



# **Academic Offering Development Process**

**Version 8.1**

**Prepared by:**

Academic Priorities and Planning Committee

## Revision History

### PLEASE NOTE

**Use of a word processing automated change tracking feature is required** when resubmitting this document in order to simplify the review and approval process. Please note the following:

- a. Once a version of the document has been approved, that version of the document should be saved for archival purposes.
- b. Prior to submitting a new version of the document, all prior tracked changes should be accepted.
- c. The process of resubmission may be repeated as needed until the final approval has been issued.
- d. **Maintain a summary of changes** in the table below.

Date	Version	Description	Author
Jan 15, 2016	V1	Initial document build	Neil Foshay, Jennifer Mitton-Kükner, Petra Hauf
Jan 25, 2016	V2	Revised based on feedback from APP meeting of Jan 19	Neil Foshay, Jennifer Mitton-Kükner, Petra Hauf
Mar 01, 2016	V3.1	Revised based on Senate Steering Committee and AVP suggestions. Annotated to highlight changes.	Neil Foshay, Jennifer Mitton-Kükner, Petra Hauf
Mar 02, 2016	V4	Revised based on feedback from APP	Neil Foshay, Jennifer Mitton-Kükner, Petra Hauf
Mar 22, 2016	V5	Revised based on feedback from PC	Kevin Wamsley
Mar 29, 2016	V6	Revised based on Senate Steering suggestions.	Neil Foshay, Jennifer Mitton-Kükner, Petra Hauf
March 30, 2016	V6.1	Revised based on Senate Steering Suggestions	Kevin Wamsley
April 18, 2017	V7	Addition of process for concentrations, restructure of the document to accommodate multiple processes.	Neil Foshay, Jennifer Mitton-Kükner, Petra Hauf

<b>Date</b>	<b>Version</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Author</b>
April 20, 2017	V7.1	Incorporated input from J. Mitton, added 'Process Approval' page	Neil Foshay
November 8, 2017	V7.2	Preliminary definition of concentration, minor and certificate academic offerings	Neil Foshay, Jennifer Mitton-Kükner, Petra Hauf
November 21, 2017	V8	Created colloquium section; added process detail to minor, certificate, concentration and colloquium – includes input Karen Brebner on Colloquia.	Neil Foshay, Jennifer Mitton-Kükner, Petra Hauf
April 10, 2018	V8.1	Minor edits and corrections of typos according to APP feedback	Neil Foshay, Jennifer Mitton-Kükner, Petra Hauf

## Process Approvals

Process	Reviewing Body	Review Date	Summary of Changes/Revisions Requested (if none – indicate APPROVED)	Name of Chair of Reviewing Body
<b>New Programs</b>	APP	March, 2016	APPROVED	Kevin Wamsley
<b>New Programs</b>	Senate	April, 2016	APPROVED	Rodney Bantjes
<b>New Programs Amendment</b>	APP	March, 2018	APPROVED	Kevin Wamsley

# Table of Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Guiding Principles .....	1
<b>2</b>	<b>Stakeholders .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Introduction to RACI .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>New or Substantially Changed Program .....</b>	<b>5</b>
4.1	When does this process apply? .....	5
4.2	Process Governance .....	5
4.3	RACI Matrix.....	7
4.4	Activity Summary .....	10
<b>5</b>	<b>Concentration.....</b>	<b>11</b>
5.1	When does this process apply? .....	11
5.2	Process Governance .....	11
5.3	RACI Matrix.....	12
5.4	Activity Overview .....	13
<b>6</b>	<b>Minor.....</b>	<b>14</b>
6.1	When does this process apply? .....	14
6.2	Process Governance .....	14
6.3	RACI Matrix.....	15
6.4	Activity Overview .....	16
<b>7</b>	<b>Certificate .....</b>	<b>17</b>
7.1	When does this process apply? .....	17
7.2	Process Governance .....	17
7.3	RACI Matrix.....	18

7.4	Activity Overview .....	19
<b>8</b>	<b>Colloquium .....</b>	<b>20</b>
8.1	When does this process apply? .....	20
8.2	Process Governance .....	20
8.3	RACI Matrix.....	20
8.4	Activity Overview .....	22

# 1 Introduction

St. Francis Xavier University (StFX) has always supported its departments, schools, and faculties in developing, and implementing, new academic offerings which are responsive to the needs of the local and broader communities. Given the recent frequency of proposals and new ideas for innovative programming at StFX, a transparent, regularized approach is needed. This document, developed by an APP ad hoc subcommittee between April 2015 and the summer of 2017, outlines a series of processes for developing new academic offerings that includes key activities and approval checkpoints as well as the roles and responsibilities of stakeholders.

