework numbered 3000 to 4999.
- Advanced Standing:** The status given to a student who is granted the authority to commence a program with credit granted for certain components of the program in recognition of previously completed studies or prior learning.
- Articulation:** According to the BC Council on Admission and Transfer (BCCAT), articulation in the context of course transfer allows multiple sectors or branches of post-secondary education, each with its own distinctive characteristics, to function as a system. Through the process of articulation, institutions assess courses offered at other institutions to determine whether to grant course credit toward their own programs or credentials. Articulation is therefore the process, while transfer credit is the end result.
- Block Transfer:** A transfer agreement in which a predetermined number of transfer credits is granted to transferring students who have successfully completed a certificate, diploma, or a group of courses at another institution. Generally, block transfer is used to award credit for courses that, as a group, are recognized as having an academic wholeness or integrity and that collectively satisfy part of the requirements for another credential.
- Direct (Assigned) Credit:** Where credit is awarded for a specific course. Direct credit may be used towards meeting prerequisite(s) or specific degree completion requirements.
- Methods of Learning:**
 - Formal learning:** Learning that is usually developed and facilitated by professional educators traditionally offered within educational institutions.

- b. **Informal learning:** Learning that takes place through work and life experiences. Learning activities are not structured or officially evaluated.
 - c. **Non-formal learning:** Learning usually offered by a sector, professional group or a company to deal with specific training needs. Formal assessment may or may not be included.
8. **Prior Learning Assessment and Recognition (PLAR):** is a systematic credit granting process used to evaluate and recognize prior learning. The process involves the identification, documentation, assessment, verification, and recognition of relevant knowledge and skills acquired through previous informal and non-formal learning, work, and life experiences, and formal learning that is ineligible for transfer credit when determining equivalency for KPU credit. The relevant learning is assessed and evaluated relative to the learning outcomes of a particular course or program.
9. **PLAR Assessor:** A PLAR assessor is a faculty member who is a subject matter expert in the field who will conduct the assessment.
10. **PLAR Department Consultant:** A PLAR department consultant is a faculty member who will conduct a pre-assessment to determine if the request will be evaluated by a PLAR assessor.
11. **Recognized Institutions / Organizations:** the following are considered recognized for the purposes of evaluating and awarding transfer credit and PLAR at KPU:
- a. Member institutions of the BC Council on Admission and Transfer (BCCAT)
 - b. Canadian public post-secondary institutions
 - c. Member institutions of Universities Canada
 - d. International institutions considered accredited or recognized in their country, as determined by the Office of the Registrar through accreditation reference materials or the Ministries of Education in that country
 - e. College Board (Advanced Placement program)
 - f. The International Baccalaureate (International Baccalaureate programs)

Any institution or organization that does not meet the above criteria may have formal recognition requested through the Senate Standing Committee on Academic Planning and Priorities (SSCAPP).

The Office of the Registrar will determine whether an institution is recognized based on whether one or more of the above criteria have been met. All other institutions are considered unrecognized. This would include, but is not limited to:

- a. Private institutions that do not meet any of the criteria above
 - b. Any educational institution or other organization that is not a post-secondary institution (e.g., secondary schools, professional organizations).
12. **Transfer Credit:** The granting of credit within the same academic level for similar or equivalent coursework undertaken at another recognized institution.
13. **Unassigned (Unspecified) Credit:** Credit granted when no direct equivalent is offered at KPU. Unassigned credit is discipline specific, where a corresponding discipline at KPU exists. Where a corresponding discipline does not exist, Faculty-level credit may be granted. Unassigned credit is granted at the appropriate year level and may be used towards meeting elective requirements.

B. PROCEDURES

1. Academic Standards

a. Articulation

- i. Articulation agreements will be established at the same academic level in which the coursework is offered.
- ii. Articulation decisions made by the adjudicating body upon review of detailed course outlines are normally considered final. Requests for an additional review will only be considered if the student submits additional relevant information along with a written request and rationale for a second review.
- iii. Articulation requests may be initiated by recognized institutions.
- iv. Articulation decisions are typically precedent-setting and will be recorded in KPU's transfer database.
- v. Articulation agreements remain active for a maximum of ten years for post-secondary credit courses from recognized institutions.

b. Transfer Credit

- i. Transfer credit will be recognized based on the discipline in which it was completed.
- ii. Credit awarded will be at the same academic level it was completed.
- iii. Coursework completed at an unrecognized institution will not be assessed for transfer credit.
- iv. Transfer credit may be in the form of direct (assigned) course credit, discipline credit, or unassigned credit. It may be awarded at any academic level in which credit courses and programs are offered at KPU.
- v. Transfer credit decisions are recognized by KPU regardless of a student's program, but the application of transfer credit for any particular program or credential is determined by the department responsible for the program.
- vi. Transfer credit will usually be limited to courses completed at a recognized institution within 10 years from the term of admission. This timeline may be shorter for programs with external professional requirements. Coursework completed outside the stated timeframe may be eligible for credit through the relevant discipline.
- vii. Students are responsible for working with an academic advisor to determine if and how transferred courses apply toward satisfying graduation requirements.

c. PLAR

- i. Awarding PLAR credit is at the discretion of the program or department.
- ii. Assessment method(s) must be appropriate for the subject or skill area, targeted to the learning outcomes, competencies, skills, or outcomes of the course, and reflective of the level of achievement expected of any student.
- iii. PLAR credit is awarded for learning that is directly applicable to the student's declared program of study. Should a student change programs, all or some of the PLAR credit previously awarded may no longer apply to the new area of study. Conversely, the student may be able to apply for additional PLAR credit that was not appropriate under the previous program of study.

