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Consultation Session

Governance Executive Summary
Advice, Discussion, Information Item

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Title</th>
<th>Consultation on Program Approval Processes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed by</td>
<td>GFC Executive ad hoc Committee on Program Approval Processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenter</td>
<td>Tammy Hopper, Vice-Provost (Programs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meg Brolley, GFC Secretary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>General Faculties Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Purpose of the Proposal is (please be specific)</td>
<td>The proposal is before the committee to discuss and receive input into proposed changes to the process for program approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Summary (outline the specific item – and remember your audience)</td>
<td>A fundamental role of GFC is to set university-wide academic regulations, and approve new programs and changes to existing programs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Report of the ad hoc Committee on Academic Governance including Delegated Authority, endorsed by GFC in April 2017, noted the following:

_The approval pathways related to programs and regulations can be convoluted and burdensome for those proposing them. The current standing committee structure does not appear to provide a cohesive approach to these activities as portions of proposals can follow different approval pathways; this results in the appearance of a confusing, slow and cumbersome pathway for approval of new programs, program changes and course changes._

_The recommendations in this section seek to ensure that the governance oversight expected by GFC is in place and that proposals follow pathways that are clear and add value at each step. Some changes are proposed which add value to the proposal and some provide a more transparent and seamless pathway to approval. The changes will ensure: approval processes are streamlined yet rigorous; that necessary consultations occur; that there is clarity with regard to which bodies have authority for particular approvals; that value is added at each step; and that resources are used efficiently._

Since GFC endorsed the ad hoc report and recommendations, there has been considerable consultation as committees have discussed and revised terms of reference to implement the recommendations. The GFC Executive Transition Committee, which was tasked with ensuring the implementation of the recommendations, has provided guidance and advice as this work unfolded.

In January 2019, the Transition Committee reported to GFC Executive that the vision of the ad hoc committee regarding program approval pathways could not be achieved within the current committee structure, and recommended that GFC Executive establish an ad hoc Committee.
For the Meeting of October 17, 2019

Consultation Session

on Program Approval Processes to conduct further consultation with stakeholders and develop more suitable pathways for program approval.

The ad hoc Committee on Program Approval Processes was mandated to propose revised pathways that are transparent, straightforward and incorporate the recommendations of the ad hoc committee on Academic Governance including Delegated Authority.

The ad hoc committee is coming forward at this time to consult on a proposal for a new process of program approval at the university that consolidates approval functions that currently reside in various committees and policy processes. This draft proposal represents a significant departure from current practice but one that could potentially provide a cohesive, transparent, and streamlined approach to the process. In the proposed pathway, all components (except resources) of new and revised programs would come to a single committee for approval.

The attached briefing note explains the principles the committee used to frame the development of a new process and the resulting outcomes.

The proposal calls for the establishment of a new committee – the GFC Programs Committee. This committee’s mandate would consolidate work currently under the responsibilities of Academic Planning Committee, Academic Standards Committee, Executive Committee and the process of GFC Policy Manual Section 37. The committee would have a clear governance focus and matters of an administrative nature would reside in the Provost’s or Registrar’s offices as appropriate.

Structurally, one new standing committee would be added to GFC, the Academic Standards Committee would be disbanded, and GFC Policy Manual Section 37 would be rescinded. Components of program approval would be removed from the terms of reference of APC and Executive. APC would continue to deal with proposals with institution wide implications to the university’s longer term academic, research, financial, and facilities development.

Operationally, proposals would receive early support by the Provost’s and Registrar’s offices during the development stages which will avoid some of the complications seen in the current system of approval which result in slowing the progress of approval, and/or put an additional workload burden on units. Approval would be streamlined as one committee would have delegated authority to approve the various components rather than the current multi-step process. Additionally, proposals which have impact beyond a single faculty would be identified early and appropriate consultation could occur in a timely fashion.

To this effect, a new University Programs Advisory Committee would be established. The mandate would include discussion and revision of administrative topics related to programs including:
Consultation Session

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions for Discussion:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The questions for discussion at this time are limited to those of governance oversight. A second phase of development would deal with the operational aspects of the final approved pathways.

1. Are the following principles, which are outlined by the ad hoc committee in Attachment 1, appropriate? Should others be added?
   - clear and transparent
   - efficient and streamlined
   - effective
   - governance focused
   - recognition that graduate programs are fundamentally different
   - institutionally focused
   - supports innovation
   - maintains attention to impact on students

2. What comments do you have on the outcomes for the proposed new process:
   - excellence in program quality
   - sustainable and efficient
   - informs the community
   - ensures appropriate administration mechanisms are in place to support units

3. What are your thoughts on establishing a Programs Committee to consolidate program approval functions in one place?

4. Is the authority delegated to the GFC Programs Committee in keeping with the GFC Principles of Delegation of Authority that calls for delegations to be reasonable in scope and appropriate to the character and capacity of the body?