This document serves to formalize existing procedures and to clarify roles and responsibilities. The process described in this document does not change the authority of any university role or body – Senate, APP, Committees on Study, President’s Council or Academic Vice President. In case of conflict, *Senate Rules of Procedure* will take precedence over this *Academic Offering Development Process* document.

Please note the following regarding the proposed process:

- It references several documents (concept paper, academic plan, academic offering overview, individual course descriptions). Standard document templates will be developed and made available to stakeholders. We assume that MPHEC standard documents will be employed to the degree possible for the documentation of the academic plan and for academic offering documentation. Existing documentation (e.g., course descriptions) will be reviewed and updated as appropriate.
- The activities associated with the process are presented in the general order that they should be carried out. However, it should be noted that in some cases, certain activities may be iterative. For example, a concept paper may be created and presented to APP and may require modification, necessitating aspects of the first step in the process to be repeated.
- The proposed process is not assumed to be ‘one size fits all’ and should be used appropriately. Some new offerings, for example, only require MPHEC approval while others may require external reviews/approvals in addition to MPHEC.

## 1.1 Guiding Principles

The proposed process described in this document is informed by the following guiding principles:

- **Transparency:** transparency of decision making and responsibilities throughout the process.
- **Structure:** a structured process with clearly defined roles and communication process between relevant stakeholders at key stages of the process.
- **Appropriate involvement:** appropriate involvement of professional staff in addition to academic staff.

- **Clear and appropriate accountability:** Clear and appropriate accountability for decision making at key stages in the process.



## 2 Stakeholders

The proposed processes involve several key individuals and bodies at different process stages. Starting with a developed idea or concept for a new academic offering, those stages focus on the concept review and approval; the development, review, and approval of an academic plan; the detailed academic offering development; and the final quality review and approval of the new academic offering. During this entire process the following key parties are involved:

- **Interested parties:** individuals or groups (e.g., individual faculty members or departmental committees) that generate ideas regarding new offerings and who participate in multiple ways throughout the process.
- **Departments and respective Curriculum Committees**
- **Deans**
- **Faculties**
- **University Librarian**
- **Service Learning**
- **Committees on Studies (Arts, Science, Professional, Graduate or Joint):** Note that a new offering will be reviewed and vetted by only one COS.
- **Senate**
- **Registrar**
- **APP**
- **Academic Vice President and President's Council**
- **Professional Staff:** Given that the development of new academic offerings can be very time consuming and / or time sensitive, professional staff will be available to facilitate the process, coordinate activities between stakeholders, manage communication and assist with documentation.
- **MPHEC**
- **External reviewers and other external accreditation boards**
- **Recruiting:** It is essential that recruiting be advised, in a timely manner, of any new or substantially changed academic offerings.

The role(s) of the stakeholder groups listed are detailed later in this document.

### 3 Introduction to RACI

The academic offering development processes in this document are presented in the form of a *RACI Matrices*. A RACI Matrix is a tool to describe how a process (or a project) is to be carried out. The matrix identifies the key activities and decision checkpoints associated with the process. A key feature of the RACI matrix is that it clearly identifies the specific roles and responsibilities of stakeholders at each step in the process. RACI is an acronym that stands for *Responsible, Accountable, Consulted or Informed*:

- **Responsible:** Those who do the work to achieve the task.
- **Accountable** (also approver or final approving authority): The role ultimately answerable for the completion of the deliverable or task, and in some cases the one who delegates the work to those responsible. Normally, there should only be one accountable role specified for each task or deliverable. **Note:** the ‘Accountable’ role in the RACI matrix is equivalent to the ‘Responsible’ role specified in the current version of the Senate *Rules of Procedure*.
- **Consulted:** Those whose opinions are sought and with whom there is two-way communication.
- **Informed:** Those who are kept up-to-date on status and progress. **Note:** in accordance with *Senate Rules*, Senate may “give advice or direction consistent with its mandate and responsibility” whenever it is informed.