- iv. Credit will be awarded for learning equivalent to the standards required by the program(s) in which the credit is sought.
- v. A student may not obtain PLAR credit for any course in which the student was registered at KPU within the previous eight (8) months.

2. Eligibility

- a. Applicants and/or students who have completed academic courses at a recognized institution may request a transfer credit assessment.
- b. Individuals applying for PLAR must first be formally admitted to KPU. Applicants, and current students considering PLAR are encouraged to explore possibilities with an academic advisor.

3. Required Documents

- a. All requests for transfer credit require the submission of official documentation. Exceptions may be made when it is not possible for a transcript to be sent directly to KPU, provided the Office of the Registrar can reasonably determine the document's authenticity.
- b. A transcript is considered to be official only when it is sent directly to KPU from the originating institution or issuing body. Hard copies must be received in the original sealed envelope signed by the institution or bearing an official stamp or seal or they will be deemed unofficial.
- c. Documents submitted to KPU become the property of Kwantlen Polytechnic University and are normally not returned to the student. In cases where documents are irreplaceable, the documents will be returned to the student provided the student requests return of the documents upon submission. Electronic images of documents will be retained by KPU.
- d. In cases where a more detailed assessment is required by either the applicant or a program area, the applicant will be asked to provide detailed course outlines or program information as necessary.
- e. If the issuing institution is not able to provide an official document in English or French, KPU may request the student to arrange to have the document translated by a BC certified translator. In this instance the documents should be sent directly from the issuing institution and KPU will provide the student with a copy for translation.
- f. It is the student's responsibility to provide a course outline / syllabus as needed to evaluate courses for transfer. For documents that are not in English or French, a translation by a certified translator is required.

4. Authority and Responsibility

- a. The decision-making authority is the same whether a request is student-initiated or initiated by an institution through the BC transfer system.
- b. The Office of the Registrar has the responsibility to maintain a record of precedent-setting decisions.
- c. The Office of the Registrar has the authority and responsibility to equate the students' grades to KPU's grading system, and to record all transfer credit decisions and appropriate grades in each student's permanent student record.

5. Assessment

In order to maximize a student's ability to satisfy program requirements and/or course pre-requisites, when assessing for transfer credit or PLAR direct credit will be granted whenever possible rather than unassigned credit.

a. Transfer Credit

- i. Review of a course outline for articulation shall be based on equivalency of knowledge and skills or learning outcomes and it is expected that a course be comparable in breadth and depth in its essential features. Not all elements of the curriculum need be identical and departments shall employ the widest possible latitude in recommending transfer approval while respecting the academic integrity of KPU courses and programs.
- ii. A rationale must be provided when decisions are not precedent-setting, or when transfer credit is denied.
- iii. In support of a student's admission, registration and program planning, KPU endeavours to ensure timely evaluation of transfer credit within the following timelines:
 - 1) Up to six weeks to assess credit and provide a response to students.
 - 2) An additional six weeks (maximum) for the departments to review course outlines and notify the Office of the Registrar of the decision, as required.
- iv. Applicants may request a transfer credit evaluation as part of their Application for Admission to KPU, and have the option of making a subsequent request up until completion of 30 credits at KPU after which time transfer credit for coursework completed prior to admission will not be evaluated.
- v. KPU students may request transfer credit beyond completion of 30 credits at KPU for coursework completed after the commencement of studies at KPU with a Letter of Permission.
- vi. All transfer credit assessments must be complete before a student applies to graduate.

b. PLAR

- i. PLAR will be assessed by qualified faculty with expertise in the relevant curriculum area.
- ii. Credit will be based on the PLAR assessor's evaluation and will be awarded for demonstrated learning, which includes knowledge, skills and abilities; credit will not be awarded for experience alone.
- iii. Assessments for units of credit intended to satisfy program requirements are based on program-level learning outcomes.
- iv. In the event an assessment is unsuccessful, reasons must be provided.
- v. KPU recognizes the following methods of assessment for PLAR:
 - 1) Examinations
 - a) Challenge exams

A test or exam (written or oral) that is designed to validate the knowledge of the candidate as it relates to course requirements. A challenge exam may be the same test or exam given to students who formally attend the course. It is limited to questions that are directly related to the learning objectives/outcomes of the course.

b) Standardized tests

Similar to a Challenge Exam. However, this test or exam is usually developed by someone other than the PLAR assessor. It is focused around widely recognized standards (as set by a department or professional/sectoral organization) that are equivalent to the course objectives.