5. What challenges do you see with the proposed process?

6. What benefits do you see with the proposed process?

Supplementary Notes and context: &lt;This section is for use by University Governance only to outline governance process.&gt;

Engagement and Routing (Include proposed plan)
Consultation Session

| Consultation and Stakeholder Participation | GFC Academic Planning Committee – September 25 (no documents), October 9, 2019  
GFC Academic Standards Committee – September 19 (no documents), October 17, 2019  
GFC ASC Subcommittee on Standards – October 3, 2019  
Vice-Provost’s Program Advisory Committee of Associate Deans Undergraduate – September 26, 2019  
GFC Executive Transition Committee Policy Review Committee, Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research – October 2, 2019  
GFC Executive Committee – November 4, 2019 (no documents) for Early Consultation  
General Faculties Committee – November 25, 2019 (no documents) for Early Consultation |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Alignment</th>
<th>Please note the Institutional Strategic Plan objective(s)/strategies the proposal supports.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alignment with For the Public Good</td>
<td>Please note below the specific institutional risk(s) this proposal is addressing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Alignment with Institutional Risk Indicator | ☐ Enrolment Management  
☐ Faculty and Staff  
☐ Funding and Resource Management  
☐ IT Services, Software and Hardware  
☒ Leadership and Change  
☐ Physical Infrastructure  
☐ Relationship with Stakeholders  
☐ Reputation  
☐ Research Enterprise  
☐ Safety  
☐ Student Success |
| Legislative Compliance and jurisdiction | Post-Secondary Learning Act  
General Faculties Council  
GFC Executive Committee  
GFC Principles of Delegation of Authority  
GFC Principles of Committee Composition |

Attachments (each to be numbered 1 - <>)

1. Attachment 1: Briefing Note
2. Attachment 2: Draft of Proposed GFC Programs Committee Terms of Reference
3. Attachment 3: Terms of Reference – GFC Executive ad hoc committee on Program Approval Processes

Prepared by: Tammy Hopper, Vice-Provost (Programs), and University Governance
Update – ad hoc Program Approval Pathways

Background

In response to the Report of the ad hoc Committee on Academic Governance including Delegated Authority endorsed by GFC in April 2017, the GFC Executive Committee established a Transition Committee to advise and guide the implementation of the Report’s recommendations. The Transition Committee provided regular reports to the Executive Committee on the progress of the implementation.

In January 2019, the Transition Committee reported to Executive on the recommendations around program approval. They concurred with the findings of the ad hoc committee that identified that the current system of program approval at the university was a complex one that involves many facets including three standing committees, one sub-committee, and a process governed by GFC policy.

Although 6 of the 11 recommendations would be addressed through upcoming changes to committee terms of reference which would streamline some of the current processes and provide oversight at the appropriate levels, the Transition Committee noted that it had become evident that further work was required to achieve the efficiencies and effectiveness envisioned for the program approval process.

On the recommendation of the Transition Committee, Executive established an ad hoc committee to conduct further consultation with stakeholders and develop appropriate pathways. This group would be tasked with reviewing current approval processes and propose revised pathways that would be transparent, straightforward and incorporate the recommendations from the ad hoc Report.

Current Status

The newly constituted ad hoc committee on program approval process met over two days May 23-24 to begin its work. The committee began by discussing the purpose of program approval, developing principles to guide what an ideal process would look like, and discussing challenges to be mindful of.

Purpose of Program Approval

- Ensure institutional program quality and sustainability
- Enhance reputation
- Alignment with institutional mandate and strategic plan
- Prevent unnecessary duplication
- Encourage inter/multidisciplinary programs and innovation
- Consider impact on students, other units
- Inform community

Principles of Program Approval Pathway

- Clear and transparent
- Efficient and streamlined
Approval items are rationally grouped together
Rigorous review and oversight
Leverage stakeholder strengths
Supports innovation

Outcomes
● Pathways and processes clear and cohesive
● Proponents receive support at an early stage
● Administrative mechanisms in place to support program development and ensure that administrative and editorial processes occur outside of the governance process whenever possible
● Streamlined approach

Challenges
● Balancing Faculty autonomy with institutional responsibility
● Budget model
● Proposals with resource implications

The group discussed these principles in the context of current processes and approval authorities. The group further discussed strategies for pulling together a coherent process that would be consistent with GFC Principles and principles of collegial governance while aligning with the principles and outcomes developed.

Next Steps

Updates – Verbal updates to Executive Committee, APC, and ASC in June 2019

Consultation – to begin fall 2019

A consultation document will be developed to guide the discussion with:
● Associate Deans undergraduate
● Policy Review Committee, FGSR
● APC
● ASC
● GFC and GFC Executive

Consultation documents:
- Briefing note
- Draft terms of reference
- Draft program development flow chart
- Guiding questions
1. **Mandate and Role of the Committee**
The GFC Programs Committee is a standing committee of General Faculties Council (GFC) charged with oversight on matters related to programs of study and courses.