To illustrate how to interpret the RACI matrix, consider the (proposed) first step in the new program development process (section 4):

	Key Stakeholders														
	Interested Parties Departments (curriculum Committee)	Dean	University Librarian	Service Learning	COS, JCO5 or Alternate COS	Senate	Registrar	Recruiting	APP	AVP/Presidents Council	Faculties	Professional Staff	MPHEC	External reviewers	Other external /accrediting approval
<b>R = Responsible</b> <b>A = Accountable</b> <b>C = Consulted</b> <b>I = Informed</b>															
<b>Idea Generation.</b> Interested parties generate and develop an idea or concept for a new offering and document in a standardized concept paper.	R,A	C	C	I											

For this activity, participants include interested parties, departments, the appropriate Dean(s) and the Library. Interested parties (for example, a group of faculty) are responsible for carrying out the activity (all tasks required to complete the concept paper) and are also accountable for the completion of the paper (the group is self-directed). Interested parties consult with members of the relevant department(s) and Dean(s) in the development of the concept for the new offering. The Library is informed regarding the new offering so they may do some preliminary research regarding, for example, library resources available to support the proposed offering.

## 4 New or Substantially Changed Program

### 4.1 When does this process apply?

Departments, schools, and faculties are asked to follow this process when the following conditions apply regarding the development of a new *academic program*<sup>1</sup>:

- a baccalaureate, master's or doctoral degree that has not been previously granted by StFX;
- a post-degree certificate or diploma not previously granted by StFX;
- a baccalaureate, master's or doctoral degree granted by StFX that contains one or more of the following elements:
  - a new major or field of specialization;
  - an existing interdisciplinary major for which the majority of the courses are new or are substantially altered to conform to the program's objectives;
  - a joint major if one or more of the fields in the joint major is not already represented by an approved major;
  - revision of a program's major objectives resulting in significant changes; and,
  - significant revision of a program that warrants credential renaming
- any new offering or changes to existing offerings requiring MPHEC approval or any external accreditation.

### 4.2 Process Governance

The following are key assumptions regarding the governance of this process:

- The *Academic Priorities and Planning Committee* is the initial point of contact for new academic offerings and will review, vet and approve, or reject a new academic offering at the concept level. The APP's authority for this level of approval is delegated from the Senate.
- The *Academic VP in consultation with the President's Council* will review/vet an assessment of the academic plan for new offerings and has the authority to approve or reject the academic plan based on its fiscal / practical feasibility. Fiscal /practical feasibility may be broadly interpreted, as situated within the mandate of the University and its approach to a comprehensive liberal arts education. On the basis of the academic plan the AVP may recommend that Senate reject the proposed offering.
- The appropriate *Committee on Studies* will review all details associated with new academic offerings including the description, the entrance requirements, degree pattern and progression and the content of individual courses to ensure overall quality and cohesion. This body has the

---

<sup>1</sup> Adapted from *New Undergraduate Degree Proposal Guidelines* and *New Graduate Degree Proposal Guidelines*, University of Victoria.

authority to recommend revisions to any aspect of the academic offering to the Dean and to recommend approval of the academic offering to Senate.

- The *University Senate* will perform the final review of the recommendations of the Committee of Studies regarding new academic offerings. The Senate will review all aspects of the offering with a focus on the strategic aspects of the offering. This body has the authority to request revisions to any aspect of the offering to the Dean and to approve the academic offering.

### 4.3 RACI Matrix

	Key Stakeholders														Comments		
	Interested Parties	Departments (curriculum Committee)	Dean	University Librarian	Service Learning	COS, JCOS or Alternate COS	Senate	Registrar	Recruiting	APP	AVP/Presidents Council	Faculties	Professional Staff	MPHEC		External reviewers	Other external /accrediting approval
<p><b>R = Responsible</b>  <b>A = Accountable</b>  <b>C = Consulted</b>  <b>I = Informed</b></p>																	
<p><b>Idea Generation.</b> Interested parties generate and develop an idea or concept for a new offering and document in a standardized concept paper.</p>	R,A	C	C	I													
<p><b>Concept Review and Approval.</b> The concept is reviewed and vetted to ensure it is aligned with the strategic academic priorities of the university. APP may approve, reject or request that interested parties update or enhance their proposal. Senate is informed of proposed new offerings at this stage.</p>	R						I			R,A*							
<p><b>Develop Academic Plan.</b> If the concept for the new offering is approved by APP, a project manager (professional staff) is assigned to drive the development of an academic plan for the offering. This plan documents the fiscal and practical feasibility of a new academic offering and is mandated by MPHEC. The details of the plan will conform to MPHEC requirements.</p>	R	I	C	C	C	I	I	C	C		I	I	R,A				

