

MEMORANDUM

To: SENATE

From: J. MUNRO, CHAIRMAN

SENATE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING

Subject: PROPOSED REVISIONS TO GUIDELINES FOR
PROGRAM REVIEW: SENATE COMMITTEE ON
ACADEMIC PLANNING

Date: NOVEMBER 17, 1981

Actions taken by the Senate Committee on Academic Planning, at its meetings of October 7 and November 4, 1981 give rise to the following motion:

MOTION: That Senate approve, as set forth in S.81-157, the revised Guidelines for Program Review, as follows:

REVISIONS TO GUIDELINES FOR PROGRAM REVIEW

As revised in Paper S.80-166, the Senate Committee on Academic Planning has three major terms of reference. The first of these, the implementation of a system of academic planning, is presently being addressed by a series of planning task forces. The second and third involve reviewing and recommending to Senate concerning proposals for new programs or major modifications to existing programs and the review of existing programs for the purposes of assessment, expansion, curtailment or discontinuance. In paper S.81-81, Senate approved guidelines for the review of programs by SCAP. Subsequent expressions of concern by members of the Committee and other members of Senate over the impact of increasing fiscal constraints on the operation of existing academic programs have led to the following proposal to revise the Guidelines for Program Review. It is also intended that SCAP will revert to the practice of closing its meetings during the final consideration and voting on program proposals.

1. According to the definition of Universities Council, "A program is a sequence of credit courses leading to a University credential. A credential is a diploma, certificate, degree or other type of official recognition awarded to a student by a University."
2. Decisions concerning whether proposed changes to existing programs are "major," and therefore fall within the terms of reference of SCAP, will be made jointly by the Secretary of Senate and the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Academic Planning.
3. New Programs are to be brought forward for approval in principle well in advance of detailed program preparation. The purpose of seeking in-principle approval is to guide departments and individual faculty members away from program planning that is inconsistent with long-term University goals and resources. In-principle approval does not bind SCAP to recommending full approval under 6. below.

Programs brought forward for approval in-principle shall:

- a) Have received endorsement by the Faculty and, in the case of graduate programs by the Senate Graduate Studies Committee;
- b) Be accompanied by information establishing the need for the program and describing its impact on, and relationship to, existing programs;
- c) Be accompanied by an outline of anticipated development of the department over the next few years;
- d) Be accompanied by information concerning the objectives of the program, an outline of its structure, enrolment estimates, and resources required.

4. When a program is given in-principle approval, SCAP shall assign one of the following priority classifications to the program, based on 3a) - d), above: "essential," "important," "desirable."
5. Once approval in-principle has been given, detailed program planning can commence. Liaison should be maintained with the Offices of the Vice-President, Academic and Analytical Studies during the program planning phase. The information that is required for consideration of new programs at the UCBC level is contained in the Program Coordinating Committee Guidelines. Program proposals should be prepared following the topical outline used in the PCC Guidelines. It should be noted that outside consultation and review are expected in the case of significant new programs.
6. When a program that has received in-principle approval is presented for full approval by the Senate Committee on Academic Planning, the following information will be included:
 - a) A statement on the academic merit and importance of the program and its impact on other programs in the University.
 - b) Enrolment projections.
 - c) Staffing and other operating budget requirements. The Dean of the Faculty may be requested to indicate the source of required new expenditures.
 - d) Space requirements.
 - e) Equipment requirements.

In considering its recommendations, the Senate Committee on Academic Planning will follow the "Criteria for Program Assessment" contained in paper S.80-98 (see Appendix A to this memorandum). The responsibility of the Senate Committee on Academic Planning is to assess the academic merit of programs but not to make a decision as to whether funds should actually be spent on the program. However, SCAP does have a role in assessing the reasonableness of estimated resource needs of new programs. Also, this information does interact with considerations of academic merit.