2. **Areas of Responsibility**
   a. Introduction, modification and termination of programs and courses
   b. Admission, Transfer and Academic Standards
   c. Physical Testing and Immunization of Students
   d. Non-Credit Programs and Courses

   All proposals for consideration of the Committee are first submitted to the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) and/or the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research who will consult as necessary with Faculties and other individuals and offices in its consideration of these proposals.

3. **Composition**
   **Voting Members**
   - Ex-officio
     - Vice-Provost (Programs), Chair
     -- others - tbd
   - Elected by GFC - tbd
   - Appointed - tbd
   **Non-voting Members**
   - tbd

4. **Delegated Authority from General Faculties Council**
   *Should be reviewed at least every three years and reported to GFC.*

   4.1 **Introduction, modification and termination of programs and courses**
   a. Approve the introduction and modification of academic programs
   b. Approve the termination of academic programs and report to GFC and APC for information.
   c. Approve the introduction, modification and termination of embedded certificates
   d. Approve the introduction, modification and deletion of courses
   e. Approve new course designators

   4.2 **Admission, Transfer and Academic Standing Regulations**
   a. Approve routine changes to admission/transfer and academic standing regulations
   b. Approve changes to International Baccalaureate (IB) and Advanced Placement (AP) regulations
   c. Approve (for inclusion in the Alberta Transfer Guide) and deny courses for transfer credit to the University of Alberta which are offered by Alberta Council on
Admissions and Transfer (ACAT) member institutions and institutions within the Alberta Postsecondary Six-Sector Model with specific exceptions outlined in the Transfer Credit Articulation Procedure.

d. Approve routine changes to Physical Testing and Immunization of Students

4.3 Non-Credit Programs and Courses
a. Approve the establishment of non-credit programs and associated courses
b. Decide on any challenge made to non-credit courses which the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) has been unable to resolve.

5. Responsibilities Additional to Delegated Authority

5.1 Introduction, modification or termination of programs and courses
a. Review and recommend program suspensions to APC

5.2 Admissions, Transfer, and Academic Standards
a. Recommend to GFC on policies regarding admission, registration, academic standing
b. Recommend to GFC on changes to admissions, transfer and/or academic standards regulations with institutional scope
c. Receive and discuss the Report of the Senate Committee of Lay Observers of the Admissions Process in Quota Programs

6. Sub-delegations from the GFC Programs Committee
Should be reviewed at least every three years and reported to GFC.

6.1 Introduction, modification or termination of programs and courses
a. Academic Programs – Graduate Degree Specializations - All proposals for establishment, suspension and termination of graduate degree second level specializations shall be submitted to the Dean of the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research. The Dean, after consultation, may approve proposals which do not involve base operating or capital funds; the Dean will report these on an annual basis to the Programs Committee.

6.2 Non-Credit Programs and Courses
a. Approval of modification or deletion of non-credit programs and courses is sub-delegated to the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) who will report these on an annual basis to the Programs Committee.

7. Limitations to Authority
The following further refines or places limitations on authorities held by or delegated to the Programs Committee:

7.1 Academic Programs
a. In cases where a new program represents a new credential for the university, final approval resides with GFC and the Board of Governors
b. Proposals which involve new space or resources or affect long-range planning shall be referred to the GFC Academic Planning Committee

7.2 Admission, Transfer and Academic Standards
a. Substantial changes and those with institutional scope are recommended to GFC
8. **Reporting**
   8.1 The Committee should regularly report to GFC with respect to its activities and decisions.

9. **Definitions**
   
   **Program** - refers to all credit programs that result in a government approved credential including: degrees, diplomas and certificates

   **Non-Credit Program** – refers to stand-alone programs for professional development and continuing education.

   **Embedded Certificate** – refers to a credit program with a specific area of focus that is completed during the course of an undergraduate or graduate degree program

   **Routine** - refers to proposals which do not involve or affect other Faculties or units and do not form part of a proposal for a new program. Routine changes include any and all changes to the wording of faculty or program specific admissions or academic standing regulations.

   **Substantial** - refers to proposals which involve or affect more than one Faculty or unit; are part of a proposal for a new program; are likely to have a financial impact; represent a definite departure from current policy; involve a quota; articulate a new academic concept.

   **Dispute** - If there is any dispute or question as to which of the above categories a proposal falls under, the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) (or delegate) will decide.