	Key Stakeholders														Comments		
	Interested Parties	Departments (curriculum Committee)	Dean	University Librarian	Service Learning	COS, JCOS or Alternate COS	Senate	Registrar	Recruiting	APP	AVP/Presidents Council	Faculties	Professional Staff	MPHEC		External reviewers	Other external /accrediting approval
<p><b>R = Responsible</b>  <b>A = Accountable</b>  <b>C = Consulted</b>  <b>I = Informed</b></p>																	
<p><b>Academic Plan Review and Approval.</b> The AVP, in consultation with the President's Council, assesses the offering in terms of fiscal and practical feasibility and approves, rejects or requests modification to the academic plan. Senate is informed about the rationale for acceptance, revision, and rejections of academic plans.</p>	R									C	R,A	I	R				
<p><b>Define details of new offering.</b> If the offering is approved based on its sustainability, the new offering is defined in detail. For some new offerings, this step will be very labour intensive.</p>	R	C	C	C	C	C		C					R,A			I,C*	* For some programs, we may need to consult with external bodies (e.g., Department of Education and Early Childhood Development).
<p><b>External Reviews.</b> For those offerings that require it, schedule and perform appropriate independent external review(s).</p>	R												R,A	R			
<p><b>Detailed Program Review.</b> COS performs a detailed review of the new offering and associated course details and approves or requests modification to the materials provided.</p>	R					R,A				I							Note that well in advance of this review, those responsible for developing the new offering should keep the COS apprised of progress and define timelines and resources required for the review.

Key Stakeholders																	
R = Responsible A = Accountable C = Consulted I = Informed	Interested Parties	Departments (curriculum Committee)	Dean	University Librarian	Service Learning	COS, JCOS or Alternate COS	Senate	Registrar	Recruiting	APP	AVP/Presidents Council	Faculties	Professional Staff	MPHEC	External reviewers	Other external /accrediting approval	Comments
	<p><b>Develop Senate Package.</b> Upon approval by COS, a package will be prepared for Senate containing all offering details. The package will contain two documents 1)Offering-level documentation and 2) Course details.</p>	R,A		C			C		C					R			
<p><b>Senate Review and Approval.</b> Senate will perform the final internal review of the new offering. Senators will be asked to focus attention on offering-level information for their review, but may review the course details at their discretion.</p>			R				R,A		I								
<p><b>Perform External Reviews / Accreditations as Required.</b> Certain offerings may require review and accreditation by external bodies in addition to MPHEC..</p>	R							I		I	I		R,A			R	
<p><b>MPHEC Review / Approval.</b></p>	R							I	I	I	I	I	R,A	R			

## 4.4 Activity Summary

The following are the primary activities associated with the proposed process for new programs as presented in the RACI Matrix.

1. *Idea Generation.* Interested parties generate and develop an idea or concept for a new offering and document in a standardized concept paper.
2. *Concept Review and Approval.* The concept is reviewed and vetted to ensure it is aligned with the strategic academic priorities of the university. APP may approve, reject or request that interested parties update or enhance their proposal. Authority to review and approve concepts is delegated from the Senate. Senate is informed of proposed new offerings at this stage.
3. *Develop Academic Plan.* If the concept for the new offering is approved by APP, a project manager (professional staff) is assigned to drive the development of an academic plan for the offering. This plan documents the fiscal and practical feasibility of a new academic offering and is mandated by MPHEC. The details of the plan will conform to MPHEC requirements.
4. *Academic Plan Review and Approval.* The AVP, in consultation with the President's Council, assesses the offering in terms of fiscal and practical feasibility and approves, rejects or requests modification to the academic plan. Senate is informed about the rationale for acceptance, revision, and rejections of academic plans.
5. *Define details of new offering.* If the offering is approved based on its academic plan, the new offering is defined in detail. For some new offerings, this step will be labour intensive.
6. *External Reviews.* For those offerings that require it, schedule and perform appropriate independent external review(s).
7. *Detailed Program Review.* COS performs a detailed review of the new offering and associated course details and approves or requests modification to the materials provided.
8. *Develop Senate Package.* Upon approval by COS, a package will be prepared for Senate containing all offering details. The package will contain two documents 1) Offering-level documentation and 2) Course details.
9. *Senate Review and Approval.* Senate will perform the final internal review of the new offering. Senators will be asked to focus attention on offering-level information for their review, but may review the course details at their discretion.
10. *External Reviews / Accreditations as Required.* Certain offerings may require review and accreditation by external bodies.
11. *MPHEC Review / Approval.*



## 5 Concentration

### 5.1 When does this process apply?

Departments, schools, and faculties are asked to follow this process when developing a new concentration or proposing significant changes to existing concentrations. A concentration is an academic offering comprised of a number of specified courses/course levels (minimum of 15 credits) within a specified program. Concentrations appear on academic transcripts as a specialization of knowledge.