7. The Senate Committee on Academic Planning will recommend to the President on the priorities to be attached to new programs as required (usually by March 31) by the UCBC Program Coordinating Committee.
8. The Committee will, by January 31 each year, recommend priorities for the implementation of all new programs approved by Senate, Board, and Universities Council and scheduled for implementation in the next fiscal year.
9. In recognition of the deadlines of the UCBC Program Coordinating Committee, the annual deadline for receipt of new program submissions for final approval by the Senate Committee on Academic Planning will be October 20.
10. The Senate Committee on Academic Planning may initiate the review of an existing program:
 - a) on its own motion;
 - b) at the request of the Vice-President, Academic or the appropriate Dean;
 - c) as requested by Senate.

The Committee shall, when it initiates a review, approve the composition and terms of reference of the review committee, including the distribution of the committee's report. The review committee may include persons from outside the University. The criteria attached in Appendix A will guide the review of existing programs.

11. The Program Guidelines of the UCBC Program Co-ordinating Committee are attached for information, Appendix B

The reason for the suggested revision in item 10 is to make the procedure for initiating, carrying out, and reporting the review of existing programs more workable. The provision of the UCBC Program Co-ordinating Committee Program Guidelines is intended to make this information more generally available to the University.

J. M. Munro

J.M. Munro

CRITERIA FOR PROGRAM ASSESSMENT

It is expected that the identification of the purposes to which Simon Fraser will direct its efforts and energies will encourage and facilitate the development of a number of new and innovative programs. Assigning priorities to various proposals will be a difficult task. Ranking should be based partly on how a proposal is measured against the following characteristics.

1. The program has intrinsic academic excellence and is something this University can expect to do well.
2. The program substantially enriches the existing teaching programs of the University.
3. The program builds upon existing programs and resources in the University.
4. The program anticipates provincial or national needs.
5. The program does not unnecessarily duplicate existing programs at other universities in the Province.
6. The excellence of the program attracts students to the University.

Existing programs should also be subject to periodic review. Such reviews provide an opportunity to assess individual programs and to provide a basis for recommending their expansion, curtailment or discontinuance.

UNIVERSITIES COUNCIL OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

PROGRAM GUIDELINES

PROCEDURES FOR THE EVALUATION OF NEW PROGRAM PROPOSALS

September 1981 revision

TERMS OF REFERENCE

The role of the Program Coordinating Committee is to:

1. Evaluate new program proposals presented by:
 - (a) the public universities (namely the University of British Columbia, the University of Victoria and Simon Fraser University) in accordance with 69(e) and (o)(ii) of the University Act (1979), and
 - (b) the Open Learning Institute, in accordance with Part II, section 2(1)(f) of the College and Institute Act (1979).and make recommendations to the Universities Council on these proposals.
2. Review existing university programs with the view to:
 - (a) identifying the special areas of interest and expertise in each of the universities;
 - (b) developing plans to reduce unnecessary duplication.
3. Identify areas in which inter-university cooperation appears desirable.
4. Consult with the Academic Council and other relevant agencies, in order to rationalize the delivery of university level programs in the Province.
5. Assist the institutions in their coordination of the delivery of distance education programs to the non-metropolitan areas of British Columbia, including all university programs offered at the David Thompson University Centre (in accordance with Part II, section 2(1)(f) of the College and Institute Act).
6. Examine the role of the universities in the development of in-service training and re-training for the professions.
7. Study and make recommendations to the Universities Council on such matters as may be referred to the Committee from time to time by the universities or by the Council.

PROGRAM GUIDELINES

This document defines the Program Coordinating Committee's role in fulfilling one of its functions, that of advising the Universities Council on new program proposals. The procedures for program approval detailed below are intended to provide a mechanism for avoiding unnecessary duplication and for ensuring that new programs are implemented at institutions which can offer them efficiently and effectively.

