

SENATE
Regular Meeting
Monday, June 28, 2021
4:00 p.m. – 6:45 p.m.
MS Teams Online

AGENDA

1. Territorial Acknowledgement and Call to Order Alan Davis 4:00
2. Approval of Agenda
3. Approval of Minutes, May 31, 2021
4. Chair's Report
 - 4.1. Board Response to Senate FY 2021 - 22 Budget Recommendations.... Michael McAdam 4:10
 - 4.2. President's Report to Senate Alan Davis 4:20
 - 4.2.1 Fall 2021 and the New KPU
 - 4.3. Provost's Report to Senate..... Sandy Vanderburgh 4:50
 - 4.3.1 Semi-annual Update:
Educational Excellence: A White Paper on KPU's Research and Scholarship 4:55
5. Senate Standing Committee on Curriculum David Burns 5:05
 - 5.1. Consent Agenda, June 28, 2021
 - 5.2. Department Name Change for Business Graduate Courses
 - 5.3. Program Change: Certificate in Foundations in Design
6. Senate Executive Committee Alan Davis 5:15
 - 6.1. Empowering the Senate Executive Committee
 - 6.2. Date Changes: Spring 2022 Exam Period.....Zena Mitchell 5:20
 - 6.3. Senate Orientation DayAmy Jeon 5:25
7. Senate Governance and Nominating Committee Sharmen Lee 5:30
 - 7.1. 2021 06 Nominations
 - 7.2. Search Advisory Committee:
Associate Vice-President, Program Development and Curriculum
 - 7.3. Faculty Bylaw Revisions
 - 7.3.1 Faculty of Educational Support and Development 5:35
 - 7.3.2 Faculty of Trades and Technology 5:40
 - 7.4. AC 13 *Faculty Qualifications*: Operations and Technical Management..... 5:45

8. Joint Senate Standing Committee on Academic Planning and Priorities and on University Budget.....	Heather Clark	5:50
8.1. 2021-22 Budget Principles and Priorities.....	Alan Davis	5:55
9. Senate Standing Committee on Appeals (no report).....	Sandy Vanderburgh	
10. Senate Standing Committee on Library (no report)	Marti Alger	
11. Senate Standing Committee on Policy	Carlos Calao	6:05
11.1. AC15 <i>Micro-credentials</i>	Rajiv Jhangiani	6:10
12. Senate Standing Committee on Program Review Annual Report	David Burns	6:20
13. Senate Standing Committee on Research and Graduate Studies.....	David Burns	6:30
14. Senate Standing Committee on Teaching and Learning (no report)	Lyndsay Passmore	
15. Senate Standing Committee on Tributes	Andre Iwanchuk	6:35
16. Office of the Registrar.....	Zena Mitchell	6:40
16.1. Approval of Graduates to June 28, 2021		
17. Items for Discussion.....	Alan Davis	6:45
18. Adjournment to Closed Meeting		

SENATE

Minutes of Regular Meeting

Monday, May 31, 2021

4:00 p.m. - 7:00 p.m.

MS Teams Online

Voting Member Quorum 18 members		
Aimee Begalka Alan Davis (Chair) Amy Jeon Andhra Goundrey Andre Iwanchuk Bogdan Bryja Bob Davis Brian Moukperian Carlos Calao Corrie Nichols	David Burns (Vice-Chair) Diane Purvey Elizabeth Worobec Fergal Callaghan Heather Clark Marti Alger Melissa Krahn Melissa Swanink	Natasha Campbell Robert Dearle Sandy Vanderburgh Sharmen Lee Stephanie Howes Steve Cardwell Todd Mundle Tom Westgate Waheed Taiwo
		Non-voting
		Zena Mitchell (Secretary)
Regrets	Senate Office	Guests
Akshat Garg Kim Baird (Chancellor) Catherine Schwichtenberg Pallav Sharma Lyndsay Passmore Harman Singh Sharanveer Singh Tahir Joseph	Meredith Laird Rita Zamluk	Donald Reddick Lori McElroy

1. Territorial Acknowledgement and Call to Order

The Chair, Alan Davis, provided a territorial acknowledgement and called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. Senate held a minute of silence in memory of the children whose bodies were uncovered in the grounds of the former Kamloops Indian Residential School.

2. Approval of Agenda

Robert Dearle moved the agenda be confirmed as circulated.

The motion carried.

3. Approval of Minutes April 19, 2021

Change 5.2.8

Sharmen Lee moved the minutes be accepted as amended.

The motion carried.

4. Chair's Report

4.1. President's Report to Senate

The President presented his report.

4.1.1. Senate as a Forum for Discussing Important Matters

Alan Davis presented the idea of having presentations at Senate to encourage and encourage future discussion. A schedule of presentations will be prepared for the 2021 – 22 academic year. The Chair asked Senators to send discussion ideas for the coming year to him. David Burns reminded senators that these sessions will not be part of the Senate meeting and hence will not include the taking of minutes, consideration of motions or a call to order.

4.2. Provost's Report to Senate

The Provost presented his report. He commended staff, students and faculty for all their work to engage and take care of KPU students while everyone was working online during the pandemic. He updated Senate on search committee progress.

4.2.1. Oversight of Educational Quality

The Provost presented a report on the role of the Board in assuring educational quality in a Canadian university. He described briefly the program quality assurance processes that KPU currently follows.

Alan Davis reported that the next step is to update the Board on the US Association of Governing Board (AGB) practices. Reporting to both Senate and the Board of Governors ensures that everyone knows what is going on in the overlapping areas of bicameral governance.

5. Senate Standing Committee on Curriculum

5.1. Consent Agenda, May 31, 2021

David Burns moved that Senate approve the attached list of new, revised, and discontinued courses.

The motion carried.

5.2. Program Changes

5.2.1. Diploma in Traditional Chinese Medicine, Acupuncture

David Burns moved that Senate approve the revised continuance and admission requirements for the Diploma in Traditional Chinese Medicine – Acupuncture, effective September 1, 2022.

The motion carried.

5.2.2. Bachelor of Science in Nursing Advanced Entry

David Burns moved that Senate approve the amended revisions to the Bachelor of Science in Nursing – Advanced Entry Program, effective September 1, 2022.

The motion carried.

5.2.3. Bachelor of Science in Nursing

David Burns moved that Senate approve the attached revisions to the Admission Requirements for the Bachelor of Science in Nursing (BSN), effective September 1, 2022.

The motion carried.

5.2.4. Bachelor of Psychiatric Nursing

David Burns moved that Senate approve the attached revisions to the Bachelor of Psychiatric Nursing (BPN), effective September 1, 2022.

The motion carried.

5.2.5. Certificate in Education Assistant

David Burns moved that Senate approve the amended revisions to the Certificate in Education Assistant program, effective September 1, 2021.

The motion carried.

5.2.6. Post Baccalaureate Diploma in Accounting

David Burns moved that Senate approve the revision to the Post-Baccalaureate Diploma in Accounting, effective September 1, 2021.

The motion carried.

6. Senate Executive Committee

The Chair of the Senate Executive Committee, Alan Davis, gave a brief verbal report.

7. Senate Governance and Nominations Committee

The Chair, Sharman Lee, presented her report.

7.1. 2021 04 Nominations

Sharmen Lee moved that Senate appoint the nominees listed on 2021 05 Nominations.

The motion carried.

8. Joint Senate Standing Committee on Academic Planning and Priorities and on University Budget

The Chair, Heather Clark, provided her report and introduced Tara Clowes, Vice-President, Administration and Finance.

8.1. FY2022 / 23 University Budget Timeline

Tara Clowes presented the FY 2022 – 23 budget development timeline and briefly described each major stage.

8.2. Institutional Recognition: Scottish Qualifications Authority

Donald Reddick, Associate Dean, School of Business introduced the topic and provided background details.

Heather Clark moved that Senate approve the request for institutional recognition from the Scottish Qualifications Authority, effective September, 2021.

The motion carried.

9. Senate Standing Committee on Appeals

The Chair, Sandy Vanderburgh, Provost, presented the report. He highlighted the training provided for the committee and others at KPU. He reported that the committee has not conducted any hearings in the past year. As Provost, he has written about four decision letters in the past year. Zena Mitchell, University Registrar, provided further information regarding the policies that govern the appeals process.

10. Senate Standing Committee on the Library

Marti Alger, Chair, provided her report. She highlighted progress on the strategic plan, the library mail-out service, and on indigenous services.

11. Senate Standing Committee on Policy

No report

12. Senate Standing Committee on Program Review

David Burns, Chair, provided a report and two quality assurance plans to Senate. He reported that this year will be the most productive year for program reviews to date. He thanked the committee members for their work.

Alan Davis congratulated the committee on their work.

12.1. Quality Assurance Plan:

12.1.1. Bachelor of Horticulture Science

12.1.2. Philosophy

13. Senate Standing Committee on Research and Graduate Studies

David Burns, Vice-Chair of Senate, provided a report on behalf of the Chair, Daniel Bernstein.

14. Senate Standing Committee on Teaching and Learning

No report

15. Senate Standing Committee on Tributes

No report.

16. Office of the Registrar

16.1. Approval of Graduates to May 31, 2021

Zena Mitchell reported that about 1,500 students will be graduating this year.

Alan Davis described the activities underway to hold the virtual convocation this spring. He reported that the fall convocation will be virtual as well.

Waheed Taiwo moved that Senate approve the list of graduates to May 31, 2021.

The motion carried.

16.2. Election of Senate Vice-Chair

The term of office is from September 1, 2021 to August 31, 2022.

Zena Mitchell, University Registrar, conducted the election and called for nominations:

First call: Fergal Callaghan nominated Amy Jeon. Amy Jeon accepted the nomination.

Second call: no nominations

Third call: no nominations

Amy Jeon was acclaimed as the Vice-Chair of Senate for a one-year term ending August 31, 2022.

16.3. Notice of Fall Byelection

Zena Mitchell, Registrar, announced she will hold fall byelection for a faculty senator from the School of Business, and the Faculty of Educational Support and Development. The call for nominations will occur in August, 2021.

17. Items for discussion

No items for discussion.

18. Adjournment to Closed Meeting

The meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

SENATE

Agenda Item: 4.1

Meeting Date: June 28, 2021

Presenter: Michael McAdam

Agenda Item	Board Response to Senate 2021/22 Budget Recommendations
Action Requested	Information
Context & Background	<p>As part of the Budget Development Process, the Senate Standing Committee on University Budget (SSCUB) provides to Senate an evaluation of the alignment of the proposed budget to academic and strategic priorities of KPU and, if in agreement, a recommendation to Senate to endorse the proposed budget.</p> <p>Senate then provides, based on SSCUB's feedback, recommendations to the Board of Governors (BOG) for the continued improvement and enhancement of the budget process. The Board of Governors then provides a board-approved response to Senate's recommendations.</p> <p>The 2021 / 22 budget development process was unique given the ongoing impacts of the COVID 19 pandemic and the institution presenting a deficit budget. For the 2021 / 22 budget development process SSCUB and Senate reviewed and endorsed the budget on two separate occasions as the underlying budget assumptions continued to adjust.</p> <p>At its meeting held on May 26, 2021, the Board of Governors approved the Response to the Senate 2021-22 Budget Recommendations.</p>
Key Messages	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Senate endorsed the 2021/22 budget, and is in agreement that budgetary key themes are in alignment with KPU's budget tenets and priorities. 2. The Board is in agreement with the comments provided by Senate.
Attachments	2021 05 18 Memo: SSCUB's Recommendations to Senate for Transmittal to the Board of Governors
Submitted by	<i>Ranminder Kaur, Confidential Assistant to the Board of Governors</i>
Date submitted	<i>June 9, 2021</i>



KWANTLEN POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY

12666 – 72ND Ave.
Surrey, BC Canada V3W 2M8

MEMORANDUM

TO: SENATE
CC: Senate Standing Committee on University Budget (SSCUB)
FROM: Michael McAdam, Chair, Board Finance Committee
DATE: May 18, 2021
SUBJECT: SSCUB's Recommendations to Senate for Transmittal to the Board of Governors

Dear Senate Members:

KPU's Board of Governors wishes to express its sincere thanks and appreciation to Senate and the Senate Standing Committee on University Budget (SSCUB) for their time and efforts spent in reviewing the University's draft 2021/22 budget, as well as for the advice they provided to the President. The diligent work and insightful feedback provided by Senate and SSCUB are very valuable and appreciated.

The 2021/22 budget development was unique given the ongoing impacts of the COVID 19 pandemic. For the first time Kwantlen Polytechnic University's administration presented a deficit budget for approval, which involved multiple rounds of informative presentations and budget development. The Board of Governors recognizes the increased diligence of Senate and the supporting role SSCUB played in two separate instances of endorsing the annual budget. The Board has asked administration to continue to work to return KPU to a balanced budgeted financial position.

SENATE

Agenda Item: 4.2

Meeting Date: June 28, 2021

Presenter: Alan Davis

Report to Senate Alan Davis, President and Vice Chancellor

In addition to regular administrative and governance meetings, there has been continued outreach to government and the community, both internally and externally.

On June 1st, the Indigenous Advisory Committee met, and spent its time working through the impact of the former Kamloops Residential School discovery of the remains of 215 children. I did my best to convey what I heard in my weekly [video message](#).

The BCAIU presidents had their regular meeting on June 2nd, and I was pleased to attend the virtual YWCA Women of Distinction event on June 7 (where Board Governor Rhianon Bennett, Dr. Balbir Gurm (Faculty of Health), and honorary graduate Dr. Joanne Archibald were all nominated). The regular KPU Foundation Board meeting was held on June 8th.

On June 9th I was pleased to join a group of college and polytechnic presidents in a discussion about the role of Marketing and Communications in post-secondary education during the pandemic, hosted by the MarComm Guild.

On the same day I joined the executive team in the last session in the Cultural Competency training program offered by the Canadian Centre for Diversity and Inclusion. The objective in the program is “to help participants understand the fundamental concepts of culture, so they can work toward being more culturally competent in their interactions with individuals from different cultural norms.”

On June 18th I attend a meeting of the faculty council for Academic and Career Preparation to discuss research and scholarship at KPU and later the same day we hosted a safe visit of Andrew Mercier (MLA for Langley) to KPU Tech to observe how we have continued with our programming during the pandemic.

That evening I attended and spoke at the opening session of CINI 2021: Integrative Thinking and Health: Post-COVID: a 3-day conference of which KPU is a sponsor.

On June 23rd I was pleased to provide a welcome to the Surrey Board of Trade event: BC's Education and Childcare with BC Minister of Education Jennifer Whiteside and Katrina Chen, Minister of State for Child Care.

On June 24th my State of the University address was broadcast, and June 25th was the regular meeting of the BCNet Board.

SENATE

Agenda Item: 4.2.1

Meeting Date: June 28, 2021

Presenter: Alan Davis

Agenda Item **Fall 2021 and the New KPU**

Action Requested	Information
Context & Background	<p>On March 8, 2021, B.C.'s Provincial Health Officer (PHO) advised that all public post-secondary institutions were able to plan for a full return to on-campus teaching, learning and research in September 2021.</p> <p>The following is description of both teaching and non-teaching activities for the Fall semester and beyond.</p>
Key Messages	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In anticipation for the finalized Go-Forward Guidelines that are to be implemented August 1, KPU is relying on the COVID-19 Return-to-Campus Primer and the lessons learned over the past year to plan for a return-to-campus in September with a new approach to learning and working at KPU – the New KPU. 2. Recent student satisfaction surveys suggest that many enjoy the flexibilities of remote learning and a majority would like to preserve some elements, while others are missing the student life experience of physically being on campus. In response to this feedback, scheduling is underway for the Fall and all plans will reflect those desires and will proceed in accordance with all existing and new safety measures. 3. Similar to students, many employees have expressed interest in more flexible and blended ways of working post-pandemic. KPU has responded to this feedback have marked September as a “transition semester” for our journey to the New KPU.
Resource Requirements	<p>The announcement is a fundamental shift in how we practice our core businesses and will impact all aspects of teaching, learning, research and scholarship, student service, university-wide service, governance and events. The support of all leaders and employees is required to move forward.</p>

Implications / Risks

KPU is a complex learning ecosystem and all proposed changes are subject to and contingent upon the necessary technology resources and HR supports, we can all expect additional changes over the coming semester as we strive to find the proper balance across service and administrative units.

Attachments

Fall 2021 and the New KPU

Submitted by

Alan Davis

Date submitted

June 11, 2021

FALL 2021 AND THE NEW KPU

June 28, 2021

Background

Since March of 2020, through the creativity and hard work of all employees in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, KPU developed a wide range of new and innovative ways to continue our core businesses of teaching, learning, research and scholarship, student service, university-wide service, governance and events. Specifically, we have excelled in communicating and collaborating effectively across the region and around the globe using video technology. Amongst the numerous challenges and changes that were presented by the pandemic, KPU achieved the following goals; all of which were accomplished without any incidents of transmission of COVID-19 on campus:

- Greater flexibility and work/life balance for both students and employees;
- Enhanced digital technology skills for both students and employees;
- Increased accessibility to education and reduced geographical barriers – students no longer experience the same geographical constraints of required courses only being offered at certain campuses and when offered remotely, courses become more accessible; finally
- Reduced dependency on vehicle travel between campuses for classes and meetings and the sustainability benefits that follow support our endeavors to be carbon neutral by 2050.

On March 8, 2021, B.C.'s Provincial Health Officer (PHO) advised that all public post-secondary institutions were able to plan for a full return to on-campus teaching, learning and research in September 2021. This decision was supported by the PHO's confidence in mass immunization, updated health and safety protocols and the consistent review and re-calibration of multi-layered institutional safety plans.

For a September return, KPU is proceeding on the basis of provincial forecasts that transmission rates will be low, and that all adults in B.C. will have had the opportunity to receive at least one dose of the COVID-19 vaccine.

In anticipation for the finalized Go-Forward Guidelines that are to be implemented August 1, KPU is relying on the [COVID-19 Return-to-Campus Primer](#) and the lessons learned over the past year to plan for a return-to-campus in September with a new approach to learning and working at KPU – the New KPU.

Guiding Principles for a New KPU

KPU will continue to embrace the innovations developed during the pandemic for both remote and blended learning and working opportunities, and utilize the disruption caused by the COVID-19 pandemic to creatively innovate a new future for KPU.

The New KPU will lean on the following guiding principles to respond to both student and employee desires to maintain some of the flexibility offered by remote working and learning options;

Student Experience – KPU will continue to put the interests of students first. On-campus activity will initially be limited to those who directly impact student experience and those who support stakeholders that directly impact student experience.

Work-Life Balance – Plans will consider work-life balance where possible to continue our momentum of less commuting, less carbon footprint and less stress.

Productivity – Plans consider attaining the best outcome by reflecting on what work can be done efficiently and effectively remotely, what must be done on campus, and what allows a blend of the two.

Trust – All plans place trust in our employees to attain our goals regardless of their physical location.

Fall 2021 – Learning

Recent student satisfaction surveys suggest that many enjoy the flexibilities of remote learning and a majority would like to preserve some elements, while others are missing the student life experience of physically being on campus. In response to this feedback, scheduling is underway for the Fall and all plans will reflect those desires and will proceed in accordance with all existing and new safety measures. At this point, we are looking at the following mix of classes:

- 60% will be available face-to-face;
- 25% will be strictly remote based; and
- 15% will be a combination of remote and face-to-face learning.

Faculties and Schools that require more hands-on learning, such as Trades and Science & Horticulture, will have a higher percentage of face-to-face delivery, given the nature of the program.

In the event that B.C. experiences an unanticipated increase in COVID-19 case counts and/or lower-than-expected immunization rates, KPU is equipped to quickly and effectively revert back to remote learning, and continue to exercise the safety protocols in place today.

Fall 2021 - Working

Similar to students, many employees have expressed interest in more flexible and blended ways of working post-pandemic. KPU has responded to this feedback by embracing the guiding principles listed above and September will be a “transition semester” for our journey to the New KPU:

Our first priority is to focus on the return of those employees who serve students directly, and phase in supporting departments when operationally possible. At this time, the future state proposal for non-teaching employees¹ is broken down below:

¹ Represents Excluded Employees, Support Staff (excluding On-call Auxiliaries), and ongoing Student Assistants and Casual Employees.

- 17% of employees will be on campus every day of the work week;
- 78% of employees will be on campus anywhere from 1-4 days a week; and
- 5% of employees will be fully remote.

The above goal will be subject to and contingent upon the necessary technology resources and HR supports, we can all expect these percentages to change as we strive to find the proper balance across service and administrative units.

KPU is a complex learning ecosystem and anything that is proposed by one department may have to be adjusted because of unintended impacts it may have on others.

The university community will be creative and agile and will use this as an opportunity to create a New KPU that stands in alignment with the VISION 2023 goals of improving experiences, increasing sustainability, fostering creativity and ensuring quality. As always, the health and safety of all employees and students will be paramount throughout this transition.

SENATE

Agenda Item: 4.3

Meeting Date: June 28, 2021

Presenter: Sandy Vanderburgh

Report to Senate Dr. Sandy Vanderburgh Provost and Vice-President, Academic June 28, 2021

Provincial News

Compulsory Trades Training

The Province is launching a made-in-B.C. certification system to support higher-paying, more stable work for trades workers and to help build the foundation of a strong economic recovery. The new skilled trades certification system will help deliver steady employment for people and address the demand for skilled workers in BC. It will also create more opportunities for women, Indigenous peoples and those just starting their careers. Based on recommendations from a 16-member stakeholder advisory working group representing industry associations, labor, post-secondary institutions, indigenous skills trainers, and the Industry Training Authority, the 10 initial trades designated for skilled trades certification are:

- gasfitter Class A and B, steamfitter/pipefitter, refrigeration and air conditioning mechanic, and sheet metal worker,
- electrical powerline technician, industrial electrician, and electrician (construction), and
- heavy-duty equipment technician, automotive service technician and autobody and collision technician.

Applied Research Committee

Tony Loughran, ADM; Governance, Legislation and Corporate Planning Division, Ministry of Advanced Education and Training, is leading a committee to review the policy and role of applied research at BC Institutes, Teaching Universities, and Colleges. The committee will be composed of VP Academics and HR representatives from various institutes in our sector. **Dr. Sandy Vanderburgh**, KPU Provost and VP, Academic, will be representing KPU on this committee.

Privacy Committee

Dr. Rajiv Jhangiani, AVP Teaching and Learning, was appointed by the Ministry of Advanced Education and Skills Training (AEST) to participate on behalf of the post-secondary system in a roundtable discussion with **Ministers Anne Kang** and **Lisa Beare** regarding the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (FOIPPA) and data residency. The roundtable will be discussing data residency restrictions under BC's

Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (FIPPA), the scope of FIPPA related wholly owned subsidiaries, and any other issues related to the Act.

Digital Learning

Dr. Sandy Vanderburgh, KPU Provost and VP, Academic, was appointed to the BC Digital Learning Advisory Committee by the AEST. The purpose of this committee is to guide work by the AEST and the post-secondary system to identify the lessons learned from the adoption of digital learning models in post-secondary education over the past year and to incorporate those into existing knowledge and best practices in order to develop recommendations that support flexible, high quality learning experiences and expand opportunities for post-secondary participation to more British Columbians.

Academic Portfolio

Senate Appeals Committee Training

Over the past year members of the Senate Standing Committee on Appeals have undergone extensive training provided by the BC Council of Administrative Tribunals (BCCAT). The training included three components: administrative justice, decision writing, and tribunal hearings.

Research, Innovation and Graduate Studies

Thanks to a very generous donation from the **Dr. Sherman Jen Education Foundation** endowed through the KPU Foundation, KPU is creating two Sherman Jen Research Chairs to conduct research that supports our polytechnic mandate locally, nationally, and globally. The inaugural chairs will be appointed in two key areas for KPU:

The Sherman Jen Research Chair in Next-Generation Design: The Sherman Jen Research Chair in Next-Generation Design will be based at the Wilson School of Design at KPU Richmond. Together with internal and external allies, the Chair will be able to undertake transformational work on next-generation design addressing pressing challenges of technological empowerment, environmental sustainability, and social inclusion.

The Sherman Jen Research Chair in Applied Genomics: The Sherman Jen Research Chair in Applied Genomics will be based in the Faculty of Science and Horticulture at KPU Surrey. Building on prior funding from the Canada Foundation for Innovation and the BC Knowledge Development Fund, KPU has completed a new facility for applied genomics that will serve as the home of this Chair. Together with leading researchers at KPU and other institutions, companies, industry associations, and non-profits, the Chair will be able to positively impact human health outcomes and competitiveness of the agricultural sector.

Teaching and Learning

The new Teaching and Learning Fund has supported eight projects this academic year, with additional proposals currently under review. Supported projects have ranged from the integration of technologies such as 3D scanning, augmented reality, virtual reality, and 3-dimensional illustration in the Wilson School of Design to the development and delivery of wellness labs to serve students in the Faculty of Arts.

People

It has been an unprecedented year, full of personal and professional challenges. Yet, through it all, we have made great accomplishments and continued to raise the prominence of KPU in our communities while still maintaining focus on the success of our students and each other.

Congratulations are in order for the following faculty who were recently acknowledged for their significant accomplishments:

Dr. Balbir Gurm, Nursing Instructor, Faculty of Health, is the recipient of the 2021 BC Achievement Foundation's Community Award, and was nominated for a YWCA Women of Distinction award in the Community Champion category. Balbir was recently recognized by the Canadian Nurses Association, Canadian Academy of Nursing Fellowship Program, as a Fellow of the Canadian Academy of Nursing (FCAN).

Katherine Dunster, Horticulture Instructor, Faculty of Science and Horticulture, was elected to the Fellows for the Canadian Society of Landscape Architects (CSLA). Induction to the College of Fellows is one of the highest honours the CSLA bestows on its members.

Dr. Patricia Coburn, Psychology Instructor, Faculty of Arts, and KPU BA honours alum (2011), will receive the Governor General's Gold Medal at Simon Fraser University's June Convocation. The Governor General's Gold Medal is one of the most prestigious awards given to graduate students in Canada.

Talent Searches

The search for the Associate Dean of the Faculty of Health has concluded and I am pleased to announce that **Sarah Beasleigh**, BSc. Phm, ND, has been appointed to the role and will begin on June 30, 2021. Sarah brings over 20 years of experience in health care and post-secondary education. As a healthcare professional, Sarah has practiced as a pharmacist and naturopathic physician.

Although the search for the next Dean of Science and Horticulture was failed, the search process will be renewed in the fall and **Dr. Elizabeth Worobec** has graciously agreed to continue to serve as the Dean of the Faculty of Science and Horticulture until February 2021. A special thanks to Dean Betty!

Notable meetings and events (to June 17) involving the Provost's Office include:

- BC Association of Institutes and Universities (BCAIU), VP Academics Meeting, May 26.
- Canadian Centre for Diversity and Inclusion (CCDI), *Diversity and Inclusion Influencer Certificate Course 1 – Gender in the Workplace*, May 27.
- Polytechnics Canada, Vice Presidents Academic Meeting, May 28.
- BC Trades and Technology Directors Meeting, June 02.
- Canadian Centre for Diversity and Inclusion (CCDI), *Diversity and Inclusion Influencer Certificate Course 2 – LGBTQ2+*, June 03.

- BC Council of Administrative Tribunals (BCCAT), Appeals Training – *Hearing Skills Workshop*, Day 1 - June 07, Day 2- June 11.
- Lancaster House, 39th Annual Labour Arbitration and Policy Conference. *The Latest Developments: Major caselaw and legislative update and Finding Calm after the Storm: Restoring the workplace and other post-investigation issues*, June 08 and 09
- Canadian Centre for Diversity and Inclusion (CCDI), *Diversity and Inclusion Influencer Certificate Course 3 – Indigenous Inclusion Training*, June 10.
- Learning Continuity Meeting, Ministry of Advanced Education and Training, June 10.
- BC Association of Institutes and Universities (BCAIU), VP Academics Meeting, June 16.
- Canadian Centre for Diversity and Inclusion (CCDI), *Diversity and Inclusion Influencer Certificate Course 4 – Including Persons with Disabilities*, June 17.

SENATE

Agenda Item: 4.3.1

Meeting Date: June 28, 2021

Presenter: Sandy Vanderburgh

Agenda Item **Semi-annual Update:**
Educational Excellence: A White Paper on KPU's Research and Scholarship

Action Requested	Information
Context & Background	The Senate Standing Committee on Research and Graduate Studies brought to Senate a paper, <i>Educational Excellence: A White Paper on KPU's Research and Scholarship</i> , that outlined 25 recommendations for the advancement of research and scholarship at KPU. Those recommendations deemed not within the scope of collective bargaining were brought forward with committees, or persons, designated to lead future discussion. These plans for discussion, the "February 1 st recommendations," were approved by Senate on February 22 nd , 2021.
Key Messages	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In the interest of fostering ongoing conversation the President has committed to bringing regular updates to Senate. 2. Short updates have been provided in the past, but this is the first regular update collecting feedback from several committees.
Consultations	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. David Burns, Chair, SSC Curriculum 2. Heather Clark, Chair, SSC Academic Planning and Priorities 3. Daniel Bernstein, Chair, SSC Research and Graduate Studies 4. Deepak Gupta, AVP Research, Innovation and Graduate Studies 5. Sandy Vanderburgh, Provost
Attachment	Collected WP Reports for June 2021
Submitted by	<i>David Burns, Vice-Chair, University Senate</i>
Date submitted	<i>June 21, 2021</i>

EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE: A WHITE PAPER ON KPU'S RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP

25 Recommendations with June 2021 Update

CONTENTS

A. Student Engagement in Research across the Institution:	1
B. Faculty Appointments / Workload:.....	3
C. Career Trajectory / Title:	4
D. Infrastructure and Start-up Funding:	5
E. Institutional Research Support:.....	6

A. STUDENT ENGAGEMENT IN RESEARCH ACROSS THE INSTITUTION:

1. Possible action through SSC APP: Request that all Faculties and Schools develop research plans in accordance with KPU's Academic Plan.

February 2021 Senate Recommendation: Refer to Chair of SSC AAP/Vice Chair Senate for discussion and recommendation to Senate.

June 2021 Update:

Per Heather Clark. The request that all KPU faculties and schools develop research plans in accordance with KPU's academic plan was shared with Faculty Council chairs on April 27th 2021. Faculty Council chairs are scheduled to next meet June 23rd, an agenda item for this meeting will be discussing the action item from the Whitepaper. The chair of SSCAPP, Heather Clark, and others have been invited to take part in this conversation and agenda item.

Faculty Specific Updates:

ACP discussed the request sent to us about a Faculty Research Plan at our May 21st Council meeting. It was also at this meeting that a motion was passed to recommend a Standing Committee in Research to the ACP Faculty as a Whole. Once this faculty specific research committee is going, they will be tasked to discuss the need for a formal research plan.

Design currently has a faculty-specific research committee, with student representation. Formed in May 2020, the committee has spent the past year engaging in conversations around best practices, opportunities, engagement, and enhancement of research within WSD. A formal, faculty-specific research plan is in development, with additional discussions to continue in the coming months.

2. Possible action through SSC APP, Curriculum, Research: Request that all Departments develop a formalized plan for integrating opportunities for undergraduate research. Research must be regarded as integral to learning objectives and be included, for instance, as a required part of a major.

February 2021 Senate Recommendation: Refer to the relevant standing committee chairs and Vice Chair of Senate for discussion and recommendation to Senate

June 2021 Update:

Per Daniel Bernstein. SSCRGs discussed these items briefly at several meetings in spring of 2021. SSCRGs Chair (Bernstein) will bring both items to the committee for full discussion and action in September and October 2021. Two possible actionable routes to explore and discuss are program review and the Academic Plan. With respect to both routes, SSCRGs might consider recommending that all departments make research a formal component of all future program reviews and that administration explicitly note and address both items in the next Academic Plan. Whatever SSCRGs decides is the best course of action to take on these two items, SSCRGs will consult with the appropriate Senate subcommittee (e.g., APP, SCC).

(repeated under 5)

3. Possible action through SSC APP, Curriculum, Research: Support curriculum and program development initiatives that promote research.

February 2021 Senate Recommendation: Refer to the relevant standing committee chairs and Vice Chair of Senate for discussion and recommendations to Senate

June 2021 Update:

Per David Burns. After the passage of the WP discussion recommendations SSC Curriculum issued a request for all Faculty Councils to respond with their recommendations for ways to promote research through the curricular system. These, after a slight delay to allow for late submissions, will be addressed at the September meeting of the committee.

4. Adjust faculty workloads to accommodate teaching students how to conduct research, as it is time-intensive work.

At the request of the trade union representing instructors, counsellors and librarians. this response has been removed.

5. Possible action through SSC Teaching and Learning, Research: Recognize research as essential to the classroom and to the scholarship of teaching and learning. KPU faculty members need to be proactive in their disciplines to ensure the continued relevance and quality of educational programs.

February 2021 Senate Recommendation: [Linked to 3) above] Refer to the relevant standing committee chairs and Vice Chair of Senate for discussion and recommendations to Senate

June 2021 Update:

Per Daniel Bernstein. SSCRGs discussed these items briefly at several meetings in spring of 2021. SSCRGs Chair (Bernstein) will bring both items to the committee for full discussion and action in September and October 2021. Two possible actionable routes to explore and discuss are program review and the Academic Plan. With respect to both routes, SSCRGs might consider

recommending that all departments make research a formal component of all future program reviews and that administration explicitly note and address both items in the next Academic Plan. Whatever SSCRGs decides is the best course of action to take on these two items, SSCRGs will consult with the appropriate Senate subcommittee (e.g., APP, SCC).

(repeated under 2)

6. Possible action through SSC APP, Curriculum, Research: Encourage the development of graduate programs that improve advanced study/research pathways for students, and that are reflective of KPU's academic focus and particular strengths. These programs should further distinguish KPU as a polytechnic university and create more opportunities for students and the broader communities we serve.

February 2021 Senate Recommendation: Refer to the Provost and AVP R, I and GS for follow up with the Deans and through them with faculty councils etc. with proposals to go to SSC APP and SSC RIGS

June 2021 Update:

Per Sandy Vanderburgh. The Deans were consulted by the AVP-A and a list of potential graduate level programs was developed and submitted to the Provost's Office and a strategy will be developed for prioritizing graduate program planning and the Provost has an upcoming meeting with the ADM of AEST to discuss KPU program related matters.

Per Deepak Gupta. Work is underway on a draft graduate studies regulations to enable this. Josephine Chan, Dr. David Florkowski, Dr. Deepak Gupta, and Zena Mitchell are collaborating on this.

The Deans were also requested to submit ideas for new programming at the graduate studies level. This resulted in an inventory of ideas that will be reviewed, screened, and prioritized, with the above recommendation as a consideration.

B. FACULTY APPOINTMENTS / WORKLOAD:

7. Create appointments that include research as a legitimate portion of faculty workload for those who want to pursue research. These faculty appointments should be available to new hires and incumbent faculty

At the request of the trade union representing instructors, counsellors and librarians. this response has been removed.

8. Eliminate barriers to time release and grow opportunities for course release.

February 2021 Senate Recommendation: Refer to the Provost to consider ways to expand research capacity among faculty

June 2021 Update:

Per Sandy Vanderburgh. **The Sherman Jen Research Chair in Next-Generation Design:** The Sherman Jen Research Chair in Next-Generation Design will be based at the Wilson School of Design at KPU Richmond. Together with internal and external allies, the Chair will be able to undertake transformational work on next-generation design addressing pressing challenges of technological empowerment, environmental sustainability, and social inclusion. This position will provide release time for faculty.

The Sherman Jen Research Chair in Applied Genomics: The Sherman Jen Research Chair in Applied Genomics will be based in the Faculty of Science and Horticulture at KPU Surrey. Building on prior funding from the Canada Foundation for Innovation and the BC Knowledge Development Fund, KPU has completed a new facility for applied genomics that will serve as the home of this Chair. Together with leading researchers at KPU and other institutions, companies, industry associations, and non-profits, the Chair will be able to positively impact human health outcomes and competitiveness of the agricultural sector. This position will provide release time for faculty.

In the 2021/2022 budget a \$4M endowment was established to support research activities that will be administered by the Office of Research Services. This funding can also be used to support faculty time release.

9. Develop and implement a system of annual or biennial review and reporting to ensure timely research, productivity, and accountability.

At the request of the trade union representing instructors, counsellors and librarians. this response has been removed.

10. Once these changes to faculty appointments and workloads are implemented, Research Institutes and Centres must be restructured to involve faculty directly as part of their membership and operations.

February 2021 Senate Recommendation: Refer to the Provost, AVP R, I and GS, and relevant Deans for recommendations

June 2021 Update:

Per Deepak Gupta. The institute directors are being invited to present to the Deans' Council to explore ideas and greater opportunities for faculty involvement in their membership and operations. The new strategic plan for ISFS already incorporates this as a priority.

Separately, work is progressing on improving mechanisms for providing faculty members with protected time to engage in research and scholarship outside of the curriculum, given collective agreement considerations, business processes, and funding rules.

C. CAREER TRAJECTORY / TITLE:

Such components of the following recommendations as pertain to academic rank and award (and not tenure, workload and other issues that must be collectively bargained).

11. Revisit the rank and advancement recommendations from the Senate Task Force (2013) and pursue an informed course of action by implementing a model that is commensurate with a typical university system and the profession, but reflective of KPU and its polytechnic mandate. A KPU system of rank and tenure needs to be prioritized and pursued immediately while ensuring that a strong and stipulated majority of faculty members are tenured, or tenure-track, full-time employees.
12. Career trajectories should recognize the equal import of teaching-focused and teaching- and research-focused faculty.
13. Each Faculty within the institution could have approximately 25% of their FTE (Full-time Equivalent) assigned teaching-research appointments to ensure equitable support for diverse disciplines and forms of research.

14. Assure that scholarly activity tied to teaching and learning is rewarded equally alongside that of basic and applied research and research-creation.

At the request of the trade union representing instructors, counsellors and librarians. this response to section 3. has been removed.

D. INFRASTRUCTURE AND START-UP FUNDING:

15. Make concerted efforts to identify infrastructure needs by program and faculty. An institutional-wide audit of the current situation should be conducted. Perhaps this should be conducted once we have rank and tenure in place?

June 2021 Update:

Per Deepak Gupta. This work has been initiated with the University Space Administration team. An initial discussion has been completed with the VPA and the Deans. It was identified that developing dedicated, collaborative spaces at each campus would be a viable start. In addition, the 2020 Teaching, Research, and Library Supports survey had questions on academic technology which will inform our strategy. We are working on mechanisms to gather input at the program and faculty levels, in conjunction with the plans to develop school/faculty level research plans.

16. Based on that audit, develop an infrastructure development plan for the institution as a whole. This plan should address needs related to space allocations, equipment, land, library holdings and services, and digital technology.

February 2021 Senate Recommendation: Refer 15 and 16 to the AVP R, I and GS and the Deans to gather information and develop such a plan.

June 2021 Update:

Per Deepak Gupta. There is a separate engagement happening with the campus planning group to look at long-term institutional infrastructure development, connected through the master campus plans. We will also be mindful of new ways of teaching, learning, and working as we move towards a post-pandemic era, and how that might inform and accelerate the development of this institutional plan.

17. Provide start-up funding for new initiatives and for grants that require matching funds.

June 2021 Update:

Per Sandy Vanderburgh. See 8 above.

Per Deepak Gupta. The university has endowed \$4M from the 2020-21 operating surplus for research. Income from this endowment will become available in 2022-23 onwards, and further allow for co-funding of multi-year projects.

18. Create an annual Presidential Fund to support publishing grants, outreach, and knowledge mobilization.

February 2021 Senate Recommendation: Refer to the AVP R, I and GS to bring forward via the budget process.

June 2021 Update:

Per Deepak Gupta. We plan to design this fund in the fall in partnership with the Library and other key stakeholders, with input via the Senate Standing Committee on Research and Graduate Studies.