Current examples include:

- Major in Psychology with a concentration in Forensic Psychology
- Major in Biology with a concentration in Ecology
- Major in Mathematics with a concentration in Actuarial Science

The following assumptions apply to the development of new concentrations:

- There are no significant financial or personnel implications associated with introducing a new concentration.
- No MPHEC or other external approval is required.
- Deans (rather than APP) have the authority to approve concentrations at the concept stage.
- The introduction of a concentration may require the creation of new courses.
- Existing concentrations should be reviewed to assure that they align with the criteria outlined in this process document.

### 5.2 Process Governance

The following are key assumptions regarding the governance of this process:

- *Faculty Deans* will review/vet and approve concentrations in concept.
- The appropriate *Committee on Studies* will review all details associated with new concentrations including the description, the entrance requirements, degree pattern and progression and the content of individual courses to ensure overall quality and cohesion. This body has the authority to recommend revisions to any aspect of the academic offering to the Dean and to recommend approval of the academic offering to Senate.
- The *University Senate* will perform the final review of the recommendations of the Committee of Studies regarding new concentrations. The Senate will review all aspects of the offering with a focus on the strategic aspects of the offering. This body has the authority to request revisions to any aspect of the concentration to the Dean and to approve it.
- New or substantially changed programs require approval from the *Maritime Province Higher Education Council (MPHEC)* and may require approval from other *External Bodies* (e.g., the Department of Education).

### 5.3 RACI Matrix

	Key Stakeholders														Comments		
	Interested Parties	Departments (curriculum Committee)	Dean	University Librarian	Service Learning	COS, JCOOS or Alternate COS	Senate	Registrar	Recruiting	APP	AYP/Presidents Council	Faculties	Professional Staff	MPHEC		External reviewers	Other external /accrediting approval
<p>R = Responsible A = Accountable C = Consulted I = Informed</p> <p><b>Idea Generation.</b> Interested parties generate and develop an idea or concept for a new concentration and document in a standardized concept paper.</p>	R,A	C	C	I													
<p><b>Concept Review and Approval.</b> The concept is reviewed and vetted by the appropriate Dean to ensure it is aligned with the strategic academic priorities of the faculty and university. The Dean may approve, reject or request that interested parties update or enhance their proposal.</p>	R		A				I			I							
<p><b>Define details of new concentration.</b> The new concentration is defined in detail (new or modified course proposals, etc.).</p>	R,A	C	C	C	C	C		C									
<p><b>Detailed Review.</b> COS performs a detailed review of the new concentration and associated course details and approves or requests modification to the materials provided.</p>	R					R,A	I			I							Note that well in advance of this review, those responsible for developing the new offering should keep the COS apprised
<p><b>Develop Senate Package.</b> Upon approval by COS, a package will be prepared for Senate containing all minor details. The package will contain two documents 1) minor-level documentation and 2) Course details.</p>	R,A		C			C		C			I						A standard template will be created. This will assure appropriate level of detail for senate review.
<p><b>Senate Review and Approval.</b> Senate will perform the final review of the new concentration. Senators will be asked to focus attention on the overall concentration (vs. courses) for their review, but may review the course details at their discretion.</p>			R				R,A		I								

## 5.4 Activity Overview

The following are the primary activities associated with the process of developing new concentrations as presented in the RACI Matrix.

1. *Idea Generation.* Interested parties generate and develop an idea or concept for a new concentration and document in a standardized concept paper.
2. *Concept Review and Approval.* The concept is reviewed and vetted by the appropriate Dean to ensure it is aligned with the strategic academic priorities of the faculty and university. The Dean may approve, reject or request that interested parties update or enhance their proposal.
3. *Define Details of New Concentration* The new concentration is defined in detail (new or modified course proposals, etc.)
4. *Detailed Review.* COS performs a detailed review of the new concentration and associated course details and approves or requests modification to the materials provided.
5. *Develop Senate Package.* Upon approval by COS, a package will be prepared for Senate containing all concentration details. The package will contain two documents 1) Concentration-level documentation and 2) Course details.
6. *Senate Review and Approval.* Senate will perform the final internal review of the new concentration. Senators will be asked to focus attention on concentration-level information for their review, but may review the course details at their discretion.

