1. Call to Order ........................................................................................................... Alan Davis

2. Confirmation of Agenda

3. Approval of Minutes (September 24, 2012)

4. Business Arising from the Minutes

5. Chair’s Report ........................................................................................................... Alan Davis

6. Senate Standing Committee on Curriculum ......................................................... Dana Cserepes
   6.1. Program Revision: Business Administration Diploma

7. Senate Executive Committee .................................................................................... Alan Davis
   7.1. Qualifications for Faculty Members – Department of Psychology

8. Senate Standing Committee on the University Budget (No Report) ....................... Marc Kampschuur

9. Board Senate Task Force on Bi-Cameral Governance (No Report) ....................... Task Force Member(s)

10. Senate Governance Committee ............................................................................. Wade Deisman
    10.1. Senate Bylaws Revision – Bylaw 2.04, 2.12.2

11. Senate Nominating Committee ............................................................................. Mary Androsiuk

12. Senate Standing Committee on Academic Planning & Priorities ......................... Robert Wood

13. Senate Standing Committee on the Library ........................................................... Robert Wood
    13.1. Approval of Committee Chair

14. Senate Standing Committee on Policy Articulation ................................................. Bob Davis
    14.1. Approval of Committee Chair
    14.2. 2013/2014 Academic Schedule
    14.3. Summer Session

15. Senate Standing Committee on Program Review .................................................. Mary Androsiuk

16. Senate Standing Committee on Tributes .................................................................. Christine Crowe

17. Approval of Graduates ......................................................................................... Robert Hensley

18. Dean’s Honour Roll (For Information) ................................................................. Robert Hensley

19. Items for Discussion ............................................................................................... Alan Davis
19.1. Board Procedures as Final Appeal Board – Non-academic Misconduct

20. For Information

20.1. Baccalaureate Registered Nurse Program Review

21. Next Meeting: November 26, 2012, 4:00pm – 7:00 pm, Surrey Campus

22. Adjournment
Issue: Approval of the Minutes of the September 24, 2012 Regular Senate meeting.

For Approval: THAT Senate approve the Minutes of the September 24, 2012 Regular Senate meeting.
1. **Call to order**
   The meeting was called to order at 4:00pm.
   Journalists from the Runner were present and recorded the meeting for the purpose of accuracy of reporting, not for further distribution.

2. **Confirmation of Agenda**

   Moved by Robert Wood, seconded by Christopher Girodat:
   THAT the agenda be confirmed with the following revisions:
   - Addition of Item 5.1 Associate Dean of Arts, Advisory Search Committee
   - Revise program title in Item 6.1 to FPP: Bachelor of Science, Major in Applications of Mathematics

   MOTION CARRIED

3. **Approval of Minutes (June 25, 2012)**

   Moved by Chris Girodat, seconded by Wendy Royal:
   THAT the minutes of the June 25, 2012 Regular Senate meeting be approved with minor revisions.

   MOTION CARRIED
4. Business Arising from the Minutes

4.1 Access Copyright Agreement (Notice of Motion Christopher Girodat / June 25, 2012)
Senate discussed the need to be proactive in determining the appropriate steps to ensure the institution moves forward in a fair and considered manner, respecting the academic rights and freedoms of faculty and students, and the right to fair compensation for authors.

The President reported that Kwantlen has opted out of the Access Copyright license renewal.

The University Librarian reported that a number of plans are in development at Kwantlen including introductory information sessions in October, a website maintained by the Library, advising the Bookstore regarding course ‘paks’, and developing a better understanding of copyright rules in general.

Moved by Christopher Girodat, seconded by Kari Michaels:
THAT the Senate Governance Committee be directed to develop the composition and terms of reference of a working group or task force on copyright modernization and communication, and to report back to senate with recommendations no later than November 26, 2012.