19. Create a class of research and technical assistants within BCGEU as dedicated Research Staff.

February 2021 Senate Recommendation: Refer to the AVP HR to explore with the GEU. Also, the Provosts Office should be involved. This is a very costly model and perhaps we can develop a KPU solution where the researchers contribute to the salaries/operational costs.

June 2021 Update:

Per Sandy Vanderburgh. The Provost and AVP-Research are currently engaged in discussions with the AVP KPU Human Resources to explore the models/options that would best fit KPU regarding research and technical assistants.

E. INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH SUPPORT:

20. Create a fully funded, staffed (e.g. grant program managers), and functional ORS to support faculty and student research

June 2021 Update:

Per Sandy Vanderburgh. Over the past 2 years significant resources have been provided to the ORS to support faculty and student research. In the 2020-2021 and annual lift of \$300k was added to the ORS budget in addition to some of the aforementioned initiatives. Also, discussions with senior executives and the ORS, on how to best support scholarship at KPU have been ongoing.

Per Deepak Gupta. An initial discussion on this is scheduled for the June 2021 meeting of SSCRGs. This will establish a list of funding programs and services to be offered (or brokered) through the Office of Research Services, and inform the staffing and funding needed to support faculty and student research.

21. Once properly funded and staffed, ORS should enhance its support for faculty through an effective system of research program development, execution, and mentorship. In connection with these initiatives, ORS should actively profile knowledge creation internally and externally (inclusive of faculty and students).

February 2021 Senate Recommendation: Refer to the AVP R, I and GS to bring forward via the budget process.

June 2021 Update:

Per Deepak Gupta. ORS is piloting a system of research advisors/facilitators to support faculty in development on critical topical areas such as responsible conduct of research.

In addition, an online web application to showcase scholarly activities across KPU is being discussed and will be implemented in the coming months.

22. Every administrative department must be charged to develop the capacity to effectively support research programming (Faculties and Dean's offices, Finance department, event coordinators, payroll, marketing, etc.)

February 2021 Senate Recommendation: Refer to the University Executive to explore

June 2021 Update:

Per Alan Davis. This matter has been referred to the President's Council and work is underway to ensure that such capacity is increased as needed.

23. Implement a system of transparent, accountable, and predictable vetting for new and ongoing research and scholarship projects that is particular to the needs of faculties and departments.

February 2021 Senate Recommendation: Agreed: refer to the AVP R, I and GS to develop this process after appropriate consultation

June 2021 Update:

Per Deepak Gupta. The Office of AVP, Research, Innovation and Graduate Studies, and Office of Research Services have embraced open, transparent, and inclusive processes to fund research grants. Selection criteria is presented upfront, and committees are chosen to be diverse, with use of online training to overcome bias in peer review.

It must be noted that the management has an obligation to act in the best interest of the university, and may exercise discretionary powers as provided for by university policies, Board-approved budgets, and other Board-governance mechanisms to make well considered investments. Often, mitigating risk, protecting university's reputation, responding to time-sensitive opportunity, and fulfilling external accountability are also part of these considerations.

24. Ensure all KPU faculties and schools have a standing committee on Research and Scholarship to support faculty and student engagement across disciplines. These Standing Committees on Research and Scholarship should hold cross-faculty research and scholarship meetings biannually to share their respective committees' initiatives and to help foster a research and scholarship culture across disciplines and the institution.

February 2021 Senate Recommendation: [Linked to 1) above] Refer to the Provost and Vice Chair of Senate for discussion and recommendation to Senate

June 2021 Update:

Per Sandy Vanderburgh. Numerous Faculties have existing Research and Scholarship Committees and because of the Whitepaper some Faculties have recently established their own Research and Scholarship Committee.

25. Task KPU's Administration and Board of Governors to increase their efforts in lobbying the provincial government for increased funding for the university. Biannual progress reports on these lobbying efforts should be shared with all university members over the next five years.

February 2021 Senate Recommendation: Refer to the President for action

June 2021 Update:

Per Alan Davis. Several initiatives are under way provincially. A review of post-secondary funding is underway by AEST and the role of scholarship at KPU will be brought forward accordingly. More informally, the teaching university presidents have committed to working together to ensure that, as a sector, our funding properly reflects our mandates. Locally, we continue to talk with our local MLAs to ensure that they understand KPU's value to the region and this includes highlighting our scholarly successes and potential.

SENATE

Agenda Item: 5.1

Meeting Date: June 28, 2021

Presenter: David Burns

Agenda Item Course Submissions

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

Recommended Resolution	THAT Senate approve the attached list of new, revised, and discontinued courses.
-------------------------------	---

Senate Standing Committee Report

On June 16, 2021, the Senate Standing Committee on Curriculum recommended that Senate approve the attached list of new, revised, and discontinued courses.

Attachments

2021 06 28 Course Submissions

Submitted by

David Burns, Chair, Senate Standing Committee on Curriculum

Date submitted

June 17, 2021

Senate
Consent Agenda
June 28, 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
Anthropology	ANTH	2142	Indigenous Peoples in Canada	1-Sep-2022	Revised	No		Required for Credential Prerequisites/Corequisites Earlier- ANTH 1100 or 1300 Now- ANTH 1100	Course outline updated to indicate that discontinuance of the course would affect the Minor in Indigenous Community Justice.
Anthropology	ANTH	2160	Culture and the Environment	1-Sep-2022	Revised	No		Course Format	Course outline updated to indicate that discontinuance of the course would affect the Minor in Indigenous Community Justice.
Anthropology	ANTH	3160	Environmental Activism	1-Sep-2022	Revised	No		Course Format	
Anthropology	ANTH	3211	Forensic Science: Fact and Fiction	1-Sep-2022	Revised	No		Course Format	
Criminology	CRIM	3305	Law and Society	1-Sep-2022	Revised	No		Course Format	
Sociology	SOCI	2240	Gender in Canada	1-Sep-2022	Revised	No		Course Format	
Journalism And Communication Studies	JRNL	1220	Citizen Journalism	1-Sep-2022	Revised	No		Required for Credential Course Format	
Journalism And Communication Studies	JRNL	4900	Special Topics	1-Sep-2022	New	No		New Course Outline	

Senate
Consent Agenda
June 28, 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
Automotive	ASTA	1110	General Automotive Services, Practices and Procedures	September 1, 2022	Revised	No		Prerequisites/Corequisites	Remove ASTA 1100 as a prerequisite.
Automotive	ASTA	1120	Electrical Fundamentals	September 1, 2022	Revised	No		Prerequisites/Corequisites	Remove ASTA 1110 as a prerequisite
Automotive	ASTA	1130	Steering, Frames, Suspension and Shock Absorbers	September 1, 2022	Revised	No		Prerequisites/Corequisites	Remove ASTA 1120 as a prerequisite
Automotive	ASTA	1140	Automotive Braking Systems	September 1, 2022	Revised	No		Prerequisites/Corequisites	Remove ASTA 1130 as a prerequisite
Automotive	ASTA	1150	Welding	September 1, 2022	Revised	No		Prerequisites/Corequisites	Remove ASTA 1140 as a prerequisite
Automotive	ASTA	1160	The Internal Combustion Engine	September 1, 2022	Revised	No		Prerequisites/Corequisites	Remove ASTA 1150 as a prerequisite
Automotive	ASTA	1170	Power Train Fundamentals	September 1, 2022	Revised	No		Prerequisites/Corequisites	Remove ASTA 1160 as a prerequisite
Automotive	ASTA	1180	Engine Management and Control Systems	September 1, 2022	Revised	No		Prerequisites/Corequisites	Remove ASTA 1170 as a prerequisite

SENATE

Agenda Item: 5.2

Meeting Date: June 28, 2021

Presenter: David Burns

Agenda Item: Department Name Change for Business Graduate Courses

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

Recommended Resolution	THAT Senate approve the change to the attached list of course outlines to reflect the new <u>Business Graduate Programs</u> department name, effective September 1, 2022.
------------------------	---

Senate Standing Committee Report

On June 16, 2021, the Senate Standing Committee on Curriculum recommended that Senate approve the changes to attached list of course outlines to reflect the new Business Graduate Programs department name, effective September 1, 2022.

Context & Background

The Board approved the new BGP-Business Graduate Program department and as a result this new name has been added to 16 course outlines (see attachment 1). These changes were presented and approved at the May 3, 2021 School of Business Curriculum Committee meeting and the May 17 School of Business Faculty Council meeting.

Key Messages

Requesting approval of revisions made to 16 course outlines to reflect new department name as **Business Graduate Programs**.

Consultations

1. David P. Burns, Vice-Chair, Senate;
2. Stephen Yezerinac, Associate Registrar, Senate & Curriculum, Office of the Registrar

Attachments

Attachment 1: List of revised course outlines

Submitted by

Meredith Laird, Administrative Assistant, University Senate

Date submitted

June 17, 2021

(Attachment 1)

Department Name Change for Business Graduate Courses

The new department name “**Business Graduate Programs**” was added to each of the following course outlines.

- 4.1 [BUSM 6100](#) Accounting and Financial Management for Managers
- 4.2 [BUSM 6110](#) Project Management
- 4.3 [BUSM 6130](#) Change Management and Digital Transformation for Business
- 4.4 [BUSM 6150](#) Managing Innovation
- 4.5 [BUSM 6160](#) Strategic Planning
- 4.6 [BUSM 6180](#) Graduate Capstone Experience Practicum

- 4.7 [GRMT 6100](#) Sustainability and Business Administration
- 4.8 [GRMT 6110](#) Green Marketing Management
- 4.9 [GRMT 6120](#) Ecological Economics for Organizations
- 4.10 [GRMT 6130](#) Principles of Green and Clean Technologies for Business and Society’s Sustainability
- 4.11 [GRMT 6140](#) Sustainable Operations

- 4.12 [IBUS 6100](#) Intercultural Communications for Business
- 4.13 [IBUS 6110](#) International Operations in Trade
- 4.14 [IBUS 6120](#) Marketing for International Organizations
- 4.15 [IBUS 6130](#) E-commerce Design and Digital Marketing
- 4.16 [IBUS 6140](#) Advanced Topics in International Business and Economic

SENATE

Agenda Item: 5.3

Meeting Date: June 28, 2021

Presenter: David Burns

Agenda Item **Program Change: Certificate in Foundations in Design**

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

Recommended Resolution	THAT Senate approve the changes to the Certificate in Foundations in Design (FIND), effective September 1, 2022.
-------------------------------	---

Senate Standing Committee Report

On June 16, 2021, the Senate Standing Committee on Curriculum recommended that Senate approve the changes to the Certificate in Foundations in Design (FIND), effective September 1, 2022

Context & Background

Based on the Foundations in Design Program Review the program is proposing to reduce the entrance requirements to minimize barriers of entering the program. Many FIND students take the certificate program to gain stronger design and portfolio skills. Highlighted in the D7 form, the removal of the art/design requirements and Letter of Intent will be replaced with an Expression of interest package. The Expression of interest package would require students to answer questions rather than showing portfolio-quality work.

Key Messages

1. Update the Program application requirements
 - Remove the Art and Design Requirements for the application process
 - Remove the Letter of Intent for the application process
 - Add an Expression of Interest Package

Consultations

1. Wilson School of Design Curriculum Committee on May 19, 2021
2. Nadia Henwood, Associate Registrar on May 28, 2021

Attachments

D-7 Certificate in Foundations In Design

Submitted by

Meredith Laird, Administrative Assistant, University Senate

Date submitted

June 17, 2021



Program Change Form

v. 2019-April 25

PROGRAM DETAILS

Faculty:	Wilson School of Design
Program Name:	Certificate in Foundations in Design
Department:	Foundations in Design
Effective date:	
Dean/Associate Dean:	Andhra Goundrey
Chair/Coordinator:	Jessica Bayntun
Submission Date:	June 16 , 2021

CONSULTATIONS

Consultations	Person Consulted	Consultation Date
Office of the Provost:		
Vice Chair of Senate:		
Other(s)* (if applicable):		

*

OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR PROPOSAL REVIEW

Review of Completed D-7 Form	Review Submission Date
Send to OREGCurrConsult@kpu.ca for review**	May 28, 2021

APPROVALS

	Proposal Approval Date
Faculty Curriculum Committee:	May 17, 2021
Faculty Council (if required):	N/A
SSC on Curriculum:	June 16, 2021
SSC on University Budget (if required):	N/A
SSC on Academic Planning and Priorities (if required):	N/A
Senate:	

Proposed Change(s):	Portfolio Requirments
Rationale:	The FIND program is a limited intake co-hort program that currently requires a portfolio package for acceptance. Many FIND students take

	the program to develop portfolio skills and often have minimal number of art and design examples to apply with. Throughout the FIND program students develop portfolio skills and upon exiting they often successfully apply to other WSD programs. The proposed change is to reduce the portfolio requirements with the elimination of the art and design requirements and written statement. Alternatively students are asked to answer a selection of questions found on the program website which will better identify their interests in the FIND program.
URL(s):	https://calendar.kpu.ca/programs-az/design/foundations-design/foundations-design-certificate/#requicertext (Insert all applicable URLs from the current Calendar.)

Impact on Students:	<p>Check all that apply:</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 current number of total credits: _____ and proposed 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>
----------------------------	--

Transition Plan	The proposed changes will not impact in-progress students.
------------------------	--

<p>Current Requirements with Proposed Changes</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>New Requirements</p> <p><i>Provide a clean copy to show how the new Calendar entry will appear. List courses in alpha/numeric order.</i></p>
---	--

Admission Requirements

In addition to the Faculty's Admission Requirements, which consist of KPU's undergraduate English Proficiency Requirement, the following program admission requirements apply:

- Portfolio review
- Reflective written statement

During the selection portfolio and interview process, faculty members evaluate each applicant for suitability for admission. Meeting the minimum admission requirements does not guarantee admission into the program. For further details about the expression of interest package, including submission specifics, visit the department's website at: <https://www.kpu.ca/design/find>

Portfolio Review

Portfolios should reflect creative interests and current art/design capabilities. The following are suggestions for inclusion in the portfolio but are intended only as a guide. There is no minimum or maximum number of projects to include.

- Photos/scans of drawings, paintings, sculptures, pottery, textiles, woodworking, printmaking, sewing/costume design,

Admission Requirements

In addition to the Faculty's Admission Requirements, which consist of KPU's undergraduate English Proficiency Requirement, the following program admission requirements apply:

- Expression of Interest Package

During the selection process, faculty members evaluate each applicant for suitability for admission. Meeting the minimum admission requirements does not guarantee admission into the program. For further details about the expression of interest package, including submission specifics, visit the department's website at: <https://www.kpu.ca/design/find>

~~garden/landscape design, room decorating or
model making~~

- ~~• Photos/scans of sketchbooks or journals~~
- ~~• Samples of photography~~

~~Portfolios will be accepted in digital or physical formats.~~

~~Reflective Written Statement~~

~~Applicants must also include a comprehensive written
statement that reflects interests in design as well as
personal, educational and career goals.~~

SENATE

Agenda Item:6.1

Meeting Date: June 28, 2021

Presenter: Alan Davis

Agenda Item Empowering the Senate Executive Committee

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

Recommended Resolution	THAT Senate empower the Senate Executive Committee to act for Senate on urgent matters of regular business during the period July 1, 2021 – August 31, 2021.
------------------------	---

Senate Standing Committee Report

For Senate Office Use Only

From the Senate Executive Mandate:

Context & Background

Senate annually, at the last regular meeting of the academic year, empowers the Executive to act for Senate on urgent items of regular business during the months of July and August. Notice of any meetings of the Executive held under this authority (except those called for the purposes of the Executive dealing with its own regular business) shall be given to all members of Senate who may attend and vote. Any actions under this authority are reported to Senate at its next meeting.

Submitted by

Rita Zamluk, Administrative Assistant, University Senate

Date submitted

June 1, 2021

SENATE

Agenda Item: 6.2

Meeting Date: June 22, 2021

Presenter: Zena Mitchell

Agenda Item

Date Changes: Spring 2022 Exam Period

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

Recommended Resolution	THAT Senate ratify the decision of the Senate Executive Committee to approve the change in dates listed below.
------------------------	--

Context and Background

When constructing the exam matrix for the Spring 2022 exam schedule during the week of June 21, the Office of the Registrar noted that students and faculty would be better served by ending the exam period on Monday, April 25 rather than Saturday, April 23. Building an additional Monday into the 8-day exam period ensures (1) the ability to maximize Monday exams for Monday-based classes could be maximized, (2) exam conflicts/overloads could be minimized.

In order to maintain the current timetable production schedule, it was critical that a decision to change the dates be made during the week of June 21. At its meeting on June 22, Senate Executive approved the following change:

From this Spring 2022 Schedule:

FULL TERM DATES

Term	Fall	Spring	Summer
Instructional Period			
First day of classes	Tue, Sep 07, 2021	Wed, Jan 05, 2022	Mon, May 09, 2022
Reading break		Mon, Feb 21-Sat, Feb 26, 2022	
Last day to withdraw (opt 1)	Fri, Nov 05, 2021	Fri, Mar 11, 2022	Fri, July 08, 2022
Last day to withdraw (opt 2)	Mon, Dec 06, 2021	Mon, Apr 11, 2022	Mon, Aug 08, 2022
Last day of classes	Mon, Dec 06, 2021	Mon, Apr 11, 2022	Mon, Aug 08, 2022
Exam Period			
Final exams start	Wed, Dec 08, 2021	Wed, Apr 13, 2022	Wed, Aug 10, 2022
Final exams end	Thurs, Dec 16, 2021	Sat, Apr 23, 2022	Thurs, Aug 18, 2022
Grade Submission Deadline	Mon, Dec 20, 2021	Wed, Apr 27, 2022	Wed, Aug 24, 2022

To this Spring 2022 Schedule:

FULL TERM DATES

Term	Fall	Spring	Summer
Instructional Period			
First day of classes	Tue, Sep 07, 2021	Wed, Jan 05, 2022	Mon, May 09, 2022
Reading break		Mon, Feb 21-Sat, Feb 26, 2022	
Last day to withdraw (opt 1)	Fri, Nov 05, 2021	Fri, Mar 11, 2022	Fri, July 08, 2022
Last day to withdraw (opt 2)	Mon, Dec 06, 2021	Mon, Apr 11, 2022	Mon, Aug 08, 2022
Last day of classes	Mon, Dec 06, 2021	Mon, Apr 11, 2022	Mon, Aug 08, 2022
Exam Period			
Final exams start	Wed, Dec 08, 2021	Wed, Apr 13, 2022	Wed, Aug 10, 2022
Final exams end	Thurs, Dec 16, 2021	Mon, Apr 25, 2022	Thurs, Aug 18, 2022
Grade Submission Deadline	Mon, Dec 20, 2021	Thurs, Apr 28, 2022	Wed, Aug 24, 2022

Submitted by *Zena Mitchell, University Registrar*

Date submitted *June 22, 2021*

SENATE

Agenda Item: 6.3

Meeting Date: June 28, 2021

Presenter: Amy Jeon

Agenda Item **KPU Senate Orientation Day, August 26, 2021**

Action Requested	Information
Context & Background	<p>The KPU Senate office will host the inaugural Senate Orientation Day for new and returning Senators. This event will include a series of mini lectures to provide an overview of KPU Senate, university governance, and Senator's roles and responsibilities.</p>
Key Messages	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The 2021 Senate Orientation Day is scheduled to take place virtually on August 26th, 2021 from 1:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. 2. Attendance is strongly encouraged for all new senators. 3. Returning Senators are encouraged to attend and to welcome new Senators.
Consultations	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Senate Vice Chair 2. Senate Executive Committee 3. University Secretary 4. Senate Governance and Nominating Committee Chair
Submitted by	<i>Amy Jeon, Vice-Chair Elect</i>
Date submitted	<i>June 22, 2021</i>

SENATE

Agenda Item: 7

Meeting Date: June 28, 2021

Presenter: Sharmen Lee

Chair's Report to Senate Senate Governance and Nominating Committee June 16, 2021

The committee reviewed revisions to the Faculty Bylaws for the Faculty of Trades and Technology. The proposed revisions address re-alignment of Groups to reflect an equitable distribution of faculty, composition of standing committees, and updating of titles. The committee also reviewed revisions to the Faculty Bylaws for the Faculty of Educational Support and Development. The proposed revisions clarify the primary role of Faculty Council, the departments within the Faculty, and the Dean of the Faculty.

The committee reviewed the proposed revisions to the Faculty Minimum Qualifications for Operations and Technical Management in the School of Business and received a presentation from Dean Brian Moukperian and Josephine Chan on proposed revisions to policy AC 13 Minimum Qualifications for Faculty Members.

The Chair also reported that she is working with the Vice-Chair of Senate and the Senate Office on an Orientation Program from Senators.

SENATE

Agenda Item: 7.1

Meeting Date: June 28, 2021

Presenter: Sharmen Lee

Agenda Item Senate Standing Committees: Nominations

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

Recommended Resolution	THAT Senate appoint the nominees on 2021 06 Nominations.
------------------------	---

Senate Standing Committee Report

On June 28, 2021, the Senate Governance and Nominating Committee recommended that Senate appoint the nominees on *2021 06 Nominations*.

Context & Background

The Senate Governance and Nominating Committee, aided by the Vice-Chair of Senate, has the mandate to nominate members to serve on Senate committees..

Consultations

- Elected senators – Vice-Chair consults with new senators to choose a minimum of two Senate committees on which to serve per Senate Bylaw 1.10
- Faculty Councils – for faculty member nominations
- Provost and Vice President, Academic – for nominations of Deans and Associate Deans. The Provost also appoints one student to the Senate Standing Committee on appeals.
- Student representatives – SGNC reviews student statements of interest and selects those to be nominated to Senate.
- Professional support staff representatives– SGNC reviews professional support staff statements of interest and selects those to be nominated to Senate..

Attachments

2021 06 Nominations

Submitted by

Rita Zamluk, Administrative Assistant, University Senate

Date submitted

June 28, 2021

SGNC NOMINATIONS TO SENATE COMMITTEES

Jun-21

Committee	First Name	Last Name	Committee Role	KPU Faculty	Voting	Start Date	End Date	Nominated by
SSC Library	Chris	Burns	Librarian	Faculty of Educational Support and Development	Voting	1-Sep-21	31-Aug-24	Chair of the Librarians
SSC Policy	Steve	Cardwell	Representative, Student Services		Voting	1-Jul-21	31-Aug-24	Vice-President, Students
SSC Teaching and Learning	Natasha	Campbell	Senator or representative from each Faculty	Wilson School of Design	Voting	1-Jul-21	31-Aug-24	Vice-Chair, Senate
SSC Library	John	Shepherd	Senator or representative from each Faculty	School of Business	Voting	1-Sep-21	31-Aug-24	Faculty Council
SSC Curriculum	Katherine	Carpenter	Senator or representative from each Faculty	School of Business	Voting	1-Sep-21	31-Aug-24	Faculty Council
SSC Program Review	Nishan	Perera	Senator or representative from each Faculty	School of Business	Voting	1-Sep-21	31-Aug-24	SGNC

SENATE

Agenda Item: 7.2

Meeting Date: June 28, 2021

Presenter: Sharmen Lee

Agenda Item **Search Advisory Committee:
Associate Vice-President, Program Planning and Curriculum**

Action Requested	Motion
Recommended Resolution	<p>THAT Senate appoint the following members to the Search Advisory Committee, Associate Vice-President, Program Planning and Curriculum:</p> <p>Student Senator</p> <p>Purru Sandhu</p> <p>Regular faculty members</p> <p>Rachel Chong</p> <p>Lyndsay Passmore</p> <p>Ulrich Paschen</p>

Senate Standing Committee Report

On June 28, 2021 the Senate Governance and Nominating Committee recommended that Senate nominate those listed above to the search advisory committee for the appointment of an Associate Vice-President, Program Planning and Curriculum.

Context & Background:

In accordance with Policy HR20, *Search Advisory, Appointment and Re-appointment of Senior Academic Administrator Positions*, and its associated Procedures, the Provost has requested Senate to appoint members to the Search Advisory Committee to appoint an Associate Vice-President, Program Planning and Curriculum.

The composition of the search advisory committee requires:

i. five regular faculty members, two of whom are appointed by the Kwantlen Faculty Association and three appointed by the Senate to ensure broad representation from among the Faculties

ii. one student, preferably a Senator, appointed by the Senate

The procedures for HR20 state:

1. The SAC will be bound by the following regulations:

c) For all the SACs referred to in this policy, faculty appointed by Senate will be based on recommendations from the Senate Nominating Committee in consultation with each Faculty Council to ensure appropriate representation, taking into account Faculty representatives appointed by the KFA. Other appointments are made according to the Appendix.

d) The membership of the SAC, once established, will be made public to the university community by the SAC Chair.

The Kwantlen Faculty Association has appointed:

- Kristie Dukewich (Faculty of Arts)
- Gregory Harris (Faculty of Science and Horticulture)

1. [HR20 Search Advisory, Appointment and Re-Appointment of Senior Academic Administrative Positions Policy](#)

2. [HR20 Search Advisory, Appointment and Re-Appointment of Senior Academic Administrative Positions Procedures](#)

3. 2021 06 23 Memo: Appointment – Associate Vice President, Program Planning and Curriculum

4. [Confidential Statements of Interest](#)

Attachments

Submitted by

Rita Zamluk, Administrative Assistant, University Senate

Date submitted

June 28, 2021

SENATE

Agenda Item: 7.3.1

Meeting Date: June 28, 2021

Presenter: Sharmen Lee

Agenda Item **Faculty Bylaw Revision:
Faculty of Educational Support and Development**

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

Recommended Resolution:	THAT Senate approve the revisions to the Faculty of Educational Support and Development bylaws.
--------------------------------	--

Senate Standing Committee Report

On June 16, 2021, the Senate Governance and Nominating Committee recommended that Senate approve the revisions to the Faculty of Educational Support and Development bylaws

Key Messages

Revisions include:

1. Removal of the FESD history statement (as per the request of the SGNC in 2020)
2. Updated list of FESD members (Library, Learning Centres, Counselling, and Accessibility Services)
3. Clarification that the VP Students in the Dean of the Faculty

Consultations

Approved by the Faculty of the Whole on May 25, 2021

Attachments

1. Table of changes
2. Copy of Revised Bylaws
3. Copy of Revised Bylaws indicating changes

Submitted by

Christina Page

Date submitted

June 18, 2021

<p>Preamble</p>	<p>History</p> <p>This new Faculty was created on June 3, 2015, with the KPU Board of Governors’ approval of a proposal from this group. The proposal had been reviewed by the Senate Governance Committee, and recommended to Senate, which in turn approved a motion recommending it to the Board. In his announcement of this news to the University, President Davis noted that:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">This Faculty has been created strictly for the purpose of ensuring its members can participate fully in Senate, with no operational impact. Next steps include establishing a Faculty Council and any required committees for Senate participation. The Faculty Council will then elect two members to Senate. For the purposes of governance only, Dr. Jane Fee, Vice-Provost, Students, will also serve as Dean of this new Faculty.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">This is an important step in ensuring that all our faculty members have a voice at Senate and will address longstanding issues of disenfranchisement from governance and a lack of voting rights on Senate for faculty in these five areas.</p> <p>The new Faculty include areas from the Library, Learning Centre, Cooperative Education, Counselling and Services for Students with Disabilities; they were then tasked with developing its first set of bylaws. It struck a Bylaws Working Group which reviewed the bylaws of existing Faculties, while bearing in mind the unique and very limited scope of this Faculty. The Working Group was</p>	<p>Revised Wording: The Faculty of Educational Support and Development was established in 2015 for the sole purpose of providing its members with a mechanism to fully participate in university governance. The statement of faculty history and purpose may be found in FESD By-laws presented in the February 27, 2017 Senate agenda documents.</p>	<p>Rationale: This change was requested by the SGNC in 2020. FESD had wished to retain to history section to provide clear knowledge as to the differences between our Faculty and other Faculties. As per SGNC request, the preamble has been shorted, removing the history section. Also as per SGNC request, the reference to the history section as contained in the Senate agenda package from February 27, 2017 has been noted.</p>
-----------------	--	---	--

	<p>cognizant of ‘mission creep’ and drafted bylaws which would not extend the function of the Faculty beyond its sole purpose of providing a mechanism for its members to fully participate in university governance. Hence, only Faculty Council will be formed and will act as the mechanism for Nominations.</p> <p>When FESD was originally created, Co-op was a constituency within that group. As of January 2019, this group was moved to align with other Faculties. Services for Students with Disabilities changed their name to Accessibility Services.</p>		
2.1	Establish a Faculty Council to act on behalf of the Faculty as a whole.	Establish a Faculty Council to act on behalf of the Faculty as a whole. The Faculty Council acts as the mechanism for nominations.	This statement clarifies the FESD Faculty Council’s primary role as a body that allows its membership to participate fully in university governance. The FESD Faculty Council does not have subcommittees or perform other functions that may be typical of other Faculty Councils.
3.1.1	All those faculty employed within the Faculty.	All those faculty employed within the Faculty, which comprises Accessibility Services, Counselling, Learning Centres and the Library.	This more clearly specifies the departments that make up the Faculty.
3.1.2.	The Dean of the Faculty, who is the Chair.	The Dean of the Faculty (VP Students), who is the Chair.	Addition to enhance clarity of the position of the Dean within the Faculty.

Faculty of Educational Support & Development

BYLAWS

The Faculty of Educational Support and Development was established in 2015 for the sole purpose of providing its members with a mechanism to fully participate in university governance. The statement of faculty history and purpose may be found in FESD By-laws presented in the February 27, 2017 Senate agenda documents.

Faculty of Educational Support and Development By-Laws

1. The Faculty of Educational Support and Development shall:

- 1.1. Elect two faculty members from the Faculty to Senate.
- 1.2. Conduct elections and nominate faculty members from the Faculty where required as potential appointees to university-wide committees, including but not limited to Senate committees.
- 1.3. Serve as the forum for sharing information and the discussion of Faculty matters.

2. Powers and Duties of a Faculty:

The powers and duties of the Faculty of Educational Support and Development are laid out in Sec. 40 of the University Act.

In addition to the above requirements of the University Act, the Faculty will:

- 2.1. Establish a Faculty Council to act on behalf of the Faculty as a whole. The Faculty Council acts as the mechanism for nominations.
- 2.2. Form special purpose ad hoc committees, as it sees fit, for the conduct of its affairs and business, and to empower such committees, where advisable, to report directly to the appropriate committee(s) of Senate.
- 2.3. Make recommendations on academic and educational matters to Senate and other University bodies.
- 2.4. Request and consider reports relating to the academic and educational affairs of the Faculty of Educational Support and Development, of Senate Standing Committees, of Senate, and of the University.

3. Faculty as a Whole Membership:

- 3.1. Membership of the Faculty of Educational Support and Development consists of:
 - 3.1.1. All those faculty employed within the Faculty, which comprises Accessibility Services, Counselling, Learning Centres and the Library.
 - 3.1.2. The Dean of the Faculty (VP Students), who is the Chair.
 - 3.1.3. The President of the University.

3.1.4. The Registrar, who is non-voting.

4. Conduct of Faculty as a Whole Business:

- 4.1. The Chair of the Faculty Council will serve as Vice Chair of the Faculty as a Whole.
- 4.2. Robert's Rules of Order shall govern the conduct of all Faculty meetings except as otherwise provided.
- 4.3. The Faculty as a Whole shall have at least one regular meeting per academic year.
- 4.4. The Faculty as a Whole meetings will be set and called jointly by the Chair (the Dean of the Faculty) and Vice-Chair of the Faculty as a Whole.
- 4.5. Notice of regular meetings shall be sent to members of the Faculty at least 30 days in advance of a meeting.
- 4.6. In circumstances of urgency or at the special request of Faculty Council, extraordinary meetings of the Faculty may be called by the Chair and Vice-Chair at least seven days in advance.
- 4.7. The normal process of business at regular meetings of the Faculty shall be set by the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Faculty as a Whole in consultation with other members of the Faculty.
- 4.8. Faculty may add meeting agenda items by talking to the Chair or Vice-Chair.
- 4.9. The quorum for meetings of the Faculty as a Whole shall be 25% of the eligible voters.
- 4.10. Any business conducted at a meeting where there is no quorum present will be considered as unofficial and subject to ratification at the next meeting held where a quorum is present. Any communication coming out of a meeting where no quorum was present shall be prefaced with a clear indication the communication is subject to ratification.
- 4.11. The majority required to pass a resolution shall be at least the majority of the members voting, except in the case of adoption of or amendments to these Bylaws, when the majority required shall be at least two thirds of the members voting.
- 4.12. In circumstances of urgency or at the special request of Faculty Council, electronic notice of motions and electronic votes may be called by the Chair and/or Vice Chair. Electronic vote procedures will follow Senate Bylaws for such.
- 4.13. Meetings of the Faculty as a Whole shall normally be open to observers. The Faculty may decide, at any time, by a two thirds vote of those present and voting, that a whole meeting or any part of a meeting be held in camera.
- 4.14. The chair of the meeting may recognize non-members on any matters of business.

- 4.15. Minutes of open meetings of the Faculty as a Whole shall be recorded and distributed to the University.
- 4.16. All documents presented to the Faculty as a Whole shall normally be regarded as public. Nevertheless, the Chair may declare a document confidential, in which case the document shall be made available in advance only to members of the Faculty and, if appropriate, the Senate.
- 4.17. A general rule made by a Faculty is not effective or enforceable until a copy has been sent to the Senate and the Senate has given its approval.

5. Powers and Duties of Faculty Council:

- 5.1. The powers and duties of the Faculty Council are delegated by the Faculty as a Whole. Unless otherwise addressed in these bylaws, the Faculty Council shall have all the powers and duties ascribed to the Faculty in Section 2.
- 5.2. Any proposed changes to these Bylaws must be approved by the Faculty as a Whole.
- 5.3. Faculty Council may, by a two-thirds ($\frac{2}{3}$) vote, send any other matter to the Faculty as a Whole for decision or advice.
- 5.4. Members of Faculty Council must endeavour to serve the interests of the entire Faculty to the best of their ability.

6. Membership of the Faculty Council:

- 6.1. Membership for the Faculty Council of Educational Support and Development consists of:
 - 6.1.1. Dean of the Faculty (voting member).
 - 6.1.2. The two (2) faculty Senators (voting members).
 - 6.1.3. Five (5) faculty members shall be elected (voting members).

7. Selection of members for the Faculty Council:

- 7.1. Any faculty member within the Faculty of Educational Support and Development who has a University appointment sufficient to serve for the term of the appointment can be elected to the Faculty Council.

8. Membership terms for the Faculty Council of Educational Support and Development:

- 8.1. Elections will be held in the spring semester of each year. The terms will run from September 1 to August 31. Elections will be conducted by secret ballot.
- 8.2. The membership terms on the Faculty Council will normally be two years.
- 8.3. In order to establish staggered membership and continuity of membership, at the first Faculty Council election, 3 members will be elected for an extraordinary term of three years. In no case may the term exceed three years.
- 8.4. Any member may resign from Faculty Council by giving the Chair notice in writing.
- 8.5. The use of alternates for voting members is not permitted.
- 8.6. In the event that a seat of a member becomes vacant, a replacement shall be appointed or elected through a by-election at the earliest possible date. Members so elected or appointed shall serve the remaining term of office of the incumbent, at which point the normal election or appointment process will be followed.
- 8.7. The seat of an elected or appointed member who fails to attend three meetings of Faculty Council between September 1 and August 31 may be declared vacant by the Chair.

9. Faculty Council Conduct of Business:

- 9.1. Faculty Council Chair and Vice Chair will be elected from the Faculty Council members. The election will occur on or about May 30, with the term of office beginning September 1. The term will be one year.
- 9.2. The Chair shall not vote unless in the case of a tie.
- 9.3. The Chair may be removed by a two thirds majority vote of councilors present and voting at any duly called meeting of Faculty Council.
- 9.4. The Vice-Chair will fulfill the duties of the Chair in the Chair's vacancy or absence and will assist in the performance of the Chair's duties.
- 9.5. Robert's Rules of Order shall govern the conduct of all Faculty Council meetings except as otherwise provided.
- 9.6. Faculty Council meetings may be conducted by videoconference and/or teleconference.
- 9.7. Voting conducted by electronic means shall follow the regulations laid out in Senate bylaw 2.14.
- 9.8. Faculty Council shall meet as necessary, but at least once a semester with a minimum of three times per year.

- 9.9. Meeting times (weekday, time, campus location, & possible dates) will be set by Faculty Council in May for the following year.
- 9.10. Notice of meetings shall be sent to members of the Faculty Council at least seven days in advance of a meeting.
- 9.11. In circumstances of urgency, extraordinary meetings may be called by the Chair of Faculty Council.
- 9.12. The normal process of business at regular meetings of the Faculty Council shall be set by the Chair in consultation with members of the Faculty Council.
- 9.13. Faculty may request items to be added to the meeting agenda through the Chair.
- 9.14. The quorum for the meetings must be the majority of the voting members.
- 9.15. Any business conducted at a meeting where there is no quorum present will be considered as unofficial and subject to ratification at the next meeting held where a quorum is present. Any communication coming out of a meeting where no quorum was present shall be prefaced with a clear indication the communication is subject to ratification.
- 9.16. The majority required to pass a motion shall be at least the majority of the members voting.
- 9.17. In the case of a tie, the Chair will cast the deciding vote.
- 9.18. Faculty Council may decide at any time, by majority vote of those present and eligible to vote, that an entire meeting or any part of a meeting be held in camera.
- 9.19. The Chair may recognize non-members on any matters of business.
- 9.20. Minutes of open meetings of Faculty Council shall be made available to the Faculty as a Whole.
- 9.21. All documents presented to Faculty Council shall normally be regarded as public. Nevertheless, the Chair may declare a document confidential, in which case the document shall be made available in advance only to members of Faculty Council and, if appropriate, the Senate.
- 9.22. Senate Bylaw No. 3, Conflict of Interest, applies.
- 9.23. Faculty Council may, as appropriate, invite guests to make presentations to Council meetings and to answer questions related to their presentations.

10. Committees of Faculty Council:

- 10.1. Faculty Council will act as the Nominations committee and advise on matters related to elections, including timelines for nominations, elections, and appointments as required to meet the needs of the Faculty, Faculty Council, and Special Purpose Committees.
- 10.2. Faculty Council will act as the Governance committee and regularly review the Bylaws of the Faculty and provide advice to the Faculty as a Whole for approval.

2021

Deleted: 0

Formatted: Font: Times New Roman

Formatted: Normal, Space Before: 0 pt, After: 0 pt,
Don't keep with next, Don't keep lines together

Faculty of Educational Support & Development

BYLAWS

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0.5"

History

This new Faculty was created on June 3, 2015, with the KPU Board of Governors' approval of a proposal from this group. The proposal had been reviewed by the Senate Governance Committee, and recommended to Senate, which in turn approved a motion recommending it to the Board. In his announcement of this news to the University, President Davis noted that:

~~This Faculty has been created strictly for the purpose of ensuring its members can participate fully in Senate, with no operational impact. Next steps include establishing a Faculty Council and any required committees for Senate participation. The Faculty Council will then elect two members to Senate. For the purposes of governance only, Dr. Jane Fee, Vice Provost, Students, will also serve as Dean of this new Faculty.~~

~~This is an important step in ensuring that all our faculty members have a voice at Senate and will address longstanding issues of disenfranchisement from governance and a lack of voting rights on Senate for faculty in these five areas.~~

~~The new Faculty include areas from the Library, Learning Centre, Cooperative Education, Counselling and Services for Students with Disabilities; they were then tasked with developing its first set of bylaws. It struck a Bylaws Working Group which reviewed the bylaws of existing Faculties, while bearing in mind the unique and very limited scope of this Faculty. The Working Group was cognizant of 'mission creep' and drafted bylaws which would not extend the function of the Faculty beyond its sole purpose of providing a mechanism for its members to fully participate in university governance. Hence, only Faculty Council will be formed and will act as the mechanism for Nominations.~~

~~When FESD was originally created, Co-op was a constituency within that group. As of January 2019, this group was moved to align with other Faculties. Services for Students with Disabilities changed their name to Accessibility Services.~~

The Faculty of Educational Support and Development was established in 2015 for the sole purpose of providing its members with a mechanism to fully participate in university governance. [The statement of faculty history and purpose may be found in FESD By-laws presented in the February 27, 2017 Senate agenda documents.](#)

Deleted: For history, see (linked document here).