## 6 Minor

### 6.1 When does this process apply?

Departments, schools, and faculties are asked to follow this process when developing a new minor or proposing significant changes to existing minors. A minor is an academic offering comprised of a number of specified courses/course levels (minimum of 24 credits) in a secondary subject in addition to a declared major, advanced major or honours in a primary subject area. In this context, a 'subject' may be multi-disciplinary (e.g., Women and Gender Studies; Public Policy and Governance). Minors appear on academic transcripts.

Current examples include:

- Major in Philosophy with a Minor in History
- Major in English with a Minor in Biology
- Major in Biology with Minor in Chemistry
- Major in Earth Sciences with Minor in Development Studies

The following assumptions apply to the development of new minor:

- There are no significant financial or personnel implications associated with introducing a new minor.
- No MPHEC or other external approval is required.
- Deans (rather than APP) have the authority to approve minors at the concept stage.
- The introduction of a minor may require the creation of new courses.
- Existing minors should be reviewed to assure that they align with the criteria outlined in this process document.

### 6.2 Process Governance

The following are key assumptions regarding the governance of this process:

- *Faculty Deans* will review/vet and approve minors in concept.
- The appropriate *Committee on Studies* will review all details associated with new minors including the description, the entrance requirements, degree pattern and progression and the content of individual courses to ensure overall quality and cohesion. This body has the authority to recommend revisions to any aspect of the academic offering to the Dean and to recommend approval of the academic offering to Senate.
- The *University Senate* will perform the final review of the recommendations of the Committee of Studies regarding new minors. The Senate will review all aspects of the offering with a focus on the strategic aspects of the offering. This body has the authority to request revisions to any aspect of the concentration to the Dean and to approve it.

### 6.3 RACI Matrix

	Key Stakeholders														Comments		
	Interested Parties	Departments (curriculum Committee)	Dean	University Librarian	Service Learning	COS, JCOS or Alternate COS	Senate	Registrar	Recruiting	APP	AYP/Presidents Council	Faculties	Professional Staff	MPHEC		External reviewers	Other external /accrediting approval
<p>R = Responsible A = Accountable C = Consulted I = Informed</p> <p><b>Idea Generation.</b> Interested parties generate and develop an idea or concept for a new minor and document in a standardized concept paper.</p>	R,A	C	C	I													
<p><b>Concept Review and Approval.</b> The concept is reviewed and vetted by the appropriate Dean to ensure it is aligned with the strategic academic priorities of the faculty and university. The Dean may approve, reject or request that interested parties update or enhance their proposal.</p>	R		A				I			I							
<p><b>Define details of new minor.</b> The new minor is defined in detail (new or modified course proposals, etc.).</p>	R,A	C	C	C	C	C		C									
<p><b>Detailed Review.</b> COS performs a detailed review of the new minor and associated course details and approves or requests modification to the materials provided.</p>	R					R,A	I			I							Note that well in advance of this review, those responsible for developing the new offering should keep the COS apprised
<p><b>Develop Senate Package.</b> Upon approval by COS, a package will be prepared for Senate containing all minor details. The package will contain two documents 1) minor-level documentation and 2) Course details.</p>	R,A		C			C		C			I						A standard template will be created. This will assure appropriate level of detail for senate review.
<p><b>Senate Review and Approval.</b> Senate will perform the final review of the new minor. Senators will be asked to focus attention on minor-level information for their review, but may review the course details at their discretion.</p>			R				R,A	I									

## 6.4 Activity Overview

The following are the primary activities associated with the process of developing new minors as presented in the RACI Matrix.

1. *Idea Generation.* Interested parties generate and develop an idea or concept for a new minor and document in a standardized concept paper.
2. *Concept Review and Approval.* The concept is reviewed and vetted by the appropriate Dean to ensure it is aligned with the strategic academic priorities of the faculty and university. The Dean may approve, reject or request that interested parties update or enhance their proposal.
3. *Define Details of New Minor* The new minor is defined in detail (new or modified course proposals, etc.)
4. *Detailed Review.* COS performs a detailed review of the new minor and associated course details and approves or requests modification to the materials provided.
5. *Develop Senate Package.* Upon approval by COS, a package will be prepared for Senate containing all minor details. The package will contain two documents 1) Minor-level documentation and 2) Course details.
6. *Senate Review and Approval.* Senate will perform the final review of the new minor. Senators will be asked to focus attention on minor-level information for their review, but may review the course details at their discretion.

## 7 Certificate

### 7.1 When does this process apply?

Departments, schools, and faculties are asked to follow this process when developing a new certificate or proposing significant changes to existing certificates *that appear on academic transcripts*. Please note that certificates that do not appear on academic transcripts do not follow the process outlined in this section.