The President or the Academic Vice-President of the university will submit proposals to the Chairman of the Universities Council for new programs which have already received senate approval. When these proposals are accompanied by a budget request, they should be submitted by January 31 or within twenty-one days of the institution's Senate meeting in January, and the budget should be endorsed by the institution's chief business officer. Each university has the responsibility for preparing the necessary program letters of intent and proposals, and for ensuring that all appropriate reference groups have been consulted including each of the other universities. The Program Coordinating Committee will ask each university to sort its own proposed new programs according to the categories set out in Appendix A.

The Program Coordinating Committee's responsibility is to evaluate the programs and advise the Universities Council. The decision to accept or reject each proposal is made by the Council, and the final adoption of an appropriate category for each program rests with the Council. The Committee Chairman will tell the Committee the reasons for Council's rejection of recommendations made by the Program Coordinating Committee.

A. LETTERS OF INTENT

1. A letter of intent serves to advise the Council of an institution's plans to develop a formal program proposal.
2. The letter of intent is optional rather than obligatory. However, forwarding a letter of intent will speed up the program evaluation process in two ways. First, in cases where approval is doubtful, the institution can be told before time is spent preparing a formal proposal. Second, Council's research into the program area can begin at an earlier date.
3. A letter of intent may be submitted to the Chairman of the Universities Council by the President or the Academic Vice-President of the university after the program has been passed by a faculty.
4. The Chairman of the Universities Council will acknowledge letters of intent promptly, and request further information or clarification, if necessary. Upon receiving the letter of intent the Chairman of the Universities Council may advise the institution that the Council is unlikely to approve the proposed program at this time, giving reasons why approval is unlikely. The Chairman shall seek the counsel of the Program Coordinating Committee before giving this advice.

B. FORMAL PROGRAM PROPOSALS

1. Programs will not be approved if the information provided is considered incomplete, non-specific or not clearly substantiated and will be returned to the institution for completion.
2. Guidelines for the proposal of new programs (see Appendix B).
3. Formal program proposals may be submitted to the Chairman of the Universities Council at any time. However, the proposal must be received by the Chairman by January 31st or within 21 days of the institution's Senate meeting in January if the university intends to include the program in the budget submission for the following academic year. Thus, a formal proposal for a program to be initiated in September 1981 must reach the Chairman within three weeks of the institution's Senate meeting in January 1982.

e.g. 21 days after January	- formal program proposal deadline
Senate, 1982	
February - June	- program evaluated
July 1, 1982	- institution informed of UCBC decision
August 15, 1982	- program (if approved) included in the budget submitted to UCBC
September, 1983	- program may be initiated
4. The institution will be informed of Council's decision approximately four months after receipt of those completed proposals which are submitted at other times during the year.
5. Where, in the opinion of Council, the proposal involves a major, high cost, and limited enrolment or employment opportunity program, the formal proposal may be forwarded to the other western provinces for their comment in light of the agreement among the western provinces (Western Provinces Post-Secondary Coordinating Committee).
6. When a program is recommended for approval by Council, the Committee may also recommend that the program be evaluated at a later date.

C. PROGRAM COORDINATING COMMITTEE

1. The Program Coordinating Committee of the Universities Council will consist of the following members:
 - (a) four members of the Universities Council, one of whom will be the Chairman of the Committee;
 - (b) one representative of each university, the academic vice president or alternate. The alternate may vote.
 - (c) one representative of the Open Learning Institute, the dean of academic affairs or alternate. The alternate may vote.
2. Only one representative of each institution will be entitled to vote on any one issue.
3. Five members of the Committee, at least two of whom shall be members of Council, shall constitute a quorum.
4. A representative of the institution whose proposal is under consideration shall not vote on that proposal.
5. No vote shall be taken at a meeting of the Committee on any proposal by an institution without a representative of that institution present.