Deleted: For history, see

Faculty of Educational Support and Development By-Laws

1. The Faculty of Educational Support and Development shall:

- 1.1. Elect two faculty members from the Faculty to Senate.
- 1.2. Conduct elections and nominate faculty members from the Faculty where required as potential appointees to university-wide committees, including but not limited to Senate committees.
- 1.3. Serve as the forum for sharing information and the discussion of Faculty matters.

2. Powers and Duties of a Faculty:

The powers and duties of the Faculty of Educational Support and Development are laid out in Sec. 40 of the University Act.

In addition to the above requirements of the University Act, the Faculty will:

- 2.1. Establish a Faculty Council to act on behalf of the Faculty as a whole. **The Faculty Council acts as the mechanism for nominations.**
- 2.2. Form special purpose ad hoc committees, as it sees fit, for the conduct of its affairs and business, and to empower such committees, where advisable, to report directly to the appropriate committee(s) of Senate.
- 2.3. Make recommendations on academic and educational matters to Senate and other University bodies.
- 2.4. Request and consider reports relating to the academic and educational affairs of the Faculty of Educational Support and Development, of Senate Standing Committees, of Senate, and of the University.

3. Faculty as a Whole Membership:

- 3.1. Membership of the Faculty of Educational Support and Development consists of:
 - 3.1.1. All those faculty employed within the Faculty, which comprises Accessibility Services, Counselling, Learning Centres and the Library.
 - 3.1.2. The Dean of the Faculty (VP Students), who is the Chair.
 - 3.1.3. The President of the University.
 - 3.1.4. The Registrar, who is non-voting.

Deleted: which comp

4. Conduct of Faculty as a Whole Business:

- 4.1. The Chair of the Faculty Council will serve as Vice Chair of the Faculty as a Whole.
- 4.2. Robert's Rules of Order shall govern the conduct of all Faculty meetings except as otherwise provided.
- 4.3. The Faculty as a Whole shall have at least one regular meeting per academic year.
- 4.4. The Faculty as a Whole meetings will be set and called jointly by the Chair (the Dean of the Faculty) and Vice-Chair of the Faculty as a Whole.
- 4.5. Notice of regular meetings shall be sent to members of the Faculty at least 30 days in advance of a meeting.

- 4.6. In circumstances of urgency or at the special request of Faculty Council, extraordinary meetings of the Faculty may be called by the Chair and Vice-Chair at least seven days in advance.
- 4.7. The normal process of business at regular meetings of the Faculty shall be set by the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Faculty as a Whole in consultation with other members of the Faculty.
- 4.8. Faculty may add meeting agenda items by talking to the Chair or Vice-Chair.
- 4.9. The quorum for meetings of the Faculty as a Whole shall be 25% of the eligible voters.
- 4.10. Any business conducted at a meeting where there is no quorum present will be considered as unofficial and subject to ratification at the next meeting held where a quorum is present. Any communication coming out of a meeting where no quorum was present shall be prefaced with a clear indication the communication is subject to ratification.
- 4.11. The majority required to pass a resolution shall be at least the majority of the members voting, except in the case of adoption of or amendments to these Bylaws, when the majority required shall be at least two thirds of the members voting.
- 4.12. In circumstances of urgency or at the special request of Faculty Council, electronic notice of motions and electronic votes may be called by the Chair and/or Vice Chair. Electronic vote procedures will follow Senate Bylaws for such.
- 4.13. Meetings of the Faculty as a Whole shall normally be open to observers. The Faculty may decide, at any time, by a two thirds vote of those present and voting, that a whole meeting or any part of a meeting be held in camera.
- 4.14. The chair of the meeting may recognize non-members on any matters of business.
- 4.15. Minutes of open meetings of the Faculty as a Whole shall be recorded and distributed to the University.
- 4.16. All documents presented to the Faculty as a Whole shall normally be regarded as public. Nevertheless, the Chair may declare a document confidential, in which case the document shall be made available in advance only to members of the Faculty and, if appropriate, the Senate.
- 4.17. A general rule made by a Faculty is not effective or enforceable until a copy has been sent to the Senate and the Senate has given its approval.

5. Powers and Duties of Faculty Council:

- 5.1. The powers and duties of the Faculty Council are delegated by the Faculty as a Whole. Unless otherwise addressed in these bylaws, the Faculty Council shall have all the powers and duties ascribed to the Faculty in Section 2.

- 5.2. Any proposed changes to these Bylaws must be approved by the Faculty as a Whole.
- 5.3. Faculty Council may, by a two-thirds ($\frac{2}{3}$) vote, send any other matter to the Faculty as a Whole for decision or advice.
- 5.4. Members of Faculty Council must endeavour to serve the interests of the entire Faculty to the best of their ability.

6. Membership of the Faculty Council:

- 6.1. Membership for the Faculty Council of Educational Support and Development consists of:
 - 6.1.1. Dean of the Faculty (voting member).
 - 6.1.2. The two (2) faculty Senators (voting members).
 - 6.1.3. Five (5) faculty members shall be elected (voting members).

7. Selection of members for the Faculty Council:

- 7.1. Any faculty member within the Faculty of Educational Support and Development who has a University appointment sufficient to serve for the term of the appointment can be elected to the Faculty Council.

8. Membership terms for the Faculty Council of Educational Support and Development:

- 8.1. Elections will be held in the spring semester of each year. The terms will run from September 1 to August 31. Elections will be conducted by secret ballot.
- 8.2. The membership terms on the Faculty Council will normally be two years.
- 8.3. In order to establish staggered membership and continuity of membership, at the first Faculty Council election, 3 members will be elected for an extraordinary term of three years. In no case may the term exceed three years.
- 8.4. Any member may resign from Faculty Council by giving the Chair notice in writing.
- 8.5. The use of alternates for voting members is not permitted.
- 8.6. In the event that a seat of a member becomes vacant, a replacement shall be appointed or elected through a by-election at the earliest possible date. Members so elected or appointed shall serve the remaining term of office of the incumbent, at which point the normal election or appointment process will be followed.

- 8.7. The seat of an elected or appointed member who fails to attend three meetings of Faculty Council between September 1 and August 31 may be declared vacant by the Chair.

9. Faculty Council Conduct of Business:

- 9.1. Faculty Council Chair and Vice Chair will be elected from the Faculty Council members. The election will occur on or about May 30, with the term of office beginning September 1. The term will be one year.
- 9.2. The Chair shall not vote unless in the case of a tie.
- 9.3. The Chair may be removed by a two thirds majority vote of councilors present and voting at any duly called meeting of Faculty Council.
- 9.4. The Vice-Chair will fulfill the duties of the Chair in the Chair's vacancy or absence and will assist in the performance of the Chair's duties.
- 9.5. Robert's Rules of Order shall govern the conduct of all Faculty Council meetings except as otherwise provided.
- 9.6. Faculty Council meetings may be conducted by videoconference and/or teleconference.
- 9.7. Voting conducted by electronic means shall follow the regulations laid out in Senate bylaw 2.14.
- 9.8. Faculty Council shall meet as necessary, but at least once a semester with a minimum of three times per year.
- 9.9. Meeting times (weekday, time, campus location, & possible dates) will be set by Faculty Council in May for the following year.
- 9.10. Notice of meetings shall be sent to members of the Faculty Council at least seven days in advance of a meeting.
- 9.11. In circumstances of urgency, extraordinary meetings may be called by the Chair of Faculty Council.
- 9.12. The normal process of business at regular meetings of the Faculty Council shall be set by the Chair in consultation with members of the Faculty Council.
- 9.13. Faculty may request items to be added to the meeting agenda through the Chair.
- 9.14. The quorum for the meetings must be the majority of the voting members.
- 9.15. Any business conducted at a meeting where there is no quorum present will be considered as unofficial and subject to ratification at the next meeting held where a quorum is present. Any communication coming out of a meeting where no quorum was present shall be prefaced with a clear indication the communication is subject to ratification.

- 9.16. The majority required to pass a motion shall be at least the majority of the members voting.
- 9.17. In the case of a tie, the Chair will cast the deciding vote.
- 9.18. Faculty Council may decide at any time, by majority vote of those present and eligible to vote, that an entire meeting or any part of a meeting be held in camera.
- 9.19. The Chair may recognize non-members on any matters of business.
- 9.20. Minutes of open meetings of Faculty Council shall be made available to the Faculty as a whole.
- 9.21. All documents presented to Faculty Council shall normally be regarded as public. Nevertheless, the Chair may declare a document confidential, in which case the document shall be made available in advance only to members of Faculty Council and, if appropriate, the Senate.
- 9.22. Senate Bylaw No. 3, Conflict of Interest, applies.
- 9.23. Faculty Council may, as appropriate, invite guests to make presentations to Council meetings and to answer questions related to their presentations.

10. Committees of Faculty Council:

- 10.1. Faculty Council will act as the Nominations committee and advise on matters related to elections, including timelines for nominations, elections, and appointments as required to meet the needs of the Faculty, Faculty Council, and Special Purpose Committees.
- 10.2. Faculty Council will act as the Governance committee and regularly review the Bylaws of the Faculty and provide advice to the Faculty as a Whole for approval.

SENATE

Agenda Item: 7.3.2

Meeting Date: June 28, 2021

Presenter: Sharmen Lee

Agenda Item Faculty Bylaw Revision: Faculty of Trades and Technology

Action Requested	Motion
Recommended Resolution	THAT Senate approve the revisions to the Faculty of Trades and Technology bylaws.

Senate Standing Committee Report

On June 16, 2021, the Senate Governance and Nominating Committee recommended that Senate approve the revisions to the Faculty of Trades and Technology bylaws.

Context & Background

The Faculty of Trades and Technology is relatively small in numbers and the revisions in this document are minor with updated titles and then small revision to groupings and committees included.

Key Messages

1. Clarification of groupings and committee membership
2. Removal of a student alumnus from the committee membership
3. Clarification of wording Curriculum Development/Funding
4. Clarification of wording for ensuring completion reports and reporting requirements are met

Consultations

The process started with our Governance committee in spring of 2020 and involved committee and Faculty Council consultations. Proposals were brought forward to Faculty Council meeting in November 2020 and after discussion Faculty Council approved a motion to send the revised Bylaws to the Faculty as a Whole for a vote. The Faculty as a Whole voted in favour of accepting the revisions to the Bylaws in a digital vote.

Attachments

1. Trades Bylaws Revisions Table June 17 rationale
2. Trades Bylaws Revisions DRAFT June 17, 2021 – clean copy
3. Trades Bylaws DRAFT June 17, 2021

Submitted by

David Fengstad – Chair of Nominations and Governance Committee

Date submitted

June 17, 2021

Original Article	Original wording (Deletions in bold)	Proposed wording (Additions in bold)	Rationale
24. 24.1.	Divisional Groupings: Two voting representatives elected from each of Group A (CADD, Public Safety, Appliance Repair, and Farrier), Group B (Welding, Metal Fabrication and Millwright), Group C (Carpentry, Plumbing, and Masonry) and Group D (Automotive Service Technician, Parts & Warehousing and Electrical) departments. Groupings shall be reviewed biannually by Nominations and Governance Subcommittee for review from Faculty Council. Divisional groupings are for the purpose of Faculty Council only. Each of these representatives shall be an active faculty member as defined by the University Act (See University Act),	Divisional Groupings: Two voting representatives elected from each of Group A (Appliance Service Technician, Automotive Service Technician, Farrier Science, Mechatronics and Advanced Manufacturing Technology, and Parts and Warehousing), Group B (Welding, Metal Fabrication and Millwright), Group C (Carpentry, Plumbing, and Masonry) and Group D (Electrical) departments. Groupings shall be reviewed biannually by Nominations and Governance Subcommittee for review from Faculty Council. Divisional groupings are for the purpose of Faculty Council only. Each of these representatives shall be an active faculty member as defined by the University Act (See University Act), .	Re-alignment of Groups to reflect an equitable distribution of faculty and to use correct, up-to-date program titles. We review these groups biannually.
24. 24.6.	One voting student representative from the Faculty of Trades and Technology,	One non-voting Divisional Business Manager,	Re: 24.6 <i>(please note the language in 24.4,24.5,24.6,24.7 in current and proposed bylaws is different order but the same except for listed addition of Divisional Business Manager) Original section up to 24.10 new 24.11.</i>

72.	<p>Each Standing Committee will have the following General Composition plus others as required for individual committees. The General Composition of Standing Committees include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dean or Associate Dean • Chair or Vice Chair of Faculty Council • One Faculty of Trades and Technology student representative • One Faculty of Trades and Technology student alumni representative • One faculty member from each Divisional Groupings plus one designated alternative as selected by each Divisional Groupings. 	<p>Each Standing Committee will have the following General Composition plus others as required for individual committees. The General Composition of Standing Committees include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dean or Associate Dean • Chair or Vice Chair of Faculty Council • One faculty member representative from each Divisional Grouping. • A Divisional Grouping may designate up to two alternate representatives, one of whom may, should the regular representative provide notice of absence, participate and vote in the stead of that representative. <p>72.1 Each Standing Committee should have:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One Faculty of Trades and Technology student representative <p>72.2 Each Standing Committee will have a minimum of five members.</p>	<p>The Faculty of Trades and Technology experiences ongoing difficulty in filling the student/alumni position on campus due to the short-term nature of our programs. Removing the student representation from the required composition and adding it as an ideal addition affords requisite flexibility should these student positions not be filled. The student alumnus representative has been removed and will be better served per consultation at a PAC.</p> <p>Two faculty designated alternates to assist in our ability to fill the standing committees of Faculty Council due to the small size of our Faculty at Trades and Technology.</p> <p>Established a minimum of membership to standing committees to ensure workload balance and good communication to Faculty Council</p>
74.	Administrative support for the Committee shall be assigned by the Business Manager, Trades and Technology.	Administrative support for the Committee shall be assigned by the Divisional Business Manager, Trades and Technology.	Divisional Business Manager is now correct title to be used
77.	The Registrar (or designate), and the Business Manager, Trades and Technology approved by the voting members of the Committee will sit as non-voting members of the Committee.	The Registrar (or designate), and the Divisional Business Manager, Trades and Technology approved by the voting members of the Committee will sit as non-voting members of the Committee .	Divisional Business Manager is now correct title to be used
78.	Administrative support for the Committee shall be assigned by the Business Manager, Trades and Technology.	Administrative support for the Committee shall be assigned by the Divisional Business Manager, Trades and Technology.	Divisional Business Manager is now correct title to be used

79. 79.5	Be responsible for the management of the Article 12.02 Curriculum Development/Program Fund, and the allocation and awarding of funds for curriculum review or development.	79.5 Be responsible for the administration of the current Collective Agreement between Kwantlen Polytechnic University and Kwantlen Faculty Association Article 12.02 – Trades curriculum/program development requiring funding	Strengthened the language and aligned to Collective Agreement between Kwantlen Polytechnic University and Kwantlen Faculty Association and Article 12.02. Use correct wording of the referenced document.
79.6	Ensure the completion reports and reporting requirements are met regarding work produced during release time, and is saved on the common departmental sites; such materials remain the property of KPU.	Ensure the completion reports and reporting requirements are met regarding work produced during release time, and is saved on the common departmental sites in compliance with Section 18.02 of the current Collective Agreement between Kwantlen Polytechnic University and Kwantlen Faculty Association and KPU Policy RS5: Intellectual Property.	This change was to ensure work in departments being done was properly saved to departmental common drives as the work belongs to KPU. If a Faculty leaves with materials then remaining Faculty could suffer. Use correct wording of the referenced document and include a reference to Policy RS5.
80.	The voting members of the Standing Committee on Academic Planning and Priorities and Budget consist of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General Composition of Standing Committees • Business Manager. Business Manager will be a permanent non-voting member. 	The voting members of the Standing Committee on Academic Planning and Priorities and Budget consist of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General Composition of Standing Committees • Divisional Business Manager. The Divisional Business Manager will be a permanent non-voting member. 	Divisional Business Manager is now correct title to be used
82.	Administrative support for the Committee shall be assigned by the Business Manager, Trades and Technology.	Administrative support for the Committee shall be assigned by the Divisional Business Manager, Trades and Technology.	Divisional Business Manager is now correct title to be used

CONTENTS

Powers and Duties of the Faculty	1
Faculty Membership.....	2
Conduct of Business.....	3
Powers and Duties of Faculty Council.....	3
Faculty Council Membership	4
Chair and Vice Chair of Faculty Council.....	6
Conduct of Faculty Council Business	6
Committee(s) of Faculty Council	7
Standing Committee on Nominations and Governance.....	8
Standing Committee on Curriculum	9
Standing Committee on Academic Planning and Priorities and Budget.....	11

POWERS AND DUTIES OF THE FACULTY

1. The powers and duties of the Faculty of Trades and Technology are established in part by the University Act (See University Act), which currently describes the Faculty as having the power and duty:
 - 1.1. to make rules governing its proceedings, including the determining of the quorum necessary for the transaction of business,
 - 1.2. to provide for student representation in the meetings and proceedings of the faculty
 - 1.3. subject to this Act and to the approval of the senate, to make rules for the government, direction and management of the faculty and its affairs and business
 - 1.4. to determine, subject to the approval of the senate, the courses of instruction in the faculty,
 - 1.5. subject to an order of the president to the contrary, to prohibit lecturing and teaching in the faculty by persons other than appointed members of the teaching staff of the faculty and persons authorized by the faculty, and to prevent lecturing or teaching so prohibited,

- 1.6. subject to the approval of the senate, to appoint for the examinations in each faculty examiners, who, subject to an appeal to the senate, must conduct examinations and determine the results,
 - 1.7. to deal with and, subject to an appeal to the senate, to decide on all applications and memorials by students and others in connection with their respective faculties,
 - 1.8. generally, to deal with all matters assigned to it by the board or the senate, and
 - 1.9. to form committees, as it sees fit, for the conduct of its affairs and business, and to empower such committees, where advisable, to report directly to the appropriate committee(s) of Senate.
2. A general rule made by the Faculty is not effective or enforceable until a copy has been sent to the Senate and the Senate has given its approval.

FACULTY MEMBERSHIP

3. Membership of the Faculty of Trades and Technology consists of:
 - 3.1. All those employed within the Faculty of Trades and Technology as an instructor, lecturer, assistant professor, associate professor, professor, or an equivalent position designated by the Senate,
 - 3.2. The Dean of the Faculty,
 - 3.3. Associate Dean(s) of the Faculty,
 - 3.4. The President of the University,
 - 3.5. The Registrar, who is non-voting
 - 3.6. One member from and appointed by each other Faculty
4. The Faculty of Trades and Technology endorses the principle of student and alumni participation in Faculty decision-making and will reflect this in the constitution of its Faculty Council and Standing Committees.
5. The Dean is the Chair of the Faculty.
6. A Vice-Chair of the Faculty shall be elected by the Faculty from among those employed within the Faculty of Trades and Technology as an instructor, lecturer, assistant professor, associate professor, or professor, for a two-year term. Vice-Chairs may serve a maximum of three consecutive terms.

CONDUCT OF BUSINESS

7. The Faculty shall have at least two regular meetings per academic year.
8. In cases of urgency, extraordinary meetings of the Faculty may be called by the Chair or the Vice-Chair of the Faculty.
9. Notice of a meeting of the Faculty shall be sent to the members of the Faculty at least seven days in advance of a meeting.
10. The normal process of business at meetings of the Faculty shall be set by the Chair.
11. The quorum for meetings of the Faculty shall be 50% plus one of the members entitled to vote.
12. Robert's Rules of Order shall govern the conduct of all Faculty meetings, subject to interpretation by the Chair. Such matters on which these Bylaws lay down specific procedures shall be accepted from the foregoing. The most recent version of Robert's Rules shall be applied.
13. The majority required to pass a resolution shall be 51% of the members voting, except in the case of adoption of or amendments to these Bylaws, when the majority required shall be two-thirds of the members voting.
14. Meetings of the Faculty shall normally be open to observers.
15. The Chair may recognize non-members on any matter of business.
16. The Faculty may decide at any time, by a 2/3 vote of those present and voting, that a whole meeting or any part of a meeting be held in camera.
17. Minutes of open meetings of the Faculty shall be recorded and distributed to the University.
18. All documents presented to the Faculty shall normally be regarded as public. Nevertheless, the Chair may declare a document confidential, in which case the document shall be made available in advance only to members of the Faculty and, if appropriate, the Senate.

POWERS AND DUTIES OF FACULTY COUNCIL

19. The powers and duties of the Faculty Council are delegated by the Faculty of Trades and Technology. Unless otherwise addressed in these bylaws, the Faculty Council shall have all the powers and duties ascribed to the Faculty by the University Act (See [University Act](#)), and by Board of Governors and Senate of the University.
20. Any recommendation to discontinue a program shall be sent, with a recommendation from the Faculty Council, to the Faculty, which will provide advice to the Senate, the Board, or other

bodies within the University as required. See KPU [Policy AC10, Procedure and Appendix A for Discontinuing a Program](#).

21. Any proposed changes to these Bylaws must be approved by the Faculty of Trades and Technology and, as required, by Senate.
22. Faculty Council may, by a 2/3 vote; send any other matter to the Faculty for decision or advice.
23. Faculty Council may, by a 2/3 vote; recommend to the Chair of the Faculty that an extraordinary meeting be called to address a matter forwarded by the Faculty Council to the Faculty for decision or advice. Barring such a recommendation, the Chair of the Faculty will determine whether the matter warrants an extraordinary meeting, or whether it shall be added to the agenda of the next regular meeting of the Faculty.

FACULTY COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP

24. Membership of the Trades and Technology Faculty Council consists of:
 - 24.1. Divisional Groupings: Two voting representatives elected from each of Group A (Appliance Service Technician, Automotive Service Technician, Farrier Science, Mechatronics and Advanced Manufacturing Technology, and Parts and Warehousing), Group B (Welding, Metal Fabrication and Millwright), Group C (Carpentry, Plumbing, and Masonry) and Group D (Electrical) departments. Groupings shall be reviewed biannually by Nominations and Governance Subcommittee for review from Faculty Council. Divisional groupings are for the purpose of Faculty Council only. Each of these representatives shall be an active faculty member as defined by the University Act (See [University Act](#)),
 - 24.2. The Dean of the Faculty, as a voting member,
 - 24.3. One Associate Dean, as a voting member,
 - 24.4. One voting student representative from the Faculty of Trades and Technology,
 - 24.5. One voting student alumni representative from the Faculty of Trades and Technology
 - 24.6. One non-voting Divisional Business Manager
 - 24.7. One non-voting representative from interdisciplinary and non-aligned programs recommended by the Nominations and Governance Committee and endorsed by the elected and ex officio members of Faculty Council. This representative shall be a faculty member as defined in the University Act (See [University Act](#)),
 - 24.8. One non-voting Professional Support Staff member (Full or Part time BCGEU or Administration).

- 24.9. Two non-voting Faculty Senators, for the term as elected to the Senate,
- 24.10. The President, ex-officio non-voting, or designate, and
- 24.11. The Registrar, ex-officio non-voting, or designate.
25. Members of Faculty Council, in their function as members of this body, do not act as delegates of the bodies or constituencies from which they were drawn; rather, as members, all must endeavour to serve the interest of the entire Faculty to the best of their ability.
26. Senate Bylaw No. 3, Conflict of Interest, applies.
27. Elections or recommendations for Faculty Council will normally occur in May of each year.
28. The term of each elected Councilor shall normally begin on August 1.
29. The term of each elected member of Faculty Council shall normally be two years, except for students and alumni whose term will be one year. Prior to any election, this term may be modified in order to ensure a staggering of terms and continuity of representation. In no case may the term exceed three years.
30. The term of a non-elected member of Faculty Council who does not serve in an ex officio capacity shall normally be one year.
31. Any member may resign from the Faculty Council by giving the Chair notice in writing.
32. The seat of a member who leaves the constituency from which that member has been elected shall be declared vacant.
33. Any member who will be absent from a meeting will notify the Chair prior to the meeting.
34. The use of alternates for voting members is not permitted.
35. The seat of any elected or appointed member who fails to attend three meetings of Faculty Council between August 1 and July 31 may be declared vacant by the Chair.
36. In the event that a seat of a member becomes vacant, a replacement shall be elected or appointed according to the usual process. For seats less than 6 months remaining in the term the seat will remain vacant until the next scheduled election. For seats with more than 6 months remaining, a bi-election shall be held. Members so elected or appointed shall serve the remaining term of office of the incumbent, at which point the normal election or appointment process will be followed.
37. Members of Faculty Council shall commit to serving on a minimum number of its committees, as set from time to time by Faculty Council. Members who do not serve on a minimum number of committees may have their seat on Faculty Council declared vacant by the Chair.

38. A vacancy in the Faculty Council does not impair the authority of the remaining members of the Faculty Council to act.

CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR OF FACULTY COUNCIL

39. Voting members of the Faculty Council will elect one Chair from within the Faculty Council's voting membership. The election will normally occur on or about September 1, and the normal term will be one year
40. The Chair is a voting member of the Faculty Council. In the event of a tie, the Chair casts the deciding vote
41. The Chair may be removed by a 2/3 majority vote of councilors present and voting at any duly called meeting of the Faculty Council.
42. Voting members of the Faculty Council will elect one Vice-Chair from within the Faculty Council's voting membership. The election will normally occur on or about September 1, and the normal term will be one year.
43. The Vice-Chair will fulfill the duties of the Chair in the Chair's vacancy or absence and will assist in the performance of the Chair's duties.
44. When necessary due to vacancy or absence of the Chair and Vice-Chair, the Dean shall serve as Chair pro-tem.

CONDUCT OF FACULTY COUNCIL BUSINESS

45. The Faculty Council shall normally have at least six (6) regular meetings per academic year (Aug. 1 – July 31).
46. In cases of urgency, extraordinary meetings of the Faculty Council may be called by the Chair of the Faculty Council.
47. Notice of a meeting of the Faculty Council shall be sent to the members of the Faculty Council at least four days in advance of a meeting.
48. The normal process of business at meetings of the Faculty Council shall be set by the Chair, Vice-Chair and the Dean.
49. The quorum for meetings of the Faculty Council shall be 50% plus 1 of the elected councilors eligible to vote.
50. Robert's Rules (the most recent version) of Order shall normally govern the conduct of all Faculty Council meetings. Such matters on which these Bylaws lay down specific procedures shall be accepted from the foregoing.

51. The majority required to pass a resolution shall be 50% of the voting membership present plus one, except where these Bylaws specify otherwise.
52. Meetings of the Faculty Council shall normally be open to observers.
53. The Chair may recognize non-members on any matter of business.
54. The Faculty Council may decide at any time, by a majority vote of those present and voting, that a whole meeting or any part of a meeting be held in camera.
55. Minutes of the Faculty Council shall be recorded and made available to the University. Minutes of in camera Faculty Council meetings shall be available to members of Faculty Council.
56. Any business conducted at a meeting where there is no quorum present will be considered as unofficial and subject to ratification at the next meeting held where a quorum is present. Any communication coming out of a meeting where no quorum was present shall be prefaced with a clear indication the communication is subject to ratification.
57. From time to time the Faculty Council Chair may invite guests to make presentations to Faculty Council meetings and to answer questions related to their presentations.

COMMITTEE(S) OF FACULTY COUNCIL

58. Faculty Council shall establish such committees, consisting of members and/or non-members, as the Faculty Council from time to time may think fit and may specify the duties to be performed by such committees.
59. The Dean (or designated Associate Dean) and the Chair of Faculty Council are recognized as voting members of all committees.
60. Committees of the Faculty Council are restricted to making recommendations to the Faculty Council, and may not assume any of the powers of the Council unless they are expressly delegated within these bylaws. Only Standing Committees will be delegated Faculty Council authority.
61. When recommending the establishment or elimination of a Standing Committee, or altering its membership or mandate, Faculty Council will seek the advice of the Standing Committee on Nominations and Governance, and make a recommendation to the Faculty for endorsement.
62. Terms of office for Standing Committee members shall normally be two years for Faculty Councilors who do not sit on the Standing Committee ex officio.
63. Terms of office for student and alumni representatives, and for Standing Committee members who are not Faculty Councilors shall normally be one year.
64. Members are eligible for re-election or reappointment.

65. Terms of office may be adjusted by the Standing Committee on Nominations and Governance to ensure continuity of membership, and to correspond to terms on Faculty Council.
66. Quorum for each Committee shall be 50% plus one of the total number of voting members.
67. Any committee member may resign from a committee by giving the Chair notice in writing.
68. The committee seat of a member who leaves the constituency from which that member has been appointed shall be declared vacant.
69. The seat of any committee member who fails to attend three committee meetings between August 1 and July 31 may be declared vacant by the Chair.
70. Each committee is chaired by a member of Faculty Council elected by the Committee for a term specified by the Committee. Until such time as a Chair is elected, the Dean or designated Associate Dean shall chair the Committee.
71. The Chair of each Committee shall be responsible for establishing the agenda, and for distributing it at least four days prior to any meeting to the members of the Committee.
72. Each Standing Committee will have the following General Composition plus others as required for individual committees. The General Composition of Standing Committees include:
 - Dean or Associate Dean
 - Chair or Vice Chair of Faculty Council
 - One faculty member representative from each Divisional Grouping.
 - A Divisional Grouping may designate up to two alternate representatives, one of whom may, should the regular representative provide notice of absence, participate and vote in the stead of that representative.
- 72.1. Each Standing Committee should have:
 - One Faculty of Trades and Technology student representative
- 72.2. Each Standing Committee will have a minimum of five members.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON NOMINATIONS AND GOVERNANCE

73. The voting members of the Standing Committee on Nominations and Governance consist of:
 - General Composition of Standing Committees
74. Administrative support for the Committee shall be assigned by the Divisional Business Manager, Trades and Technology.
75. The Standing Committee on Nominations and Governance shall:

- 75.1. Advise Faculty Council on matters related to elections, including timelines for nominations, elections, and appointments as required to meet the needs of the Faculty, Faculty Council and Standing Committees.
- 75.2. Ensure that nominations are made for all elections for the Faculty and for Faculty Council
- 75.3. Where requested by Faculty Council, conduct and oversee elections for designated positions on Faculty, Faculty Council and Faculty Council Committees.
- 75.4. Appoint or recommend members to serve on Faculty Council and Committees as outlined in these bylaws.
- 75.5. Advise Faculty Council on procedures for the recommendation and selection of Faculty representatives for university committees, and oversee these processes as requested by the Faculty Council.
- 75.6. Advise the Faculty Council on all matters related to the conduct of its business, its meetings and its proceedings
- 75.7. Advise Faculty Council on matters related to duties of members and conflict of interest.
- 75.8. Coordinate the work of Faculty Council Committees, especially where consultation between Committees is required.
- 75.9. Review regularly the bylaws of the Faculty and provide advice to Faculty Council, which will make any recommendations to the Faculty for approval.
- 75.10. Review at least once every three years the configuration of standing committees, their membership, terms of reference, and their consultation and reporting relationships, and propose to Faculty Council any recommendations for change
- 75.11. Establish such subcommittees as required to fulfill the Committee's responsibilities
- 75.12. Perform other duties as assigned by Faculty Council

STANDING COMMITTEE ON CURRICULUM

76. The voting members of the Standing Committee on Curriculum consist of:
 - General Composition of Standing Committees
 - One Advisor, approved by Faculty Council
77. The Registrar (or designate), and the Divisional Business Manager, Trades and Technology approved by the voting members of the Committee will sit as non-voting members of the Committee.

78. Administrative support for the Committee shall be assigned by the Divisional Business Manager, Trades and Technology.
79. The Standing Committee on Curriculum shall:
- 79.1. Exercise the delegated authority of the Trades and Technology Faculty Council to receive, review and approve all curriculum offered for credit by the departments, and to recommend curriculum to Senate and its appropriate Standing Committees for approval;
 - 79.2. Review periodically curricular and program components including, but not limited to, prerequisite structures, class format, credit assignment, learning outcomes, learning activities, assessment models, prior learning assessment processes, and make such recommendations to Faculty Council as may be appropriate.
 - 79.3. Ensure that all curriculum developed within the department conforms to University policies and procedures;
 - 79.4. Ensure appropriate consultation for courses that will be seeking articulation;
 - 79.5. Be responsible for the administration of the current Collective Agreement between Kwantlen Polytechnic University and Kwantlen Faculty Association Article 12.02 – Trades curriculum/program development requiring funding.
 - 79.6. Ensure the completion reports and reporting requirements are met regarding work produced during release time, and is saved on the common departmental sites in compliance with Section 18.02 of the current Collective Agreement between Kwantlen Polytechnic University and Kwantlen Faculty Association and KPU Policy RS5 Intellectual Property.
 - 79.7. Receive and review Program Concepts and Full Program Proposals (or such equivalent submissions as come to stand in their place) for degree and non-degree programs (such as post-baccalaureate credentials, associate degrees, diplomas, certificates, and citations), consult with the Standing Committee on Academic Planning and Priorities, and report with recommendations to Faculty Council.
 - 79.8. Review the implementation of new degree and non-degree programs as required by Senate or its appropriate Standing Committee(s). Report with recommendations to Faculty Council.
 - 79.9. Receive and review program revisions for degree and non-degree programs, and report with recommendations to Faculty Council.

- 79.10. Ensure that all external requirements for licensing, certification and accreditation arising from degree and non-degree programs within the Faculty are met;
- 79.11. Ensure that all curriculum materials are properly documented for approval and for use by other University Departments (Registrar's Office, Admissions, Counselling, etc.);
- 79.12. Provide detailed minutes including a list of curriculum approved at each meeting of the Curriculum Committee, for information, to the next scheduled meeting of the Faculty Council.
- 79.13. Attend/ensure attendance by each department at provincial articulation meetings and bring reports back to Faculty Council.
- 79.14. Review periodically the Committee's mandate, composition, processes, and approval criteria and make such recommendations to the Nominations and Governance Committee as may be appropriate.
- 79.15. Establish such subcommittees as required to fulfill the Committee's responsibilities
- 79.16. Perform other duties as assigned by Faculty Council.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING AND PRIORITIES AND BUDGET

80. The voting members of the Standing Committee on Academic Planning and Priorities and Budget consist of:
 - General Composition of Standing Committees
 - Divisional Business Manager. Divisional Business Manager will be a permanent non-voting member.
81. The elected Senators from the Faculty of Trades and Technology sit as non-voting members of the Committee.
82. Administrative support for the Committee shall be assigned by the Divisional Business Manager, Trades and Technology.
83. The Standing Committee on Academic Planning and Priorities and Budget shall:
 - 83.1. Advise Faculty Council on the mission, educational goals, objectives, strategies and priorities of the Faculty
 - 83.2. Advise Faculty Council on whether the establishment, revision or discontinuance of educational programs and other curricular changes support the mission, educational goals, objectives, strategies and priorities of the Faculty.

- 83.3. Advise Faculty Council on the priorities for implementation of new programs leading to apprenticeships, certificates, diplomas and degrees.
- 83.4. Advise Faculty Council on the establishment or discontinuance of programs of the Faculty
- 83.5. Advise Faculty Council on whether the terms of affiliation, articulation and other contractual agreements with other post-secondary institutions support the mission, educational goals, objectives, strategies and priorities of the Faculty.
- 83.6. Advise Faculty Council on processes for the development, review, implementation and communication of educational plans that support the priorities of the Faculty
- 83.7. Advise the Faculty Council on whether the Faculty budget proposal supports the academic priorities of the Faculty.
- 83.8. Make recommendations to Faculty Council on how research and scholarship within the Faculty may be facilitated, in support of the Faculty's mission, educational goals, objectives, strategies and priorities.
- 83.9. Advise Faculty Council on the establishment, revision or discontinuance of research centres, institutes, and research chairs and professorships, and other research-related matters requiring Faculty Council approval
- 83.10. Establish such subcommittees as needed to fulfill the Committee's responsibilities
- 83.11. On behalf of Faculty Council, advise the Dean and Associate Dean on the review and development of Academic Planning and Priorities.
- 83.12. On behalf of Faculty Council, advise the Dean and Associate Dean on the review and development of academic budgetary priorities, major capital plans, and the allocation of funds.
- 83.13. Advise Faculty Council and its committees on the budgetary implications of matters within the jurisdiction of Council and its Committees, including proposals for the new educational, research or other programs or initiatives, as required by Council and its committees,
- 83.14. At the request of Faculty Council, provide advice on matters related to the University's property, buildings and structures,
- 83.15. Assist Faculty Council in the development of budgetary policies, guidelines, processes and models,

- 83.16. Assist Faculty Council with the development of consultation and communicate strategies related to budgetary matters.
- 83.17. Present the annual Trades and Technology Divisional budget to Faculty Council
- 83.18. Other duties as assigned by Faculty Council



**Approved Dec. 19, 2016-
Faculty of Trades and
Technology
Faculty Bylaws**

Powers and Duties of the Faculty

1. The powers and duties of the Faculty of Trades and Technology are established in part by the University Act (See [University Act](#)), which currently describes the Faculty as having the power and duty:
 - 1.1 to make rules governing its proceedings, including the determining of the quorum necessary for the transaction of business,
 - 1.2 to provide for student representation in the meetings and proceedings of the faculty
 - 1.3 subject to this Act and to the approval of the senate, to make rules for the government, direction and management of the faculty and its affairs and business
 - 1.4 to determine, subject to the approval of the senate, the courses of instruction in the faculty,
 - 1.5 subject to an order of the president to the contrary, to prohibit lecturing and teaching in the faculty by persons other than appointed members of the teaching staff of the faculty and persons authorized by the faculty, and to prevent lecturing or teaching so prohibited,
 - 1.6 subject to the approval of the senate, to appoint for the examinations in each faculty examiners, who, subject to an appeal to the senate, must conduct examinations and determine the results,
 - 1.7 to deal with and, subject to an appeal to the senate, to decide on all applications and memorials by students and others in connection with their respective faculties,
 - 1.8 generally, to deal with all matters assigned to it by the board or the senate, and
 - 1.9 to form committees, as it sees fit, for the conduct of its affairs and business, and to empower such committees, where advisable, to report directly to the appropriate committee(s) of Senate.
2. A general rule made by the Faculty is not effective or enforceable until a copy has been sent to the Senate and the Senate has given its approval.

Faculty Membership

3. Membership of the Faculty of Trades and Technology consists of:
 - 3.1 All those employed within the Faculty of Trades and Technology as an instructor, lecturer, assistant professor, associate professor, professor, or an equivalent position designated by the Senate,
 - 3.2 The Dean of the Faculty,
 - 3.3 Associate Dean(s) of the Faculty,
 - 3.4 The President of the University,
 - 3.5 The Registrar, who is non-voting
 - 3.6 One member from and appointed by each other Faculty
4. The Faculty of Trades and Technology endorses the principle of student and alumni participation in Faculty decision-making and will reflect this in the constitution of its Faculty Council and Standing Committees.
5. The Dean is the Chair of the Faculty.
6. A Vice-Chair of the Faculty shall be elected by the Faculty from among those employed within the Faculty of Trades and Technology as an instructor, lecturer, assistant professor, associate professor, or professor, for a two-year term. Vice-Chairs may serve a maximum of three consecutive terms.



Approved Dec. 19, 2016-
Faculty of Trades and
Technology
Faculty Bylaws

Conduct of Business

7. The Faculty shall have at least two regular meetings per academic year.
8. In cases of urgency, extraordinary meetings of the Faculty may be called by the Chair or the Vice-Chair of the Faculty.
9. Notice of a meeting of the Faculty shall be sent to the members of the Faculty at least seven days in advance of a meeting.
10. The normal process of business at meetings of the Faculty shall be set by the Chair.
11. The quorum for meetings of the Faculty shall be 50% plus one of the members entitled to vote.
12. Robert's Rules of Order shall govern the conduct of all Faculty meetings, subject to interpretation by the Chair. Such matters on which these Bylaws lay down specific procedures shall be accepted from the foregoing. The most recent version of Robert's Rules shall be applied.
13. The majority required to pass a resolution shall be 51% of the members voting, except in the case of adoption of or amendments to these Bylaws, when the majority required shall be two-thirds of the members voting.
14. Meetings of the Faculty shall normally be open to observers.
15. The Chair may recognize non-members on any matter of business.
16. The Faculty may decide at any time, by a 2/3 vote of those present and voting, that a whole meeting or any part of a meeting be held in camera.
17. Minutes of open meetings of the Faculty shall be recorded and distributed to the University.
18. All documents presented to the Faculty shall normally be regarded as public. Nevertheless, the Chair may declare a document confidential, in which case the document shall be made available in advance only to members of the Faculty and, if appropriate, the Senate.

