



TRU Curricular Governance Process

Streamline and Renewal

First Thoughts

Thompson Rivers University campuses are on the traditional lands of the Tk'emlúps te Secwépemc (Kamloops campus) and the T'exelc (Williams Lake campus) within Secwepemcúlucw, the traditional and unceded territory of the Secwépemc. The region TRU serves also extends into the territories of the St'át'imc, Nlaka'pamux, Nuxalk, Tâilhqot'in, Dakeh, and Syilx peoples.

“Curricular Governance” Defined

- Curricular governance refers to TRU’s process for curriculum development and renewal, which involves the collegial review of new and revised programs and courses.
- It is based on a philosophy of collegial governance, which involves
 - Discussion
 - Debate
 - Decision by committee
- Curricular governance is enacted through Curriculum Committees, Faculty Councils, EPC, GSC, APPC, PCOL, and Senate.

Informal Feedback

- Too many steps; steps added without taking any away
- Process can be confusing
- Forms can be confusing and overwhelming
- Information required doesn't always seem relevant
- Mixing of academic and financial priorities
- Process needs to honour expertise of faculty and committees
- CurriQúnet is clunky



Approach

Reduce Steps and Administrative Control

Streamline Forms

Clarify Communication


Update Process

Reduce Steps

Current Process


We recommend integrating the sustainability review into the curricular review to create a single approval flow.

New Program/Program Change Review Process



Reduce Steps - recommendations

- PSW will become DQAB document (either Stage 1 or non-degree template) and the program proposal will be modified to include TRU specific information (e.g., mission alignment)
- CSW will be discontinued; the course proposal will be modified to include necessary information
- Currently, APPC has designated approval authority of CSW to AVPA
 - *AVPA is available for course development and becomes provider of feedback, support, and advice if requested, but not an approver*
- Graduate curriculum consideration being discussed by GSC – stay tuned...



Reduce Steps - recommendations



- Peer review process (5 – 10++ business days for completion)
 - Programs — *maintain?*
 - Courses — *discuss?*
 - Course Modifications — *discontinue?*
- Library Form is signed by Library Liaison
 - *Does the University Librarian also need to approve in CurriQúnet?*
 - *Update: UL working on a process to complete all signing prior to uploading the form*
- Registrar is represented at all levels of governance
 - *Does the Registrar need to sign off in CurriQúnet?*
 - We suggest we might not need both sign-offs
 - *Update: OQA and Registrar meeting regularly to discuss this as well as other possible improvements*

Streamline Forms

Proposed revisions to PSW

While maintaining necessary information:

- Stage 1 DQAB documents attached to new proposal in CurriQúnet as PDF
 - *Prevents using outdated information and looks like grant application, which is familiar to faculty*
- Additional TRU-specific information to be captured in new program proposal (in software), such as alignment with mission and strategic priorities
 - *Two forms rather than four!!*

DQAB Stage 1

<https://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/education/post-secondary-education/institution-resources-administration/degree-authorization/psips/stage-1-template.docx>

Streamline Forms

Proposed revisions to CSW

- Reviewed current CSW for vital aspects; all vital pieces will become fields in new course proposal (in software)
 - Instead of completing market analysis, ask Chair and Dean to sign off that the course meets a need, and resources required when/if the course is offered will be found in the program/faculty budgets
 - *One form rather than three!!*



Clarify Communication

- Clarity in naming — One form for each:
 - New Program Proposal Form (instead of PSW, NOI, program proposal)
 - New Course Proposal Form (instead of CSW, NOI, course proposal)
- Ensure Senate has “full view” of proposal as a whole (e.g., program, curriculum, fit with TRU Mission, etc.)
- CurriQúnet is a software tool to assist with tracking and storing approved curriculum. It is not the collegial governance process which is defined by Senate.
- CurriQúnet is not automated and requires human action **at each step in the approval flow** (similar to paper-based systems)
- Streamlining and clarifying *Definitions of Categories*

Committee Roles/Responsibilities

Do committees know which parts of the proposal they are responsible for reviewing?

May need to update ToRs and perhaps provide some training

Definition of Categories

Initial draft revisions

Category A “Edits” (EPC)

These are minor edits approved by respective Faculty Councils that require institutional review for consistency and fair process; however, they follow from existing institutional planning and priorities as evidenced by previous Senate approved decisions. Category A edits require Faculty Council approval of a motion, and EPC review for institutional consistency and fair process. Category A changes are sent to Senate “for information”.

- Minor edit to a course title
- Minor edit to a calendar description (does not change intent of course)
- Change of description for course learning outcomes that does not impact course content
- Vectoring of a course
- Course deletion
- Level of course (e.g., change from 3000 to 2000 level)
- Minor credential change (e.g., substituting different course(s) or additions/deletions of requirements that lead to a credential)
- Pre-requisites or co-requisites of a course

Category B “Changes” (APPC)

Category B changes require discussion regarding impact for institutional planning and/or priorities. At this stage, APPC is, in essence, pre-reviewing information for Senate. APPC votes on a motion to make a recommendation for Senate’s approval, following an overall look at academic redundancy, shifts in priorities, etc. at the university. This is the place where “deep” review and discussion take place so that Senate is well-advised to assist in making decisions. Category B changes require APPC to vote on a motion to recommend to Senate for approval via consent agenda.

- New course
- New credential
- Deletion of a credential
- New field of specialization at the major, minor, concentration, or honours level
- Course changes to seek Institutional Learning Outcome, High Impact Practice, or capstone designation
- Major credential changes (e.g., changes to the majority of the courses that lead to a credential)
- Changes to credential requirements for admission, promotion, graduation (including residency)
- Other academic decisions that require in-depth institutional dialogue
- *Method of delivery when it has a significant impact on the nature of the programming*

Update Process

- Change motion to “recommend to Senate for approval” rather than “approve and recommend” to ensure academic decision-making authority clearly rests with Senate
 - *Except where it’s truly an approval at an earlier level (e.g., Category A)*
- Recommend to Senate consideration for the use of a “consent agenda” as distinct from “for information” items for items submitted from APPC, allowing Senators to pull out individual motions that they may want to discuss further
 - *EPC approvals go “for information”*
 - *APPC motions go to consent agenda*



Summary of Suggested Changes

- Less steps overall = reduced timeline
- One form (course/program proposal) instead of three or more (CSW/PSW, NOI, course/program proposal, DQAB)
- Two *Categories* (A, B) instead of three (I, II, III)
- Reduce approval duplications (Library, Registrar)
- Senate academic decision-making authority and oversight clarified

Thank you!
—
Questions?