6. The Chairman will vote as a member of the Committee.
7. A tie vote will be regarded as a negative vote.
8. One function of the Program Coordinating Committee shall be to approve the establishment of new program proposals in accordance with the criteria set forth in Appendix B and to make recommendations about those proposals to the Universities Council. Council may accept, modify or reject all such recommendations made by the Committee. (Other functions of the Program Coordinating Committee can be seen in the Terms of Reference).
9. The Chairman of the Council may engage the services of professional consultants to assist in program evaluation, subject to approval of a budget for such expenditures.
10. Meetings of the Committee will be held at the call of the Chair.

APPENDIX A

PROGRAM CATEGORIES

The responsibilities of the Universities Council as specified in the Universities Act, 1974 are detailed on the front page of this document. All new programs must therefore be authorized by the Universities Council, where:

A program is a sequence of credit courses leading to a university credential.

A credential is a diploma, certificate, degree, or other type of official recognition awarded to a student by a university. Completion of a minor program is viewed as receiving official recognition by the university.

It is not intended that non-credit programs be subject to the procedures in these Guidelines at present. However, they may be placed under this or another policy in the future.

The Universities Council is concerned with:

- (a) the establishment of a new faculty or school;
- (b) the establishment of a new department or similar unit;
- (c) the establishment of a new program as defined above;
- (d) the reorganization of existing units or sequence of courses in order to provide a new credential.

Programs Requiring UCBC Evaluation:

1. all new doctoral degree programs;
2. all new master's degree programs (see exceptions in the following group)
3. all new bachelor's degree programs (type and major) involving a funding request for additional faculty, library resources, support costs, etc;
4. all new bachelor's degree programs which purport to provide training for employment, and/or need to be accredited, and/or whose graduates require certification, even when these program proposals are not accompanied by a budget request;
5. all new programs which would otherwise figure in Category II when not accompanied by a funding request.

A Letter of Intent is desirable for these programs. It may be submitted as soon as the program has been passed by a faculty, and should: (i) present a short description of the program (ii) identify the presumed need for the program (iii) estimate the cost of the program

This letter of intent will be circulated to the other institutions.

A Formal Proposal should be submitted by the accepted deadline (January 31 or 21 days after the January meeting of the Senate) for inclusion in the institution's budget estimates for the following year. The proposal should include the items listed in Appendix B.

Programs Not Requiring UCBC Evaluation:

Programs falling into this category are those for which no additional funding is requested. They include: new master's degree programs deriving from existing master's programs in the same department; new bachelor's degree programs (with the exception of #4 in the preceding group), new "minors", "options", "streams" within existing programs; post-baccalaureate diploma programs; certificate programs.

n.b. new doctoral degree programs and new master's degree programs not deriving from existing programs will be evaluated even if no additional funding is requested for them.

A formal notification by the institution to UCBC of its intention to implement the program will normally suffice.

This notification, including program objectives and curriculum, indication of need and enrolment projections, will be circulated at a meeting of the Program Coordinating Committee. The other institutions will have two months in which to raise objections to the implementation of the program. In case of conflict, the Program Coordinating Committee will apply the usual program evaluation procedures. Otherwise, the program will be recommended to Council for approval within two months of its circulation at the Program Coordinating Committee meeting.

Budget Submission:

The proposal should include the university's own classification of its program into one of the following categories:

1) Category I program:

Programs which should be implemented and fully funded regardless of the level of total operating grants, i.e. the program is of such priority that its funding should take precedence over the funding of established programs.

2) Category II programs:

Programs which should be implemented if UCBC is satisfied that the level of total operating grants contains amounts intended for these programs. The level of funding requested for them may be such as to require a specific mention in the budget (e.g. engineering programs, nursing programs).

3) Category III programs:

Programs which should be implemented only after UCBC has sought the advice of the University prior to allocating the Provincial operating grant.

4) Category IV programs:

Programs for which no additional funding is requested.

When making its recommendations to UCBC on appropriate levels of funding for new programs, the PCC will also review the university's categorization and make its recommendation to UCBC on this matter as well.