Powers & Duties of Faculty Council, Membership, Chair & Vice Chair, Conduct of Faculty Business

19. The powers and duties of the Faculty Council are delegated by the Faculty of Trades and Technology. Unless otherwise addressed in these bylaws, the Faculty Council shall have all the powers and duties ascribed to the Faculty by the University Act (See [University Act](#)), and by Board of Governors and Senate of the University.
20. Any recommendation to discontinue a program shall be sent, with a recommendation from the Faculty Council, to the Faculty, which will provide advice to the Senate, the Board, or other bodies within the University as required. See KPU [Policy AC10, Procedure and Appendix A for Discontinuing a Program](#).
21. Any proposed changes to these Bylaws must be approved by the Faculty of Trades and Technology and, as required, by Senate.
22. Faculty Council may, by a 2/3 vote; send any other matter to the Faculty for decision or advice.
23. Faculty Council may, by a 2/3 vote; recommend to the Chair of the Faculty that an extraordinary meeting be called to address a matter forwarded by the Faculty Council to the Faculty for decision or advice. Barring such a recommendation, the Chair of the Faculty will determine whether the matter warrants an extraordinary meeting, or whether it shall be added to the agenda of the next regular meeting of the Faculty.



Approved Dec. 19, 2016-
Faculty of Trades and
Technology
Faculty Bylaws

Faculty Council Membership

24 Membership of the Trades and Technology Faculty Council consists of:

- 24.1 Divisional Groupings: Two voting representatives elected from each of Group A (Appliance Service Technician, Automotive Service Technician, Farrier Science, Mechatronics and Advanced Manufacturing Technology, and Parts and Warehousing), Group B (Welding, Metal Fabrication and Millwright), Group C (Carpentry, Plumbing, and Masonry) and Group D (Electrical) departments. Groupings shall be reviewed biannually by Nominations and Governance Subcommittee for review from Faculty Council. Divisional groupings are for the purpose of Faculty Council only. Each of these representatives shall be an active faculty member as defined by the University Act (See University Act),
- 24.2 The Dean of the Faculty, as a voting member,
- 24.3 One Associate Dean, as a voting member,
- 24.4 One voting student representative from the Faculty of Trades and Technology.
- 24.5 One voting student alumni representative from the Faculty of Trades and Technology
- 24.6 One non-voting Divisional Business Manager.
- 24.7 One non-voting representative from interdisciplinary and non-aligned programs recommended by the Nominations and Governance Committee and endorsed by the elected and ex officio members of Faculty Council. This representative shall be a faculty member as defined in the University Act (See University Act),
- 24.8 One non-voting Professional Support Staff member (Full or Part time BCGEU or Administration).
- 24.9 Two non-voting Faculty Senators, for the term as elected to the Senate,
- 24.10 The President, ex-officio non-voting, or designate, and
- 24.11 The Registrar, ex-officio non-voting, or designate.
25. Members of Faculty Council, in their function as members of this body, do not act as delegates of the bodies or constituencies from which they were drawn; rather, as members, all must endeavour to serve the interest of the entire Faculty to the best of their ability.
26. Senate Bylaw No. 3, Conflict of Interest, applies.
27. Elections or recommendations for Faculty Council will normally occur in May of each year.
28. The term of each elected Councilor shall normally begin on August 1.
29. The term of each elected member of Faculty Council shall normally be two years, except for students and alumni whose term will be one year. Prior to any election, this term may be modified in order to ensure a staggering of terms and continuity of representation. In no case may the term exceed three years.
30. The term of a non-elected member of Faculty Council who does not serve in an ex officio capacity shall normally be one year.
31. Any member may resign from the Faculty Council by giving the Chair notice in

Deleted: CADD, Public Safety,

Deleted: Repair

Deleted: and

Deleted: Automotive Service Technician, Parts & Warehousing and

Moved (insertion) [1]

Formatted: Not Expanded by / Condensed by

Deleted: Business Manager,

Moved up [1]: <#>One voting student representative from the Faculty of Trades and Technology,¶
<#>One voting student alumni representative from the Faculty of Trades and Technology¶



**Approved Dec. 19, 2016-
Faculty of Trades and
Technology
Faculty Bylaws**



**Approved Dec. 19, 2016-
Faculty of Trades and
Technology
Faculty Bylaws**

32. The seat of a member who leaves the constituency from which that member has been elected shall be declared vacant.
33. Any member who will be absent from a meeting will notify the Chair prior to the meeting.
34. The use of alternates for voting members is not permitted.
35. The seat of any elected or appointed member who fails to attend three meetings of Faculty Council between August 1 and July 31 may be declared vacant by the Chair.
36. In the event that a seat of a member becomes vacant, a replacement shall be elected or appointed according to the usual process. For seats less than 6 months remaining in the term the seat will remain vacant until the next scheduled election. For seats with more than 6 months remaining, a bi-election shall be held. Members so elected or appointed shall serve the remaining term of office of the incumbent, at which point the normal election or appointment process will be followed.
37. Members of Faculty Council shall commit to serving on a minimum number of its committees, as set from time to time by Faculty Council. Members who do not serve on a minimum number of committees may have their seat on Faculty Council declared vacant by the Chair.
38. A vacancy in the Faculty Council does not impair the authority of the remaining members of the Faculty Council to act.

Chair and Vice Chair of Faculty Council

39. Voting members of the Faculty Council will elect one Chair from within the Faculty Council's voting membership. The election will normally occur on or about September 1, and the normal term will be one year.
40. The Chair is a voting member of the Faculty Council. In the event of a tie, the Chair casts the deciding vote.
41. The Chair may be removed by a 2/3 majority vote of councilors present and voting at any duly called meeting of the Faculty Council.
42. Voting members of the Faculty Council will elect one Vice-Chair from within the Faculty Council's voting membership. The election will normally occur on or about September 1, and the normal term will be one year.
43. The Vice-Chair will fulfill the duties of the Chair in the Chair's vacancy or absence and will assist in the performance of the Chair's duties.
44. When necessary due to vacancy or absence of the Chair and Vice-Chair, the Dean shall serve as Chair pro-tem.

Conduct of Faculty Council Business

45. The Faculty Council shall normally have at least six (6) regular meetings per academic year (Aug. 1 – July 31).
46. In cases of urgency, extraordinary meetings of the Faculty Council may be called by the Chair of the Faculty Council.
47. Notice of a meeting of the Faculty Council shall be sent to the members of the Faculty Council at least four days in advance of a meeting.
48. The normal process of business at meetings of the Faculty Council shall be set by the Chair, Vice-Chair and the Dean.
49. The quorum for meetings of the Faculty Council shall be 50% plus 1 of the elected councilors eligible to vote.
50. Robert's Rules (the most recent version) of Order shall normally govern the conduct of all Faculty Council meetings. Such matters on which these Bylaws lay down specific procedures shall be accepted from the foregoing.



**Approved Dec. 19, 2016-
Faculty of Trades and
Technology
Faculty Bylaws**

51. The majority required to pass a resolution shall be 50% of the voting membership present plus one, except where these Bylaws specify otherwise.
52. Meetings of the Faculty Council shall normally be open to observers.
53. The Chair may recognize non-members on any matter of business.
54. The Faculty Council may decide at any time, by a majority vote of those present and voting, that a whole meeting or any part of a meeting be held in camera.
55. Minutes of the Faculty Council shall be recorded and made available to the University. Minutes of in camera Faculty Council meetings shall be available to members of Faculty Council.
56. Any business conducted at a meeting where there is no quorum present will be considered as unofficial and subject to ratification at the next meeting held where a quorum is present. Any communication coming out of a meeting where no quorum was present shall be prefaced with a clear indication the communication is subject to ratification.
57. From time to time the Faculty Council Chair may invite guests to make presentations to Faculty Council meetings and to answer questions related to their presentations.

Committee(s) of Faculty Council

58. Faculty Council shall establish such committees, consisting of members and/or non-members, as the Faculty Council from time to time may think fit and may specify the duties to be performed by such committees.
59. The Dean (or designated Associate Dean) and the Chair of Faculty Council are recognized as voting members of all committees.
60. Committees of the Faculty Council are restricted to making recommendations to the Faculty Council, and may not assume any of the powers of the Council unless they are expressly delegated within these bylaws. Only Standing Committees will be delegated Faculty Council authority.
61. When recommending the establishment or elimination of a Standing Committee, or altering its membership or mandate, Faculty Council will seek the advice of the Standing Committee on Nominations and Governance, and make a recommendation to the Faculty for endorsement.
62. Terms of office for Standing Committee members shall normally be two years for Faculty Councilors who do not sit on the Standing Committee ex officio.
63. Terms of office for student and alumni representatives, and for Standing Committee members who are not Faculty Councilors shall normally be one year.
64. Members are eligible for re-election or reappointment.
65. Terms of office may be adjusted by the Standing Committee on Nominations and Governance to ensure continuity of membership, and to correspond to terms on Faculty Council.
66. Quorum for each Committee shall be 50% plus one of the total number of voting members.
67. Any committee member may resign from a committee by giving the Chair notice in writing.
68. The committee seat of a member who leaves the constituency from which that member has been appointed shall be declared vacant.
69. The seat of any committee member who fails to attend three committee meetings between August 1 and July 31 may be declared vacant by the Chair.
70. Each committee is chaired by a member of Faculty Council elected by the Committee for a term specified by the Committee. Until such time as a Chair is elected, the Dean or designated Associate Dean shall chair the Committee.



Approved Dec. 19, 2016-
Faculty of Trades and
Technology
Faculty Bylaws

71. The Chair of each Committee shall be responsible for establishing the agenda, and for distributing it at least four days prior to any meeting to the members of the Committee.
72. Each Standing Committee will have the following General Composition plus others as required for individual committees. The General Composition of Standing Committees include:
- Dean or Associate Dean
 - Chair or Vice Chair of Faculty Council
 - One faculty member representative from each Divisional Grouping.
 - A Divisional Grouping may designate up to two alternate representatives, one of whom may, should the regular representative provide notice of absence, participate and vote in the stead of that representative.
- 72.1 Each Standing Committee should have:
- One Faculty of Trades and Technology student representative
- 72.2 Each Standing Committee will have a minimum of five members.

Standing Committee on Nominations and Governance

73. The voting members of the Standing Committee on Nominations and Governance consist of:
- General Composition of Standing Committees
74. Administrative support for the Committee shall be assigned by the Divisional Business Manager, Trades and Technology.
75. The Standing Committee on Nominations and Governance shall:
- 75.1 Advise Faculty Council on matters related to elections, including timelines for nominations, elections, and appointments as required to meet the needs of the Faculty, Faculty Council and Standing Committees.
 - 75.2 Ensure that nominations are made for all elections for the Faculty and for Faculty Council
 - 75.3 Where requested by Faculty Council, conduct and oversee elections for designated positions on Faculty, Faculty Council and Faculty Council Committees.
 - 75.4 Appoint or recommend members to serve on Faculty Council and Committees as outlined in these bylaws.
 - 75.5 Advise Faculty Council on procedures for the recommendation and selection of Faculty representatives for university committees, and oversee these processes as requested by the Faculty Council.
 - 75.6 Advise the Faculty Council on all matters related to the conduct of its business, its meetings and its proceedings
 - 75.7 Advise Faculty Council on matters related to duties of members and conflict of interest.
 - 75.8 Coordinate the work of Faculty Council Committees, especially where consultation between Committees is required.
 - 75.9 Review regularly the bylaws of the Faculty and provide advice to Faculty Council, which will make any recommendations to the Faculty for approval.
 - 75.10 Review at least once every three years the configuration of standing committees, their membership, terms of reference, and their consultation and reporting relationships, and propose to Faculty Council any recommendations for change
 - 75.11 Establish such subcommittees as required to fulfill the Committee's responsibilities
 - 75.12 Perform other duties as assigned by Faculty Council

Standing Committee on Curriculum

76. The voting members of the Standing Committee on Curriculum consist of:
- General Composition of Standing Committees
 - One Advisor, approved by Faculty Council

Deleted: <#>One Faculty of Trades and Technology student representative¶
<#>One Faculty of Trades and Technology student alumni representative¶

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1.38"

Deleted: <#>One faculty member from each Divisional Groupings plus one designated alternative as selected by each Divisional Groupings.¶

Formatted: Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 1.38" + Indent at: 1.63"



**Approved Dec. 19, 2016-
Faculty of Trades and
Technology
Faculty Bylaws**

77. The Registrar (or designate), and the [Divisional](#) Business Manager, Trades and Technology approved by the voting members of the Committee will sit as non-voting members of the Committee.



Approved Dec. 19, 2016-
Faculty of Trades and
Technology
Faculty Bylaws

78. Administrative support for the Committee shall be assigned by the [Divisional](#) Business Manager, Trades and Technology.
79. The Standing Committee on Curriculum shall:
- 79.1 Exercise the delegated authority of the Trades and Technology Faculty Council to receive, review and approve all curriculum offered for credit by the departments, and to recommend curriculum to Senate and its appropriate Standing Committees for approval;
 - 79.2 Review periodically curricular and program components including, but not limited to, prerequisite structures, class format, credit assignment, learning outcomes, learning activities, assessment models, prior learning assessment processes, and make such recommendations to Faculty Council as may be appropriate.
 - 79.3 Ensure that all curriculum developed within the department conforms to University policies and procedures;
 - 79.4 Ensure appropriate consultation for courses that will be seeking articulation;
 - 79.5 [Be responsible for the administration of the current Collective Agreement between Kwantlen Polytechnic University and Kwantlen Faculty Association Article 12.02 – Trades curriculum/program development requiring funding.](#)
 - 79.6 [Ensure the completion reports and reporting requirements are met regarding work produced during release time, and is saved on the common departmental sites in compliance with Section 18.02 of the current Collective Agreement between Kwantlen Polytechnic University and Kwantlen Faculty Association and Policy RS5 Intellectual Property.](#)
 - 79.7 Receive and review Program Concepts and Full Program Proposals (or such equivalent submissions as come to stand in their place) for degree and non-degree programs (such as post-baccalaureate credentials, associate degrees, diplomas, certificates, and citations), consult with the Standing Committee on Academic Planning and Priorities, and report with recommendations to Faculty Council.
 - 79.8 Review the implementation of new degree and non-degree programs as required by Senate or its appropriate Standing Committee(s). Report with recommendations to Faculty Council.
 - 79.9 Receive and review program revisions for degree and non-degree programs, and report with recommendations to Faculty Council.
 - 79.10 Ensure that all external requirements for licensing, certification and accreditation arising from degree and non-degree programs within the Faculty are met;
 - 79.11 Ensure that all curriculum materials are properly documented for approval and for use by other University Departments (Registrar's Office, Admissions, Counselling, etc.);
 - 79.12 Provide detailed minutes including a list of curriculum approved at each meeting of the Curriculum Committee, for information, to the next scheduled meeting of the Faculty Council.
 - 79.13 Attend/ensure attendance by each department at provincial articulation meetings and bring reports back to Faculty Council.
 - 79.14 Review periodically the Committee's mandate, composition, processes, and approval criteria and make such recommendations to the Nominations and Governance Committee as may be appropriate.
 - 79.15 Establish such subcommittees as required to fulfill the Committee's responsibilities
 - 79.16 Perform other duties as assigned by Faculty Council.

Formatted: Not Expanded by / Condensed by

Formatted: Not Expanded by / Condensed by

Standing Committee on Academic Planning and Priorities and Budget

80. The voting members of the Standing Committee on Academic Planning and Priorities and Budget consist of:
- General Composition of Standing Committees
 - [Divisional](#) Business Manager. [Divisional](#) Business Manager will be a permanent non-voting



**Approved Dec. 19, 2016-
Faculty of Trades and
Technology
Faculty Bylaws**

member.

81. The elected Senators from the Faculty of Trades and Technology sit as non-voting members of the Committee.
82. Administrative support for the Committee shall be assigned by the [Divisional](#) Business Manager, Trades and Technology.
83. The Standing Committee on Academic Planning and Priorities and Budget shall:



**Approved Dec. 19, 2016-
Faculty of Trades and
Technology
Faculty Bylaws**

- 83.1 Advise Faculty Council on the mission, educational goals, objectives, strategies and priorities of the Faculty
- 83.2 Advise Faculty Council on whether the establishment, revision or discontinuance of educational programs and other curricular changes support the mission, educational goals, objectives, strategies and priorities of the Faculty.
- 83.3 Advise Faculty Council on the priorities for implementation of new programs leading to apprenticeships, certificates, diplomas and degrees.
- 83.4 Advise Faculty Council on the establishment or discontinuance of programs of the Faculty
- 83.5 Advise Faculty Council on whether the terms of affiliation, articulation and other contractual agreements with other post-secondary institutions support the mission, educational goals, objectives, strategies and priorities of the Faculty.
- 83.6 Advise Faculty Council on processes for the development, review, implementation and communication of educational plans that support the priorities of the Faculty
- 83.7 Advise the Faculty Council on whether the Faculty budget proposal supports the academic priorities of the Faculty.
- 83.8 Make recommendations to Faculty Council on how research and scholarship within the Faculty may be facilitated, in support of the Faculty's mission, educational goals, objectives, strategies and priorities.
- 83.9 Advise Faculty Council on the establishment, revision or discontinuance of research centres, institutes, and research chairs and professorships, and other research-related matters requiring Faculty Council approval
- 83.10 Establish such subcommittees as needed to fulfill the Committee's responsibilities
- 83.11 On behalf of Faculty Council, advise the Dean and Associate Dean on the review and development of Academic Planning and Priorities.
- 83.12 On behalf of Faculty Council, advise the Dean and Associate Dean on the review and development of academic budgetary priorities, major capital plans, and the allocation of funds.
- 83.13 Advise Faculty Council and its committees on the budgetary implications of matters within the jurisdiction of Council and its Committees, including proposals for the new educational, research or other programs or initiatives, as required by Council and its committees,
- 83.14 At the request of Faculty Council, provide advise on matters related to the University's property, buildings and structures,
- 83.15 Assist Faculty Council in the development of budgetary policies, guidelines, processes and models,
- 83.16 Assist Faculty Council with the development of consultation and communicate strategies related to budgetary matters.
- 83.17 Present the annual Trades and Technology Divisional budget to Faculty Council
- 83.18 Other duties as assigned by Faculty Council

SENATE

Agenda Item: 7.4

Meeting Date: June 28, 2021

Presenter: Sharmen Lee

Agenda Item: **AC 13 Qualifications for Faculty Members:
Operations and Technical Management (OTM) Department**

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

Recommended Resolution:	That Senate approves the amended AC 13 Qualifications for Faculty Members for School of Business, Operations and Technical Management (OTM) Department.
--------------------------------	--

Senate Standing Committee Report: On June 16, 2021, the Senate Governance and Nominating Committee recommended that Senate approve the amended AC 13 Qualifications for Faculty Members for School of Business, Operations and Technical Management (OTM) Department.

Consultations: Approved by the OTM Department in January 2021 and Faculty Council in February 2021

Attachments:

1. Table showing current and proposed AC13 *Qualifications for Faculty Members*
2. AC 13 Qualifications for Faculty Members Policy, Procedures, and Table

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

Date submitted: *June 18, 2021*

SENATE OFFICE

AC13 FACULTY QUALIFICATIONS SUBMISSION

SCHOOL OF BUSINESS

OPERATIONS AND TECHNICAL MANAGEMENT (OTM)

Discipline/Program	Academic	Professional	Teaching	Experience
Current				
OTM – a newly formed department	A relevant Master's degree		Prior instructional experience building inclusive learning experiences in an intercultural environment, teaching with cases, and web-based technology delivery is an asset.	5 years related work experience
Proposed				
OTM	Master's degree in business OR master's degree in a field related to the course(s) to be taught.	Appropriate professional designation preferred (such as PMP, SCMP, C.Mgr., and ASQ).	Preference will be given to candidates with successful teaching experiences at a post-secondary level in a teaching-intensive, applied, intercultural environment.	Minimum 5 years of relevant industry experience related to the discipline/topic of the program and course (s).

SENATE

Agenda Item: 8

Meeting Date: June 28, 2021

Presenter: Heather Clark

Chair's Report to Senate

Joint Senate Standing Committee on Academic Planning and Priorities and University Budget June 4, 2021

For June we had another joint Academic Planning and Priorities and University Budget meeting. The meeting started with a call for nominations for the SSCUB chair position. With no nominations, current Vice-Chair of Senate, David Burns will continue in the position until his term is finished and then the incoming Vice-Chair of Senate will step into the role in the coming fall.

There was a brief discussion on policy AC10 Development and Change of Senate Approved Programs, with the reminder shared that the policy is also on the blog for further input and discussion at this time.

Tara Clowes shared the university priorities and FY 2022-23 budget tenants. In these priorities it was shared that there is an expectation for a balanced budget, with the plan this is a one-year budget to allow for stabilization to occur post pandemic. This discussion resulted in the motion THAT the Joint Standing Committee on Academic Planning and Priorities and on University Budget recommend that Senate endorse the budget principles and tenets for FY 2022 – 23 with additional consideration to recognize support for the New KPU, which was carried.

A child care facility proposal was presented by Tara Clowes and Sandy Vanderburgh. This presentation touched on the aim that the child care facility, requiring a new build on the Surrey campus, will be managed by a third party operator, with it also providing practicum options for an Early Childhood Educator (ECE) program. Preliminary financial work has been done on this proposal and opportunities for potential government funding to support the project were also highlighted. It was noted that while the child care facility and ECE program might have some overlap, they are separate proposals. This was generally felt to be an exciting proposal by the committee.

Rajiv Jhangiani shared an update on the work that has been done on policy AC15 Micro Credentials, and the quantity of feedback gained and then addressed from committee presentations and the policy blog. The motion THAT the Senate Standing Committee on Academic Planning and Priorities recommend that Senate recommend to the Board of Governors the approval of Policy and Procedure AC15 *Micro-credentials* was carried.

Rajiv Jhangiani noted the following highlights from the Teaching and Learning report: new recording studio has opened and is available for use, Camtasia is now available to all faculty and instructional staff for video editing, and that the Teaching and Learning Innovation Fund has been a great success with a number of exciting projects and initiatives on the go in a range of faculties.

SENATE

Agenda Item: 8.1

Meeting Date: June 28, 2021

Presenter: Alan Davis

Agenda Item 2022-23 Budget Principles and Priorities

Action Requested	Motion
Recommended Resolution	THAT Senate endorse the budget principles and priorities for FY 2022 – 23 with additional consideration to recognize support for the New KPU.

Senate Standing Committee Report

On June 4, 2021 the Joint Standing Committee on Academic Planning and Priorities and on University Budget recommended that Senate endorse the budget principles and priorities for FY 2022 – 23 with additional consideration to recognize support for the New KPU.

Context & Background

The FY 2022-23 budget development process is now in planning. Producing the annual budget for the university is a detailed process that begins shortly into the new fiscal year. Learning from the successful budget development process in FY 2021-22, multiple touchpoints with stakeholders throughout the budget development process are planned.

Key Messages

1. In line with the budget timelines that were presented to SSCUB on May 7, 2021, administration would like to gather feedback on the draft FY 2022-23 budget principles and priorities.
2. The Board of Governors has indicated they are expecting a balanced budget for FY 2022-23. The university must ensure any principles and priorities that are set can be achieved within a balanced budget framework.

Consultations

1. University Executive
2. Finance Committee

Attachments

1. KPU Memo_University Priorities FY23 v3
2. 2022-23 Budget Principles v4

Submitted by

*Tara Clowes, Vice-President, Administration and Finance
Updated by Rita Zamluk, Administrative Assistant, University Senate*

Date submitted

June 23, 2021

MEMORANDUM

TO: Senate Standing Committee on University Budget

FROM: Tara Clowes, VP Finance and Administration

DATE: May 19, 2021

SUBJECT: FY 2022-23 University Priorities

Dear Governors,

It is time to turn our attention to the FY 2022-23 budget priorities. KPU's primary goal is to ensure business continuity in these uncertain times. We need to prioritize student success and support for faculty as outlined in the Academic Continuity Plan. Continuing to support and improve the work of the Strategic Enrolment Planning Committee will be essential. While KPU previously had a focus on moving towards a multi-year budget strategy, in these uncertain times consideration has been given to the uncertainty of what pandemic recovery looks like for the post-secondary industry. The recommendation is to return to a one-year budget strategy for at least FY 2022-23, with the option of a multi-year budget up for consideration in the subsequent year.

While the FY 2021-22 budget was approved as a deficit budget it is important that the FY 2022-23 budget process focus on returning KPU's financial position back to a balanced budget.

For the development of the FY 2022-23 budget, the University Executive will utilize the following organizational priorities as set out in Vision 2023 and the Academic Plan 2023:

1. A portion of KPU's revenue continues to be volatile and less predictable than in prior years. As such, budgets must remain as flexible in order to allow KPU to react appropriately in a continually evolving context.
2. Support academic continuity with a focus on innovative teaching and learning, and research.
3. Support our employees with the tools and services that they need.
4. Maintain the experience of our students by ensuring access to diverse courses and programs, experiential learning opportunities where possible, as well as services, resources and facilities that support student learning, development and mental health, with an emphasis on continued teaching and learning support.
5. Maintain the experience of employees by providing access to professional development and technological training, internal advancement opportunities, and an inclusive workplace where all people are treated with dignity and respect.

6. Improve the integrated planning culture through the continued implementation of an enrolment management strategy, with a focus on aligning recruitment, admissions and retention processes with KPU's capacity to meet demand and support student success.
7. Through integrated planning, continue to focus on financial sustainability and predictability, and improving alignment of organizational resources with strategic priorities.
8. Diversify and optimize revenue streams, through projects and initiatives and targeted program development for revenue generation, to offset increasing cost pressures.
9. Demonstrate value and respect for the richness of cultures and traditions of Indigenous peoples.
10. Enhance KPU's reputation as an integral and transformative post-secondary institution and continue to invest in government relations and community engagement.

Budget Principles and Priorities

Budget Principles	2023 Budget Priority
Ensure financial sustainability for the university.	The 2022 – 2023 fiscal budget will be balanced.
Support for continuity of teaching, learning, research and the student experience	The University Budget will help to address the changing environment related to COVID-19 post pandemic by maintaining, as far as possible, sustained levels of staffing, core teaching and learning activities and the student experience. The budget will continue to support the continued enhancement of research activities in line with the Whitepaper on Research recommendations. Budget shifts to support “New KPU” are encouraged with an understanding they should be funded out of existing funding pots.
Predictability for faculties	The University Budget will provide predictability for faculties by being built on a roll-forward budget basis. Incremental changes will be made to reflect budget changes for strategic priorities.
All new activities must be funded on a lifecycle basis	All activities must be funded over the lifecycle of the activity, initiative or project to ensure adequate funding over the life of the activity, initiative or project. Approved projects will have budget spanning fiscal years, where appropriate. KPU will continue to proceed with caution on any new projects and initiatives with a focus on cost recovery or strategic program development
Capital expenditures should not increase annual amortization expense	KPU's self-funded annual amortization expense is approximately 5% of the operating expense budget; no capital expenditures should be incurred that will increase this amount without targeted external funding to support ongoing amortization commitments. Capital asset investments in support of key areas such as teaching and learning, IT, research and innovation support will continue to be high priority to the extent capital asset funds allocation will be available.
Budget models must be based on enrolment drivers	A set of assumptions must be adopted regarding enrolment expectations on a long-term basis to create a foundational assumption for the development of the budget and to address growing waitlists.

International tuition and enrolment should be forecasted in a moderately conservative manner and maintained at desired levels	KPU is reliant on international tuition as a revenue stream, and efforts to control and predict this stream are critical. KPU shall be conservative in budgeting international revenue, while allowing flexibility in the projection model to reflect ever changing situational facts surrounding international student enrollment during the pandemic.
Budget changes shall fall within the scope of each executive portfolio.	Efforts shall be made to maintain the relative size of each institutional portfolio budget (academic, student, administration) to ensure each area retains its relative allocation of institutional resources.
Historically unutilized budget will be re-profiled to other institutional priorities	Based on pre-pandemic level and pandemic level trending data, budgets in areas with historical utilization rates of less than 90% may be considered for the potential to be re-profiled to other institutional priorities
Ancillary services will be budgeted at no less than a balanced budget	Ancillary services has historically been a modest profit centre for the institution. The revenues of ancillary services was significantly impacted due to pandemic forces. Post pandemic ancillary services is expected to return to a balanced budget with a long-term view to return to a modest profit centre for the institution.
KPU will maintain sufficient contingency budget to respond to unanticipated pressures.	KPU has historically maintained contingency budget to respond to unanticipated revenue downturns as well as inflationary pressures. The 2022/23 budget will better document the basis for those contingency budgets as well as explore if additional contingency budget is required to cover foreign exchange fluctuations.

SENATE

Agenda Item: 11

Meeting Date: June 28, 2021

Presenter: Carlos Calao

Chair's Report to Senate Senate Standing Committee on Policy June 6, 2021

The Senate Standing Committee on Policy started with a territorial acknowledgement followed by one minute of personal reflection.

The June 6th SSCP agenda consisted of discussions associated with the following policies:

1. **AC1 (Program Advisory Committees):** Brian Moukperian highlighted the consultation process including the extensive consultation with Deans, Associated Deans, and Program/Department Chairs in April 2021. AC1 is currently open for comments via KPU's Policy blog and will remain available until June 24th, 2021.
2. **AC10 Development and Change of Senate-approved Programs:** Dr. Burns provided background and context for the discussion pursuant to AC10. He overviewed the current process to develop policies, noted key changes included streamlining the policy, guidelines, and processes to be as clear and concise as possible. AC10 is currently open for comments via KPU's Policy blog and will remain available until June 24th, 2021.
3. **AC15 Micro-credentials:** Rajiv Jhangiani thanked the KPU community for their contributions and comments. He updated the committee on recent policy revisions, provincial and federal activity regarding micro-credential development, and the next steps before the policy moves forward to Senate. All comments received during the consultation period (Feb to April 2021) have been responded to by the Policy Developer. Senate Standing Committee on Policy recommend that Senate recommend to the Board of Governors the approval of policy and procedure for AC15 - Micro-credentials.

Report of Special Assistant to Provost and Vice-President, Academic: Josephine Chan advised SSCP that the President has approved RS6 *Animal Use and Ethics in Teaching and Research*.

SENATE

Agenda Item: 11.1

Meeting Date: June 28, 2021

Presenter: Rajiv Jhangiani

Agenda Item

AC15 *Micro-credentials*

Action Requested	Motion
Recommended Resolution	THAT Senate recommend to the Board of Governors the approval of Policy and Procedure AC15 <i>Micro-credentials</i>.

Senate Standing Committee Report

On June 2, the Senate Standing Committee on Policy recommended that Senate recommend to the Board of Governors the approval of Policy and Procedure AC15 *Micro-credentials*.

On June 4, the Joint Standing Committee on Academic Planning and Policy and on University Budget recommended that Senate recommend to the Board of Governors the approval of Policy and Procedure AC15 *Micro-credentials*.

On June 16, 2021, the Senate Standing Committee on Curriculum recommended that Senate recommend to the Board of Governors the approval of Policy and Procedure AC15 *Micro-credentials*.

Context & Background

Draft Policy and Procedure AC15 were posted on the [KPU Policy Blog](#) from February 26 – April 8, 2021. Leading up to and during this time period, all Faculty Councils (and in the case of Health and Design, Chairs and additional Faculty committees) and three Senate Standing Committees (SSCC, SSC Policy, SSCAPP) were consulted for feedback. All feedback and corresponding responses have been provided in the attached “AC15 Consultation Feedback February-April 2021” document, with suggestions incorporated in the attached draft Policy and Procedure.

Responses to the blog comments were posted on the Blog throughout the 6-week public commenting period, and are attached herewith for ease of reference. In response to the comments and suggestions posted on the Blog, some revisions were made to the draft Policy and Procedure. These include:

- Affirmation that micro-credentials will be offered in accordance with existing university bylaws and policies
- Addition of a definition of the Digital Badge Committee
- Clarification of the definitions for Micro Course and Short Course
- Inclusion of key details that will be required in the Micro-credential outline form
- Assertion that proposals for credit-bearing micro-credentials must first receive approval from the relevant Faculty curriculum committee and Faculty Council prior to being submitted to the SMC Chair
- Revisions to the workflow of the Senate Micro-credentials Committee (SMC), including that the review will be performed by all members of the SMC (instead of a subset of 3 members), with a minimum response rate for approval of 7 out of 11 members for a decision, and an approval requirement of a simple majority
- Removal of the appeal process of the adjudication committee's decision as the decision will now be made by all members of the SMC
- Revision of the timeline for the review of proposals by Department Chairs (in cases of potential duplication of offerings) from 5 working days to 10 working days
- Revision of the timeline for the periodic review of approved micro-credentials from 1 year to 2 years

Updates were also made to the Backgrounder & FAQs document to reflect recent developments, including the publication of white papers, reports, and frameworks related to micro-credentials in Canada.

Key Messages

1. All feedback collected from February to April 2021 have been documented and responded to by the Policy Developer (please see "AC15 Consultation Feedback February-April 2021")
2. All comments received during the 6-week public posting period have been responded to by the Policy Developer (attached).
3. The revisions made to the policy and procedure have addressed the major concerns and questions raised and incorporated many of the suggested revisions offered during the consultation process.

Consultations

Please see "AC15 Consultation Feedback February-April 2021" and "AC15 Blog Comments and Responses" attached.

Attachments

1. Draft AC15 *Micro-credentials* Policy
2. Draft AC15 *Micro-credentials* Procedure

3. Micro-credentials at KPU: Backgrounder & FAQs
4. AC15 Consultation Feedback February-April 2021
5. AC15 Blog Comments and Responses
6. Policy Timeline AC15 Micro-credentials

Submitted by *Dr. Rajiv Jhangiani, Associate Vice President, Teaching and Learning*

Date submitted *June 17, 2021*

Policy History
Policy No. AC15
Approving Jurisdiction: Board of Governors with the advice of Senate
Administrative Responsibility: Provost and Vice President Academic
Effective Date:

Micro-credentials Policy

A. CONTEXT AND PURPOSE

This policy establishes a framework for the development and approval of short, non-traditional educational offerings at Kwantlen Polytechnic University (KPU) in line with section 35.2(5) of the *University Act*. It aims to create a clear distinction between those offerings which are approved by Senate and those which are approved by the Provost.

B. SCOPE AND LIMITS

This policy applies to all educational offerings at KPU which fall outside of the jurisdiction of KPU Policy AC14 *KPU Credential Framework*. This includes a framework for the approval of Micro-credentials and Digital Badges. Micro Courses are noted for definitional purposes only, but fall under the scope of AC14. Short courses are also noted for definitional purposes.

C. STATEMENT OF POLICY PRINCIPLES

1. Micro-credentials are short, competency-based offerings.
2. Micro-credentials are represented by verifiable, portable, and shareable Open Badges that allow learners flexibility in the way they articulate their competencies.
3. Micro-credentials are subject to an expedited Senate approval process to facilitate just-in-time development of new training needed by learners, employers, and the wider community.
4. Micro-credentials will be offered in accordance with existing university bylaws and policies, including those concerning student tuition and fees and student evaluation and grading.
5. Digital Badges are distinct from Micro-credentials in their content and assessment and are subject to a clear development and approval process under the oversight of the Provost and Vice President, Academic. This process should be shared with Senate and regular reports on Digital Badges sent to Senate in line with section 35.2(6)(c) of the *University Act*.

D. DEFINITIONS

Refer to Section A of AC15 *Micro-credentials Procedure* for a list of definitions in support of this Policy.

E. RELATED POLICIES & LEGISLATION

AC14 *KPU Credential Framework*

F. RELATED PROCEDURES

AC15 Micro-credentials Procedure

DRAFT

Policy History
Policy No. AC15
Approving Jurisdiction: Board of Governors with the advice of Senate
Administrative Responsibility: Provost and Vice President Academic
Effective Date:

Micro-credentials Procedure

A. DEFINITIONS

1. **Digital Badge:** A KPU Digital Badge is used to represent completion-based learning through an activity offered by a KPU academic or service unit. It is not approved by Senate and is non-credit-bearing. It is verifiable, portable, and shareable.
2. **Digital Badge Committee (DBC):** A committee created by the Provost for the purpose of reviewing and approving Digital Badges.
3. **Micro Course:** A KPU Micro Course is shorter in length and curriculum than a traditional course and results in less than 3 credits. It may be a new, standalone offering or a modular version of an existing KPU course. It is approved by Senate. Micro Courses that are competency-based may be proposed as Micro-credentials.
4. **Micro-credential:** A KPU Micro-credential is a short, flexible offering that is competency-based. It is approved by the Senate Micro-credential Committee, may be non-credit-bearing, credit-bearing, or embedded within credit-bearing courses or programs, and is represented through an Open Badge.
5. **Open Badge:** A KPU Open Badge is used to represent competency-based learning through a KPU Micro-credential. It contains information about the competency and whether the associated Micro-credential is non-credit-bearing, credit-bearing, or embedded within a credit-bearing course or program. It is verifiable, portable, and shareable.
6. **Senate Micro-credential Committee (SMC):** A senate committee that may conduct its business synchronously or asynchronously for the purpose of expeditiously reviewing and approving micro-credential offerings at KPU.
7. **Short Course:** A KPU Short Course is a non-credit offering that is focused on knowledge acquisition in line with KPU Policy *AD4 Continuing Education and Contract Services*. Short Courses that are competency-based may be proposed as Micro-credentials.

B. PROCEDURES

1. Micro-credentials

- a. The Senate Standing Committee on Curriculum (SSCC) will create a subcommittee, *Senate Micro-credential Committee (SMC)*, for the purpose of reviewing and approving micro-credential offerings at KPU.
- b. The SMC will have an elected Chair, from among the following members:
 - i. One faculty member from each Faculty
 - ii. One representative from the Office of the Provost and Vice President Academic
 - iii. One representative from Continuing & Professional Studies
 - iv. One decanal representative
- c. The SMC will create and make available a Micro-credential Outline form, which will require information including but not limited to:
 - i. Confirmation that the proposed Micro-credential meets the criteria for a competency-based Micro-credential
 - ii. The type (credit-bearing or non-credit-bearing) and the academic level (preparatory, vocational, undergraduate, or graduate) of the proposed Micro-credential
 - iii. Details concerning the proposed Micro-credential (e.g., title, description, learning outcomes, etc.)
 - iv. Summary of relevant consultations that have occurred
- d. For Micro-credential proposals that are non-credit-bearing, the proponent will complete the Micro-credential Outline form and submit it to the SMC Chair.
- e. For Micro-credential proposals that are credit-bearing or embedded within credit-bearing courses or programs, the proponent will complete the Micro-credential Outline form and submit it to the relevant Faculty Standing Committee on Curriculum and then Faculty Council for approval, prior to being submitted to the SMC Chair.
- f. The SMC will oversee the following expedited approval process:
 - i. The SMC Chair receives a Micro-credential Outline form
 - ii. The SMC Chair determines if the form is complete and ready to be reviewed by the SMC. If the form is not complete, the SMC Chair will provide feedback to the proponent and await resubmission.
 - iii. The chair will forward the Micro-credential Outline form to all members of the committee for their review that will be completed within 10 working days. As SMC members conduct their review, they will also consider the following questions:
 - 1) Does the Micro-credential represent a duplication of offerings at KPU?
 - a) If the Micro-credential represents a duplication, the Department Chair(s) of the department(s) with the existing offering will be sent the proposal for review.
 - b) The Department Chair(s) will be given 10 working days to review the proposal and respond to the SMC Chair.
 - 2) Is the Micro-credential competency-based?
 - 3) Will the Micro-credential be credit-bearing or embedded within credit-bearing courses or programs?
 - iv. At the end of the 10-working day review period, the Chair will electronically call the question on the approval of the proposed Micro-credential.
 - v. The minimum response rate for approval will be 7 members of the SMC, with a simple majority required for approval.
 - vi. If the SMC approves the proposal, the Chair of the SMC will sign the proposal and send to the Provost for signature.