2) Competency Based Assessments

a) Products/Portfolios

Documents or objects that have been produced by the candidate and demonstrate tangible proof of accomplishment. These may include, but are not limited to, reports, videos, illustrations, prototype models, or an artist's portfolio. Students may be asked to demonstrate abilities or answer questions about the portfolio by the PLAR assessor.

b) Demonstration

Simulation or actual presentation of candidate's abilities, which may be live, recorded, or videotaped. The demonstration may include, but is not limited to, such activities as presenting a speech, role-playing a situation, creating a document on computer, giving a musical performance, performing a lab experiment, interviewing a client, operating equipment, or completing a procedure.

c) Interview

The PLAR interview is focused around course objectives and may include techniques such as open-ended questions, case studies, and prepared analyses. The interview is used to clarify areas of learning, and may be used in parallel with other methods, as a sole method of assessment, and/or as a means to ensure authenticity of products.

d) Worksite assessment

The candidate is observed performing tasks as a part of normal work routine, or as specifically assigned, in the place of work. Assessment is normally made by faculty assigned to a candidate, but may also be made by a work supervisor or field expert. If performed by an external assessor, it may be followed up by a self-assessment and/or interview with a PLAR assessor.

e) Industry-Based Evaluation

Credit may be awarded through recognition of pre-assessed training based on established agreements with select employers, training organizations, Continuing Studies programs, recognized Credit Banks, or Red Seal certifications.

f) External Evaluation

Assessment provided by an expert other than Kwantlen faculty. Assessment method may include, but is not limited to, performance evaluation, letter of validation, or worksite assessment, and may require follow-up by faculty.

g) Self-assessment

Assessment performed by the candidate, usually with the aid of an established form or questionnaire. Normally requires a parallel assessment by a field expert and/or PLAR assessor.

6. Granting Transfer Credit

a. For individual post-secondary courses:

- i. Credit for individual courses is given in most situations where equivalencies to KPU courses have been established.
- ii. When courses have been articulated for precedent-setting transfer to KPU, Office of the Registrar staff will grant transfer credit according to the articulation agreements retained in the KPU transfer database and/or the BC Transfer Guide. When precedent-setting transfer has not been established, the following guidelines will be used:
 - 1) When there are no current articulation agreements for a credit course taken at a recognized institution, and the discipline is offered at KPU, students are expected to provide detailed course outlines for departmental review. A faculty member designated by the discipline will determine if the course transfers for direct (assigned) credit.
 - 2) When a student is unable to provide detailed course information, Office of the Registrar staff may grant unassigned discipline/Faculty credit at the lower level for undergraduate-level courses from a recognized institution.
 - 3) The Dean responsible for the most closely related discipline may approve assigned or unassigned upper-level credit. When KPU offers the discipline, it is the responsibility of the faculty member designated by that discipline to decide what upper level credit, if any, will be granted.
- iii. When a course from another recognized institution is deemed equivalent to a KPU course, credit normally will be assigned as follows:
 - 1) Courses completed at recognized institutions will normally be given transfer credit for credits comparable, but not necessarily identical in number to the number of credits given at the originating institution. For example, a two-semester course or two one-semester courses would normally receive the equivalent of two semesters of credit (i.e., at least 6 credits) at KPU.
 - 2) Courses with equivalent learning outcomes will normally be given the same number of credits as the KPU course.
 - 3) If a student is awarded transfer credit for a course AND takes the same course at KPU, both courses will become part of the student's academic record. Only the higher grade will be recognized for credit and in the calculation of the student's GPA.
- iv. Special Types of Courses:
 - 1) Clinicals, practica, field study courses, internships, and cooperative education courses will be awarded transfer credit according to any existing articulation agreements. When no agreements exist, no transfer credit is assigned; however, the appropriate designate for the discipline may articulate courses from recognized institutions that are comparable to KPU courses as per the guidelines above. Such decisions are considered precedent-setting and will be recorded in KPU's transfer database.

b. For block transfer:

- i. Applicants with a post-secondary undergraduate credential or a vocational certificate or diploma from a recognized institution may be considered for block credit in situations where a formal partnership agreement exists, or in exceptional circumstances where course credit cannot readily be established.
- ii. The following guidelines are used to establish block credit:
 - 1) The amount of block credit assigned will depend upon the length of the program for which the credential was awarded. For each period of study equivalent to two semesters of full-time study at KPU, programs may receive a block of up to 30 credits. The total number of credits assigned will not exceed the number of credits (equated to the KPU credit system) granted at the originating institution.
 - 2) A student granted block credit will be assigned direct and/or unassigned credit for individual courses within the block as determined by the Office of the Registrar.
 - 3) Undergraduate, lower-level credit is given for programs KPU classifies as undergraduate programs (except when upper-level credit is approved by the appropriate designate for the discipline); vocational or preparatory-level credit is given for programs that are non-academic.