A certificate is an academic offering and qualification comprised of a number of specified courses/course levels, normally composed of approximately 30 credits, which is shorter than a degree or diploma.

Current examples include:

- Certificate in Elementary Mathematics Education
- Certificate in Outdoor Education

The following assumptions apply to the development of new certificate:

- There may be financial or personnel implications associated with introducing a new certificate
- MPHEC or other external approval may be required.
- Approvals may need to involve Deans, the APP committee and the President's Council.
- The introduction of a certificate may require the creation of new courses.
- Existing certificates should be reviewed to assure that they align with the criteria outlined in this process document.

### 7.2 Process Governance

The following are key assumptions regarding the governance of this process:

- *Faculty Deans* will review/vet and approve certificates in concept.
- The appropriate *Committee on Studies* will review all details associated with new certificates including the description, the entrance requirements, degree pattern and progression and the content of individual courses to ensure overall quality and cohesion. This body has the authority to recommend revisions to any aspect of the academic offering to the Dean and to recommend approval of the academic offering to Senate.
- The *University Senate* will perform the final review of the recommendations of the Committee of Studies regarding new certificates. The Senate will review all aspects of the offering with a focus on the strategic aspects of the offering. This body has the authority to request revisions to any aspect of the concentration to the Dean and to approve it.
- Certificates *may* require approval from the *Maritime Province Higher Education Council (MPHEC)* and may also require approval from other *External Bodies* (e.g., the Department of Education).

### 7.3 RACI Matrix

	Key Stakeholders														Comments		
	Interested Parties	Departments (curriculum)	Dean	University Librarian	Service Learning	COS, JCOS or Alternate COS	Senate	Registrar	Recruiting	APP	AVP/Presidents Council	Faculties	Professional Staff	MPHEC		External reviewers	Other external /accrediting
<b>Idea Generation.</b> Interested parties generate and develop an idea or concept for a new certificate and document in a standardized concept paper.	R,A	C	C	I													
<b>Concept Review and Approval.</b> The concept is reviewed and vetted by the appropriate Dean to ensure it is aligned with the strategic academic priorities of the faculty and university. The Dean may approve, reject or request that interested parties update or enhance their proposal.	R		A				I			I							
<b>Define details of new certificate.</b> The new certificate is defined in detail (new or modified course proposals, etc.).	R,A	C	C	C	C	C		C									
<b>Detailed Review.</b> COS performs a detailed review of the new certificate and associated course details and approves or requests modification to the materials provided.	R					R,A	I			I							Note that well in advance of this review, those responsible for developing the new certificate should keep the COS apprised of progress and define timelines and resources required for the review. For some certificates, we may need to consult with external bodies (e.g., Department of Education and Early Childhood Development).
<b>External Reviews.</b> For those certificates that require it, schedule and perform appropriate independent external review(s).	R,A														R		
<b>Develop Senate Package.</b> Upon approval by COS, a package will be prepared for Senate containing all certificate details. The package will contain two documents 1) certificate-level documentation and 2) Course details.	R,A		C			C		C			I						A standard template will be created. This will assure appropriate level of detail for senate review.
<b>Senate Review and Approval.</b> Senate will perform the final review of the new certificate. Senators will be asked to focus attention on information related to the overall certificate (vs. course details) for their review, but may review the course details at their discretion.			R			R,A		I									
<b>Perform External Reviews / Accreditations as Required.</b> Certain certificates may require review and accreditation by external bodies in addition to MPHEC.	R,A							I		I	I					R	
<b>MPHEC Review / Approval.</b>	R,A							I	I	I	I			R			



## 7.4 Activity Overview

The following are the primary activities associated with the process of developing new certificates as presented in the RACI Matrix.

1. *Idea Generation.* Interested parties generate and develop an idea or concept for a new certificate and document in a standardized concept paper.
2. *Concept Review and Approval.* The concept is reviewed and vetted by the appropriate Dean to ensure it is aligned with the strategic academic priorities of the faculty and university. The Dean may approve, reject or request that interested parties update or enhance their proposal.
3. *Define details of new certificate.* The new certificate is defined in detail (new or modified course proposals, etc.).
4. *Detailed Review.* COS performs a detailed review of the new certificate and associated course details and approves or requests modification to the materials provided.
5. *External Reviews.* For those certificates that require it, schedule and perform appropriate independent external review(s).
6. *Develop Senate Package.* Upon approval by COS, a package will be prepared for Senate containing all certificate details. The package will contain two documents 1) certificate-level documentation and 2) Course details.
7. *Senate Review and Approval.* Senate will perform the final review of the new certificate. Senators will be asked to focus attention on information related to the overall certificate (vs. course details) for their review, but may review the course details at their discretion.
8. *Perform External Reviews / Accreditations as Required.* Certain certificates may require review and accreditation by external bodies in addition to MPHEC.
9. *MPHEC Review / Approval.*