- vii. If the SMC does not approve the proposal, an electronic meeting will be held to discuss the proposal. At the end of the meeting a final vote will be called. If the proposal still does not have approval from a majority of SMC members, it will be returned to the proponent for revisions.

- 1) For Micro-credential proposals that are credit-bearing or embedded within credit-bearing courses or programs, the revised proposal must obtain approval from the relevant Faculty Standing Committee on Curriculum and Faculty Council, prior to being resubmitted to the SMC Chair.

- g. Micro-credential proposals that are non-credit-bearing will go through the SMC approval process. If approved by the SMC the proposal will then be submitted to the Provost for signature.
- h. Micro-credential proposals that have requested to be credit-bearing or embedded within credit-bearing courses or programs or to be recognized as a requisite for other KPU courses or degree requirements, will go through the SMC approval process. If approved by the SMC the proposal will then be submitted to the Provost for signature. Upon receipt of the signature of the Provost, the Micro-credential proposal will be sent to SSCC for review and recommendation to Senate.
 - i. An approved Micro-credential that has been signed off by the Provost may be offered as non-credit-bearing while it is awaiting review by the SSCC and Senate.
- i. Micro-credentials will be reviewed biennially by the relevant program area to ensure their currency and other related factors. Micro-credentials not offered for a period of 2 years will be considered by the Provost for discontinuance and sent to the SMC for action as needed.

2. Digital Badges

- a. The Provost will create a *Digital Badge Committee (DBC)* for the purpose of reviewing and approving Digital Badges.
- b. The DBC will have an elected Chair, from among the following members:
 - i. One faculty representative
 - ii. One representative from the Office of the Provost and Vice-President Academic
 - iii. One non-academic administrative representative
 - iv. One decanal representative
- c. The Provost will send a regular report to SSCC listing all Digital Badges that have been approved since the last SSCC meeting.
- d. If SSCC determines that a Digital Badge has been created erroneously and should have fallen under the Micro-credential approval or other Senate approval process, the Provost will be asked to provide a more detailed explanation of the Digital Badge at the next SSCC meeting.
- e. If SSCC remains dissatisfied with the Digital Badge, it will be sent to Senate for a final decision.

C. RELATED POLICY

Refer to *Micro-credentials Policy*.

Backgrounder: Growth in Micro-Credentials in BC and Canada

Growth in Micro-credentials across Canada

A rapidly growing number of PSIs are now developing and offering micro-credentials, including:

- Polytechnics Canada's 13 members, who have agreed on a [common understanding of micro-credentials](#) and are working together to develop and pilot shared micro-credentials
- [22 member institutions of eCampusOntario](#) that are piloting micro-credentials, including the University of Guelph, Lakehead University, OCAD University, Ontario Tech University, Ryerson University, and the University of Toronto
- Individual initiatives such as those at the [University of Calgary](#), [McMaster University](#), [Saskatchewan Polytechnic](#), [Conestoga College](#), [NAIT](#), [Lethbridge College](#), [Vancouver Community College](#), [Humber College](#), [Sheridan College](#), [Red River College](#), [St. Lawrence College](#), [Durham College](#), [Collège Boréal](#), [Fanshawe College](#), [Loyalist College](#), [University of Windsor](#), [Red River College](#), [Manitoba Institute of Trades and Technology](#), [Carleton University](#), and [York University](#). Many of the institutional micro-credentialing initiatives have launched or expanded since the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic.

This growth mirrors federal lobbying efforts by [Universities Canada](#), [Polytechnics Canada](#), and [Colleges & Institutes Canada](#) for investments into upskilling and reskilling by providing funding for accessible short courses that develop career-relevant skills in key demand areas.

In 2020, the [Government of Ontario pledged a \\$59.5 million investment](#) over 3 years to support micro-credentials. This includes the April 2021 launch of the [Ontario Micro-credentials Challenge Fund](#), which provides \$15 million to support post-secondary institutions that wish to partner with industry, employers, and other organizations to “accelerate the development of rapid training programs and help people retrain and upgrade their skills to succeed in their current careers or find new employment.” Ontario has also [expanded the Ontario Student Assistance Program](#) (OSAP) to include nearly 600 micro-credential programs.

Growth in Micro-credentials in BC

A growing number of BC PSIs are also now offering micro-credentials. In Sept. 2020 the BC Ministry of Advanced Education and Skills Training invited proposals from PSIs for a \$4M initiative to support the rapid development of up to 10 micro-credentials in high-demand, industry driven areas (to be launched between Nov. 2020-Jan. 2021). A total of [24 micro-credentials were developed and offered](#) by 15 public post-secondary institutions in BC. The Ministry has since drafted a Provincial framework for micro-credentials that will be circulated for discussion. This draft framework was developed in consultation with a post-secondary advisory group that includes representation from KPU.

The BC Council on Admissions and Transfer (BCCAT) recently published a [report](#) about the implications of micro-credentials for post-secondary admission and transfer practices. This report highlighted current examples of micro-credentials in BC such as [Thompson Rivers University's micro-credit transfer towards a university-level qualification](#), [Simon Fraser University's FASS Forward microcredit courses](#), and the [University of British Columbia's integration of open badges into courses and programs](#). The report also notes that 41% of Canadian institutional respondents surveyed by BCCAT reported that their institution is exploring establishing micro-credentials.

The Canadian Federation of University Faculty Associations of British Columbia (CUFA BC) released a [white paper on micro-credentials](#) that recognizes the value of these new types of offerings and that issues a series of recommendations for the design of credit-bearing micro-credentials.

Growing Market Demand for Micro-credentials

Several labour market reports have identified interest and demand for micro-credentials in the Canadian marketplace. This includes reports from:

- [Higher Education Strategy Associates](#) (May 2019), which pointed to the Canada Training Benefit announced in 2019 federal budget (will pay up to 50% of training costs up to \$250 per year to encourage lifelong learning) in making a case for creating short-duration/high-value micro-credentials, with skills represented via digital badges.
- [BBC Worklife](#) (Feb 2020), which reported that human resource leaders in US companies across various industries were moving towards skills-based hiring, and that pointed to the use of micro-credentials as a supplement to core qualifications.
- [Deloitte](#) (May 2020), which forecasted scenarios for higher education over the next 3-5 years, including a greater need for institutions to work with industry to define the skills their employees will need. In ¾ of the recovery scenarios the report suggests the demand for short term, non-degree, micro-credentials that are linked to jobs and employers will be an important part of higher education's recovery. The report predicts an "uptick in enrollment at 2-year institutions as demand increases for stacked credentials and certificates and the traditional 4 year degree becomes less sought after" and that "Tech, manufacturing, and other medium skill jobs [will] recover faster than others, driving employers to significantly shift their screening and signaling a shift from the 4-year degree to micro-credentials and certifications that allow for much more rapid skilling/reskilling to better meet their specific needs."
- [RBC](#) (June 2020), which in a report on the future of post-secondary education pointed to the need for an inclusive and flexible approach to alternative learning, such as micro-credentials, along with efforts to modernize the credit transfer system to recognize micro-credentials towards a diploma or a degree.
- The [Institute of Public Policy and Economy](#) (June 2020), which in a report about the future of Ontario's work force includes a recommendation for Colleges Ontario and the Ontario government to work together to develop and implement a robust micro-credential framework as a rapid re-training tool for displaced workers.
- The [Future Skills Council](#) (November 2020), which in a report about the future of Canada's workforce recommended the creation of tailored short-term training to meet workplace demands through micro-credentials that can be combined to capture skills acquired over time.
- [Academica Group](#) (March 2021), which provides a high-level exploration of some of the emerging themes, policies and strategies around micro-credentials in Alberta, Canada and beyond. This report includes a labour market analysis for micro-credentials in Northern Alberta and identifies relevant competencies and skills highlighted by employers, including in the Alberta Colleges Economic Recovery Task Force.
- In April 2021 Universities Canada and the Canadian Association for University Continuing Education prepared a report for Employment and Social Development Canada that highlighted the role that micro-credentials can play in upskilling and reskilling Canadians.
- The [Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario](#) (HEQCO) will soon publish a report on micro-credentials based on a survey of 2,000 Canadian adults and 201 employers.

Efforts to Develop Common Frameworks for Micro-credentials

Even prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, the exponential increase in the number and range of organizations both issuing and accepting micro-credentials had spurred several efforts at developing a common understand of and shared framework for this new currency of learning:

- In Europe, the [Common Micro-credential Framework](#) aims for greater consistency, quality and portability of micro-credentials (European MOOC Consortium 2019).
- The [New Zealand Qualifications Authority](#) introduced a micro-credential system in 2019 as part of New Zealand's regulated education and training system.
- The US-based [Credential Engine](#)'s online registry provides scalable, system level mechanisms for supporting the quality assurance credential ecosystem.
- In 2019, [eCampusOntario](#) (eCO) published a set of principles and a framework for micro-certifications that was developed by a working group of employers and post-secondary representatives in Ontario.
- In June 2020 a group of senior academic officers from member institutions of Colleges & Institutes Canada (CICan) developed a definition and guiding principles for micro-credentials. In April 2021 CICan published a [report on micro-credentials](#) that validates the guiding principles in their [National Framework for Micro-credentials](#), which itself was published in March 2021.
- The recent call for proposals for micro-credentials from the BC Ministry of Advanced Education and Skills Training was described as forming the foundation for ongoing development in the BC post-secondary sector that will include the development of a micro-credentialing framework with BCCAT as part of a larger provincial initiative.
- The Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario (HEQCO) has proposed a [common definition of micro-credentials](#).
- eCampus Ontario and the Diversity Institute released a [report on micro-credentials](#) in March 2021 that views these new offerings as a complement to traditional postsecondary education and part of an effective lifelong learning system with industry relevance.
- eCampus Ontario published an [open competency toolkit](#) in April 2021 that is intended to provide linkages to micro-credentials and other certification pathways, including academic and industry qualifications.

Frequently Asked Questions About Micro-Credentials

1. [What is the difference between micro-credentials, open badges, and digital badges? Which may be credit-bearing vs. non-credit-bearing? Who approves each?](#)
2. [What value do micro-credentials add?](#)
3. [Who are the potential audiences for micro-credentials?](#)
4. [Do employers understand micro-credentials?](#)
5. [What is the relationship of an open badge to a micro-credential?](#)
6. [What information is contained within open badges?](#)
7. [What is the relationship of open badges to the transcript?](#)
8. [Who regulates the international technical standards for open badges?](#)
9. [Why are you proposing to use the terms credit-bearing micro-credentials and non-credit-bearing micro-credentials? Wouldn't it be simpler to simply refer to non-credit-bearing micro-credentials as badges?](#)
10. [Are we being required to develop and embed micro-credentials in our academic courses and programs?](#)
11. [Doesn't the use of the term "badge" trivialize education?](#)

1. What is the difference between micro-credentials, open badges, and digital badges? Which may be credit-bearing vs. non-credit-bearing? Who approves each?

The following table summarizes the relationships between these concepts:

	Non-credit-bearing	Credit-bearing
Completion-based offering	<i>Type of recognition:</i> Digital Badge <i>Approving body:</i> Digital Badge Committee <i>Example:</i> Academic Integrity tutorial for students	N/A
Competency-based offering	<i>Type of recognition:</i> Micro-credential, represented by an Open Badge <i>Approving body:</i> Senate Micro-credential Committee <i>Example:</i> CPS/WSOD Short Course on Design Thinking	<i>Type of recognition:</i> Micro-credential, represented by an Open Badge <i>Approving body:</i> Senate Micro-credential Committee <i>Example:</i> Micro Course on Geographic Information System (GIS)

Note that credit-bearing micro-credentials will be a subset of micro-courses and non-credit-bearing micro-credentials will be a subset of CPS short courses.

2. What value do micro-credentials add?

There are many different ways in which micro-credentials can add value for a broad range of audiences:

- **Motivation:** Offered within an existing program, micro-credentials can motivate current students to persist. A micro-credential could be issued to students after the successful development and assessment of key competencies (e.g., data collection and analysis). The open badge associated with the micro-credential gives students tangible evidence of accomplishment that they can publicly post and share. Research shows that micro-credentials that recognize that specific skills and competencies have been mastered have a positive effect on persistence (West & Randall, 2016).

- Articulation of Skills and Competencies: The meta-data contained within open badges associated with micro-credentials (learning outcomes, assessments, links to student work if an e-portfolio is used) can help students better internalize and articulate the competencies they have mastered.
- Supporting Program Review: The integration of micro-credentials within academic programs would support program review efforts by providing clear data about the intra-curricular and cross-curricular competencies achieved by graduates.
- Developing Complementary Skill Sets: As an add-on to an existing degree program, micro-credentials allow students to distinguish themselves in a competitive marketplace through mastery of skills complementary to their chosen field of study. Consider the computer science major who adds a micro-credential in business communication or the computer science alumnus who needs to gain skills in the latest programming language. Consider the English major who adds a micro-credential in business analytics.
- Providing Pathways to, or Back to, Higher Education: For adult learners looking to start or return to college, micro-credentials can be used to break a degree program down into smaller sections of curriculum that stack toward a degree. After an extended period of time away from education, it can be intimidating to commit to a full degree. Allowing students to start small and build from there can provide a motivating, welcoming pathway to KPU.
- Supporting Business/Industry: Increasingly employers are looking for ways to up-skill their current employees to be able to promote from within, whether due to pending retirements, positions changes resulting from new technology, or simply overall organizational goals.
- Supporting Communities: Micro-credentials that provide professional development (e.g., basic business skills micro-credentials for QuickBooks, Excel, etc.) to small businesses and community organizations can be important extension of campus outreach.
- Life-Long Learning: Micro-credentials can be terrific tools to support life-long learning and professional development. This has applicability to business/industry and community organizations as described above. It also has significant potential for alumni and even KPU's own faculty and staff.
- Recruitment: To be *the* source for life-long learning for alumni can be part of recruitment strategy. Flexible, online micro-credentials could be developed to refresh skills, up-skill and/or prepare for a change in career. Thinking strategically about the development of these types of credentials, micro-credentials targeting alumni could stack to their next progressive degree.

3. Who are the potential audiences for micro-credentials?

Given the wide range of potential uses for micro-credentials, there are a number of different potential target audiences:

- Current students
- Prospective students
- Adult learners
- Alumni
- Business/Industry partners

- Community partners

4. Do employers understand micro-credentials?

While some employers may have heard of micro-credentials (and others like IBM and Ernst & Young are actively engaged in awarding them), we have much work to do with our local Boards of Trade to ensure that local businesses understand these new forms of recognition and how they support their need for skilled workers.

5. What is the relationship of an open badge to a micro-credential?

This relationship is similar to that of a parchment to a formal credential in that it carries information about the learning that has taken place along with features that attest to its official connection to the institution (e.g., stamps, signatures, and branding elements). However, an open badge is also verifiable, shareable, portable, and interoperable.

6. What information is contained within open badges?

Open badges include meta-data about the relevant micro-credential. An open badge clearly articulates the nature of the learning that has taken place, including what the outcomes of the learning were, whether the learning was credit-bearing or non-credit-bearing, when it was completed (and whether it expires), and whether the micro-credential is one of a sequence or stacks. Open badges can even link to evidence of the learner's work if an e-portfolio is used and may contain endorsements of the value of the micro-credential from professional bodies or industry partners. It may be useful to think of this meta-data as the equivalent of a food label, but for small units of competency-based learning.

7. What is the relationship of open badges to the transcript?

Open badges would complement and augment the traditional transcript.

8. Who regulates the international technical standards for open badges?

The international technical standards for open badges were first developed by [Mozilla](#) but are now managed and sustained by the [IMS Global organization](#).

9. Why are you proposing to use the term micro-credential for both credit-bearing and non-credit-bearing applications?

The term micro-credentials is used by PSIs and other organizations around the world to recognize learning that is both credit-bearing and non-credit-bearing. The proposed terms follow a recommendation in a [recent comprehensive report about micro-credentials](#) from Deakin University and would also allow KPU's micro-credentialing initiatives to be consistent with the [International Standard Classification of Education \(ISCED\)](#).

10. Are we being required to develop and embed micro-credentials in our academic courses and programs?

No. The decision to develop micro-credentials within credit-bearing courses and programs rests with faculty and departments. This is not required; however, the desire to develop and offer micro-credentials has been expressed by several program areas.

11. Doesn't the use of the term "badge" trivialize education?

There have been concerns expressed about the term "badge;" however, open badges remain very prominent, powerful, and increasingly popular tools that learners can use as a reference when describing the skills/competencies they have mastered that can also be posted on an e-resume and

social media or shared via email with prospective employers or internship directors. The application of open badges with micro-credentials thus serves to enhance the value education for learners.

Date	Stakeholder	Feedback	Responses (from Policy Developer)
February 19, 2021	Faculty of Arts Faculty Council	Procedure B.1.g – the annual review of micro-credentials (MCs). The cycle seems intense – what does that entail? If a MC hasn't been offered for a year, is it automatically discontinued if it hasn't been reviewed?	<p>This is to ensure the currency of MCs, and so that we are able to be flexible, responsive and reflect the labour market demands, industry needs, etc.</p> <p>If an MC hasn't been offered for a year it will not be automatically discontinued but rather considered for potential discontinuance as there may be good reasons why a given MC has not been offered.</p> <p>Post-hoc note: The review cycle for approved MCs has been revised from one year to two years, following additional feedback from the university community.</p>
		Definitions of MCs – can this be tighter? It seems to overlap with some of the other definitions (open badge).	This has been addressed in the drafts that will be posted on the Policy Blog as part of the 6-week public posting period.
		How will MCs impact regular and non-regular faculty workplace practices, corporate mission creep?	Credit-bearing MC development is going to be driven by faculty. Workload and other Collective Agreement related issues are outside the scope of the policy discussion. KPU Administration will work with the labour union to address these items in the proper venues.
		As we continue to develop MCs and perhaps explore the possibility of offloading some of the development, assessment or monitoring work to external consultants/program managers, how will	There are no plans to outsource this work outside of KPU.

**Draft Policy and Procedure AC15 Micro-credentials
Consultation Feedback (February - April 2021)**

Date	Stakeholder	Feedback	Responses (from Policy Developer)
		that impact our institutional mandate as a publicly funded body?	
		Higher education framework on Interoperability?	The forthcoming Provincial framework will set guidelines for all PSIs in BC. BCCAT is one of the key stakeholders that is considering questions of transferability and interoperability.
		Will industries have a greater role in these types of offerings?	MCs could be developed and offered in partnership with industry in some cases, but this is not required. However, given their focus on competency development, MCs are an opportunity to better serve the labour market.
		What will this mean for Arts in terms of the potential opportunities for MCs?	There are many possibilities for both digital badging (e.g., Writing Labs are one example) as well as for (competency-based) MCs.
		ASCC (Curriculum Committee) – what role will ASCC play in determining MCs? Will they have outlines to vet? Would they go through APP and then ASCC?	<p>There will be an MC outline form that requires consultation in the development process. The Policy/Procedure currently do not stipulate that it must go through ASCC, but it does require the proponent to submit it through the department and Faculty. For credit-bearing MCs, they are required to go to SSCC for review and recommendation to Senate.</p> <p>Post-hoc note: The revised policy now affirms the role of Faculty curriculum committees and Faculty Councils in the approval of proposals for credit-bearing MCs.</p>

**Draft Policy and Procedure AC15 Micro-credentials
Consultation Feedback (February - April 2021)**

Date	Stakeholder	Feedback	Responses (from Policy Developer)
		Credit-bearing MCs – will they be stackable in a way that they can culminate in a 3-credit course?	If the department/program wishes to design a sequences of stackable MCs and this receives approval, this is possible. An existing competency-based 3-credit course may also be proposed to be disaggregated into a sequence of credit-bearing MCs. However, credit-bearing MCs may also be offered as standalone offerings.
		Suggestion of a Faculty workshop on developing MCs (perhaps after the approval of the Policy)	Thank you for this suggestion.
		How will faculty be compensated for assessing competencies, as well as the workload that comes with developing and supporting MCs? Who will review and assess competencies?	Workload, compensation, and other Collective Agreement related issues are outside the scope of the policy discussion. KPU Administration will work with the labour union to address these items in the proper venues.
		For consideration re: the issue of course development and approval: The Arts Bylaws, under Bylaw 2, specify that "Per the University Act, the Faculty has the following powers and duties": (d) to determine, subject to the approval of the Senate, the courses of instruction in the Faculty. This suggests that the committees of Faculty Council should play a role in the approval of proposed microcredit courses, prior to submission to Senate - if a micro-credential is considered to be a 'course' or a component of a course.	Post-hoc note: The revised policy now affirms the role of Faculty curriculum committees and Faculty Councils in the approval of proposals for credit-bearing MCs.
February 25, 2021	Yan Mei Li	Suggestion to design a new badge to represent micro-credentials.	Marketing will be involved in the design of the visual aesthetic of open badges that are associated with MCs.

**Draft Policy and Procedure AC15 Micro-credentials
Consultation Feedback (February - April 2021)**

Date	Stakeholder	Feedback	Responses (from Policy Developer)
March 4, 2021	Brad Sacho	There is interest from the Accounting department in developing MC.	Noted
March 5, 2021	Lucie Gagné	WSOD sees an opportunity to serve industry, including through professional education and upgrading requirements.	Noted
March 9, 2021	Political Science Department (via Conrad King)	Some POLI faculty have used micro-courses (and micro-credentials) offered by the library -- digital badges for academic integrity, for example. We find them useful, and we are relatively unconcerned about the library being the area that develops MC such as this. Develop as appropriate, more or less. Where those MC require subject expertise, that would be a sine qua non for faculty to be involved in their creation.	Thank you very much for making the time to summarize and share this feedback. It is much appreciated. Two points might be worth clarifying: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The policy distinguishes between Digital Badges (completion-based and non-credit-bearing, such as with the Library's Academic Integrity tutorial) and Micro-credentials (competency-based and either credit-bearing or non-credit-bearing). 2. Proposals for credit-bearing micro-credentials would indeed need to be driven by faculty and departments.
March 9, 2021	Faculty of Educational Support and Development Faculty Council	If a unit within FESD, for example, the Library wanted to develop and offer a credit bearing MC, are we in a position to do so? FESD does not have a curriculum committee, and we are a Faculty that is set up not to have operational powers.	This policy will provide a framework and opportunity for areas to develop and offer both credit-bearing and non-credit-bearing MCs; however, if a Faculty is not currently eligible to develop and offer credit-bearing curriculum then policy AC15 would not change that reality. Unless this changes, FESD would be limited to developing and offering non-credit-bearing micro-credentials and digital badges.
March 15, 2021		Open badges that are CPS/executive education based – do they have to go through a Senate	Digital badges will be approved by the Digital Badge Committee, which is overseen by the

**Draft Policy and Procedure AC15 Micro-credentials
Consultation Feedback (February - April 2021)**

Date	Stakeholder	Feedback	Responses (from Policy Developer)
	School of Business Faculty Council	process? Or can they be facilitated via our CPS process?	Provost (not Senate). However, non-credit-bearing MCs (including those that may be offered by CPS) must receive the approval of the SMC prior to going through the CPS process.
		If changes are required in the submissions as adjudicated by SMC, would the proponent have to wait another month or can those changes be made, reviewed and approved without having to wait for another SMC meeting the following month?	The SMC will operate flexibly (synchronously and asynchronously) so there will not be any need to wait for a set monthly meeting schedule to resubmit a revised proposal. However, proposals for credit-bearing MCs that are revised will have to receive the approval of the relevant Faculty curriculum committee and Faculty Council prior to being resubmitted to the SMC.
		From an education perspective, is this initiative going to be something our students will be interested in pursuing down the road?	MCs will help us to attract new learners to KPU while also better serving our current students. It is very clear that there is a demand for these new types of offerings.
		Is there a way for students to take their badges digitally and put them elsewhere? How do we differentiate ourselves from training from LinkedIn, Lynda, etc.? Is the plan to outsourcing our curriculum to these service providers?	1) Yes, the badges will adhere to the common technical standard that ensure their interoperability and portability. 2) There are many differences between KPU and LinkedIn Learning, including our ability to offer credit-bearing curriculum and award credentials, and the delivery of campus-based training. 3) No
		What is the difference between a micro-credential and part of a degree? There seems to be confusion	Credit-bearing MCs may be standalone or embedded within existing courses and programs.

**Draft Policy and Procedure AC15 Micro-credentials
Consultation Feedback (February - April 2021)**

Date	Stakeholder	Feedback	Responses (from Policy Developer)
		in the market about in-depth competency-based training.	
March 16, 2021	Faculty of Science and Horticulture Faculty Council	FAQ #10 – embedding MCs within our course offerings. How will faculty be compensated for the work, e.g. developing and offering MCs?	Workload, compensation, and other Collective Agreement related issues are outside the scope of the policy discussion. KPU Administration will work with the labour union to address these items in the proper venues.
		Annual review of MCs - there is a concern about adding this to the existing workload on Chairs.	This concern is understood and the review cycle for approved MCs may be revisited during the forthcoming policy revision. Post-hoc note: The review cycle for approved MCs has been revised from one year to two years, following additional feedback from the university community.
		Procedure regarding “duplication”. Does this bypass the existing curriculum process, and puts the burden on our Chairs? Is duplicate “in whole” or “in part”?	There will be several checks along the approval process that consider the question of duplication of existing curriculum. First, there are the consultations by the proponent that must be summarized in the MC outline form. Second, with proposals for credit-bearing MCs there is the approval of the relevant Faculty curriculum committee. Third, there is the approval of the relevant Faculty Council. All of this is before a proposal is submitted to the SMC Chair. Fourth, if the SMC still believes there is potential duplication that gives the relevant Department Chair(s) an opportunity to provide their input. And fifth and finally,

**Draft Policy and Procedure AC15 Micro-credentials
Consultation Feedback (February - April 2021)**

Date	Stakeholder	Feedback	Responses (from Policy Developer)
			following the approval of a proposal for a credit-bearing MC by the SMC, this will go on to SSCC for further approval.
		<p>Procedure: "An approved MC that has been signed off by the Provost may be offered as non-credit-bearing while it is awaiting review by the SSCC and Senate."</p> <p>If a course is being offered and it's being sought for credit, who vets the faculty who will be teaching these courses?</p>	Proposals for credit-bearing MCs will be driven by departments and programs. These MCs will be taught by faculty who are deemed qualified by the relevant program or department.
		Can students take 3 non-credit-bearing MCs, and bundle them into a credit bearing MC or a for credit course?	No. Non-credit-bearing MCs does not translate or bundle into course credit. The only possibility is if the faculty PLAR assessors in a given department make a determination that a given set of competency-based training (which may include MCs) should receive course credit during the evaluation of a PLAR application. As per policy AC6, "Awarding PLAR credit is at the discretion of the program or department" (B. 1. c. i.) and "PLAR will be assessed by qualified faculty with expertise in the relevant curriculum area" (B. 5. b. i.).
		Procedure: It appears the MC can be approved by the SMC without the department. What if the MC is not supported by the department?	In its forthcoming revision the policy will affirm the role of Faculty curriculum committees and Faculty Councils in the approval of proposals for credit-bearing MCs. We expect that these bodies will interrogate proposals to ensure that they have the support of the relevant department/program.

**Draft Policy and Procedure AC15 Micro-credentials
Consultation Feedback (February - April 2021)**

Date	Stakeholder	Feedback	Responses (from Policy Developer)
			Post-hoc note: The revised policy now affirms the role of Faculty curriculum committees and Faculty Councils in the approval of proposals for credit-bearing MCs.
		Composition of the SMC: 3 member sub-committee. Can we ensure we have at least 1 to 2 faculty members (or at least 1 from the Faculty that is proposing the MC) in that sub-committee?	<p>Thank you for this suggestion. The workflow of the SMC will be revisited during the forthcoming policy revision.</p> <p>Post-hoc note: The approval process of the SMC has been revised to address this concern.</p>
		What is the minimum credit that a MC will hold?	There is no specified minimum but the credit value will have to be clearly indicated. There are examples from other institutions where the minimum credit is 0.5, this can be an item for further discussion.
		How much would MCs cost students, comparing to per/credit?	Credit-bearing MCs will be offered in accordance with existing university bylaws and policies concerning tuition fees.
		<p>How many people will be taking MCs? (from the perspective of class size, enrolment). For students coming into an academic course that are strictly wanting to complete a competency-based component of a course (e.g. lab, module), how will that impact the class size that is capped for that course?</p> <p>For equipment/resources supporting MCs, where does the funding for that come from?</p>	<p>In the case of standalone credit-bearing MCs, a student may choose to complete this offering by itself. This could also occur in the case of a competency-based course that is disaggregated into a sequence of MCs. However, in either case enrolment would be distinct within each MC.</p> <p>However, if a traditional course is <u>not</u> disaggregated into MCs then students would <u>not</u> be able to enroll in just the competency-</p>

**Draft Policy and Procedure AC15 Micro-credentials
Consultation Feedback (February - April 2021)**

Date	Stakeholder	Feedback	Responses (from Policy Developer)
			<p>based component but instead would have to enroll in the entire course.</p> <p>The university provides an annual equipment budget to programs.</p>
		Are MCs expected to be offered online so they do not interfere with scheduling full term courses?	No. MCs may be offered in any delivery mode. However, the assessment of the relevant competency may dictate which delivery mode(s) are most appropriate.
		Will there be grades or will it be a pass/fail for MCs?	All grading methods outlined in policy AC4 will be available for MCs.
March 17, 2021	School of Design Curriculum Committee	The SMC: would it be populated by members of SSCC (Faculty reps) by default?	This will likely be the case, but will defer to the Senate office's guidance regarding populating subcommittees of SSCs.
		Transferability to other institutions – please elaborate on this. How is this recognized on a transcript?	The forthcoming Provincial framework will set guidelines for all PSIs in BC. BCCAT is one of the key stakeholders that is considering the question of transferability. Open badges (that accompany MCs) would complement and augment the traditional transcript, whereas credit-bearing Senate-approved offerings (those that are standalone as well as those that are required for a credential) will appear on the traditional transcript.
		Will Faculty (ie. WSD) Curriculum Committee will have input in MCs or the approvals of MCs?	In its forthcoming revision the policy will affirm the role of Faculty curriculum committees and Faculty Councils in the approval of proposals for credit-bearing MCs.

**Draft Policy and Procedure AC15 Micro-credentials
Consultation Feedback (February - April 2021)**

Date	Stakeholder	Feedback	Responses (from Policy Developer)
			Post-hoc note: The revised policy now affirms the role of Faculty curriculum committees and Faculty Councils in the approval of proposals for credit-bearing MCs.
		Other institutions like Royal Roads have MCs that ladder onto graduate studies. Will this be the case here?	It is possible to design and offer MCs at different levels, including preparatory, vocational, undergraduate, and graduate levels.
		Are the "Short Courses" intended to replace CPS?	Short Courses are in fact what CPS offers
		Could credit bearing micro-credentials affect cohort based programs in a similar way that general transfer credits do? (available seats in programs, etc.)	If credit-bearing MCs are proposed to be part of a program's requirements we expect that the implications of this will need to be carefully considered by the proponent and the relevant Faculty curriculum committee and Faculty Council. We expect that the inclusion of MCs within program requirements will also be interrogated at SSCC.
		How will FTE (i.e funding for instructors) be funded? Traditional sections?	Workload and other Collective Agreement related issues are outside the scope of the policy discussion. KPU Administration will work with the labour union to address these items in the proper venues.
		MCs can be valuable for transfer students (to 2 nd and 3 rd year) missing key elements.	Agreed
		How do MCs and CPS link together?	Non-credit-bearing MCs may be a subset of CPS short courses.

**Draft Policy and Procedure AC15 Micro-credentials
Consultation Feedback (February - April 2021)**

Date	Stakeholder	Feedback	Responses (from Policy Developer)
March 17, 2021	Faculty of Trades and Technology Faculty Council	Discussion arose regarding what could be considered as examples of competency-based MCs in the Faculty.	N/A
		There is the question about the control of a credential – the jurisdiction of a Faculty when it comes to endorsing and supporting an authentic credential.	<p>In its forthcoming revision the policy will affirm the role of Faculty curriculum committees and Faculty Councils in the approval of proposals for credit-bearing MCs.</p> <p>Post-hoc note: The revised policy now affirms the role of Faculty curriculum committees and Faculty Councils in the approval of proposals for credit-bearing MCs.</p>
March 19, 2021	Faculty of Academic and Career Preparation Faculty Council	Can anyone develop a MC? What about a proponent in a service area - does it still go through Faculty curriculum committee? How does a service unit develop a MC?	MCs may be either non-credit-bearing or credit-bearing. Faculties could develop and offer credit-bearing or non-credit-bearing MCs whereas CPS may develop and offer non-credit-bearing MCs, including in partnership with the Faculties. Service units (e.g., IT, HR, etc.) may develop completion-based Digital Badges.
		Examples will really help illustrate and clarify the distinctions between all the various offerings (digital badge, non-credit bearing vs. credit bearing MC), even after the policy is implemented.	The FAQs in the backgrounder document includes some examples of each type of offering.
		Procedure: “non credit-bearing” → should it be non-credit-bearing?	<p>Research revealed that international standard practice is often “non credit-bearing”</p> <p>Post-hoc note: Additional research shows that non-credit-bearing is also commonly</p>

**Draft Policy and Procedure AC15 Micro-credentials
Consultation Feedback (February - April 2021)**

Date	Stakeholder	Feedback	Responses (from Policy Developer)
			used and so the documents were updated to reflect this styling of hyphenation.
		Approving jurisdiction – why is this policy not being approved by Senate, but by the Board with Senate’s advice?	This was determined through consultation with stakeholders including the Vice-Chair of Senate, the University Secretary, and external legal counsel. Note that this policy covers both MCs and Digital Badges, the latter of which are not under the purview of Senate. Moreover, the approval of MC proposals will always occur within the Senate Micro-credentials Committee.
		<p>Procedure B.1.a: With the SMC, could the Chair choose 3 members who may not be faculty? This may be problematic as we are dealing with curriculum.</p> <p>This “3-person committee” decides that there are duplication and sends to the Chair for decision – what happens if the Chair’s decision is not the same as the 3-person committee’s decision? Does it go back to the proponent? Can the proponent appeal and if so, how?</p> <p><i>It was noted that the structure within the SSC on Program Review (review teams) can be looked into for consideration.</i></p>	<p>This is not likely, as 8 out of the 11 members of the SMC are faculty. However, the approval process of the SMC will be revisited in the forthcoming policy revision.</p> <p>The premise of this question appears to focus on a disagreement in judgment between the SMC and a Department Chair, whereas this disagreement would in fact also be with the prior judgments of Faculty Curriculum Committee members and Faculty Council members. SSCC also plays a role after the SMC and would offer the Department Chair another venue to make the argument that previously failed to convince their Faculty colleagues.</p> <p>Post-hoc note: The SMC approval process has been revised to eliminate the first concern.</p>

**Draft Policy and Procedure AC15 Micro-credentials
Consultation Feedback (February - April 2021)**

Date	Stakeholder	Feedback	Responses (from Policy Developer)
March 19, 2021	Faculty of Health Faculty Council	If we offer MCs, are external instructors/subject matter experts (outside of KPU) able to teach them due to their unique and specialized expertise in the subject matter? (e.g. outsourcing of delivery)	The development of credit-bearing MCs will be driven by departments and programs. KPU faculty (whether regular or non-regular instructors) would teach these. LOU4 in the KPU-KFA Collective Agreement defines both bargaining unit CPS faculty and non bargaining unit CPS faculty.
		How do you see MCs fitting given that we have faculty programs and also CPS studies programs? Would MCs be housed in both, or primarily in CPS studies in the Faculty?	MCs may be either non-credit-bearing or credit-bearing. Faculties could develop and offer credit-bearing or non-credit-bearing MCs whereas CPS may develop and offer non-credit-bearing MCs, including in partnership with the Faculties.
		The evaluation and review of MCs – is this an automatic process?	The periodic review of approved MCs will be the responsibility of the department/program that is offering that MC. This is mainly to ensure the currency of the MC.
		Pre- and Co-requisites – Are there any risks to MCs being pre- and co-requisites?	Credit-bearing MCs may be proposed as pre-requisites or co-requisites; however, in these cases we expect that the implications of this will need to be carefully considered by the proponent and the relevant Faculty curriculum committee and Faculty Council. We expect that the inclusion of MCs as pre-requisites or co-requisites will also be interrogated at SSCC.
		With the platform being proposed for the digital and open badges, is it possible for other organizations to create badges that we (KPU) can use for our students? (e.g. CPR provider that issues an open badge or certification/training on CPR –	It would be up to the relevant program or department to determine whether any third party training can be used as part of admission requirements. For example, the BSN program requires a current standard first

**Draft Policy and Procedure AC15 Micro-credentials
Consultation Feedback (February - April 2021)**

Date	Stakeholder	Feedback	Responses (from Policy Developer)
		can future or existing students complete these types of badges for the purpose of completing degree or admission requirements at KPU?	aid certificate as part of its admission requirements. If the third party training results in the issuing of a digital or open badge, this simply makes the process of verifying the completion of that training that much easier.
		We have students who complete 15-hour courses in order to be able to vaccinate – can these students go back retroactively and earn a badge for what they have done in the past? We have many students who have spent a tremendous amount of time on these types of learning, is it possible to retroactively to issue badges to recognize their learning?	From a technological perspective, it is possible to issue badges to learners who are known to have completed the unit of study in question. However, this question will require more discussion before such a precedent is set.
		What about establishing common learning competencies (course/program level) and creating badges/MCs for that?	It would be possible to outline the common/required competencies for a given program and then develop related MCs (that could then be embedded within that program). The University of California at Davis has done something similar with its sustainable agriculture major.
		Can badges be shared or embedded anywhere? Do they expire? Can earners modify badges?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The common technical standard for badges makes them portable and shareable 2) Badges expire only if they are designed in this way (e.g., in cases of where periodic re-certification is required) 3) No, earners cannot modify the badges they are issued. However, they can control whether and where they wish to share or display these badges.