c. For Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate:

- i. Secondary school graduates admitted to KPU who have completed Advanced Placement subjects will receive advanced standing in accordance with the table of course equivalencies established in consultation with faculty and published by the Office of the Registrar.
- ii. Secondary school graduates admitted to KPU who have completed International Baccalaureate subjects will receive advanced standing in accordance with the table of course equivalencies established in consultation with faculty and published by the Office of the Registrar.

d. For recognition of PLAR previously awarded at a recognized institution:

- i. KPU may accept credit earned through PLAR from all recognized Canadian post-secondary institutions. Such credit will be recognized and awarded as PLAR and may be in the form of direct (assigned) course credit, discipline credit, or unassigned credit. It may be awarded at any academic level in which credit courses and programs are offered at KPU.

7. Support and Training

- a. PLAR training and support will be provided to all employees involved in the PLAR process as part of a quality PLAR system.
- b. Transfer Credit training and support will be provided to all employees involved in the transfer credit process.

8. Grading and Recognition

a. Transfer Credit

- i. All transferable courses and corresponding grades, equated to the KPU grading system, are recorded on the student's academic record and form the transfer GPA,

- ii. The official KPU transcript will indicate the transferred courses, the grade, and the number of credits for which transfer credit is granted.
- iii. Once transfer credit has been awarded and posted to the student's academic record, KPU will not amend/change the transfer credit that has been awarded.
- iv. Duplicate transfer credit will not be awarded. Students who have completed equivalent courses at multiple institutions will be granted transfer credit once, for the highest grade achieved.
- v. When a student has repeated a course at another recognized post-secondary institution, KPU will not grant transfer credit again for the same course. Students wishing to repeat a transferred course to achieve a higher grade must complete the course at KPU.

b. PLAR

- i. For PLAR assessments, grades will be awarded in accordance with KPU policy.
- ii. Academic credit awarded through the PLAR process will appear on a student's KPU transcript.
- iii. Duplicate PLAR credit will not be awarded.
- iv. Academic credit awarded through the PLAR process will appear as part of a student's individual My Action Plan (MAP) credential audit, indicating the program requirements for which PLAR is applicable.
- v. Transcripts reflect the PLAR credit being granted and will count as credits attempted and taken, but not for GPA calculations.
- vi. PLAR credit is not applicable towards a term's course load and does not apply toward eligibility for full-time or part-time student status, Dean's Honour Roll, student financial aid, awards and/or scholarships.
- vii. Credits granted as part of the PLAR process may be used to satisfy admission requirements, registration pre-requisites and/or curricular requirements for graduation.
- viii. PLAR candidates must fulfill assessment requirements within four (4) months of an application. If the candidate's assessment is unsuccessful, the candidate may be reassessed if evidence of additional learning is provided, and upon consultation with a PLAR department consultant.

c. PLAR Fees

- i. Fees are representative of the services performed in the PLAR assessment process and not solely based on the amount of credit awarded.
- ii. Students are responsible for all associated costs involved with the PLAR process.

C. RELATED POLICIES AND BYLAWS

Bylaw 4 Fees

AC6 Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL)

AR2 Admission

AR16 Requirements for Graduation

FM8 Student Tuition and Fees

Thank you to everyone who have taken the time to review the drafts and provided valuable feedback and suggestions on the KPU Policy Blog during the 6-week public commenting period. Due to the number of detailed responses received, the policy developers and the Policy AC6 Working Group would like to provide an omnibus response to address questions and feedback raised.

1. Micro-credentials

We have received a significant amount of support to remove references to “micro-credentials” in the draft Procedure. As a result, we have removed it from Section A, *Definitions*, as well as under “Competency Based Assessments – Products/Portfolios on page 6 of 10 in the draft Procedure (Section B.5.b.v.2)a)).

2. Definitions

- We have added “academic advisor” as a new definition. The definition can also be found in the Glossary section in the University Calendar [here](#).
- For added clarity, we have renamed “PLAR Program Advisor” to “PLAR Department Consultant”, and clarified that a PLAR department consultant is a **faculty member** who will conduct a pre-assessment to determine if the request will be evaluated by a PLAR assessor.
- For added clarity, we have renamed “PLAR Program Assessor” to “PLAR Assessor”, and clarified that a PLAR assessor is a faculty member who is a subject matter expert in the field who will conduct the assessment.

3. Awarding PLAR credit

- Procedure B.1.c.i., Academic Standards – PLAR
 - Revised wording for added clarity: Awarding PLAR credit is at the discretion of the ~~academic department~~ program or department.

4. PLAR Assessment

- Procedure B.5.b.i., Assessment – PLAR
 - Revised wording for added clarity: PLAR will be assessed by qualified ~~individuals~~ faculty with expertise in the relevant curriculum area.