MOTION CARRIED
Abstained: Alan Davis

4.2 President’s Follow-up to the June 25, 2012 Senate Meeting
The President responded to issues raised at the previous meeting:

Associate Vice President, International Education Position
Selection Committee:
• There are no support staff members on the selection committee
• 1 student member from the President’s Ambassadors Team (PAT) was chosen based on their level of understanding of the University.
• 2 faculty members were on the original selection committee, 1 remains. The second member could not continue due to scheduling.

Budget:
• The position was not listed in the original 2012/2013 budget, and has since been added.

Centre for Academic Growth / Creation of a New Teaching & Learning Centre
Timelines:
There is no new Teaching & Learning Centre at this time. A new administrator is required to lead that. A position description is in development and a firm will be hired to conduct a search. Senate and other appropriate bodies will be consulted when establishing the Advisory Search Committee.

Senate requested ongoing information and consultation when appropriate, regarding both issues.

ACTION: Jane Fee and Gordon Lee to bring forward information to SSCAPP, and to update Senate.
ACTION: Alan Davis to report to Senate on the status of both issues by the next Senate meeting.
5. **Chair's Report**

The Chair will provide regular reports to Senate. The reports will summarize both the President’s activities and activities within the University.

The Strategic Plan is targeted for Board of Governors final approval by June 2013. To facilitate an inclusive and open process, a webpage is planned and members of the Kwantlen community are encouraged to provide suggestions and comments.

5.1 **Associate Dean of Arts Advisory Search Committee**

Moved by Dana Cserepes, seconded by George Verghese:

THAT Senate appoint the following individuals as members of the Associate Dean, Faculty of Arts, Advisory Search Committee:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sibeal Foyle</td>
<td>Faculty, Fine Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billeh Nickerson</td>
<td>Faculty, Creative Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey Shantz</td>
<td>Faculty, Criminology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Button</td>
<td>Student, Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christina Fung</td>
<td>Professional Support Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Haggith</td>
<td>Associate Dean, Faculty of Academic &amp; Career</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advancement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MOTION CARRIED

6. **Senate Standing Committee on Curriculum**

Due to scheduling issues, the committee Chair responsibilities will be shared between Tally Wade and Dana Cserepes for the Fall 2012 term.

6.1 **Full Program Proposal: Bachelor of Science, Major in Application of Mathematics**

Lin Hamill and Allyson Rozell, Faculty of Science and Horticulture attended to answer questions.

Moved by Dana Cserepes, seconded by Chris Girodat:

THAT Senate approve the Full Program Proposal for a Bachelor of Science, Major in Applications of Mathematics.

MOTION CARRIED

6.2 **Trades & Technology Math Admission Requirements**

In June 2012, the Assessment and Learning in Knowledge Spaces (ALEKS) testing scores were revised which changed the numerical scoring of the test, but not the percentage required for admission. The 2012/2013 calendar will be updated to reflect percentage scoring only.

For information only.

6.3 **Credit Changes to Community & Health Studies (CAHS) Courses as a Result of Credit Calculator Correction**

A systems error within the Lotus Notes Course Outline template, in the Teaching Modes table, incorrectly assigned course credits in the Reality Learning Environment section (Mode 20). As a result, some clinical courses in CAHS programs were affected and have since been corrected.

For information only.
7. Senate Executive Committee
The following items were discussed at the September 11, 2012 SEC meeting:
1. Approval of the Minutes of June 4, 2012
2. Draft Senate Agenda September 24, 2012
3. Notice of Motion re: Access Copyright

8. Senate Standing Committee on the University Budget
The committee Chair provided an update on revisions to the 2013/2014 budget review process.
Highlights:
- Faculty and Service Area budget documents will be submitted prior to presentations, which will be held in an open forum
- SSCUB to receive budget presentations at the same time as administration
- One set of presentations for both administration and SSCUB
- Timelines to avoid conflicts with term end/startup, and to allow more time for SSCUB review prior to Senate

9. Board Senate Task Force on Bi-cameral Governance

9.1 Protocol for Policy Development Process

Moved by Dana Cserepes, seconded by Wade Deisman:
THAT Senate approve the revisions to the procedures of Policy E4, Protocol for the Development of University Policies & Procedures, including a revised policy development or amendment process for academic and administrative policies.