**Draft Policy and Procedure AC15 Micro-credentials
Consultation Feedback (February - April 2021)**

Date	Stakeholder	Feedback	Responses (from Policy Developer)
		Are there limitations to the delivery mode of MCs? Does it have to be solely online-based, or can there be a face-to-face component?	MCs may be offered in any delivery mode. However, the assessment of the relevant competency may dictate which delivery mode(s) are most appropriate.
		Fees – how does this work for MCs and badges? There are costs associated with the development of them. How are they established? Who is responsible for the funding/support aspect of it?	Fees for Senate approved credit-bearing offerings will be determined by the Board of Governors through KPU's Bylaw on Fees, pursuant to the University Act. Post-secondary boards are responsible for setting and determining tuition fees within the government tuition limit policy. Curriculum development is considered part of the normal duties of a faculty member, as per the KPU-KFA collective agreement.
March 26, 2021	Senate Standing Committee on Academic Planning and Priorities	The ability to identify duplication and transfer academic content into academic credential. How is this handled?	There will be several checks along the approval process that consider the question of duplication of existing curriculum. First, there are the consultations by the proponent that must be summarized in the MC outline form. Second, with proposals for credit-bearing MCs there is the approval of the relevant Faculty curriculum committee. Third, there is the approval of the relevant Faculty Council. All of this is before a proposal is submitted to the SMC Chair. Fourth, if the SMC still believes there is potential duplication that gives the relevant Department Chair(s) an opportunity to provide their input. And fifth and finally, following the approval of a proposal for a

**Draft Policy and Procedure AC15 Micro-credentials
Consultation Feedback (February - April 2021)**

Date	Stakeholder	Feedback	Responses (from Policy Developer)
			credit-bearing MC by the SMC, this will go on to SSCC for further approval.
March 31, 2021	Senate Standing Committee on Policy	How can we prevent MCs from duplicating (or compromising) the existing diverse range of credit-bearing programming currently offered, and the flexibility of learning currently offered in many of our existing credit-bearing courses?	There will be several checks along the approval process that consider the question of duplication of existing curriculum. First, there are the consultations by the proponent that must be summarized in the MC outline form. Second, with proposals for credit-bearing MCs there is the approval of the relevant Faculty curriculum committee. Third, there is the approval of the relevant Faculty Council. All of this is before a proposal is submitted to the SMC Chair. Fourth, if the SMC still believes there is potential duplication that gives the relevant Department Chair(s) an opportunity to provide their input. And fifth and finally, following the approval of a proposal for a credit-bearing MC by the SMC, this will go on to SSCC for further approval.
		Will students be able to complete credit-bearing MCs, and use that to ladder into our existing degrees (degree completion)? What are the implications to that?	Credit-bearing MCs may be standalone or embedded within existing courses or programs. They may be proposed as program electives or program requirements; however, in the latter case we expect that the implications of this will need to be carefully considered by the proponent and the relevant Faculty curriculum committee and Faculty Council. We expect that the inclusion of MCs within program requirements will also be interrogated at SSCC.

**Draft Policy and Procedure AC15 Micro-credentials
Consultation Feedback (February - April 2021)**

Date	Stakeholder	Feedback	Responses (from Policy Developer)
		Pleased to see the consultation period (Department Chair) is going to 10 days from 5 days as suggested on the blog. However, the review of potential duplication of proposals still involves a 5-day turnaround time. This may be problematic for Chairs from a workload perspective.	<p>The review timeline for Department Chairs in the case of potential duplication of offerings will be revisited in the forthcoming revision.</p> <p>Post-hoc note: The review timeline for Department Chairs has also been increased to 10 working days.</p>
April 7, 2021	Senate Standing Committee on Curriculum	There are concerns about the impact this may have on international students as it relates to the credit and non-credit bearing MCs (e.g. work permit, full time status, etc.). Have we consulted with KPU International to discuss some of these potential concerns/issues?	<p>Some members of KPU international have provided feedback on the policy, including on the policy blog.</p> <p>Credit-bearing MCs could be included as part of a student's course load toward full-time eligibility.</p>
		Can credit-bearing MCs be used towards undergraduate program requirements?	<p>If credit-bearing MCs are proposed to be part of a program's requirements we expect that the implications of this will need to be carefully considered by the proponent and the relevant Faculty curriculum committee and Faculty Council. We expect that the inclusion of MCs within program requirements will also be interrogated at SSCC.</p>
		Will there be a revision to the roles that Faculty curriculum committees and FC play in the review/approval of credit-bearing MC, as suggested during the blog commenting period?	<p>Yes. The revision will confirm the role of Faculty curriculum committees and Faculty Councils in the approval of proposals for credit-bearing MCs.</p> <p>Post-hoc note: The revised policy now affirms the role of Faculty curriculum committees</p>

**Draft Policy and Procedure AC15 Micro-credentials
Consultation Feedback (February - April 2021)**

Date	Stakeholder	Feedback	Responses (from Policy Developer)
			and Faculty Councils in the approval of proposals for credit-bearing MCs.
		One major concern about this draft is that the policy itself, with details, provides very clear indication on how the SMC will fully operate. However, this SMC is being proposed as a sub-committee of SSCC. Should SSCC determine the membership and terms of reference of SMC? Is there an overstep if this policy is to dictate how SMC (sub-committee of SSCC) should operate?	A draft policy that did not include these details would likely generate a lot of discomfort and calls for greater transparency. In providing the draft procedure we are attempting to provide transparency and to shape this procedure through the process of consultation. SSCC has had two opportunities to discuss the draft procedure during the consultation process, and this draft policy will return to SSCC for a third time during the approval process. We believe this provides SSCC members with ample opportunities to provide input on and shape the procedure.
		What happens if SSCC wants to make changes to how SMC operates after the policy is approved? Will we need to make changes to the policy first, each time SSCC wants to make revisions to how SMC is to operate?	SSCC has had two opportunities to discuss the draft procedure during the consultation process, and this draft policy will return to SSCC for a third time during the approval process. We believe this provides SSCC members with ample opportunities to provide input on and shape the procedure that outlines how the SMC operates. All of the suggestions provided about the workflow of the SMC will be considered during the forthcoming revision of the policy. Post-hoc note: The workflow of the SMC has been revised following feedback received at SSCC.

**Draft Policy and Procedure AC15 Micro-credentials
Consultation Feedback (February - April 2021)**

Date	Stakeholder	Feedback	Responses (from Policy Developer)
		Can we remove the description of the operation of the SMC from the policy and the procedure? Instead, it will come to SSCC as a recommendation on how this proposed SMC can efficiently operate. SSCC can then consider the proposal and have the ability to establish the operations of the SMC.	<p>A draft policy that did not include these details would likely generate a lot of discomfort and calls for greater transparency. In providing the draft procedure we are attempting to provide transparency and to shape this procedure through the process of consultation.</p> <p>SSCC has had two opportunities to discuss the draft procedure during the consultation process, and this draft policy will return to SSCC for a third time during the approval process. We believe this provides SSCC members with ample opportunities to provide input on and shape the procedure. All of the suggestions provided about the workflow of the SMC will be considered during the forthcoming revision of the policy.</p> <p>Post-hoc note: The workflow of the SMC has been revised following feedback received at SSCC.</p>
		The proposed timeline for approval is still too short, and this could be problematic given the number of MCs that could inundate the workload of all those involved (Chair, SMC). There needs to be appropriate time for feedback and approval.	<p>The workflow of the SMC will be revisited during the forthcoming policy revision.</p> <p>Post-hoc note: The timeline for the feedback of the Department Chair (in cases of potential duplication of offerings that are identified by the SMC) has been doubled in the revised policy. The minimum response rate and approval requirements of the SMC have also been revised to provide more flexibility to SMC members.</p>

**Draft Policy and Procedure AC15 Micro-credentials
Consultation Feedback (February - April 2021)**

Date	Stakeholder	Feedback	Responses (from Policy Developer)
		How will individual instructors, departments, etc. set MCs up (is there training?), and have support so their work can be kept on track as we continue to respond to the need of the industry and general public (as MCs become more popular over time). How do we keep track of all of this, from a workload and timeline perspective?	<p>This is an evolving field, so ongoing education will be useful for all members of the university community. Training will be provided to SMC members, including the SMC Chair who can help guide MC proposal developers. Program advisory committees will often be an excellent source of information concerning industry and community needs for skill development.</p> <p>KPU Administration will work in cooperation with the labour union to address any aspects of AC15 as they relate to the collective agreement and faculty workload and working conditions.</p>
		There are concerns about potential fragmentation and duplication of curricular content. Do we have any safeguards in our policy to avoid issues relating to that? This is problematic particular given the time restriction. There is a concern that issues may fall through the crack with the challenging time restriction. Is there an opportunity to have a larger committee for adjudication (which should be the role of SSCC)?	<p>There will be several checks along the approval process that consider the question of duplication of existing curriculum. First, there are the consultations by the proponent that must be summarized in the MC outline form. Second, with proposals for credit-bearing MCs there is the approval of the relevant Faculty curriculum committee. Third, there is the approval of the relevant Faculty Council. All of this is before a proposal is submitted to the SMC Chair. Fourth, if the SMC still believes there is potential duplication that gives the relevant Department Chair(s) an opportunity to provide their input. And fifth and finally, following the approval of a proposal for a</p>

**Draft Policy and Procedure AC15 Micro-credentials
Consultation Feedback (February - April 2021)**

Date	Stakeholder	Feedback	Responses (from Policy Developer)
			credit-bearing MC by the SMC, this will go on to SSCC for further approval.
		When this draft returns to SSCC for approval, can we include something like a series of stress tests (similar to what accompanied draft AC10 in the preliminary consultations over the past months) so we can see how different scenarios (or challenging scenarios) play out?	<p>The consultation process for AC15 has been extensive in length and scope. Many of the comments on the blog (and the responses to these) postulate scenarios that effectively serve as stress tests (with associated responses).</p> <p>Policy GV2 is now also being revised so this is an excellent opportunity to propose the inclusion of stress tests as a required component for future policies, if desired.</p>
April 12, 2021	Zena Mitchell	As part of their policy development when they established MCs, the University of Colorado (Boulder) made a deliberate choice to use the term “learner” versus “student” throughout their MC policy and related communication. They had noted that in pursuing both credit and non-credit MC options, the term ‘student’ may have been misleading to the university community. The term “student” implies matriculation and an assumption that someone has been formally <u>admitted</u> to the University, whereas ‘learner’ they felt better encompasses someone who may or may not be formally <i>admitted</i> , and who may simply be <i>pursuing non-credit offerings</i> such as MCs.	The policy documents have been revised to change the phrasing from “students” to “learners”

Policies and Procedures

AC15 Micro-credentials

Posted on: February 26th, 2021 by Josephine Chan [80 Comments](#)

Rationale

The draft Policy and Procedure AC15 Micro-credentials establishes a framework and processes for the development and approval of short, flexible, competency-based educational offerings at KPU in line with section 35.2(5) of the University Act. The Policy aims to create a clear distinction between those offerings which are approved by Senate and those which are approved by the Provost. Specifically, draft AC15 establishes a framework for the approval of Micro-credentials and digital badges.

A Background document is attached with this submission. It includes two sections, the first titled "Growth in Micro-Credentials in BC and Canada" and the second titled "Frequently Asked Questions About Micro-Credentials."

A number of suggestions and other feedback was received from the Micro-credentials Working Group and the Senate Standing Committees on Policy (SSC Policy), Academic Planning and Priorities (SSCAPP), and Curriculum (SSCC) between January 23rd to February 10th, 2021. Responses to all feedback have been provided in the "AC15 Feedback and Responses Jan-Feb 2021" document, with suggestions incorporated in the attached draft Policy, Procedure and Background/FAQ documents.

Consultation

The following stakeholder groups have been consulted as part of the policy development process:

- Polytechnic University Executive (PUE)
- Academic Council
- Vice Chair of Senate
- University Secretary
- University Registrar
- Deans
- Director, Flexible Learning and Academic Integrity
- Divisional Business Manager, Continuing & Professional Studies
- Manager, Learning Technology and Educational Media
- Micro-credentials Working Group
- Senate Standing Committee on Policy
- Senate Standing Committee on Academic Planning and Priorities
- Senate Standing Committee on Curriculum

Consultations with all Faculty Councils (or, in the case of Health and Design, Chairs and additional Faculty committees) and Senate Standing Committees (SSCC, SSC Policy, SSCAPP) will continue to take place leading up to and during the 6-week public posting period on the KPU Policy Blog.

Comments are welcomed during this 6-week public posting period, and will close on **April 9, 2021**. The Policy Developer will review all comments and provide responses on this post.

1. [AC15 Micro-credentials Policy Draft](#)
2. [AC15 Micro-credentials Procedure Draft](#)
3. [Micro-credentials at KPU: Background & FAQs](#)
4. [AC15 Feedback and Responses Jan-Feb 2021](#)
5. [Draft Policy Timeline AC15 Micro-credentials](#)

Tags: [Academic](#), [Digital Badge](#), [Micro Course](#), [Micro-credentials](#), [Open Badge](#), [Short Course](#)

[Edit this entry.](#)

Problem submitting comments?

Send comments directly to Josephine.Chan@kpu.ca

Recent Posts

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

[BP7 University Space](#)

[AC15 Micro-credentials](#)

[FM8 Student Tuition and Fees \(Procedures Only\)](#)

[Co-operative Education Policies \(ST8, ST9, ST10\)](#)

Recent Comments

Josephine Chan on [BP7 University Space](#)

jobrian@kwt.priv on [BP7 University Space](#)

tchanyun@kwt.priv on [BP7 University Space](#)

tchanyun@kwt.priv on [BP7 University Space](#)

Tara Clowes on [BP7 University Space](#)

Archives

[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](#)

[May 2017](#)

[January 2017](#)

[October 2016](#)

[September 2016](#)

[May 2016](#)

[March 2016](#)

[February 2016](#)

[January 2016](#)

80 Responses

rjhangia@kwt.priv says:

April 9, 2021 at 8:25 am (Edit)

After more than a year of consultations, repeat visits to 3 Senate Standing Committees, visits to 8 Faculty Councils or other Faculty committees, and six weeks of comments on this blog I want to thank all members of the university community who have positively engaged with the development of this policy and strengthened it by sharing constructive suggestions as well as your aspirations for future micro-credentials or digital badges.



I am happy to report that this policy has received the third most comments of any policy posted on this blog since this process began! For those of you who are data nerds (like me) you may be interested to know that the mean number of comments provided across the 70 policies posted for comments between January 2013 and March 2021 was 10.1, with a standard deviation of 17.45. This places AC15 (with 80 comments) at 4 standard deviations above the mean. Caveat: nearly half of those comments are my responses to comments made by other members of the university community.

The next steps will involve me considering all of the helpful feedback provided during the extensive consultation process and making any necessary revisions to the policy documents. Once the revised policy is prepared, I will begin to take it through the approval process, which begins with visits to the Senate Standing Committees on Academic Planning & Priorities, Policy Review, and Curriculum before going on to Senate (as outlined in the policy timeline document linked above).

ecunnin@kwt.priv says:

April 8, 2021 at 7:48 pm (Edit)



There is no doubt MCs are new kid on the University blocks that are primarily a response to student preferences for flexibility and increased access to learning. In general they are great way for academic institutions to expand their markets by increasing the product lines of education we provide to students and their employers. I wholly get and celebrate that.

Some of my concerns surrounding the Policy include:

1) The lack of an articulated process for determining 'duplication' for courses – I have heard a few things about how this will be determined including Rajiv stating at the FSH Faculty Council meeting that this will be determined by the Joint (KFA/KPU) Committee on CPS courses. However, in relation to Rajiv's statement above that "Collective Agreement related issues are outside the scope and function of Senate and related Academic Policies. KPU Administration will continue to work with the labour union to address these items in the proper venues" I am left wondering just how the issue of 'duplication' will be addressed in the Policy. I am further perplexed because I fail to see how a policy that directly impacts the labour of the faculty can be deemed to be outside the scope of the fundamental agreement that establishes the terms and condition of that labour. The repeated shutting down that dialogue, in this blog and in committee/Council meetings seems antithetical to the open and transparent consultation that has been stated to be so integral to the development of this policy.

2) Given the issues with duplication and disaggregation of courses, at a high level, I do not see how this proposed policy addresses the real risk of watering down SOME of KPU's academic programs to the basic competencies with the highest exchange value in the labour market leading to a reduction of diploma/degree completion and programs. There are real concerns that, unchecked, microcredentials for can promote the dissolution of a robust education that enables citizens to fulfill their civic and cultural responsibilities and enables a proliferation of reductive thinking in students, and consequently society. Because of that, I really look forward to seeing the revisions that address the process for credit-bearing micro-credentials to be recommended by Faculty Standing Committees on Curriculum and Faculty Councils.

rjhangia@kwt.priv says:

April 9, 2021 at 8:22 am (Edit)



Thank you for your comments. I am happy to hear that you recognize and celebrate some of the benefits of micro-credentials.

To your stated concerns:

1. I have addressed this question both on this blog and at consultation meetings. For example, see my response to this comment from your KFA colleague that outlines the various checks and layers of oversight regarding potential duplication within credit-bearing offerings: <https://blogs.kpu.ca/policies/?p=773#comment-964> Note that my reference to the joint KPU-KFA LOU 3 committee is relevant only when considering non credit-bearing offerings.

As a table officer of the KFA I expect that you are aware of which elements are matters for Senate and its committees and which elements are matters for LMRC. At recent SSC meetings the Vice-Chair of Senate affirmed this separation of scope on a point of order, so I am not sure it is fair to characterize this clarification and separation of scope as a shutting down of dialogue (especially as we have a joint KPU-KFA meeting scheduled on the very next business day from when I post this comment in order to discuss AC15 with the labour union). I do believe that the record reflects a lengthy, open, and transparent consultation process.

2. I am not sure I share your pessimism concerning the potential of micro-credentials to proliferate reductive thinking across society. However, to your final comment, I am happy to affirm once again what I have already posted numerous times on this blog and stated at consultation meetings:

"The revision of the policy documents that will take place following the blog posting period will make it clear that proposals for credit-bearing micro-credentials will need to go through and be recommended by Faculty Standing Committees on Curriculum and Faculty Councils prior to the relevant Micro-credential Outline Forms being submitted to the Chair of the Senate Micro-credentials Committee (SMC)."

[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](#)

gharris@kwt.priv says:

April 8, 2021 at 7:20 pm (Edit)



Before the policy blog closes, I want to briefly echo some concerns made elsewhere to emphasize the fact that they are not singular concerns but rather shared by multiple members of the KPU community and that they warrant appropriate action in terms of revisions to the policy and/or action on the part of the administration.

1. The fragmentation and potential for duplication of curriculum is a very real risk and I believe there are insufficient safeguards in place to prevent this, given time constraints of the small SMC. If this c'tee were to have a larger and more broad composition across Faculty areas, it will greatly reduce the likelihood of duplication across different disciplines that is not likely to be recognized by singular Faculty councils. With current technology there is no reason why a SMC c'tee of ten members cannot function as efficiently as a c'tee of three.

There are numerous references made regarding the need for expediency and responsiveness in approving MCs but no justification has been provided for why this is so important compared to traditional curricular offerings. Can you please provide a clear pedagogical rationale for this?

2. There have been repeated calls for greater clarity regarding who can develop and teach/offer the different categories of MCs. It would be unfortunate and counter-productive to see internal conflicts resulting from a policy that fails to provide adequate parameters to identify roles and sufficient safeguards to ensure compliance with the Collective Agreements.

3. There are outstanding problematic issues that inextricably link this policy to faculty workloads. While such issues may be outside the scope of the policy document itself, there must be a genuine commitment on the part of the administration to have such issues resolved prior to the approval and implementation of the policy. The lack of such resolution or establishment of LOU's would be an invitation to disputes and possible grievances. If this policy is going to bring benefits to the KPU community, it is in everyone's best interest that meaningful dialogue on these issues be made a priority.

rjhangia@kwt.priv says:

April 9, 2021 at 8:21 am (Edit)



Thank you for sharing your comments, Dr. Harris. With ten comments now you will be pleased to know that you have been the most active commenter on this draft policy! I would like to acknowledge the time and energy you have dedicated to this subject, including at the meetings of SSCC.

I recognize that some of your comments here are echoing your own comments at SSCC on April 7, so I will reassure you that your comments at that meeting along with my responses have already been captured for the record and will accompany the policy documents when they go through the approval process.

1. I have noted your comments and those of others about the composition of the SMC. As I have previously stated, I will be looking at the SMC composition again during the policy revision process. To be clear, the SMC is currently proposed to have 11 members (not 10), including one representative from each of our 8 Faculties. However, I do understand that the spirit of your suggestion concerns the adjudication of individual proposals being completed by the entire committee.

To address your question, micro-credentials are often developed to serve populations that are underserved by higher education (such as working adults), especially in the context of the need to upskill or reskill. A current example of this is the development of micro-credentials at a variety of BC post-secondary institutions to support the post-pandemic economic recovery. See for example this press release from BCIT:

<https://commons.bcit.ca/news/2021/02/microcredentials-fast-track-to-high-demand-jobs-for-british-columbians/>
As an open access polytechnic university, I believe that KPU has a terrific opportunity to innovate with short, flexible, competency-based offerings that will serve our learners and their communities. As our forthcoming provincial framework will advise, this sometimes involves working in partnership with industry or at least being responsive to industry and market needs. One thing that is well understood at both the Provincial and national levels is that standard timelines for the development and approval of new curriculum at post-secondary institutions are not conducive to the market responsiveness that is a key feature of micro-credentials. Through my consultations across the university I have encountered a widespread acknowledgement of the need for a more agile approval process for micro-credentials.

2. While this question has indeed been raised a few times I will note that I have addressed this question every time it has been raised (including on this blog; see for example: <https://blogs.kpu.ca/policies/?p=773#comment-953>) and the draft policy documents also address this question. Draft policy AC15 is in alignment with the collective agreements.

3. KPU administration has clearly indicated a desire to work cooperatively with the labour union to address these aspects. In fact, as I write this response I will note that we are already scheduled to jointly meet on the very next business day to discuss this policy.

gdearle@kwt.priv says:

March 31, 2021 at 2:43 pm (Edit)



The KFA strongly supports the potential growth and creative work enabled by Policy AC15 Micro-credentials, but we want to ensure that this work remains the responsibility of KPU faculty and that it aligns with current workload and compensation models as defined in the Collective Agreement.

The KFA wishes to recognize Rajiv Jhangiani's extensive responses to faculty on the policy blog to date. We hope that all faculty feedback will be carefully considered and appropriately reflected in forthcoming revisions to the policies and procedures of AC15. We also wish to thank faculty who have taken the time to comment on the policy blog.

The following are some of the KFA's questions and concerns about the impacts of this policy and its procedures:

- Unless handled properly, Micro-credentials may result in fragmentation of workload and the curriculum, course offering duplication, as well as competition and disputes between faculty and professional areas.
- Although the constitution of the Senate Micro-Credential Committee (SMC) is broad, its currently proposed workflow is problematic because it does not include all members of the committee, and it may not provide enough time for careful consideration of whether MCs duplicate offerings in other areas. We are also concerned that the members of the SMC may not have the necessary breadth of knowledge or the tools to correctly identify the potential for overlap.
- No process to address disputes about duplication or the "ownership" of course work has been defined. Currently, the KFA is in dispute with the Employer about work being done by Continuing and Professional Studies that, in our view, substantially duplicates bargaining-unit work. The Employer's position appears to be that coursework that only partially duplicates an area can be treated as non-bargaining unit work. The potential for duplication of offerings is a significant concern.
- AC15 seems to allow for any area of the university to create Micro-Credentials. According to the Collective Agreement, however, faculty are explicitly responsible for developing curriculum at KPU.
- AC15 does not yet explicitly state that MCs need to go through Faculty councils and their curriculum committees. However, the KFA maintains that all curriculum development must be done by faculty and follow established procedures.
- AC15 may allow for "educational offerings" taught by non-faculty. We need to ensure that instruction remains the responsibility of faculty.
- "Disaggregated" or fragmented courses may force faculty to accept numerous course preps for multiple micro courses or micro-credentials. The Collective Agreement states that faculty will be assigned no more than three course preparations in one semester without their consent.
- Compensation, benefits, FTE, workload, vacation time, PD time, and regularization are intrinsically tied to the current credit system. How will the fragmentation of credits affect this system? Do MCs have the potential to increase workload or to increase the number of non-regular faculty at KPU?
- "Micro Course" is identified in the policy, but a more thorough explanation of what a Micro Course is and how it relates to micro-credentials is required as such courses will have an effect on workload.

gpaul@kwt.priv says:

March 31, 2021 at 7:39 pm (Edit)



Gillian offers a thorough distillation of serious issues looming around the edges of MCs. It is difficult for me to improve on her post.

I would add that the fragmentation of courses—the possibility of breaking full semester courses into micro-sized segments—is one that I find confusing and difficult to justify or understand pedagogically. Meaningful teaching in my experience involves developing a relationship and a rapport with a classroom and its individual students, to say nothing of scaffolded assignments and incremental learning outcomes that need time (reading, writing, responding, conversation, feedback) to be realized. MCs might offer flexibility in certain areas and departments, but they must be implemented with great care and with attention to the best practices of our faculty and in the best interests of our students.

rjhangia@kwt.priv says:

April 8, 2021 at 8:48 am (Edit)



Thank you for your comments.

I appreciate that some faculty members will struggle with the notion of disaggregating courses. Dr. Beverly Oliver (Emeritus Professor, Deakin University) who wrote one of the most important recent reports on micro-credentials (see: <https://dteach.deakin.edu.au/wp-content/uploads/sites/103/2019/08/Making-micro-credentials-work-Oliver-Deakin-2019-full-report.pdf>) often describes this as the challenge of being able to envision a world in which individual songs could be sold and enjoyed in digital format while the majority of listeners are still buying and listening to full albums on compact discs. This analogy is far from perfect, of course.

To be clear, disaggregation is not an approach that will work in all areas. For one, these offerings need to be competency-based if they are to be proposed as micro-credentials (and many academic courses are not competency-based). And even if a traditional offering is competency-based, the decision to develop

credit-bearing micro-credentials needs to be driven by faculty and programs. Indeed, it is this very same faculty agency that is driving the desire for this form of curricular innovation on the part of many of your colleagues.

Finally, I will note that faculty members and programs interested in developing micro-credentials could also consider new, standalone credit-bearing micro-credentials that would benefit our learners. In short, the flexibility that comes from disaggregation is not the only path to curricular innovation with micro-credentials.

janetw@kwt.priv says:

April 8, 2021 at 10:01 am (Edit)



An April 7, 2021, a blog post by Janice Deakin, Julia Colyar and Jackie Pickett of the Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario flags two important points about micro-credentials which could have policy implications when institutions advance their prescriptive aims. I think it's worth adding these points to this discussion. The authors' points are in response to the e-campus report entitled "Is the Future Micro?" (https://micro.ecampusontario.ca/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/Is_the_Future_Micro-1.pdf)

HEQCO blog post:

<https://heqco.ca/janice-deakin-julia-colyar-jackie-pichette-microcredentials-short-focused-learning-that-responds-to-emerging-demands/>

Excerpts here:

1. "First, the assertion that microcredentials "need to be digital," is not aligned with either our definition of microcredentials or the reality on the ground in Ontario. Working with BHER and CIGan, we surveyed 105 Canadian postsecondary institutions in November/December of 2020; we found 81% of surveyed institutions with microcredential programs are offering a mix of online and in-person options and just 13% are offering them exclusively online. This mix of modalities is positive from an accessibility standpoint. It's also not surprising when we consider that hands-on learning is essential for practicing the skills some microcredentials aim to teach. To reflect this reality and support high-quality, accessible programs, Ontario's microcredential strategy must make room for online, in-person and hybrid teaching modalities. "

2. "The report also promotes the "unbundling of skills into constitutive parts and their re-bundling into stackable microcredentials." In our view, colleges and universities should focus less on deconstructing existing curricula and focus more on designing innovative, focused content that serves a new market of students. HEQCO sees the primary functions of microcredentials as responding quickly to evolving social and economic needs (like the pandemic), and catering to underserved learners (like adults). We also caution against pursuing stackability at the expense of a credential's independent value. Like the New Zealand Qualifications Authority, we support the idea of a microcredential as "a stand-alone package of learning, valuable in and of itself." Stackability should be a bonus, not the primary goal."

Respectfully submitted.

rjhangia@kwt.priv says:

April 8, 2021 at 1:12 pm (Edit)



Thank you for sharing this new blog post, Janet.

To the first point that you highlight, we very much agree that micro-credentials need not be digital in their delivery. This is also the position of the forthcoming Provincial framework on micro-credentials, which will acknowledge that micro-credentials may be delivered in any format (i.e. campus-based, blended, or fully online).

To the second point you highlight, our draft policy does allow for disaggregation as one form of curricular innovation, but this will only happen if this is a direction that the department/program wishes to go in (and that Faculty curriculum committees and Faculty Councils are willing to support). I think there are several considerations here, including that certain credit-bearing programs are already specifically marketed to working adults (the underserved learners referenced in the blog post), a population that has demonstrably benefited from the greater flexibility afforded by online delivery this past year. But our draft policy also supports the development of new, standalone micro-credentials that cater to "a new market of students" (to quote the blog post).

Again, I want to thank you for your consistent engagement during this policy consultation process. I sincerely appreciate how much work you have done to share from reports and articles that you have read. Your interest, enthusiasm, and growing expertise are much appreciated.

rjhangia@kwt.priv says:

April 8, 2021 at 7:01 am (Edit)



I am glad that the KFA strongly supports the potential growth and creative work that will be enabled by AC15 and I appreciate your acknowledgement of my responses on this blog.

I have repeatedly affirmed that all feedback (from all members of the KPU community, including but not limited to faculty) will be carefully considered as I revise the draft policy following the blog posting period. This is an important part of the policy development process and will be made transparent by a table that summarizes all of the feedback received along with responses to that feedback. This table will accompany the revised policy documents when it later goes through the policy approval process.

To your stated concerns:

A. The scope of faculty instructional duties within the bargaining unit are defined in the collective agreement and Policy AC15 is in alignment with the collective agreement.

B. There have been several (and different) suggestions offered for how we might revise the workflow of the SMC. These will all be carefully considered as I revise the draft policy documents. One additional detail I will note here is that there will be training provided to all members of the SMC to ensure that there is a clear grasp of the key concepts and relevant criteria. I have previously mentioned this at several Senate Standing Committee and Faculty Council meetings.

C. Collective Agreement related issues are outside the scope and function of Senate and related Academic Policies. KPU Administration will continue to work with the labour union to address these items in the proper venues.

D. The development of curriculum is identified as one of the normal duties performed by faculty within the scope of the bargaining unit and "explicit responsibility" is not identified in the collective agreement. Collective Agreement related issues are outside the scope and function of Senate and related Academic Policies. KPU Administration will continue to work with the labour union to address these items in the proper venues.

E. I will repost here what I had already posted on this blog several times prior to your comment: "The revision of the policy documents that will take place following the blog posting period will make it clear that proposals for credit-bearing micro-credentials will need to go through and be recommended by Faculty Standing Committees on Curriculum and Faculty Councils prior to the relevant Micro-credential Outline Forms being submitted to the Chair of the Senate Micro-credentials Committee (SMC)."

The role of faculty in the development of curriculum at KPU is identified in the current collective agreement.

The University Act of BC clearly states that the Senate of a special purpose, teaching university has the power and duty to determine the processes, procedures, and policies related to the development of curriculum and other curriculum related issues for the university and we will continue adhere to these policies and procedures.

F. The scope of faculty instructional duties within the bargaining unit are defined in the collective agreement and Policy AC15 is in alignment with the collective agreement.

G. Collective Agreement related issues are outside the scope and function of Senate and related Academic Policies. KPU Administration will continue to work with the labour union to address these items in the proper venues.

H. These are important and relevant questions and KPU Administration will work in cooperation with the labour union to address any aspects of AC15 as they relate to the collective agreement and faculty workload and working conditions.

I. Thank you for this suggestion. Collective Agreement related issues are outside the scope and function of Senate and related Academic Policies. KPU Administration will continue to work with the labour union to address these items in the proper venues.

rhollawa@kwt.priv says:

April 8, 2021 at 12:18 pm (Edit)



Hello Rajiv,

Please forgive me for posting so close to the deadline. I wanted to give faculty ample time to send me feedback. The following is a summary of concerns from several faculty members.

1) The composition of the SMC has been mentioned a few times, but I don't think it's been expressed on the blog that the working group membership, which is appointed by the chair of the SMC, does not need to include any faculty members. As I previously mentioned on this blog, increasing the membership from three to six of the 11 members will ensure faculty representation.

2) The process for the approval of non-credit micro-credentials is problematic. Perhaps you'll indulge me in a scenario. A proposal is brought forward to the SMC for a non-credit MC. The chair appoints three members of SMC to review it. None of the members are faculty. The SMC approves the proposal. The proposal does not go to SSCC because it is a non-credit bearing MC, and the Provost signs off on it. Once the MC is made public, it is found that the MC duplicates existing courses at KPU. You mentioned at SSCC on April 7 that the Collective Agreement will cover any issues with duplication of courses, yet Gillian Dearle has pointed out on this blog that the definition of duplication at the university is currently in dispute. In the scenario I've outlined above, several non-credit MCs could be offered to students while a lengthy arbitration process proceeds. During this time, the preexisting course offerings could suffer low enrollment as the MC version of the course will most likely be offered at a lower cost.

3) Let's take the same scenario above, but at some point a chair of an affected department learns of a proposal that duplicates an existing course in their department. In the current version of the policy, there is no mechanism to resolve disputes between chairs and the SMC for either non-credit and credit-bearing MCs. What happens if the SMC and a chair disagree about duplication?

4) The procedures for Digital Badges seem to include a loophole by which an Open Badge could be passed by Senate without undergoing the approval process of the SMC and without being approved by SSCC.

5) Will faculty be required to grant PLA for micro-credentials? Will it be possible to do most of a degree or a prerequisite without having to take any classes but to pay the PLA for MCs? It's a win for KPU: the price of tuition without the expense of instructors.

6) In the SSCC meeting on April 7, Policy AC15 was described as being applicable to undergrad courses but not prepatory or graduate courses. Could you please expand on this idea?

Thank you for your time in responding to the above concerns. I appreciate your willingness to engage in this process.

rjhangia@kwt.priv says:

April 9, 2021 at 8:18 am (Edit)



No problem at all. I fully expected this.

I will address each of the anonymous comments in turn, even as I note that this anonymity takes away from the intended openness and transparency of this blog posting process.

1. Thank you for this comment and suggestion. The composition and the workflow of the SMC is one of the things that I will be looking at as I revise the draft policy. I will note that the intent of the balance of the SMC should be rather evident in that its composition is currently proposed to include 8 Faculty representatives and 3 others. Nonetheless, I hear you and I will consider this suggestion.

2. Whereas I am happy to engage in hypotheticals, I am afraid that your imagined scenario makes a couple of incorrect assumptions. For one, it assumes that the Chair of SMC would select all 3 of the non-Faculty representatives to review this proposal, when in fact 8 out of 11 members in the SMC represent the Faculties (in its current proposed composition). Nonetheless, I take your point which was made by the first anonymous commenter and to which I have responded above. The second incorrect assumption you make is that there is no other oversight of non credit-bearing micro-credentials. I will clarify here that just as SSCC will consider approved micro-credentials that are credit-bearing, the joint committee described in LOU 3 of the KPU-KFA collective agreement considers all potential new Continuing & Professional Studies courses (these would, in the future, include non credit-bearing micro-credentials). One of the things that body considers is duplication with credit-bearing offerings.

3. I assume this comment comes from the same anonymous author as for #2 above. In the case of this second hypothetical scenario, you are overlooking the steps along the path of micro-credential development that will include early consultations on the part of the proponent (which will be required information in the micro-credential outline form), the collective judgment and decision-making by the relevant Faculty Curriculum Committee, and the collective judgment and decision-making by the relevant Faculty Council. This is all before a proposal for a new micro-credential is submitted to the Chair of the SMC (who is meant to determine whether the proposal is ready for review by the SMC) and the SMC members (who are explicitly asked to interrogate the proposal for potential duplication/overlap). In short, the premise of your question appears to focus on a disagreement in judgment between the SMC and a Department Chair, whereas I would suggest that this disagreement would in fact also be with the prior judgments of Faculty Curriculum Committee members and Faculty Council members. I will also remind you that SSCC plays a role after the SMC and would offer the Chair another venue to make the argument that has previously failed to convince their Faculty colleagues.

4. As the list of definitions at the top of the draft Procedure document makes clear, digital badges are not the same thing as open badges. Open badges will be used to represent competency-based learning through a KPU micro-credential whereas digital badges will be used to represent completion-based learning through an activity offered by a KPU academic or service unit. In short, an open badge simply cannot exist without an approved micro-credential, which most certainly involves the approval process of the SMC.

5. Not at all. I will refer this anonymous commenter to Policy AC6 (and its attached Procedure), which affirms that "Awarding PLAR credit is at the discretion of the program or department" (B. 1. c. i.) and that "PLAR will be assessed by qualified faculty with expertise in the relevant curriculum area" (B. 5. b. i.). This Procedure also explicitly defines a PLAR Assessor as "a faculty member who is a subject matter expert in the field who will conduct the assessment." See: <https://www.kpu.ca/sites/default/files/Policies/AC6%20Recognition%20of%20Prior%20Learning%20Procedure.pdf> As I have stated repeatedly, this draft policy does not overrule or override existing university policies. Departments and programs may choose to consider whether or not they wish to allow for micro-credentials to be considered as pre-requisites, but these changes would have to be formally proposed and approved at the appropriate venues (Faculty Curriculum Committee, Faculty Council, SSCC and Senate).

My final response to this anonymous comment is that I strongly disagree with the negative presumption in its final sentence and am saddened by its divisive tone. I don't think any of us are served well by anonymous comments that appear to pit the university and the faculty against one another when most of us show up to work each day working in good faith to support our collective mission.

6. I'm afraid this anonymous commenter misheard me at SSCC on April 7. What I had stated was that micro-credentials may be developed at any level (e.g., preparatory, undergraduate, post-Baccalaureate, graduate) and that this information would be clearly indicated. This comment was made in the context of a question about the use of credit-bearing micro-credentials towards undergraduate program requirements, and so I had to clarify that micro-credentials may not always be at the undergraduate level.

My pleasure, Rachelle. I have always been happy to answer any questions and engage with any member of the university community who wishes to discuss this subject. My desire is to do so openly and transparently in a way that can demonstrate responsiveness to feedback and that can build trust.

cburns@kwt.priv says:

March 26, 2021 at 5:00 pm (Edit)



Follow-up: My apologies. My question about the technical infrastructure for the digital badges is addressed in your response to an earlier post: "KPU's current badging platform is CanCred, which is certified by the IMS Global organization as compliant with the Open Badges 2.0 common technical standard. See: <https://www.canced.ca>".

rjhangia@kwt.priv says:

March 28, 2021 at 4:59 pm (Edit)



No worries at all, Chris. There has been a lot of information shared related to this policy and I appreciate you sharing and highlighting this detail here.

janetw@kwt.priv says:

April 3, 2021 at 12:03 pm (Edit)



I'm trying to catch up on some of the larger issues associated with MC development in BC, having thoroughly read through all the background information provided here as well as reviewing some of my own research associated with the MC feasibility study I collaborated on for ACP back in 2017. Open Badges seem to be a moving target, globally, especially as the digital disruption to higher ed is more palpable now due to the pandemic conditions of teaching and learning.

Here are some of my questions related to the platform (managed by T&L Commons at KPU) used for housing MCs and digital badges

Which CanCred subscription would KPU be purchasing if AC15 is adopted? The Premium or the Pro? Or, would we start with a conservative subscription and work our way up to a larger capacity? I'm assuming that KPU would look to the 'plug and play' integration with Moodle? See link for the choices available at CanCred. <https://factory.canced.ca/>

Who at KPU would be ensuring that our KPU issued MCs or digital badges comply with the Open Badges 2.0 common technical IMS Global standards? Would faculty who develop credit-bearing MCs need to incorporate the IMS standards into their 'short courses'?

We do not yet have a higher-ed provincial framework from the Ministry for MCs; although, I understand that we should be getting a framework this spring 2021. The standards of each body should match?

The IMS of competencies and academic standards exchange reads:

"Summary

The IMS Competencies and Academic Standards Exchange® (CASE®) standard facilitates the exchange of information about learning and education competencies. CASE also transmits information about rubrics, criteria for performance tasks, which may or may not align to competencies. By implementing CASE, it is possible to electronically exchange competency definitions so that applications, systems, and tools can readily access and manage this data. Having universal identifiers for education competencies makes it possible for any tool or application to share information between systems easily. This includes learning management systems, assessment tools, curriculum management apps, certificate and competency-based evaluation systems, and any other tool, process, or content that aligns to or references a competency or framework. This framework makes it possible to define relationships within a competency framework or between two separate frameworks.

Note that according to these standards institutions can move to 100% digital assessment or maintain paper exams as necessary.

<https://www.imsglobal.org/developers>

Another question: Should KPU first develop an academic badge ecosystem framework for credit-bearing short courses before accepting individual MC outlines and proposals? It seems we were at that point with the MC Working Group under Meg Goodine a few years back.