5. Granting Transfer Credit

- Procedure B.6.a.ii.1)
 - Revised wording for added clarity: A **faculty member** designated by ~~for~~ the discipline will determine if the course transfers for direct (assigned) credit.
- Procedure B.6.a.ii.3)

- Revised wording for added clarity: it is the responsibility of the **faculty member** designated by ~~for~~ that discipline to decide what upper level credit, if any, will be granted.

6. Grading and Recognition - PLAR

- Procedure B.8.b.i.: removed “successful” for clarity.
- Removed original sub-bullet iii. “If the PLAR assessment process if unsuccessful, a grade of NCG (no credit granted) will appear on the academic transcript.”
- Procedure B.8.b.iii.
 - Revised wording for added clarity: **Duplicate** PLAR credit will not be ~~granted~~ awarded for a course previously transcribed.

Policy Sponsor: Provost and Vice President Academic

Approving Jurisdiction: Senate

Policy Developer: Working Group for Recognition of Prior Learning

Step(s)		Action(s)	Date(s)	Submission Deadline
1.	Formalize Policy Working Group. Solicit feedback from stakeholder group(s) on draft policy and procedure. Finalize draft policy and procedure.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review best practices, draft Policy and Procedures, set up monthly working group meetings between August 2019 to January 2020 Research/preliminary consultations. 	May 29, 2019 – January 10, 2020	
2.	Provost	For approval to proceed to PUE.	January 15 – January 29, 2020	
3.	PUE	For approval to proceed to public posting.	February 4, 2020	January 29, 2020
4.	KPU Policy Blog (6-week public posting) <i>Senate Standing Committee on Policy</i> <i>Senate Standing Committee on APP</i>	6-week public posting period on KPU Policy Blog. <i>For feedback.</i> <i>For feedback.</i>	February 5 – March 17, 2020 <i>March 4, 2020</i> <i>March 6, 2020</i>	 <i>February 24, 2020</i> <i>February 21, 2020</i>
5.	Finalize draft policy and procedure.	Respond to blog comment(s), if any. Finalize draft Policy and Procedure and incorporate feedback where appropriate.	March 18 - April 3, 2020	
6.	Provost (Sponsor)	For approval to proceed to PUE.	April 9 - April 15, 2020	
7.	PUE	For approval to proceed to final approval process.	April 22, 2020	April 15, 2020
8.	Senate Standing Committee on Policy <i>Senate Standing Committee on APP</i>	For approval to Senate for approval. <i>For review.</i>	May 6, 2020 <i>May 8, 2020</i>	April 27, 2020 <i>April 24, 2020</i>
9.	Senate	For approval.	May 25, 2020	May 15, 2020
For Implementation September 1, 2020				

Acting Vice Provost, Teaching & Learning: Report for Senate Standing Committee on Academic Planning & Priorities & Senate Standing Committee on University Budget

April 17, 2020 (for the period of March 14- April 17)

SUPPORTING THE PIVOT TO REMOTE DELIVERY

- In response to the need to rapidly pivot to remote delivery, the Teaching & Learning Commons built the [Keep Teaching](#) website, which includes resources, strategies, and other supports.
- **Additional resources** developed include a [Summer Moodle course template](#), a [New to Moodle? \(Basics\) video tutorial](#) for new faculty, a [Moodle rubrics video tutorial](#), a one-week intensive course for faculty on [Learning to Teach Online](#), and a guide for [designing online courses](#).
- Over the four weeks covered by this report, the Commons team satisfied **more than 700 individual requests for assistance**.
- The Commons team (i.e. Learning Technology, Educational Consultants, and Teaching Fellows) spent **over 75 hours on consultations** with faculty (individuals and departments). Consultation and support requests can be submitted through this [intake form](#).
- In addition, the Commons team offered **workshops/webinars** on BigBlueButton (Advanced), Kaltura Capture: Teaching with Audio, Kaltura Capture: Teaching with Video, and Engaging Students with Video.
- Working closely with IT and the Library, we satisfied nearly every **request for devices** we received from faculty (e.g., laptop, iPad, etc.).
- Working with the Deans and IT, we solicited and are processing **requests for software** needed for teaching and learning.

Keep Teaching

This website has been developed to support KPU instructors who need to plan and facilitate teaching and learning activities remotely in the event of an unexpected campus closure. This site provides quick tips, strategies, and tools for moving teaching and learning resources (e.g., lectures and readings) and practices (e.g., activities and assessments) online.

If you need support with learning technologies, educational media, or redesigning learning activities or assessments, please [use this intake form](#). This will enable us to determine your needs and assign the appropriate team member to assist you.

This site was last updated: April 17, 2020, 3:00PM

Getting started with Remote Delivery

Things to consider if you need to move your course delivery online.

[+SHOW ME](#)

Using Moodle?

Are you currently using Moodle? Learn how to fully leverage Moodle and its integrated technologies.

[+LEARN MORE](#)

Not using Moodle?

Are you not currently using Moodle? Learn about the options available to you.