## 8 Colloquium

### 8.1 When does this process apply?

Departments, schools, and faculties are asked to follow this process when developing a new colloquium or proposing significant changes to existing colloquia. Normally a colloquium is a combination of three subject areas (totalling 18 credits) that addresses a common theme concurrently, offered in the first year of study to a cohort of students in dedicated course sections. The course composition of a given colloquium may change from year to year. A Colloquium appears on academic transcripts.

Current examples include:

- Humanities Colloquium (normally Philosophy 100, History 101/102, English 100)
- Social Justice Colloquium (normally Women and Gender Studies 100, Anthropology 111/112, History 111/112)

The following assumptions apply to the development of new colloquium:

- Normally, there are no significant financial implications associated with introducing a new colloquium.
- No MPHEC or other external approval is required.
- Deans (rather than APP) have the authority to approve colloquia at the concept stage.
- The introduction of a colloquium may require the creation of dedicated sections of existing courses, which may have personnel implications.

### 8.2 Process Governance

The following are key assumptions regarding the governance of this process:

- *Faculty Deans* will review/vet and approve colloquia in concept.
- The appropriate *Committee on Studies* will review all details associated with new colloquia including the description, the entrance requirements, degree pattern and progression and the content of individual courses to ensure overall quality and cohesion. This body has the authority to recommend revisions to any aspect of the academic offering to the Dean and to recommend approval of the academic offering to Senate.
- The *University Senate* will perform the final review of the recommendations of the Committee of Studies regarding new colloquia. The Senate will review all aspects of the offering with a focus on the strategic aspects of the offering. This body has the authority to request revisions to any aspect of the colloquia to the Dean and to approve them.

### 8.3 RACI Matrix

	Key Stakeholders														Comments		
	Interested Parties	Departments (curriculum Committee)	Dean	University Librarian	Service Learning	COS, JCOOS or Alternate COS	Senate	Registrar	Recruiting	APP	APP/Presidents Council	Faculties	Professional Staff	MPHEC		External reviewers	Other external /accrediting approval
<p>R = Responsible A = Accountable C = Consulted I = Informed</p> <p><b>Idea Generation.</b> Interested parties generate and develop an idea or concept for a new colloquium and document in a standardized concept paper.</p>	R,A	C	C	I													
<p><b>Concept Review and Approval.</b> The concept is reviewed and vetted by the appropriate Dean to ensure it is aligned with the strategic academic priorities of the faculty and university. The Dean may approve, reject or request that interested parties update or enhance their proposal.</p>	R		A				I			I							
<p><b>Define details of new colloquium.</b> The new colloquium is defined in detail (themes, courses to be leveraged, etc.)</p>	R,A	C	C	C	C	C		C									
<p><b>Detailed Review.</b> COS performs a detailed review of the new colloquium and approves or requests modification to the materials provided.</p>	R					R,A	I			I							Note that well in advance of this review, those responsible for developing the new offering
<p><b>Develop Senate Package.</b> Upon approval by COS, a package will be prepared for Senate containing all colloquium details.</p>	R,A		C			C		C			I						A standard template will be created. This will assure appropriate level of detail for senate review.
<p><b>Senate Review and Approval.</b> Senate will perform the final review of the new colloquium.</p>			R				R,A	I									

## 8.4 Activity Overview

The following are the primary activities associated with the process of developing new colloquia as presented in the RACI Matrix.

1. *Idea Generation.* Interested parties generate and develop an idea or concept for a new colloquium and document in a standardized concept paper.
2. *Concept Review and Approval.* The concept is reviewed and vetted by the appropriate Dean to ensure it is aligned with the strategic academic priorities of the faculty and university. The Dean may approve, reject or request that interested parties update or enhance their proposal.
3. *Define details of new colloquium.* The new colloquium is defined in detail (themes, courses to be leveraged, etc.)
4. *Detailed Review.* COS performs a detailed review of the new colloquium and approves or requests modification to the materials provided.
5. *Develop Senate Package.* Upon approval by COS, a package will be prepared for Senate containing all colloquium details.
6. *Senate Review and Approval.* Senate will perform the final review of the new colloquium.