Finally, here is a reading from MIT's Media Lab, the leader of Blockcerts (blockchain architecture used for digital credentials-moving closer to a Web 3.0 standard) to help readers of the AC15 policy blog understand some of the considerations going forward when applying high tech to post-secondary credentials and/or academic designations. This article was written in 2016, and the technology has already evolved significantly, but I thought that some of the points made could be relevant to our discussion about AC 15: open source code, how technology can shape socioeconomic practices, inevitable evolution of open badge specifications, digital wallets for holding academic credentials, badge revocation, privacy, the right to curation for the learner, tracking the use of credentials.

...trying to maintain a balanced view of MCs 😊

rjhangia@kwt.priv says:

April 8, 2021 at 9:06 am (Edit)



Thank you for your additional questions. I sincerely appreciate how much research and study you have been doing on this topic.

To your questions:

1. "Which CanCred subscription would KPU be purchasing if AC15 is adopted? The Premium or the Pro? Or, would we start with a conservative subscription and work our way up to a larger capacity? I'm assuming that KPU would look to the 'plug and play' integration with Moodle? See link for the choices available at CanCred.

<https://factory.canced.ca/>"

We currently have a Premium subscription with CanCred; however, this is being re-evaluated as a higher tier subscription would increase our badge issuing capacity and add several additional features without significantly increasing the cost of our yearly contract.

2. "Who at KPU would be ensuring that our KPU issued MCs or digital badges comply with the Open Badges 2.0 common technical IMS Global standards? Would faculty who develop credit-bearing MCs need to incorporate the IMS standards into their 'short courses'?"

We do not yet have a higher-ed provincial framework from the Ministry for MCs; although, I understand that we should be getting a framework this spring 2021. The standards of each body should match?"

KPU's badging platform is certified for the Open Badges 2.0 standard by the IMS Global organization. The required meta-data that accompanies this technical standard will be requested as required information in the micro-credential outline form, and so embedded into the process of micro-credential proposal development.

The provincial framework for micro-credentials has now been drafted and will be circulated for feedback across the sector. As a member of the advisory group that helped shape this framework I can confirm that our draft policy documents are in line with the principles and guidelines of this draft framework.

3. "Another question: Should KPU first develop an academic badge ecosystem framework for credit-bearing short courses before accepting individual MC outlines and proposals? It seems we were at that point with the MC Working Group under Meg Goodine a few years back."

One of the things that the MC working group had previously been considering was the different categories of offerings. The separation of (completion-based) digital badges from (competency-based) micro-credentials addresses an important part of this. The consultations across the university has made clear that there is great interest in advancing with these two types of offerings at this time. The forthcoming provincial framework for micro-credentials provides even more reassurance, as our policy will be in line with those principles and guidelines.

cburns@kwt.priv says:

March 26, 2021 at 4:54 pm (Edit)



Echoing what Celia Brinkerhoff said earlier, librarians are keen to move forward with creating a digital badge for our Doing Research tutorial to complement the existing Academic Integrity tutorial which already has a digital badge. This idea was strongly supported by faculty and instructional staff in the 2020 Teaching, Research and Library Supports Survey. We're very glad to see a policy framework being developed to enable this. It's been a long time coming, but we appreciate that it is a complex process requiring extensive consultations and careful planning.

I'm curious to know what form digital badges might take as compared with Open Badges. The definition in the Procedure document says that digital badges will be "verifiable, portable, and shareable". How will this verifiability/portability/shareability be achieved? Will the digital badges use an open badge standard similar to what I imagine will underlie KPU's planned Open Badges (e.g. <https://openbadges.org/>)?

Also, as mentioned during your visit to the Faculty of Educational Support & Development Council meeting on March 9th, faculty members in FESD (which does not offer credit-bearing courses or have a Curriculum Committee) are interested to know if there will be a mechanism by which its departments (which include the Learning Centres, Counselling, and Accessibility Services, in addition to the Library) might offer Micro-Credentials — including credit-bearing ones — in the future?

Many thanks for your work on this!

rdearle@kwt.priv says:

March 28, 2021 at 12:49 pm (Edit)



With due respect to my colleagues in FESD, the fact that FESD does not have a curriculum committee or credit-bearing courses suggests that it should not be creating credit-bearing MCs. Were it to do so, it would be doing the work of instructional faculty who have been hired to teach and create curriculum.

If FESD faculty are already being paid for other work involving educational support and development, the work of creating and offering credited MCs would represent unofficial and unpaid work that could impact teaching faculty by reducing student demand for courses in other areas. I know that FESD faculty interested in MCs do not intend this consequence, but we must be aware of it.

kmeijer@kwt.priv says:

March 28, 2021 at 3:43 pm (Edit)



I don't understand your comment, do you mean that if the Library for example would offer a MC in research skills, then students wouldn't want to take other classes anymore?

How about if we create one directed to faculty? The kind of teaching and curriculum building that we already do lends itself really well to that.

kmeijer@kwt.priv says:

March 28, 2021 at 3:58 pm (Edit)



And just to make clear, I mean non-credit bearing MCs, not credit bearing, I know we can't do that.

rdearle@kwt.priv says:

March 28, 2021 at 7:40 pm (Edit)



My comment was directed specifically at the question of FESD creating credit-bearing Micro-credentials as articulated in the third paragraph of cburns' comment above. I have no issue at all with FESD creating non-credit bearing credentials, whether for students, faculty, or anyone else. In fact, I support it.

My core point was simply that if the Library (for example) were to offer credit-bearing MCs and students began to assemble credits to equal a course (or more), that change could impact other teaching areas where students currently seek elective credits.

I hope this helps clarify.

cburns@kwt.priv says:

March 31, 2021 at 8:54 am (Edit)



Thanks, Robert, for your feedback on my question about a mechanism for FESD departments to potentially offer Micro-Credentials (whether credit or non-credit) — in addition to non-credit Digital Badges — in the future. I can appreciate that faculty members might be concerned about competition for enrollment in existing courses when a range of micro-credentials are available, though this might apply equally to offerings from other Faculties, not just FESD. I do want to clarify, though, that instruction is already a core element of the work that most faculty members in FESD do, so this would not be unofficial or unpaid additional work. Indeed, librarians and counsellors have partnered with other Faculties in the past to offer credit-bearing courses, such as UNIV 1100 and LCOM. Perhaps that partnership approach is the way forward, if there is an identified need for credit offerings to which FESD faculty members could contribute?

rjhangia@kwt.priv says:

March 28, 2021 at 5:08 pm (Edit)



Thank you very much for reading the draft policy documents and for your support. The keen interest of our librarians in developing additional digital badges has been noted during the consultation process and I appreciate you highlighting it in this forum. I am grateful to the Library for leading such a successful badging pilot with our popular Academic Integrity tutorial (previously known as "I Cite My Sources").

As you note in your comment above, your question about the use of open badge standards has been addressed and our badging platform is indeed compliant with this standard.

As I noted during my visit to FESD Faculty Council, this policy will provide a framework and opportunity for areas to develop and offer both credit-bearing and non credit-bearing micro-credentials; however, if a Faculty is not currently eligible to develop and offer credit-bearing micro-credentials then policy AC15 would not change that reality. Unless this changes, I believe that FESD would be limited to developing and offering non credit-bearing micro-credentials and digital badges.

gharris@kwt.priv says:

March 24, 2021 at 2:15 pm (Edit)



I have full confidence that the proponents of this policy were diligent and thorough in conducting background research on micro-credentials prior to the development of the policy. Any new initiative is bound to carry potential benefits/rewards as well as risks/challenges. It is thus concerning to find that the information made publicly available to KPU stakeholders appears to provide a very biased and one-sided perspective on the issue. On the Micro-credentials backgrounder & FAQ document we see many comments and links that extol the potential value and benefits of micro-credentials but it would be naive of us to assume there are no associated risks and challenges. I could find little or no reference to the potential pitfalls that may be encountered in embarking on this new initiative, nor any evidence of a cost-benefit analysis.

Why have stakeholders been provided with such a one-sided perspective on this issue?

Surely a transparent process would include a fulsome coverage of alternate perspectives with potential or known risks being clearly identified and articulated from a review of the literature.

A balanced perspective is essential to making informed decisions. A well-informed policy should have built-in safeguards to protect against possible risks/pitfalls. How is this possible when we have not been informed about what those risks might be?

janetw@kwt.priv says:

March 24, 2021 at 10:10 pm (Edit)



Hello,

You will have to pardon my intrusion here. I am going to add another reading about blockchain and the future of digital learning, assessment and management (2018) to help readers of this policy blog understand the larger picture of MC development at post-secondary institutions (Europe is ahead of the game on this). If you don't want to read the article, scroll down to the bottom of it to get a visual model of what a student's educational digital record could look like on their smartphone in the future in BC (Blockcerts Model Image of Blockcert and verification similar to the MIT model)

<https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1218203.pdf>

The AC15 policy is forward-thinking for a polytechnic university, in my view, even if there are some critical questions which need addressing.

janetw@kwt.priv says:

March 31, 2021 at 8:31 pm (Edit)



Here is a recent article by BC Business about how micro- credentials are catching on in BC post – secondary institutions. The article includes a chart (at the end of the article) with universities or colleges that offer 'stackable' micro-credentials leading to a more traditional university designation like a certificate, diploma or degree.

<https://www.bcbusiness.ca/2021-Education-Guide-Micro-credentials-are-catching-on-at-BC-universities-and-colleges>

gharris@kwt.priv says:

March 24, 2021 at 10:08 am (Edit)



If I am not mistaken, I believe that a Gov't Policy/report on Micro-credentials is to be released in the near future. Wouldn't KPU stand to benefit from waiting to see the details of this policy and then developing our own policy in the light of the vision and direction provided by the government? This would ensure that our policy is consistent with government guidelines/recommendations. By rushing forward with our own policy in advance of gov't guidelines, is there a risk that our policy may not be consistent or in-line with gov't and perhaps require substantial revision? Are we placing the cart in front of the horse?

rjhangia@kwt.priv says:

March 26, 2021 at 8:33 am (Edit)



Thank you very much for bringing attention to the forthcoming Provincial framework on micro-credentials. As you may have seen, I referenced this framework in the backgrounder document attached to the draft policy documents. I also made sure to mention this at every Senate Standing Committee and Faculty Council meeting that I visited.

As a member of the Ministry of Advanced Education and Skills Training's advisory group on micro-credentials, I can confirm that the Provincial framework will soon be available for review. As a result of my direct involvement in the drafting of this framework, I can confidently assert that the proposed policy is entirely in line with the principles and guidelines of the forthcoming Provincial framework.

gharris@kwt.priv says:

March 22, 2021 at 7:17 pm (Edit)



Re: B. Procedures

The first reference made in the policy regarding the approval process for micro-credentials appears to be: 1.d.i. "The SMC Chair receives a Micro-credential Outline form"

What should be made explicit in the policy is the intended role of curriculum committees in the approval process prior to reaching the SMC. Do the proponents intend to bypass curriculum committees and Faculty Councils? Please provide some clarification on this.

There appears to be a 'grey' area in this policy regarding who can develop micro-credentials. Developing curriculum is recognized as faculty work, so it should be made explicit in the policy that any micro-credential that is intended to form part of the curricular offerings of a program, must be developed by faculty, so as to avoid any potential conflict with the Collective Agreement.

rjhangia@kwt.priv says:

March 24, 2021 at 8:59 am (Edit)



Thank you very much for reading the draft policy documents. Your questions and comments are very welcome.

The point you raise was made earlier on this blog by your colleague Robert Dearle (to which I responded on March 11; see below). It was also raised at a couple of Faculty Council meetings. In short, no, we do not intend to bypass curriculum committees and Faculty Councils. Proposals for credit-bearing micro-credentials can certainly go through the relevant Faculty curriculum committee prior to the submission of the micro-credential outline form to the SMC Chair. I will make sure to address this question in the revision of the policy documents following the blog posting period.

I will also affirm here that policy AC15, if approved, would not overrule or disregard existing university policies or collective agreements.

gharris@kwt.priv says:

March 24, 2021 at 2:26 pm (Edit)



Your response seems to imply that credit-bearing micro-credentials may come to the SMC Chair via curriculum committees but also that they might not. Is this your intention? Please clarify.

I am suggesting that the process should require micro-credentials to be recommended to the SMC by the relevant curriculum committees and that the policy should explicitly state this.

rjhangia@kwt.priv says:

March 26, 2021 at 10:08 am (Edit)



The revision of the policy documents that will take place following the blog posting period will make it clear that proposals for credit-bearing micro-credentials will need to go through and be recommended by Faculty Standing Committees on Curriculum and Faculty Councils prior to the relevant Micro-credential Outline Forms being submitted to the Chair of the Senate Micro-credentials Committee (SMC).

gharris@kwt.priv says:

March 22, 2021 at 6:46 pm (Edit)



Re: B.1 under Procedures

If the proposed SMC is to be a subcommittee created by SSCC then SSCC should have the authority to determine the mandate and terms of reference under which the SMC should operate. It seems instead that Policy AC15 is dictating terms to SSCC about the composition and functional operation of the SMC to the extent that should SSCC decide to modify any of the details listed under B.1. then it would also require changes to be made to the policy, otherwise they would be in conflict. This would be a cumbersome and time consuming process. I believe it is inappropriate for Policy AC15 to be dictating terms to SSCC on how it should conduct its business.

There is no rationale for the SMC to function any differently from other committees that review and approve curriculum. The proposed expedited approval process is badly flawed and lends itself to rushed and biased decision making that is inconsistent with how all other curriculum committees function. What is the point of establishing a committee of 10 or more members when it functions as a defacto 3 member committee appointed by the Chair? It is also not reasonable or appropriate to specify a time-limit for the approval of micro-credentials. Such arrangements do not lend themselves to robust discussion and well-informed decision making.

rjhangia@kwt.priv says:

March 26, 2021 at 1:36 pm (Edit)



The draft procedure does outline how the Senate Micro-credentials Committee will operate in terms of its composition and workflow because we believe that it is important to be clear and transparent about the approval process for micro-credentials in this proposed policy. I am certain that there would be strenuous objections raised at having a proposed policy that did not include these details.

In terms of the authority of SSCC, I will note that SSCC has two opportunities to provide direct input on the policy and procedure during the consultation process. The first opportunity was on February 10 and the feedback received during that discussion has already been incorporated into the draft policy documents. The second opportunity is coming up on April 7, while the policy is still posted on the policy blog.

Once the draft policy documents have been revised following the blog posting period, the proposed policy will then come back to SSCC (for a third time) as part of the policy approval process. To be clear, this means that approval from SSCC is required as part of the policy approval process. I believe that this approval process does respect the authority of SSCC.

I appreciate your feedback on the proposed workflow for the Senate Micro-credentials Committee and will consider it along with the other feedback received on this forum and at the various Senate Standing Committee and Faculty Council meetings. I disagree, however, with your suggestion that a university committee is unable to make a decision that is unbiased and well-informed within a specified timeline. I can personally attest to the robustness and integrity of the decision-making process by at least two committees that make their decisions on proposals within two weeks: the Open Education Working Group (which adjudicates applications for OER grants) and the Teaching & Learning Innovation Fund adjudication committee. Finally, I will add that there is widespread recognition within the BC post-secondary system that the approval process for micro-credentials will need to be agile in order to be responsive to the needs of the communities we serve. I agree that it is a variation to the usual pace at which we approve curriculum. Micro-credentials will be a new platform for institutions to offer programming and they provide an opportunity for us to adopt new ways to process information through our governance procedures in a more expedited but controlled manner.

rhollawa@kwt.priv says:

March 30, 2021 at 12:57 pm (Edit)



Hello Rajiv,

Comparing the timeline of the SMC to the timeline of committees that assess funding applications is unfair. The SMC will need to determine duplication of micro-credentials in whole or in part against hundreds of courses and programs. This requires more than 10 working days and more than 3 members of the committee. The SMC's working-group composition should include subject matter experts and preferably include at least six of the total SMC's membership. This would guarantee faculty representation and reduce the inevitability of errors due to a rushed process.

rjhangia@kwt.priv says:

March 30, 2021 at 3:41 pm (Edit)



Thank you very much for reading the draft policy documents. My intent in pointing to those two decision-making bodies was simply to illustrate the ability of members of the KPU community to make effective and unbiased decisions within an identical time frame as what is proposed in the current draft procedure. I will point out that the proposed decision-making process for credit-bearing micro-credentials by the Senate Micro-credentials Committee (SMC) will be preceded by decision making within Faculty Curriculum Committees and Faculty Councils. Personally, I have great confidence in the ability of my faculty colleagues who sit on these bodies to detect and act on any errors that manage to elude the earlier development and consultation process. The SMC decision will also be followed by decision making by the Senate Standing Committee on Curriculum, another committee in whose ability I have great confidence. However, I will certainly consider your suggestions along with the others made concerning the composition and workflow of the SMC as I revise the draft policy documents following the posting period on this blog.

rhollawa@kwt.priv says:

March 31, 2021 at 3:38 pm (Edit)



Hello Rajiv,

You wrote: "I will point out that the proposed decision-making process for credit-bearing micro-credentials by the Senate Micro-credentials Committee (SMC) will be preceded by decision making within Faculty Curriculum Committees and Faculty Councils." I see that you're referring to an upcoming change in the policy in response to comments on the blog, and I'm very appreciative of that. I think many people will be assured once these implied procedures are made explicit in the next version of the policy. I appreciate as well your willingness to consider the need for adequate time and adequate SMC member participation during the approval process.

rjhangia@kwt.priv says:

April 6, 2021 at 8:44 am (Edit)



Thank you Rachelle. Yes, as I have noted in some of my other responses to comments on this blog, when I revise the draft policy documents I will make explicit the role of Faculty Curriculum Committees and Faculty Councils in the development and approval of Micro-credentials (prior to the submission of proposals for new Micro-credentials to the Chair of the Senate Micro-credentials Committee). Your suggestions and those of others relating to the SMC will also be carefully considered as I revise the draft policy documents.

janetw@kwt.priv says:

March 22, 2021 at 8:38 am (Edit)



I wanted to share The Confederation of University Faculty Associations of BC white paper on Micro-credentials released March 11, 2021.

The paper is entitled: "Faculty Voice: On Academic Credibility in Micro-Credentials at BC's Research Universities."

The paper was shared at the ACP Faculty Council meeting last week.

<https://www.cufa.bc.ca/cufa-bc-releases-white-paper-on-micro-credentials/>

rjhangia@kwt.priv says:

March 22, 2021 at 10:56 am (Edit)



Thank you very much for sharing this white paper, Janet. As at the ACP Faculty Council meeting, I have been sharing this new publication at other recent Faculty Council visits.

I am pleased to note here that the approach we are taking with the draft policy and procedure for AC15 is in line with the major recommendations of CUFA's white paper, including the understanding of what micro-credentials are:

- "They are usually completed in a condensed time-frame compared to traditional forms of education, and allow for flexibility and customizability in ways the traditional pathways do not. Micro-credentials are appealing in that they generally comprise skills-based pedagogies rather than content-based." (p. 4)
- "A micro-credential then is an educational attainment that covers material more specific and focused in nature than does a traditional credential and can be achieved in a compressed timeframe." (p. 5)

On their value:

- "At their best, micro-credentials are an elegant complement to traditional learning as they can meet students' needs for specific skill-based learning, employers' needs for targeted skills, higher education's needs for pedagogical diversification and increasing revenue streams, and government's needs to better integrate higher education and industry." (p. 7)
- "The flexibility of micro-credentials benefits the learners as well and expands upon many of the major shifts in educational programming seen in post-secondary today. They can be developed to respond to individual learning needs (offered online, in-person, or hybrid; full- or part-time), career needs (mid-career shifts or as value-added learning opportunities), entry-point needs (recognition of prior learning, learning outside of Canada), and equity needs (single parents, learners with cognitive or other kinds of disabilities, or those living in rural areas)." (p. 8)

And on their development and governance:

- "We see the role of faculty and university senates as central to their success in credited programs, as they are accountable for academic quality and oversight of the university's academic mission." (p. 4)
- "Academic senates and institutional governing bodies must have oversight of for-credit micro-credentials." (p. 11)
- "Faculty and academic staff, acting through collegial governance procedures, should be involved in the development, oversight, and delivery of all for-credit micro-credential programs." (p. 11)
- "As with other for-credit academic programming, it will need to comply with collegial governance processes and with collective agreements." (p. 11)
- "Micro-credentials will need to be sensitive to market demands while also working within the institution's decision-making hierarchies with faculty and senate. Any implementation rollout beyond non-credit pilot projects will need to be directed by faculty and senates in order to facilitate the integration of micro-credentials into credible (and creditable) higher education programming." (p. 12)

gharris@kwt.priv says:

March 21, 2021 at 6:51 pm (Edit)



It is deeply disappointing to see another example of a curricular policy driven by a top-down process that is not conducive to faculty support and ownership and also raises doubts about motivation and transparency.

If the proponents were genuine in their efforts to obtain input and guidance from faculty on this policy, why would they:

- a) Fail to consult widely with Faculty Councils (as major stakeholders) PRIOR to public posting of the policy despite the fact they have had more than a year to do so?
- b) Refuse to consult with Faculty Councils prior to posting, when this was specifically requested during both SSCC and Senate consultations?
- c) Only agree to consult with Faculty Councils – at least in one instance – AFTER being requested to do so by the Faculty Council Chair?

I acknowledge that consultation with Faculty Councils has now taken place but my point is that this level of broad stakeholder consultation should have taken place PRIOR to public posting. To ignore such requests from SSCC and Senate only serves to raise questions about the motivation for doing so and to undermine faith that the consultation process is genuine and transparent. Such action also fails to respect the role of faculty in developing curriculum.

rjhangia@kwt.priv says:

March 22, 2021 at 2:36 pm (Edit)



As the policy developer, I am disappointed to see my sincere efforts to consult widely characterized in this fashion as I have expended a significant amount of time and energy to ensure that we develop a policy that reflects the needs and will of the KPU community. Allow me to review the path that has led up to now:

1. There has been consultation and grassroots discussions taking place across the university for more than a year (although this process was understandably interrupted due to the onset of the pandemic). More than a year ago, I began to meet with both faculty (e.g., Faculty of Science & Horticulture Chairs) and staff (e.g., Student Services) groups, as well as members of the cross-functional Micro-credentials Working Group.

2. Given the newness of micro-credentials it was necessary to take a conservative approach and to make sure that we first consulted (including seeking legal advice) on the proper governance and jurisdiction of micro-credentials before we could have a draft policy in hand to share for feedback. I am glad to say that since we made these determinations and drafted the policy our chosen approach has been confirmed by the (forthcoming) Provincial framework for micro-credentials and the recent white paper on micro-credentials published by the Confederation of University Faculty Associations of BC.

3. Other pre-blog consultations included those with the Vice Chair of Senate, University Registrar, University Secretary, and the Senate Standing Committees on Policy Review, Academic Planning & Priorities, and Curriculum. Members of those three Senate Standing Committees were encouraged to share the draft documents with their colleagues.

4. In order to ensure that all faculty were aware of this draft policy (and not just representatives on Faculty Councils or other Faculty committees), I directly emailed the draft policy documents to all faculty. I will note that this was not a required step in the policy approval process and might reasonably be regarded as an attempt to be more transparent, not less. In my email to all faculty, I specifically alerted everyone to the posting of the draft policy documents on the blog and the deadline for receiving comments.

5. In your comment you claim that we have done the following “Refuse to consult with Faculty Councils prior to posting, when this was specifically requested during both SSCC and Senate consultations?” While it is true that you as an individual did propose a motion at the Senate Standing Committee on Curriculum about wanting the Faculty Councils to see the draft policy prior to the posting on the policy blog, I will note for the benefit of others who were not at that meeting that your motion failed to elicit a seconder as the consensus at that committee meeting was that there was sufficient time to engage with and receive feedback from all stakeholders. Although I do understand that you feel differently on this issue, a failed motion does not reasonably reflect the will of the committee, and so I have to state that the implied allegation that the will of SSCC was ignored is simply false. In addition, to the best of our recollection and reading of the minutes, there was no such discussion at any recent meeting of Senate.

6. In your comment you also claim that we have done the following: “Only agree to consult with Faculty Councils – at least in one instance – AFTER being requested to do so by the Faculty Council Chair?” However, there was always a commitment to visit each of our eight Faculty Councils to seek feedback on the draft policy, as explicitly noted by the Provost during the consultations at the three Senate Standing Committees.

7. My visits to the eight Faculty Councils were productive and at none of these meetings did anyone argue that this policy ought to have been presented at all eight Faculty Councils prior to being posted on the blog. I did, however, receive plenty of constructive questions and suggestions. The overwhelming sentiment that I perceived was that Faculty Councillors and other Faculty committee members were pleased to review this policy and have a good-faith opportunity to provide feedback.

8. I will reaffirm here what I explicitly noted at each of the Faculty Council and Senate Standing Committee meetings: That the feedback that is being received during this consultation period (including from the policy blog and all of the many committee and Faculty Council meetings) is being carefully recorded and will influence any necessary revisions to the draft policy documents. In short, the version of the policy on this blog may not be the final version and there is still plenty of opportunity for feedback.

9. At the point when all eight Faculty Councils had been visited (March 19), there were still three weeks remaining to collect comments on the policy blog. For reference, there is also a plan to post a notice to remind all employees of the posting when there are two weeks remaining to collect comments on the blog. Again, this is not a required step but a practice to ensure that we are doing this work transparently and that everyone who wishes to provide feedback (including our many BCGEU staff stakeholders) has an opportunity to do so.

10. I will note again that the draft policy and procedure will revisit the Senate Standing Committees on Policy Review, Academic Planning & Priorities, and Curriculum for a second time while the draft policy documents are still on the policy blog and open for comments.

11. Once the draft policy is revised and deemed ready for the policy approval process it will revisit (for a third time) the Senate Standing Committees on Policy Review, Academic Planning & Priorities, and Curriculum, and from there on go to Senate, the Board Governance Committee, and the Board of Governors as part of the approval process. A table summarizing all of the feedback received during the consultation period will accompany the policy documents at this stage to ensure that all of the comments received and noted and that the policy addresses any expressed concerns.

12. I will also note here that I have consistently expressed a willingness to make time to discuss the draft policy documents directly, whether by email, phone, or via a virtual meeting. Several members of the KPU community have taken me up on this offer and their feedback is also being summarized and will be reflected in the record of consultations. In every single case I have responded to the faculty or staff member in question within 24 hours and set up a meeting as needed.

Thank you for providing your feedback, both here on the policy blog and at SSCC. In addition to these forums, please also feel free to reach out to me directly if you would like to discuss this draft policy further.

gharris@kwt.priv says:

March 24, 2021 at 11:04 am (Edit)



Thank you for your detailed reply. I would like to note, however, that despite an elaborate response to my comments, my fundamental question about why consultation with Faculty Councils as major stakeholders did not take place PRIOR to public posting of the policy, remains unanswered.

One hypothesis to explain this action is that after being delayed for a year, the policy is now being rushed forward for approval in an attempt to obtain gov't funding that has a narrow time window of opportunity. Is there any truth to this as an explanation? If not, then I request a direct response to my original question for transparency.

rjhangia@kwt.priv says:

March 26, 2021 at 7:54 am (Edit)



I do not have more to add to my detailed response above, except to state that I do not believe that the consultation process for AC15 reflects an effort to rush. There is no step in KPU's policy development and approval process that has been skipped.

I can state unequivocally that there is no truth to your offered explanation. There is no current government call for funding related to micro-credentials nor any narrow window of opportunity that is closing. There is, however, an opportunity for KPU to better serve our learners and community in a way that aligns with the mission of a polytechnic university and the goals of our Academic Plan, including:

- 7.3 Encouraging a leap forward in providing hybrid, online, and micro-credential delivery.
- 2.5 Provide a range of learning environments and advance our existing classroom, technology-enhanced and online learning environments.
- 2.6. Pursue and develop a new approach to adult learning education recognizing the need for alternative delivery modes capable of addressing the challenges and obstacles for this learner group.

gharris@kwt.priv says:

March 28, 2021 at 12:01 pm (Edit)



How can we believe this is a transparent process when you repeatedly refuse to address a very simple and reasonable question?

Why did you disregard multiple requests to consult with Faculty Councils as major stakeholders, PRIOR to public posting of the policy?

Faculty are arguably the largest collective stakeholder in this policy. I am simply trying to understand why you would NOT want to consult with them to strengthen the policy BEFORE public posting. It simply doesn't add-up!

I respectfully request (again) a DIRECT response to this question.

kmeijer@kwt.priv says:

March 28, 2021 at 3:53 pm (Edit)



As far as I understand the process, Faculty Councils are not required to be consulted before a policy is posted to the blog. Posting to the blog in addition provides an opportunity for wide input and feedback, from anyone at the University.
How does posting to the policy blog make this a non transparent process?

And if it is not a requirement that Faculty Councils see a policy before it is posted, then why is the answer to why this policy was posted earlier necessary? You seem to imply that this is somehow malicious, whereas it's clear from the above that it is not.
The answer is just "it wasn't", and the consequence of that has been nil: there has been plenty of time and opportunity for feedback regardless, as the numerous comments on this blog make clear.

fcallagh@kwt.priv says:

March 26, 2021 at 9:52 am (Edit)



Hello Rajiv, regarding point 5 above, I would just like to make a clarification: At the Feb 22nd meeting of Senate, I did ask if the public posting period could be delayed to start after the Faculty Council consultations have been completed. Although I did not make a motion, I did ask the question. It is

recorded in the minutes in terms of a discussion of changing the process timeline. I just wanted to clarify that.

rjhangia@kwt.priv says:

March 26, 2021 at 10:00 am (Edit)



Thank you for clarifying this, Fergal. Your contributions and constructive feedback during this consultation process (even outside of Senate Standing Committees and this blog) are sincerely appreciated.

gharris@kwt.priv says:

March 28, 2021 at 11:38 am (Edit)



If due diligence has been applied in the development of this new and significant initiative then the contents and process should hold-up to scrutiny when viewed through a public lens such as this policy blog. This draft policy AC15 has fallen short in this regard and it calls into question the degree to which it is genuine and transparent as it claims to be.

On 22nd March your reply to a comment posted on this blog on 21st March, dismisses a claim that a recent discussion took place at Senate regarding a request to postpone public posting of the policy until consultation had taken place with Faculty councils. Your comment has since been shown categorically to be false and might be interpreted to be a deliberate attempt to invalidate comments and to brush aside and dismiss genuine and repeated concerns raised about the integrity of the consultation process.

Furthermore, under point number 8 of the same reply, you boldly claim that: "... the feedback that is being received during this consultation period (including from the policy blog and all of the many committee and Faculty Council meetings) is being carefully recorded". If this statement were true, then how is it possible that a significant discussion about the consultation process that took place at Senate and was recorded in Senate Minutes, somehow was not only conveniently overlooked but was outright denied in your response as having ever taken place? I also note that there has been no attempt to retract, correct or amend your statement(s).

As stakeholders, we are now left wondering what other feedback has been deliberately or otherwise ignored or overlooked and just how many other statements and claims made in relation to this policy are either false or misleading in an attempt to advance an agenda that has not been made transparent. Our confidence that the process being followed is authentic and accurate has been severely undermined.

Josephine Chan says:

March 28, 2021 at 3:22 pm (Edit)



Hello Greg,

Thank you for your comments.

In regards to the last point in your comment (paragraph 4) "*...we are now left wondering what other feedback has been deliberately or otherwise ignored or overlooked and just how many other statements and claims made in relation to this policy are either false or misleading in an attempt to advance an agenda that has not been made transparent.*" I can reassure you that I have not intentionally ignored or deliberately left out any feedback received, heard or written. This includes all consultations before and during this 6-week public commenting period. Your feedback from the Feb 10th SSCC regarding the opportunity to consult all Faculty Councils before the 6-week was captured, reflected in and responded to in the "[AC 15 Feedback and Responses January-February 2021](#)" (see bottom of page 6 of 11), which is available on this blog post.

Detailed feedback received outside of this blog is also currently being captured in a detailed document, similar to "AC 15 Feedback and Responses January-February 2021". This feedback document, along with responses from the policy developer, will be presented to all SSCs and Senate after the completion of the 6-week public commenting period.

I hope this clarifies your concern.

Thank you,
Josephine

kmeijer@kwt.priv says:

March 28, 2021 at 3:56 pm (Edit)



Hi Greg,

Your opinions are not shared by all stakeholders and all faculty. Can you please use I statements in future so as not to imply that everyone else agrees with you?

I personally am very satisfied with how this policy is being developed, as well as its process.

Furthermore, at FESD council the response was very positive and no-one had an issue with the process, policy, or timeline.

kmeijer@kwt.priv says:

March 28, 2021 at 4:08 pm (Edit)



Also, Greg, if you read through all the policy documents, this blog, and listen to other people's experiences as they expressed questions about this policy, you will see that this comment is unwarranted and uncalled for: "a deliberate attempt to invalidate comments and to brush aside and dismiss genuine and repeated concerns raised about the integrity of the consultation process."

I also want to let you know that disagreeing with a policy and proceedings is one thing, but questioning the integrity and honesty of a person is quite another, as you have done several times in the above comment.

rjhangia@kwt.priv says:

March 19, 2021 at 9:47 am (Edit)



I wanted to provide an update to confirm that each Faculty has now been visited individually and consulted about this draft policy and procedure. I have visited the following meetings:

- Faculty of Arts Faculty Council (February 19)
- Faculty of Educational Support and Development Faculty Council (March 9)
- School of Business Faculty Council (March 15)
- Faculty of Science and Horticulture Faculty Council (March 16)
- Wilson School of Design Curriculum Committee, with all faculty invited (March 17)
- Faculty of Trades and Technology Faculty Council (March 17)
- Faculty of Academic and Career Preparation Faculty Council (March 19)
- Faculty of Health Faculty Council, with other Faculty committee members invited (March 19)

All of the feedback from these consultations has been carefully recorded and will inform any necessary revisions to the policy documents. This feedback (along with the feedback from this policy blog) will also accompany the version of the draft policy that is brought forward during the later policy approval process.

I am grateful for the university-wide engagement in this policy development process and am delighted to observe the extent of the excitement across our Faculties in this new type of offering.

rhollawa@kwt.priv says:

March 30, 2021 at 1:13 pm (Edit)



I can't speak for other faculty council meetings, but the visit from Rajiv to our meeting, while informative, cannot technically be called a consultation. A few faculty members had time to ask a couple of questions, but the information flow happened mostly in one direction, and the meeting felt rushed. A process for faculty consultation would include the ability of all faculty to provide feedback. I appreciate that this blog is one way for faculty to do just that, but some of the criticism is that feedback should be gathered before a policy is created. That kind of collaboration and transparency creates trust, but that kind of collaboration did not happen in many Faculties.

rjhangia@kwt.priv says:

March 31, 2021 at 10:54 am (Edit)



Thank you for your comment. I will first add a few details here to make even more explicit my approach to consultation in the Faculty of Academic and Career Preparation and then offer a couple of observations.

Additional details about my consultation with ACP Faculty Council:

1) My email correspondence with Mark Diotte (ACP Faculty Council Chair) during which I requested to present and discuss the draft policy AC15 at ACP Faculty Council was explicitly understood as a consultation. During this correspondence I was advised at the time that February ACP FC meeting agenda was already very full and so was invited to instead attend the March ACP FC meeting. I will note that Mark Diotte was unavailable to attend the March meeting and so Chris Traynor chaired the meeting in his place.

2) I accepted the suggested time to join the ACP FC meeting, presented my overview in about 5 minutes and then responded to any and every question or comment that was posed. I relied on the Chair of the FC meeting to determine the agenda and to direct traffic at the meeting. After I read your comment I checked with other attendees of that meeting and they have expressed to me that in their opinion the Chair did a good job of keeping everything flowing. I concur with their judgment and believe that Chris did

a very good job at making sure that questions were raised and addressed. Naturally, if I am the sole person responding to a series of questions I will end up speaking and providing more information than others. This in my view is a feature and not a bug in the consultation process.

3) Our colleague Josephine Chan kindly attended the ACP FC meeting with me and made sure to take careful notes about all questions and comments that were made at the meeting. A summary of these will be attached to the revised policy when it goes through the approval process. Thanks to these detailed records I can confirm that there were several questions raised at ACP FC, including about who/which units would be eligible to develop micro-credentials, requests for additional examples of the different types of offerings (e.g., micro-credentials vs. digital badges), a question about the use of hyphenation in the term "non credit-bearing," a question about the approving jurisdiction, and questions about the composition and workflow of the Senate Micro-credentials Committee.

Observations:

From my (policy developer's) perspective, I have been doing as much as I can (and more than what is required) in order to make sure that I am consulting widely. This includes visiting meetings of all eight Faculties to present and receive feedback on the draft policy. Although some believe that Faculty Councils are the optimal venue for consultation on draft policies that relate to academic matters, I was fully aware that limiting my consultation to the various Faculty Councils would not provide an opportunity to the many faculty members who do not serve on their Faculty Council to provide their feedback and raise their questions. This is why I chose to directly email the draft policy documents to every single faculty member at the university on February 25. In that email I wrote the following:

"I want to make sure that all faculty are aware of this draft policy before the six week posting period on the blog begins (I have attached a copy of the draft policy documents to this email so that you do not need to search for them). I also want to make sure that you know that feedback on this policy is welcome, whether through your representatives at the upcoming meetings of your Faculty Council or the 3 Senate Standing Committees, or directly on the policy blog. Finally, I will continue to make time to meet with any member of the university community who wishes to discuss this draft policy or potential future micro-credentials."

The six-week posting period on the policy blog is indeed an opportunity for university-wide feedback, as you note. In my email to all faculty members I sought to affirm this, while also pointing to the various other channels through which faculty members could provide their input.

I will close with one other observation: I hear from your comments that my efforts (which include visiting 3 Senate Standing Committees twice during the consultation phase, along with 8 Faculty Councils, a direct email to all faculty members, as well as fielding and responding to comments on the policy blog itself) fall short of what you would regard as collaborative and transparent. I regret that this is your perception but in this case I would also respectfully suggest that your concern is more about the policy development and approval process at KPU. Happily, the relevant policy (GV2) is planned to be revised and the policy developer is in the process of conducting university-wide consultations at this very time. I will be sure to pass on your comment to the policy developer and would encourage you to share your suggestions about what you consider to be the ideal process for consultation and policy approval during that discussion, whether directly with the policy developer, at relevant consultation meetings, or on the policy blog itself.

rhollawa@kwt.priv says:

March 31, 2021 at 3:48 pm (Edit)



Perhaps you and I can chat privately about our perceptions of fulsome, transparent consultation as I don't want to pull focus away from AC15. I appreciate your offer to forward my concerns re: GV2.

rjhangia@kwt.priv says:

April 6, 2021 at 8:45 am (Edit)



Thank you Rachelle. I'd be delighted to discuss this with you and have emailed you directly in order to follow up.

rdearle@kwt.priv says:

March 7, 2021 at 3:01 pm (Edit)



Thanks for all of your work on this, Rajiv. It's quite a task, not least in responding to a multitude of questions and comments. I regret I must ask a few more:

1. It seems to me that the application form for MC approval should ask the proponent to state that the proposed MC
 - does not duplicate offerings at KPU
 - is competency based
 - is credit or non-credit bearing

The work of the committee would then be to verify that these claims are correct. I expect this has been considered, but perhaps this should be stated here for the sake of clarity?

2. No role for Faculty-level curriculum committees has been identified in the procedure. The general feeling at Arts Faculty Council is that MC approval should not bypass the Faculty Curriculum Committees. Having MCs go to CurrComms first would not slow the approval process considerably and they will be able to help ensure that the main questions (identified above as the work of the SMC) have been carefully considered by the proponents.

3. I am unsure about the proposed workflow of the committee. Why form a committee of eleven people and then only use three of them at any given time? Using only three members chosen by the chair appears to create the potential for exclusion, opacity, and deck-stacking; even if these don't occur, this model might expose the chair to accusations of such.

I think a better model (and one we will likely use on SWIC, which has a similar composition) is to put the question to the entire committee but have an established minimum response rate for approval. That minimum could be as low as three members if necessary, but hopefully engagement would be more robust. This approach would allow anyone on the committee to raise concerns. In my experience, it is safer to have more "eyes on" than fewer if we want to get it right.