[+LEARN MORE](#)

Student Support

Learn about the supports available to students learning remotely.

[+LEARN MORE](#)

Learning Opportunities

Learn about training opportunities and resources for remote teaching and online course design.

[+LEARN MORE](#)

Designing Online Courses

Learn about principles of online learning and strategies for designing an effective online course.

[+LEARN MORE](#)

Need immediate help?

Blog Posts

Our blog “[Friday Morning Coffee](#)” has been updated weekly with posts by members of the Teaching & Learning Commons team. Recent posts include:

- [Microphones for Teaching & Learning](#) (G. Cobb)
- [KPU Instructors Transitioning to Remote Learning: Four Faculty Share Their Stories](#) (G. Cobb)
- [UDL and Moving Online](#) (S. Takacs)
- [Compassion](#) (S. Takacs)
- [Pivots, Pirouettes, and Piqués: Gracefully Managing the Anxieties of Remote Teaching and Learning](#) (R. Jhangiani)

UPCOMING

- **Level Up: Learning to Teach Online:** New for the Summer semester! We have developed an intensive learning experience for faculty to conceptualize online learning and design an effective and engaging online course. The first two cohorts of this week-long online course will begin on April. Registration is full but a waitlist for future offerings is available. [REGISTER HERE](#)
- **OLC Innovate:** KPU has purchased an unlimited group package which allows any member of the KPU community with an OLC account to attend this fully virtual conference. The conference will take place from June 15 – 26 and will include more than 200 sessions, keynotes, and industry showcases. Attendees will also be able to access recorded sessions up to one year after the event. [MORE INFO](#)

FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES

0.6% Faculty Professional Development Fund

Thank you to all who submitted applications for the February deadline; a total of \$157,600.00 in funding was awarded. The next deadline for submission will be June 1. [LEARN MORE](#)

Scholarly Inquiry Grants (SIGs)

Grants of up to \$2,000 are available year-round to faculty members looking to engage in projects relating to the enhancement of teaching or of student learning. Applications are accepted on an ongoing basis. [APPLICATION INFORMATION](#)

Open Educational Resources (OER) Grants

The Open Educational Resources (OER) Grant program provides funding and staff support to KPU faculty members interested in creating, adapting, and adopting OER (or engaging in other forms of Open Pedagogy). The next deadline for applications is May 1. Three levels of OER Grants are offered:

1. [OER Adoption Grant](#)
2. [OER Adaptation Grant](#)
3. [OER Creation Grant](#)



SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING AND PRIORITIES AND ON UNIVERSITY BUDGET

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

Friday, January 10, 2020

10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Surrey Campus Boardroom, Cedar 2110

SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING AND PRIORITIES		
Present: (Quorum: 6 voting members)		Ex-Officio / Non-voting
Natasha Campbell (Chair) David Florkowski Andhra Goundrey Deepak Gupta Andre Iwanchuk Michelle Molnar	Catherine Schwichtenberg Tom Westgate Allyson Rozell Randal Thiessen	David Burns Stephanie Chu Zena Mitchell Sandy Vanderburgh Lori McElroy
		Ex-Officio / Voting
		Alan Davis
Regrets:	Senate Office	Guests:
Kristan Ash Ranpal Sandhu	Meredith Laird	Steve Cardwell Ann Marie McLellan
SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY BUDGET		
Present: (Quorum: 8 voting members)		Ex-Officio / Non-voting
Barnabe Assogba Faith Auton-Cuff Sonu Bratch Caroline Daniels Rebecca Harbut	Stephanie Howes Robert Ironside Reza Khakbaznejad Waheed Taiwo Tom Westgate	David Burns (Chair) Natasha Campbell Joe Sass Sandy Vanderburgh
		Ex-Officio / Voting
		Alan Davis
Regrets:	Senate Office	Guests:
Seanna Takacs Stephanie Phillips Diane Purvey Guramritpal Singh	Meredith Laird	Stefanie Singer Elena Franco Joe Sass Candice Gartry

1. Call to Order

Natasha Campbell called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

2. Approval of Agenda

Rebecca Harbut moved the agenda be accepted as circulated.

The motion carried.

3. Approval of Minutes, December 6, 2019

David Florkowski moved the minutes be confirmed as circulated.

The motion carried.

4. Chair's Report

Natasha Campbell welcomed Candice Gartry from Finance.

Action: Sandy Vanderburgh and Lori McElroy to review the Strategic Enrolment Planning Council documents distributed to SSCAPP members in December to determine if they may be more widely circulated.

5. Update on University Budget

Joe Sass provided members with a FY2020/21 Key Budget Highlights document. He answered questions on the financial documents that circulated in December. He highlighted the reallocation of \$150,000 to Teaching & Learning and \$320,000 to Research and Scholarship. He praised individuals throughout the organization for collaboration and breaking down silos to address issues.

He described to the committee how Strategic Enrolment Management has helped to flatten out the enrolment volatility.