APPENDIX B

PROPOSAL FOR NEW PROGRAMS (Guidelines for the Universities)

I - GENERAL INFORMATION

1. title of the program
2. credential to be awarded to graduates
3. faculty or school, department or unit to offer the program
4. date of Senate approval
5. schedule for implementation

II - PROGRAM DESCRIPTION AND RELATED MATTERS

1. objectives of the proposed program
2. relationship of the proposed degree to the role and mission of the university
3. list and brief description of existing programs at the other institutions related in content and similar in objectives to the proposed program
4. indication of how the proposed program will:
 - (a) either complement existing similar programs within the institution or at the other institutions
 - (b) or be distinct from other programs in the field at the other institutions
5. curriculum: courses directly identified with the program:
 - (a) existing courses
 - (b) new courses
6. for professional degrees: evidence of formal consultation with the professional organizations or licensing agencies which accredit programs of the type proposed
7. for professional degrees: if the university already offers a program at another level in the same field, evidence that the existing program is accredited by the professional organization
8. details of consultation with non-university agencies such as likely employers, trade groups, etc.

III - NEED FOR PROGRAM

1. indication of cultural, societal or professional needs the program is designed to meet in addition to the objectives, already mentioned
2. enrolment:
 - (a) evidence of student interest in the program (written enquiries, etc.)
 - (b) enrolment predictions, indicating the proportion of new and transfer students (program's impact on the total university enrolment)
 - (c) evidence (other than (a)) to support enrolment estimates
 - (d) proposed growth limits and minimum enrolment

3. types of jobs for which the graduates will be suitable
4. for Ph.D's and professional degrees: estimate of (annual) employer demand for graduates, provincially and nationally
5. for Ph.D's and professional degrees: estimate of number of current candidates for appropriate (annual) openings in the employment market, provincially and nationally,
 - (a) from the institution itself
 - (b) from the other two B.C. universities
 - (c) from Canadian universities
6. (as a further indicator of demand) if the department already offers graduate or professional programs: indication of student placement patterns in these programs over the last three years (teaching, industry, professional, government, other)

IV - PRESENT AND PROJECTED RESOURCES

1. administrative personnel (to be hired or reassigned)
2. faculty, including T.A.'s and R.A.'s (to be hired or reassigned)
3. library resources (existing and proposed)
4. capital costs attributable to the new program (classrooms, labs, office, etc.)
5. indication of anticipated external funds
6. Budget requests will be calculated according to the methodology outlined in New and Emergent Programs: Budget Submission Guidelines.
7. for graduate programs: indication of faculty research awards in the department (amount and sources)

V - EVALUATION

1. evaluation of the proposal by the other B.C. institutions referring to:
 - (a) need for the proposed program, particularly in the context of the relationship to existing programs which have a similar or complementary purpose
 - (b) academic quality of the proposed program
 - (c) feasibility of the proposed program
 - (d) probable impact of the proposed program on existing and anticipated programs at the other institutions
2. any external evaluation of the proposal obtained from experts in the field of the program
3. procedures for institutional evaluation of the program during and subsequent to implementation
4. plans for future external evaluation

APPENDIX C

PROGRAM BUDGETS

The Program Coordinating Committee and the universities have the following responsibilities in the area of program budgets.

1. When the Program Coordinating Committee recommends a program to Council, the Committee will advise Council on an appropriate budget for that program. Furthermore, if that program is to be an emergent program in the succeeding years, the Committee will provide an estimated budget appropriate for each of those years, at the time of recommendation.
2. In a program's emerging year(s) enrolment figures will be provided by the relevant institution by the deadline for program proposals, and Council will review funding for the following year(s) accordingly.
3. If a new program proposal states that the program does not require funds for its implementation and continuation, no funds may later be requested for that program under new or emergent program categories from the Universities Council.
4. Budgets will be calculated according to the methodology outlined in New and Emergent Programs: Budget Submission Guidelines.