   **Academic staff** – as defined by the [Recruitment Policy (Appendix A) Definition and Categories of Academic Staff, Administrators and Colleagues](#)

10. **Links**
    
    - [Admissions Policy](#)
    - [Transfer Credit Articulation Procedure](#)
    - [Undergraduate Admissions Procedure](#)
    - [Academic Standing Policy](#)
    - [Academic Standing Regulations Procedure](#)

Approved by General Faculties Council:
GFC Executive Committee *ad hoc* committee on Program Approval Processes

**Purpose:**

To review current approval processes and propose revised pathways that will be transparent, straightforward and will incorporate the recommendations of the report of the *ad hoc* committee on Academic Governance including Delegated Authority, and other issues that have arisen since the report was endorsed by GFC.

**Suggested Composition:**

Vice-Provost (Programs), as Chair
One member of the GFC Academic Planning Committee
One member of the GFC Academic Standards Committee
One student member
One representative from the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
One representative from the Registrar's Office

Resource members: University Governance, others as required

The *ad hoc* committee may add to its membership as it deems necessary.

**Meetings:**

The *ad hoc* committee will meet once or twice a month until completion.

Guests will be invited to attend as required. Other consultation activities will be determined by the *ad hoc* committee.

**Terms of Reference:**

1. To consider the current program approval process, the recommendations of the *ad hoc* committee (see item 5 below), and input from GFC standing committees and other stakeholders related to:
   - Approval, modification, suspension and termination of programs
   - Consideration of alternate pathways for graduate programs
   - Consideration of pathways for Centre collégial de l'Alberta (CCA) programs
   - Approval, modification and termination of non-credit programs
   - GFC Policy Manual, Section 37: course and minor program changes (including service courses)
   - Other delegations related to programs and courses within GFC standing committee terms of reference (such as: approval of courses for new programs, course designators, course renumbering)

2. To develop pathways for program approval that are consistent with GFC Principles and principles of collegial governance
3. To recommend revisions to GFC standing committee terms of reference and GFC policy to reflect proposed pathways.

4. To identify further steps (ie administrative delegations, faculty councils, UAPPOL).

5. An implementation plan for the following 5 recommendations from the ad hoc Committee on Academic Governance including Delegated Authority will constitute part of the ad hoc committee’s activities:
   · That, over the next year, the ASC Subcommittee on Standards be charged with reviewing and revising the policy on course and minor program changes (recommendation 16)
   · That the delegated authority to ratify new course designators and to approve re-numbering of courses move from the Executive Committee to the Academic Standards Committee (recommendation 17)
   · That the Academic Standards Committee review and approve courses associated with new program, subject to challenge through normal course circulation process (recommendation 19)
   · That the Academic Standards Committee be given delegated authority to approve the establishment, termination, and changes to college level diploma and certificate programs from the Centre collegial de l’Alberta; those requiring additional funding and/or space would be recommended to the Academic Planning Committee for approval (recommendation 20)
   · That further works and consultation occur with FGSR and Governance to develop a proposal for approval pathways that recognizes the unique nature of the Faculty (recommendation 43)

Timeline:

Final recommendations to be submitted no later than April 30, 2020

Established by GFC Executive Committee January 14, 2019
## Mandates, Responsibilities, Composition of Committees

### Mandates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FGSR Committee</td>
<td>Discussion and revision of administrative topics related to programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFC Programs Committee</td>
<td>Oversight on all matters related to programs of study and courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Administration Support Committee</td>
<td>Administration of admissions and selection processes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FGSR Committee</td>
<td>Administration of admissions and selection processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFC Programs Committee</td>
<td>Approve introduction, modification programs, certificates, courses including designators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Administration Support Committee</td>
<td>Approve routine changes to admission/transfer academic standing regulations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chair

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FGSR Committee</td>
<td>Vice-Provost (Programs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFC Programs Committee</td>
<td>Dean, FGSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Administration Support Committee</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appointed/Resource

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FGSR Committee</td>
<td>'x' Asso Dean(s), 2 year term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFC Programs Committee</td>
<td>'x' Asso Dean(s), 2 year term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Administration Support Committee</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Elected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FGSR Committee</td>
<td>7 faculty members, at least 4 from GFC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFC Programs Committee</td>
<td>6 faculty members, at least 4 from GFC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Administration Support Committee</td>
<td>1 UG or GR student member of GFC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Resource

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FGSR Committee</td>
<td>Librarian, selected by Chief Librarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFC Programs Committee</td>
<td>Librarian, selected by Chief Librarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Administration Support Committee</td>
<td>with APC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cross-rep

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FGSR Committee</td>
<td>Librarian, selected by Chief Librarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFC Programs Committee</td>
<td>Librarian, selected by Chief Librarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Administration Support Committee</td>
<td>Communication with APC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appendix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option A</td>
<td>Provost (delegate Vice-Provost Programs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option B</td>
<td>Provost (delegate Vice-Provost Programs)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>