David Burns, Chair of the Senate Standing Committee on University Budget, praised the work of the Finance team in working to address the priorities established by Senate.

Alan Davis asked for members' feedback and questions.

Reza Khakbaznejad informed the committee that training for new software and IT equipment is part of the investment in new technology. He described a new initiative for training in administrative tools that are owned by the University in order that employees may make full use of the tools available.

Deepak Gupta informed the committee that there was already funding for two Canada Research Chairs and the possibility of a third, with an announcement expected in April. He answered questions the approvals required for research involving animals.

Sandy Vanderburgh informed the committee that funding has been allocated for a genomics lab and the Research Chairs, as well as an innovation component to the Research portfolio.

Rebecca Harbut moved that the Senate Standing Committees on Academic Planning and Priorities and on University Budget recommend that Senate advise the President that the 2020/2021 Draft University Budget enacts the priorities given on October 28, 2019.

The motion carried.

David Burns introduced the revised draft plan for review of the budget beginning in Fiscal 2021/22.

Waheed Taiwo moved to amend the draft Budget Assessment process to add an October executive update and questions session and a review of spending actuals in June.

The motion carried.

Tom Westgate moved that the Senate Standing Committees on Academic Planning and Priorities and on University Budget recommend that Senate approve the amended Senate draft Budget Assessment process and the 2021 / 2022 Key Dates.

The motion carried.

6. Items for Discussion

None.

7. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 10:48 a.m.



SENATE STANDING COMMITTEES ON ACADEMIC PLANNING AND PRIORITIES AND ON UNIVERSITY BUDGET

Agenda Item: 11.3
Meeting Date: May 8, 2020
Presenter: David Burns

Agenda Item: 2021 / 2022 Draft Budget Assessment Process

Action Requested:

- ☒ Motion to Approve
☐ Discussion
☐ Information

**Recommended
Resolution**

THAT the Joint Committee recommend that Senate approve the Senate Budget Assessment Process and meeting dates.

**Context &
Background:**

University Act, Section 62 (2): *The president must prepare and submit to the board an annual budget in consultation with the appropriate standing committee of the senate.*

SSC Academic Planning and Priorities Mandate: *Advise the Senate Standing Committee on the University Budget on the academic priorities for the allocation of funds.*

SSC University Budget Mandate: *On behalf of Senate, and in consultation with the Senate Standing Committee on Academic Planning and Priorities, advise the President and Vice-Presidents on the review and development of academic budgetary priorities, major capital plans, and the allocation of funds.*

Key Messages:

1. On January 27, 2020 Senate approved the draft Senate Budget Process and the 2021 / 2022 Key Dates and requested KPU Finance to visit Faculty Councils in February 2021.
2. The Joint Committee needs to choose the date, attendees, and agenda for an executive meeting in October.
3. The Joint Committees will approve the final dates in June 2020 when the budget assessment process cycle for the 2021 / 2022 begins.

Attachments:

Draft 2021 / 2022 Senate Budget Assessment Process

Submitted by: *Rita Zamluk, Administrative Assistant, University Senate*

Date submitted: *April 29, 2020*

SENATE BUDGET ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES				
	President	SSCAPP / SSCUB ("Joint Committee")	Senate	Draft 2021 / 2022 Budget Development Meeting Dates
May	* President meets with Joint Committee	* Joint Committee reviews and recommends that Senate approve the final draft of Senate Budget Assessment Process and meeting dates of Joint Committee	* Senate approves the agenda items and timelines for Senate and Senate Standing Committees	May 7, 2020: Joint Committee May 31, 2020: Senate
June	* President receives Senate advice on initial principles and priorities	* Joint Committee provides feedback on 2021/22 Budget Philosophy and Key Tenets * Joint Committee provides feedback on Executive priorities and budget philosophy and makes recommendation to Senate.	* Senate receives and provides feedback on 2021/22 Budget Tenets & Philosophy * Senate advises the President on Executive priorities and budget philosophy.	June 4, 2020: Joint Committee June 28, 2020: Senate
July				
August				
September		* Joint Committee reviews and makes recommendations on priorities for the draft 5-year budget * Financial Services provides documents for review, presents the budget and answers questions of the committees		September 25, 2020: Joint Committee
October		* Joint Committee reviews the 2021 / 22 draft University Budget and advises Senate on alignment with priorities *Meeting with Executive	* Senate advises the President on the priorities in the 2021 / 22 Draft University Budget	October 2, or October 9, Executive meeting October 16, 2020: Joint Committee October 26, 2020: Senate
November				
December				
January		* Financial Services presents an updated version of the 2021 / 22 draft University Budget and * Joint Committee advises Senate on alignment with priorities	* Senate advises the President on the alignment	January 8, 2021: Joint Committee January 25, 2021: Senate
February				
March				
April				



SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING AND PRIORITIES AND UNIVERSITY BUDGET

Agenda Item: 11.4

Meeting Date: May 8, 2020

Presenter: David Burns

Agenda Item: Senate Effectiveness Survey

Action Requested:

- ☐ Motion to Approve
- ☐ Discussion
- ☒ Information

**Senate Standing
Committee Report:**

For Senate Office Use Only

**Context &
Background:**

Office of Planning and Accountability regularly conducts a [survey to gauge Senate Effectiveness](#). The most recent survey was conducted in June 2017, following which President Alan Davis and David Burns, Vice-Chair of Senate, compiled and presented a [list of recommendations](#) to the Senate Governance Committee and to Senate in November 2017.