4. If credit-bearing, what process would be used for determining how many credits a MC receives?

janetw@kwt.priv says:

March 9, 2021 at 10:28 am (Edit)



"1. It seems to me that the application form for MC approval should ask the proponent to state that the proposed MC

- does not duplicate offerings at KPU"

Would 'disaggregation' or the 'unbundling' of a current credit course offering at KPU constitute 'duplication'?

What I mean by this as an example, could you take an essay writing course like ENGQ 1099 and 'unbundle' it into its component parts-say offer a digital badge for a thesis writing 'short course' or digitized tutorial and another digital badge for outlining skills (competency-based), etc.

Just a question about what constitutes 'duplication' and how the terms 'unbundling' or 'disaggregation' apply to a digital badge ecosystem at KPU.

These have been some of my questions.

rjhangia@kwt.priv says:

March 11, 2021 at 10:57 am (Edit)



Thank you very much for reading the draft policy documents. Your questions are very welcome.

1. The process of proposing and approving a new micro-credential will indeed verify that the proposed offering is competency-based and whether it is credit-bearing or non credit-bearing.

First, some of these details will be required in order to complete the micro-credential outline form and (if and when the micro-credential proposal is approved) also included in the meta-data of the associated open badge.

Second, the SMC Chair would verify these details during the step outlined in the draft Procedure as B.1.d.ii. "The SMC Chair determines if the form is complete and ready to be reviewed by the SMC."

And third, the SMC would also verify these details during the step outlined in the draft Procedure as B.1.d.iii.2) "Is the Micro-credential competency-based?"

Your question about duplicative offerings is a bit more complicated for precisely the reason that Janet mentions in her comment.

Proposals for new micro-credentials would need to clearly articulate their relationship to existing courses and programs (including to ensure that the relevant faculty and departments have been consulted during the development process). This is outlined in the draft Procedure as B.1.d.iii.1) "Does the Micro-credential represent a duplication of offerings at KPU? a) If the Micro-credential represents a duplication, the Department Chair of the department with the existing offering will be sent the proposal for review. b) The Department Chair will be given 5 days to review the proposal and respond to the SMC Chair."

However, as Janet suggests, proposals could also seek to deliberately disaggregate or "unbundle" an existing 3-credit offering via a set of stacked micro-credentials (e.g., 3 x 1-credit micro-credentials), assuming of course that the offerings are all competency-based (if not, there is no possibility of creating a set of micro-credentials). Also, to be clear, proposals for disaggregated, competency-based offerings like this would be candidates for micro-credentials and not digital badges (which are completion-based offerings).

2. Thank you for raising this question. Proposals for credit-bearing micro-credentials could certainly go through the relevant Faculty curriculum committee prior to the submission of the micro-credential outline form to the SMC Chair.

3. I appreciate your suggestion and will give this careful consideration.

4. We have a definition of Credits/Credit Hours/Semester Credit Hours in the University Calendar. This begins with: "A specific numerical value assigned to a course, generally corresponding to either the number of contact hours per week throughout the semester or to some other metric of student engagement." (See: <https://calendar.kpu.ca/glossary/> for the full definition).

On this basis a proposal for a 1-credit micro-credential (to use one example) would have to correspond to 1/3 of the number of contact hours or student engagement of a typical 3-credit course. This is also information that would be required in order to complete the micro-credential outline form.

cho@kwt.priv says:

March 24, 2021 at 1:31 pm (Edit)



With respect to credit-bearing micro-credentials going through Faculty curriculum committees, I think this needs to be more explicit in the Procedures document. At what stage in the development process will curriculum committees be consulted, and what will the consultation process look like? The single Faculty representative on the SMC might not have sufficient knowledge/information to detect issues such as duplication between proposed micro-credentials and existing courses.

rjhangia@kwt.priv says:

March 26, 2021 at 10:09 am (Edit)



Thank you very much for reading the draft policy documents.

The revision of the policy documents that will take place following the blog posting period will make it clear that proposals for credit-bearing micro-credentials will need to go through and be recommended by Faculty Standing Committees on Curriculum and Faculty Councils prior to the relevant Micro-credential Outline Forms being submitted to the Chair of the Senate Micro-credentials Committee (SMC).

I will add that the broad representation of the SMC will also help ensure the detection of any potential duplication of offerings across the Faculties.

hcy@kwt.priv says:

March 7, 2021 at 2:02 pm (Edit)



I am pleased to see KPU moving towards more options for uncredentialed internal-facing digital badges. The language here for these badges seems to me very clear and flexible. The Academic Integrity badge is a phenomenal project created by Ulrike Kestler, and I can see myself using the badging system for the voluntary writing labs that I co-coordinate with a colleague. It will help us to use Moodle in ways that are efficient and less time-consuming than our current methods for recognizing internal-facing achievement.

rjhangia@kwt.priv says:

March 7, 2021 at 7:20 pm (Edit)



Thank you very much for reading the draft policy documents. I am glad to hear that the proposed language is clear and flexible in your view.

I agree that the Academic Integrity badge has been an excellent pilot project for digital badging at KPU. I also agree that the issuing and tracking of digital badges carries significant advantages for both recognition and program evaluation.

Your interest in developing a digital badge related to the writing labs is noted!

aniosi@kwt.priv says:

March 6, 2021 at 9:26 am (Edit)



Mashman has captured my thoughts and sentiments on this policy as well. Digital badges will serve our KPU student community well and provide an important option in higher-ed learning.

Micro-credentials have been used by many tech companies for decades: they are recognized and valued in many industries. I hope to see more integration of micro-credentials and digital badges in our courses, which would eliminate the "need" (more like imposition) to have our students complete expensive 3rd-party, American-server-based, credentials that aren't always contextualized to our business environment and often impose harmful financial burdens on our students.

More compatibility with Open is a good path forward for KPU.

rjhangia@kwt.priv says:

March 7, 2021 at 7:14 pm (Edit)

Thank you very much for reading the draft policy documents. We agree that this proposed policy will serve our students well, including by enabling them to easily articulate their skills.



In your comment you identified an additional potential benefit of micro-credentials and digital badges that was not considered within the background document, and for this I am grateful. It is certainly my hope that AC15 will be able to support nimble curricular innovation at KPU that will harness the expertise of our faculty and meet the needs of our local context.

panteli@kwt.priv says:

March 4, 2021 at 9:01 am (Edit)



Greetings AC15 Team!

Congrats on a worthwhile and necessary initiative. A few issues came to mind as I reviewed the policy, which I have grouped under FISCAL and Academic categories.

FISCAL STUFF

This first issue I believe would be more of interest to students than to faculty.

- 1) There is no mention of cost/tuition, and whether the Board needs to approve the cost/tuition for these credentials, as it does for credit bearing courses. who determines/approves cost/tuition for the various credentials?
- 2) Would registration for some of these credentials count towards requirements for financial aid?

ACADEMIC STUFF

On a less fiscal and more academic note, it may be an idea to address the issues of laddering and transcribing. (Not sure if that is a word, lol.)

I assume badges would not appear on the transcript as they are metadata based evidence of some kind of proficiency that is hyperlinkable (a word?) so students can put it on their LinkedIn etc. .

Would non-badge micro-credentials appear on transcripts, especially if they carry credits. If so, do they count towards GPA, or would they be an Achieved/Not Achieved type thing ?

Which brings us to laddering. If a series of credit-bearing micro-credentials ladder towards an AC 14 credential (e.g., diploma or degree), would those appear on the transcript and would those have a GPA type grade?

I believe that these issues would need to be addressed sooner or later as micro-credentialing evolves at KPU, so it may be an idea to de-adhocize (another new word!) them up front in this policy, rather than deal with them as they arise.

My apologies—the Policy Blog Spellchecker has identified 3 non-words in my post. In my defense, English is (apparently) a living language, lol!

Overall, very well thought out!

Cheers,

Panteli

rjhangia@kwt.priv says:

March 8, 2021 at 10:10 am (Edit)



Thank you very much for reading the draft policy documents. I am glad to hear that you believe this initiative is worthwhile, necessary and well thought out.

Thank you also for your excellent questions!

First, to address your questions listed under "Fiscal Stuff":

Fees for Senate approved credit-bearing offerings will be determined by the Board of Governors through KPU's Bylaws on Fees – Bylaw 4, pursuant to the University Act. See:

<https://www.kpu.ca/sites/default/files/Policies/Bylaw%20No.%204%20Fees.pdf>

Post-secondary boards are responsible for setting and determining tuition fees within the government tuition limit policy found here: <https://www2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/education-training/post-secondary-education/institution-resources-administration/tuition-limit-policy>

And second, to address your questions listed under "Academic Stuff":

Open badges would complement and augment the traditional transcript, whereas credit-bearing Senate-approved courses (those that are standalone as well as those that are required for a credential) will appear on the traditional transcript. Grading and GPA calculations will depend on the specific grading system used for the course(s) — in accordance with Policy AC 4 – Student Evaluation and Grading. See:

<https://www.kpu.ca/sites/default/files/Policies/AC4%20Student%20Evaluation%20and%20Grading%20Policy.pdf>

Sarah Zaidi says:

April 6, 2021 at 12:35 pm (Edit)



Just to add to the tuition fee comment. I am curious to know how international students will be charged for these credit bearing micro-credentials. It would be unfair to charge the same as regular courses.

rjhangia@kwt.priv says:

April 7, 2021 at 11:06 am (Edit)



Thank you for your comment, Sarah.

When it comes to credit-bearing micro-credentials these will be subject to the same tuition fee structure as our regular academic courses, which is determined by the number of credits being enrolled in (see the link to Bylaw 4 in the comment just above). Where the difference lies in how many credits will come into the calculation, as most traditional academic courses are worth 3 credits whereas standalone credit-bearing micro-credentials may be worth 1 credit, to use one example. In this example the tuition fees for a 1-credit standalone micro-credential would be 1/3 of the tuition fees for a 3-credit course offered within the same program, with the relevant domestic or international tuition rate applied.

tesmith@kwt.priv says:

March 1, 2021 at 2:57 pm (Edit)



I reviewed the draft policy and procedures with a focus on the digital badge component which I see will be managed by committee under the Provost and VP, Academic. I found it clear and hope to be able to issue these types of badges for some of the workshops offered through Human Resources (which employees are asking for instead of PDF certificates).

rjhangia@kwt.priv says:

March 1, 2021 at 4:51 pm (Edit)



Thank you very much for reading the draft policy documents. I am glad to hear that the proposed procedures are clear in your view.

HR's interest in developing additional digital badges is noted.

cbrinker@kwt.priv says:

March 1, 2021 at 10:06 am (Edit)



I am very happy to see the proposed policy and procedures regarding the development of a badging and micro-credential programme here at KPU. The work done so far has resulted in a set of clear and appropriate mechanisms for the creation of flexible learning opportunities with a wide range of potential applications.

I especially appreciate the recent work that has been done to carefully distinguish between micro-credentials and digital badging and the separate procedures for their approval and implementation. For service areas wishing to create short, completion-based activities, this will certainly expedite the process. Over the last year, the library has been developing a second digital badge related to information literacy and research skills, and we are keen to be able to offer this to our students in the remote/hybrid learning environments that will likely continue after the current pandemic is over.

rjhangia@kwt.priv says:

March 1, 2021 at 4:49 pm (Edit)



Thank you very much for reading the draft policy documents. I am glad to hear that the proposed mechanisms are clear and appropriate in your view.

The Library is an important stakeholder in this conversation, especially given the valuable experience of issuing thousands of digital badges for the Academic Integrity tutorial. Your interest in developing additional digital badges is noted!

mashman@kwt.priv says:

February 28, 2021 at 12:46 pm (Edit)



The policy and procedure seem clear and reasonable to me. The backgrounder document was comprehensive, thoughtful, and answered all my questions. I'm really pleased to see KPU taking steps towards to make sure the institution has a strong foothold in the future of education.

I can see lots of uses for the digital badges (based on activity completion) in courses at KPU.

I can also see great potential in programs being able to offer microcredentials (which are represented through open badges).

I can also see value in offering badges (generally) with the workshops and trainings offered by the Learning Centre (beyond the academic integrity badge provided by the library).

I also appreciate that consultation and checkpoints are embedded within the stages and steps required to develop badges, so it's not a free-for-all. This supports the opportunity for intra-institutional collaboration in developing digital badges and microcredentials.

rjhangia@kwt.priv says:

February 28, 2021 at 10:40 pm (Edit)



Thank you very much for reading the draft policy documents. I am delighted to hear that the background document was helpful and that it addressed your questions.

There is a growing list of academic departments and service units that have expressed an interest in developing micro-credentials or digital badges. This includes The Learning Centres, as you note. I invite you and any other member of the KPU community to connect with me if you would like to discuss any potential proposals that you are considering. My email address is rajiv.jhangiani@kpu.ca

janetw@kwt.priv says:

February 26, 2021 at 11:14 am (Edit)



Having read through the Deakin University Report on 'Making Micro-Credentials Work' (2019), I think that the KPU micro-credential definition needs to be stronger and less circular in its references. The terms open badge, digital badge and micro-credential are used interchangeably in all the posted documents. There is also little mention in these documents of the housing of these types of credentials on cloud – based platforms.

rjhangia@kwt.priv says:

February 28, 2021 at 10:34 pm (Edit)



Thank you very much for reading the draft policy documents. I appreciate your thoughtful feedback.

The excellent report from Deakin University that you reference is one of several background readings that I have been recommending for additional reading. I will add the link here in case anyone else is interested in reading it: <https://dteach.deakin.edu.au/wp-content/uploads/sites/103/2019/08/Making-micro-credentials-work-Oliver-Deakin-2019-full-report.pdf>

I will add that, although the draft policy AC15 has been informed by this report (among several others), the language in our policy must necessarily reflect our context, including our University Act.

As noted in the AC15 Feedback and Responses Jan-Feb 2021 document (linked in the post above), a similar concern re: circularity was raised at recent discussions of the Senate Standing Committees on Policy Review, Academic Planning & Priorities, and Curriculum. Following these meetings, the definitions of Micro-credentials, Open Badges, and Digital Badges (all of which are listed in the Procedure document) were revised with a view to making them clearer and to remove circular references. A table was also added to the background document (what is now FAQ #1) to help clarify the interrelationships between these concepts. However, I will carefully go through all of the draft policy documents to address any other places where the terms may still be referenced in a confusing fashion.

You are correct in that a cloud-based platform is not explicitly referenced in the draft policy documents (although it is referenced in the AC15 Feedback and Responses Jan-Feb 2021 document). The software platform used to manage and issue open badges and digital badges is indeed cloud-based. KPU's current badging platform is CanCred, which is certified by the IMS Global organization as compliant with the Open Badges 2.0 common technical standard. See: <https://www.cancred.ca>

janetw@kwt.priv says:

March 5, 2021 at 10:30 am (Edit)



Thank you for your reply!

I'm going to add this link to Dr. Doug Belshaw's workshop on Open Badges (includes digital badge and micro-credential references) posted to You Tube March 2/21.

Start at 10 minutes in to avoid the technical difficulties of the presentation. The workshop offers good visuals to help those unfamiliar with conceptualizing Open Badges in the institution.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gZY7-LRVpHU&list=PLfEY8jRiRbPvQTWP-nSosyWMffjB-5Uvw>

Policy Sponsor: President and Vice Chancellor

Approving Jurisdiction: Board of Governors, with Senate Advice

Policy Developer: Dr. Rajiv Jhangiani, Associate Vice President, Teaching and Learning

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, draft Policy and Procedures, consult with stakeholder groups. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Academic Council SSC Policy SSCAPP SSCC 	January 21, 2021 February 3, 2021 February 5, 2021 February 10, 2021	January 18, 2021 January 25, 2021 January 22, 2021 January 27, 2021
2.	Provost	For approval to proceed to PUE.	February 11 – 18, 2021	
3.	PUE	For approval to proceed to public posting.	February 25, 2021	February 19, 2021
4.	KPU Policy Blog (6-week public posting)	6-week public posting period on KPU Policy Blog. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SSCAPP SSC Policy SSCC 	February 26 – April 8, 2021 March 26, 2021 March 31, 2021 April 7, 2021	March 12, 2021 March 22, 2021 March 24, 2021
5.	Finalize draft policy and procedure.	Respond to blog comment(s), if any. Finalize draft Policy and Procedure and incorporate feedback where appropriate.	April 9 – April 23, 2021	
6.	Provost (Sponsor)	For approval to proceed to PUE.	April 26 – May 6, 2021	
7.	PUE	For approval to proceed to final approval process.	May 13, 2021	May 7, 2021
8.	Final Approval Process (Senate)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SSC Policy SSCAPP SSCC Senate (for approval and recommendation to the Board for approval) 	June 2, 2021 June 4, 2021 June 16, 2021 June 28, 2021	May 21, 2021 May 21, 2021 June 2, 2021 June 18, 2021
9.	Final Approval Process (Board)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Board Governance Committee Board of Governors (for approval) 	September 8, 2021 September 29, 2021	August 27, 2021 September 17, 2021

SENATE

Agenda Item: 12

Meeting Date: June 28, 2021

Presenter: David Burns

Chair's Report to Senate Senate Standing Committee on Program Review June 28, 2021

The Government of British Columbia charges KPU with the responsibility to perform cyclical, timely and faculty-driven program reviews. This process is a core component of commitment to our community.

The Senate Standing Committee on Program Review (SSCPR) is the KPU body responsible for our programs' academic quality assurance as directed via provincial mandate and Senate.

SSCPR members determine direction and review and approve all documents submitted by programs.

Office of Planning & Accountability (OPA) staff provide logistical support for programs' review work throughout the process.

	Progress of SSCPR work over last 6 academic years:					
	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
Program reviews launched:	11	8	10	11	5	3
Reports approved:	11	19	28	29	24	31
Program reviews completed:	2	4	7	6	8	7

SSCPR productivity is steadily increasing due to improved processes and timelines but is, as ever, powered by the efforts of a community of people. Special thanks go out to:

- SSCPR members for their time and dedication in reviewing reports and directing the committee's work.

- Program Review Chairs and Coordinators for their hard work on behalf of their programs.
- Deans and Dean's Office staff for supporting the work of program review writers.
- Faculty who serve as External Review Team members.
- Lori McElroy, Melike Kinik-Dicleli, Brandon Lee, Rajdeep Singh Gill and other OPA staff for their perseverance, stability, clarity and tact in making all this valuable work happen.

PROGRAM REVIEWS INITIATED:

- Fashion and Technology (September 2020)
- Creative Writing (May 2021)
- Physics for Modern Technology (May 2021)

THE SSCPR APPROVED 31 REPORTS IN 2020/21 ACADEMIC YEAR.

1. Self-Study Reports Approved:

- 1.1. Mathematics Self-Study Report (October 2020)
- 1.2. CSIT Self-Study Report (November 2020)
- 1.3. History Self-Study Report (February 2021)
- 1.4. Anthropology Self-Study Report (April 2021)
- 1.5. FIND Self-Study Report (April 2021)
- 1.6. Education Assistant Self-Study Report (May 2021)
- 1.7. Fashion and Technology Self-Study Report (June 2021)

2. External Review Reports Approved:

- 2.1. Interior Design External Review Report (September 2020)
- 2.2. Technical Apparel Design External Review Report (November 2020)
- 2.3. HCAP External Review Report (February 2021)
- 2.4. CSIT External Review Report (April 2021)
- 2.5. Product Design External Review Report (May 2021)
- 2.6. Mathematics External Review Report (May 2021)

3. Quality Assurance Plans Approved:

- 3.1. Minor in Counselling Quality Assurance Plan (October 2020)
- 3.2. BPN Quality Assurance Plan (November 2020)
- 3.3. Technical Apparel Design Quality Assurance Plan (January 2021)
- 3.4. Interior Design Quality Assurance Plan (February 2021)
- 3.5. Philosophy Quality Assurance Plan (April 2021)
- 3.6. BHS Quality Assurance Plan (April 2021)
- 3.7. HCAP Quality Assurance Plan (June 2021)

4. Annual Follow-up Reports on Quality Assurance Plan Progress Approved:

- 4.1. Fashion Marketing First Annual Follow-Up Report (September 2020)

- 4.2. HRMT First Annual Follow-Up Report (October 2020)
- 4.3. ENTR First Annual Follow-Up Report (October 2020)
- 4.4. GDMA First Annual Follow-Up Report (October 2020)
- 4.5. Health Science First Annual Follow-Up Report (January 2021)
- 4.6. Accounting First Annual Follow-Up Report (February 2021)
- 4.7. New BSN First Annual Follow-Up Report (February 2021)
- 4.8. Policy Studies Second Annual Follow-Up Report (April 2021)
- 4.9. Psychology First Annual Follow-Up Report (May 2021)
- 4.10. Sociology Second Annual Follow-Up Report (May 2021)
- 4.11. Asian Studies Second Annual Follow-Up Report (May 2021)

OTHER ACTIVITIES:

- Reviewed the program review timelines for following programs:
 - Biology (September 2020)
 - English (September 2020)
 - Creative Writing (June 2021)
 - Brewing and Brewery Operations (June 2021)
 - Physics for Modern Technology (June 2021)
- Reviewed mandate and committee membership (September 2020)
- Reviewed role of SSCPR in reviewing program review reports (September 2020)
- Discussed the results of Senate Effectiveness Survey (September 2020)

PROGRAM REVIEWS PLANNED FOR 2021/22 ACADEMIC YEAR:

- English Upgrading
- Geography/Applied Geography
- Languages and Cultures
- Music
- NGO and Non-profit Studies
- Brewing and Brewery Operations
- Horticulture Technology

SENATE

Agenda Item: 12

Meeting Date: Entered by Senate Office

Presenter: David Burns

Chair's Report to Senate Daniel Bernstein, Chair, Senate Standing Committee on Research and Graduate Studies June 28, 2021

The Vice-Chair of Senate delivered this report orally on June 28 and added the report to the agenda package on June 29, 2021.

1. Chair's Report

The Chair thanked student member Simi Kaur for her contribution and shared that a new student, Celine Li, would begin her term with the committee in September. He thanked the three members whose term is expiring in July for renewing their membership and thanked David Burns, outgoing Vice-Chair, for his contribution and mentorship. The Chair reminded the committee of its responsibilities regarding the White Paper on Research and Scholarship, which SSCRS will consider in detail in the fall.

2. Associate Vice-President, Research, Innovation and Graduate Studies Report

Deepak Gupta highlighted the competition for the two Sherman Jen Research Chair Positions that are currently underway. He expressed hope that the nominating committee will be able to meet over the summer for a September start for the Research Chairs. Gupta also announced that KPU has been granted its third Canada Research Chair, Karen Davison, in Nutrition Informatics, and that the office of the AVPRIGS is working to secure lab space suitable for this work. Gupta informed the committee that Policy RS6 *Animal Use and Ethics in Teaching and Research* is now approved and in effect.

3. Chair, Research Ethics Board Report

Tara Lyons shared that the Research Ethics Board will have a new member, Zahaia Marzouk, starting in the fall, who will assist the team with the scholarship of teaching and learning. Lyons shared that the REB office has been kept busy with work on multijurisdictional files and with outreach to departments concerning course-based research. The REB discussed the development of a data retention plan and the fact that it is not always possible to predict the possible future uses of data. Lyons invited the committee to take a moment to acknowledge the tragic loss of Katie Warfield from the KPU community.

4. New Business

4.1. Draft Policy AC13 *Minimum Faculty Qualifications*

The committee discussed how it may play an advisory role on faculty qualifications, its current mandate related to academic standards for graduate studies and whether the input sought from this committee should be broadened to include the conduct of research at any academic level.

4.2. Creating a fully-funded, staffed, and functional ORS

Deepak Gupta asked the committee for its advice about this item from the White Paper. The committee suggested grouping items into categories or themes which might then connect to individual roles. Deepak Gupta will bring this item back to the committee with a specific request for the support he is seeking.

4.3. Developing a web application for Scholarly Impact Showcase

Deepak Gupta explained the work done to date in response to the committee's and White Paper's suggestions that there be more celebration of research at the institution. The ORS has been working on the development of a web application for researchers to create an online portfolio and contribute updates regularly.

4.4. Alpha Release of ORS SharePoint Website

Jim Rahaman requested volunteers to provide feedback on the draft ORS SharePoint site so that this can be incorporated into the next update of the site in preparation for its launch. Several committee members will provide this feedback.

4.5. Survey on Teaching, Research & Library Supports

Lori McElroy presented a portion of the most recent TRLS survey that concerned research, innovation, and graduate studies. The committee discussed insights to be gleaned from these data and the survey's usefulness in highlighting priorities for the institution as well as measuring progress against institutional goals.

4.6. Volunteer presenters for Oct, Nov, Jan meetings

Deborah Henderson volunteered to share her research for the October meeting, Mark Vardy volunteered to share his research in November.

5. Adjournment

The Chair wished the members a pleasant summer break, quoting from his favorite junior high school yearbook entry: "Stay as sweet as you are, don't ever change, have a great summer, see you in the fall."

SENATE

Agenda Item: 15

Meeting Date: June 28, 2021

Presenter: Andre Iwanchuk

Chair's Report to Senate Senate Standing Committee on Tributes June 15, 2021

The SSC Tributes met on June 15th, 2021. The SSC Chair informed committee members that promotional announcements for the new Distinguished Awards have gone out, according to the communication plan. The Chair also advised that all Tributes nomination forms will be revised based on advice from KPU General Counsel, to comply with data privacy regulations.

SSC Tributes received notice that its recent recommendations for Emeritus/Emerita appointments were approved by Senate on April 20, 2021.

SSC Tributes evaluated nomination packages, and a recommendation will be brought forward to Senate in the following category: Professor Emeritus/Emerita.

Vice Chair of Senate David Burns led the nomination and election of the SSC Chair for the term of September 1, 2021 to August 31, 2023. Senator Andre Iwanchuk was acclaimed as SSC Chair and will continue in the position for an additional term.

Andre Iwanchuk, Chair, SSC Tributes

SENATE

Agenda Item: 16.1

Meeting Date: June 28, 2021

Presenter: Zena Mitchell

Agenda Item Approval of Graduates to June 28, 2021

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

Recommended Resolution	THAT Senate approve the list of graduates to June 28, 2021.
------------------------	--

Context & Background

University Act, Section 7: The roll of the convocation must be continued and kept up to date by the registrar.

University Act, Section 9.2: The senate may add names to the roll of the convocation under section 5, (Composition of convocation)

Attachments

Grads for Senate Approval 20210628

Submitted by

Zena Mitchell, University Registrar and Secretary of Senate

Date Submitted

June 15, 2021

Graduates for Senate Approval

SENATE MEETING: Monday, 28-Jun-2021

Graduates from the Chip and Shannon Wilson School of Design

Baccalaureate Degree

Bachelor of Design, Product Design

Xavier Samuel Drysdale

Bachelor of Interior Design

Darian Katrina Shephard

Diploma

Diploma in Fashion Marketing

Ethan Matthias Sorensen

Certificate

Certificate of Foundations in Design

Hyunbin Paul Yang

Graduates from the Faculty of Academic & Career Advancement

Developmental Credential

BC Adult Graduation Diploma

Stephen Broyles

Graduates from the Faculty of Arts

Baccalaureate Degree

Bachelor of Arts

Mark Jens Barton

Major in Creative Writing

Major in English

Daniel Sebastian Paczek

Major in Criminology

Major in Psychology

Bachelor of Arts, Major in Creative Writing

Siobhan Alexandra Bonner

Bachelor of Arts, Major in Criminology

Sarah Lyn Brownlee

Ravjoth Singh Heer

Jessica Lu

Miri Park

Co-operative Education Option

Dapinder Singh Pooni

Tair Rasulov

Jasjyot Singh Sanghera

Gurpreet Kaur Tiwana

Bachelor of Arts, Major in General Studies

Qi Wen Feng

Minor in Language and Culture

Haley Richelle Penner

(With Distinction)

Minor in Counselling

Tasia Leigh Wurtz

(With Distinction)

Bachelor of Arts, Major in Political Science

Timothy-Ryan Luis

Bachelor of Arts, Major in Psychology

Noah Jacob Molema

Minor in Counselling

Elizabeth Pauline Nicole Marie Simoy

Minor in Counselling

Bachelor of Arts, Major in Sociology

Wenjing Deng

Nicholas Barrie Johnson

Bachelor of Fine Arts, Visual Arts

Alison Laura Curtis

(With Distinction)

Jacob Tyler Strohan

Bachelor of Journalism

Mohammed Ahmed Mansoor

Janelle Susan Swift

Minor in Creative Writing

Associate Degree

Associate of Arts in Criminology

Shaienne Klair

Associate of Arts in Geography
Nicole Ann Ames

Associate of Arts in Psychology
Navjeet Kaur Bhamrah
Arshdeep Kaur

Diploma

Diploma in Arts
Ashveen Gill
Maria Zoey Justus

Diploma in Criminology
Bhupinderdeep Bains

Diploma in General Studies
Ajaypal Singh
Ajay Bhatia
Junxiang Bi
Lovedeep Singh Brar
Azreen Kaur Chabba
Kangchu Chen
Yiwen Chen
Simran Datta
Amardeep Singh Dhillon
Gurpreet Kaur
Shane David Hampson
Aafreen Singh Jolly
Kanishka Kanishka
Karmjit
Aashmeet Kaur
Baljeet Kaur
Gyan Kaur
Jaspreet Kaur
Nivjot Kaur
Parleen Kaur
Parminder Kaur
Ragwinder Kaur
Rajveer Kaur
Simran Kaur
Talwinder Kaur

**Varinder Kumar
Serena Lee
Yueyao Li
Zhenyu Liu
Mehul Madaan
Iqbal Singh Mann
Manpreet Singh
Yixuan Qi
Bowen Qiao
Rajdeep Singh
Shiprajit Kaur Rehal
Sahil Samialia
Zhuowei Shang
Sagar Sharma
Arshdeep Singh
Arvind Singh
Gurspaj Singh
Harkirat Singh
Lovepreet Singh
Manjot Singh
Romanpreet Singh
Sukhwant Singh
Subkarmandeep Singh
Rongwei Sun
Sunmeet Kaur
Gurvinder Singh Virdi
Jiabao Wang
Yunuo Wang
Gurdeep Singh Waraich
Tong Wu
Tong Wu
Zhenhao Zhao**

Certificate

Certificate in Arts

**Hanna Harkiran Kaur Rai
Jasleen Kaur Sandhu
Cassandra Willow Strutt**

Certificate in Criminology

Clint Alexander Fulton

Keesha Prasad

Certificate in Education Assistant

Zoya Khushnuma Ahmad

Zoya Akbar

(With Distinction)

Emily Kersten Anderson

(With Distinction)

Pooja Arora

(With Distinction)

Esther Elizabeth Barber

(With Distinction)

Claire Aimee Bate

(With Distinction)

Joanna Emma Bergen

(With Distinction)

Emalee Karen Braun

(With Distinction)

Hannah Mary Buchan

(With Distinction)

Cassidy Keay Chegwidden

(With Distinction)

Jada Marie Christensen

(With Distinction)

Bridgette Marie Dahlie

(With Distinction)

Siobhan Fee

(With Distinction)

Zabrina Haight

Kirstie Jae Hutchison

(With Distinction)

Souzan Issa

(With Distinction)

Joana Jacobs

(With Distinction)

Sarpreet Kaur

(With Distinction)

Alyssa Nicole Kennedy

(With Distinction)

Kacey Larissa Lamont

(With Distinction)

Christina Elizabeth Ledenko

(With Distinction)

Jisu Lee

(With Distinction)

Allison Morrison Marcell

Megan Gwynne Markowski

(With Distinction)

Karlie Magdalena Miller

(With Distinction)

Presley Mills

(With Distinction)

Lina Fernanda Morisset

(With Distinction)

Devon George Najman

(With Distinction)

Tatum Nicol

(With Distinction)

Kaitlin Marina Ottens

(With Distinction)

Esther Shyh-Chyi Peebles

(With Distinction)

Madison Conny Marie Poloway

Samantha Sharon Rogers

(With Distinction)

Mehib Saleem

(With Distinction)

Kassandra Sandhu

(With Distinction)

Shandelle Rose Scott

(With Distinction)

Kelsi Siebolts

Crystal Kaitlin Smith

(With Distinction)

Samantha Marie Tonkin

(With Distinction)

Stephanie Vytasek

(With Distinction)

Xin Wang

(With Distinction)

Megan Wanner

(With Distinction)

Taya Lenora Weel

(With Distinction)

Jessie Williams

(With Distinction)

Katelin Jenn Woudstra

(With Distinction)

Erin Yae Eun Yoon

(With Distinction)

Certificate in Non-Governmental Organizations and Nonprofit Studies

William Weijen Chen

Aashi Kaur Gill

Aaron William Lindh

Matthew McKinnon

Graduates from the Faculty of Health

Baccalaureate Degree

Bachelor of Science in Nursing

Julya Dolor Decano

Karlee Sandford

Certificate

Certificate in Community Support Worker

Jessica Scott

Certificate in Early Childhood Education

Kathryn J. Choi

Certificate in Graduate Nurse, Internationally Educated Re-entry

Rex Villanueva Duremdes

(With Distinction)

Dexter Raquinio Tinaza

(With Distinction)

Gerardo Raquinio Tinaza

(With Distinction)

Kristine De Guzman Vivar

(With Distinction)

Certificate in Health Care Assistant

Lesley Antic

(With Distinction)

Lea-Rayone Bortnick-Marks

(With Distinction)

Taylor Evelyn Cooper

(With Distinction)

Timothy Jordan Delage

Kulvir Karla Dhanda

(With Distinction)

Paige Dominique D'souza

(With Distinction)

Disha Elizabeth Fernandez

(With Distinction)

Cayley Ann Hamilton

(With Distinction)

Brittany Joy Jensen

(With Distinction)

Amanpreet Kaur

(With Distinction)

Jasmine Grace McDermick

(With Distinction)

Carrie O'Sullivan

(With Distinction)

Maha Moh' D E Tanbouz

(With Distinction)

Brianne Kaitlin Dawn Ungurean

(With Distinction)

Claire Christine Vantil

(With Distinction)

Certificate in Health Foundations

Su Jung Kim

Pamela Nadine Tutt

(With Distinction)

Graduates from the Faculty of Science and Horticulture

Baccalaureate Degree

Bachelor of Horticulture Science, Major in Urban Ecosystems

David Heinrich Epp

Bachelor of Science, Major in Applications of Mathematics

Farhaan Assar

Concentration in Mathematics Education

Bachelor of Science, Major in Biology

Amneet Kaur Athwal

Melissa Conklin

Bachelor of Science, Major in Health Science

Jaco Liu

Associate Degree

Associate of Science in General Science

Reema Aladdin Al-Khafaji

Yan Kai

Hanna Harkiran Kaur Rai

Daleena Williams

Diploma

Diploma in Computer Aided Design and Drafting

Owen Buchanan Iversen

Nikola Pavlovic

Diploma in Horticulture Technology

Alysen J. R. Graham

Diploma in Science

Manpreet Kaur Deogun

Certificate

Certificate in Computer Aided Design and Drafting

Manpreet Kaur Sandhu

Concentration in Structural Drafting

Certificate in Engineering

Yibo He

(With Distinction)

Citation

Citation in Computer Aided Design and Drafting

Gurpartap Grewal

Citation in Horticulture Technology

Nicole Lee Widdifield

(With Distinction)

Concentration in Horticultural Science

Graduates from the Faculty of Trades and Technology

Diploma

Diploma in Mechatronics and Advanced Manufacturing Technology

Harkirat Singh Gill

(With Distinction)

Declan Quinn Murphy-Boyle

Blessing Samson Nabbimba

(With Distinction)

Certificate

Certificate in Appliance Servicing

Jasman Singh Basran

(With Distinction)

Parminder Kumar Dhingra

Jonah Laurence Emerson

(With Distinction)

Justin William Law

(With Distinction)

Jen-Wei Lin

(With Distinction)

Manjot Singh Padda

Shaun Charles White

(With Distinction)

Certificate in Automotive Service Technician

Nicolas Ryan Dyke

(With Distinction)

Kyle Hooper

Milandeep Singh Kular

Amanda Lynne Neidig

(With Distinction)

Simon Prak

Nigel Antonio Vendasco

(With Distinction)

Certificate in Welding Foundation

Robert Forbes

(With Distinction)

Nadine Holly Turner

(With Distinction)

Citation

Citation in Carpentry/Building Construction

Brycen Nicholas Lichti

Citation in Parts, Warehousing, Logistics and Distribution

Riley Joshua Zane Holyk

(With Distinction)

Citation in Welding Level B

Edgar Manuel Reyes Juarez

(With Distinction)

Graduates from the School of Business

Graduate Diploma

Graduate Diploma in Business Administration - Global Business Management

Sonia Bangar

Tushal Jassal

Amandeep Kaur

Kamalpreet Kaur

Komalpreet Kaur

Komalpreet Kaur

Abhishek Kharbanda

Diksha Mittal

Nidhi Rani

Simran

Waheed Ademola Taiwo

Graduate Diploma in Business Administration - Green Business Management and

Aalmveer Singh Birring

Sabnoor Kaur Chatha

Jashanpreet Kaur Jaura

Post-Baccalaureate Diploma

Post-Baccalaureate Diploma in Accounting

Mi Ran Jin

(With Distinction)

Bikramjeet Singh Kahlon

Yiman Zha

Post-Baccalaureate Diploma in Operations and Supply Chain Management

Mehmet Baybars Bagdatli

Baljinder Singh

Jeyapathiraja Elangovan
Karanveer Singh Gill
Jyoti Grover
Himanshu
Ishant Kalra
Arshpreet Kaur
Gurleen Kaur
Simrandeep Kaur
Vimal Kaur
Purva Kehar
Tejpal Singh Rathore
Vishal Saini
Shruti Shruti
Simran
Kuldeep Singh
Arun Theverkunnel

Post-Baccalaureate Diploma in Technical Management and Services

Kettan Kataria
Paras Khanna

Baccalaureate Degree

Bachelor of Business Administration in Accounting

Joshua Denver Coueffin
Rebecca Kathleen Sarkaria
(With Distinction)
Nitin Kumar Vijayvargi

Bachelor of Business Administration in Entrepreneurial Leadership

Yat Fai Sunny Choi
Cuong Van Dinh
Huixing Li
Rhejis S Wicks

Bachelor of Business Administration in Human Resources Management

Ishneet Gill
Samantha Marie Savoy
Kalen Ashan Singh

Bachelor of Business Administration in Marketing Management

Navjot Bhogal
Kirti Malhotra

Bachelor of Technology in Information Technology

Antonio Parente

Anthony Pastoukhovitch

Associate Degree

Associate of Arts in Economics

Kiranpreet Kaur Sekhon

Diploma

Diploma in Accounting

Parvir Singh Haer

Khadijah Bibi Shaikh

Harinder Teja

Diploma in Business Management

Sirag Moh Bsis

Brian Chow

Zachary Alexander Colpitts

Sylvia Bich Dang

Mitchell Alan Fetter

Jason Cameron Leitner

Sandeep Singh

Simranpreet Kaur

Mona Verma

Steven Richard Travis Weidmann

Diploma in Computer Information Systems

Apryl Violet Achtymichuk

Talha Atif

Ravneet Singh Chadha

Annelise Natalie Denny

Sachreet Dhillon

Xingyu Hou

Inderpreet Kaur

Manbir Kaur Tatla

Jingyuan Zhang

Diploma in General Business Studies

Paramjot Kaur

Aaron William Lindh

Diploma in Marketing Management
Jaehyun An

Certificate

Certificate in Accounting
Lisa Jayne Box

Certificate in Business Management
Eric Krishnil Chand

Certificate in Computer Information Systems
Navneil Pillay

Certificate in General Business Studies
Mehul Madaan
Shiprajit Kaur Rehal
Sahil Samialia
Arveen Kaur Sondh
Xianming Tao

Certificate in Legal Administrative Studies
Tanvir Johal
Aminder Kaur Sohi