Several changes have been instituted based on the recommendations made and this year's survey will assess progress against these recommendations. New questions in this year's survey will assess new aspects of Senate effectiveness.

Key Messages:

1. Senators will be asked to complete a Senate Effectiveness Survey in May, 2020.
2. Office of Planning and Accountability will analyze the data and present a report to the Chair and Vice-Chair of Senate.
3. The Chair and Vice-Chair will compile and present recommendations to the Senate Governance and Nominating Committee and to Senate.

Submitted by:

Meredith Laird, Administrative Assistant, University Senate

Date submitted:

March 11, 2020



SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY BUDGET

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

Friday, January 10, 2020

11:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Surrey Campus Boardroom, Cedar 2110

SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY BUDGET		
Present: (Quorum: 8 voting members)		Ex-Officio / Non-voting
Barnabe Assogba Faith Auton-Cuff Sonu Bratch Caroline Daniels Rebecca Harbut	Stephanie Howes Robert Ironside Reza Khakbaznejad Waheed Taiwo Tom Westgate	David Burns (Chair) Natasha Campbell Joe Sass Sandy Vanderburgh
		Ex-Officio / Voting
Regrets:	Senate Office	Guests:
Alan Davis Stephanie Phillips Diane Purvey Guramritpal Singh Seanna Takacs	Meredith Laird	Candice Gartry Elena Franco Stefanie Singer Brian Moukperian Kristie Dukewich Gerard Laverty

8. Call to Order

David Burns called the meeting to order at 11:00 a.m.

9. Approval of Agenda

Robert Ironside moved the agenda be accepted as circulated.

The motion carried.

10. Approval of Minutes, December 6, 2019

Tom Westgate moved the minutes be confirmed as circulated.

The motion carried.

11. Chair's Report

David Burns highlighted the progress made on Strategic Enrolment Management and the efforts of Finance to support this work.

12. Certificate in Farrier Science

Brian Moukperian, Dean of the Faculty of Trades and Technology, informed the committee that the Certificate in Farrier Science program proposal represents the culmination of a great deal of work, which included multiple meetings with the Program Advisory Committee and the Teaching and Learning Commons. He asserted that the reconfiguration of this Program represents the best of

polytechnic work of the institution, and noted that a large proportion of students of the program are women (which supports the University's work to diversify participation in the skilled trades). Brian Moukperian described how the Faculty of Trades and Technology determined the number of prospective students and informed the committee that the request for funds for marketing in the budget as presented may increase once the marketing plan is solidified.

Gerard Laverty, instructor, informed the committee that the Farrier Program attracts students from the United States and across the country, as well as from within BC. He advised the committee that a number of Farrier Program graduates become self-employed while others choose to move into other aspects of animal care.

Joe Sass, Executive Director, Finance and Administration, briefly described how overhead figures are calculated and requested direction from the committee about how budget information might be presented to better assist in academic decision-making.

Sandy Vanderburgh, Provost and Vice-President, Academic, praised the proponents for their work in writing this full program proposal. He informed the committee that the Program falls well within the expected costs for programs and that the current finances were more sound than in previous years. He informed the committee that the curriculum proposed answers very well to what the equine industry is seeking.

David Burns pointed out that programs are made stronger by integrating organizations such as the Program Advisory Committee in planning.

Action: David Burns to work with Finance about how to report overhead cost to the committee.

Rebecca Harbut moved THAT the Senate Standing Committee on University Budget recommend that Senate recommend that the Board of Governors approve the Full Program Proposal for the Certificate in Farrier Science, with an effective date of September 1, 2020.

The motion carried.

13. Items for Discussion

14. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 11:32 a.m.



SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY BUDGET

Agenda Item: 17
Meeting Date: May 8, 2020
Presenter: David Burns

Agenda Item: Notice of Election of Committee Chair

Action Requested:

- ☐ Motion to Approve
- ☐ Discussion
- ☒ Information

**Context &
Background:**

The term for David Burns as Chair of the Senate Standing Committee on University Budget will end August 31, 2020.

Key Messages:

1. All Senators who are members of the committee are eligible to be elected as committee Chair.
2. The Chairs of Senate standing committees are normally elected for a three-year term beginning in September. The term of office will be from September 1, 2020 to August 31, 2023.
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 secret ballot.
4. The Vice Chair of Senate will conduct the election of committee Chair.

Submitted by:

David Burns, Vice-Chair, Senate

Date submitted:

February 4, 2020