MOTION CARRIED

ACTION: University Secretary to add sections/numbering to the policy
ACTION: University Secretary to add the term University Officer to definitions

9.2 Principles to Guide the Development of a Successful Model of Bi-cameral Governance at Kwantlen Polytechnic University

Moved by Dana Cserepes, seconded by Wade Deisman:
THAT Senate approve the Principles to Guide the Development of a Successful Model of Bi-cameral Governance at Kwantlen Polytechnic University.

MOTION CARRIED

ACTION: University Secretary to update document numbering

10. Senate Governance Committee

10.1 Revisions to Faculty of Arts Bylaws 1-66

Moved by Diane Purvey, seconded by Dana Cserepes:
THAT Senate approve amendments to the Faculty of Arts Bylaws 1-66.

MOTION CARRIED
10.2 Ratification of Faculty of Arts Bylaws 67-91
Moved by Kari Michaels, seconded by Chris Girodat:
THAT Senate approve the Faculty of Arts Bylaws 67-91.

10.3 Revision to Senate Bylaw 2.04
Notice of Motion was served for the October 29, 2012 Senate meeting.

10.4 New Senate Bylaw – Extension of Meeting Times (2.12)
Notice of Motion was served for the October 29, 2012 Senate meeting.

10.5 Revisions to the Election Rules
Three revisions to the Election Rules were presented.

Moved by Chris Girodat, seconded by Henry Reiser:
THAT Senate approve revisions to the Election Rules.

MOTION CARRIED

ACTION: Dana Cserepes to clarify length of term for Chairs of Senate Standing Committees

11. Senate Nominating Committee (no report)

12. Senate Standing Committee on Academic Planning & Priorities

12.1 Senate Standing Committee on Academic Planning & Priorities Chair

Moved by Kari Michaels, seconded by Jared Penland:
THAT Senate approve Robert Wood as the Chair of the Senate Standing Committee on Academic Planning & Priorities.

MOTION CARRIED

13. Senate Standing Committee on the Library (no report)

14. Senate Standing Committee on Policy Articulation (no report)

15. Senate Standing Committee on Program Review
Revision to the written report – the Faculty of Science & Horticulture Program Review is in progress.

15.1 Senate Standing Committee on Program Review Chair

Moved by Dana Cserepes, seconded by Wayne Tebb:
THAT Senate approve Mary Androsiuk as the Chair of the Senate Standing Committee on Program Review.

MOTION CARRIED

16. Senate Standing Committee on Tributes (no report)
Senators are reminded that the deadline for teaching awards is November and that application forms are available online.
17. Approval of Graduates to September 24, 2012

Added:

**Associate of Arts Degree in Psychology**
Saadia Ghani Sheikh

**Bachelor of Arts, Double Minor in Philosophy and Political Science**
Thomas Antony Falcone

**Certificate in Special Education Teaching Assistant**
Nancy He, with Distinction

Moved by Dana Cserepes, seconded by George Verghese:

THAT Senate approve the Graduates to September 24, 2012

MOTION CARRIED

18. Items for Discussion

- Senator Kari Michaels will be on the list of Graduates for the October 4th ceremony.

19. Next Meeting: October 29, 2012, 4:00pm – 7:00pm, Surrey Campus

20. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:31 pm.
Issue: Senate Standing Committee on Curriculum

For Information: The Senate Standing Committee on Curriculum met on October 3, 2012

The committee approved revisions to the following:

- Business Administration Diploma

The committee received the list of electives for the Bachelor of Design in Product Design. This list will be passed onto the Office of the Registrar.
Issue: Program Revision: Business Administration Diploma

For Information: At its September 5, 2012 meeting the Senate Standing Committee on Curriculum recommended the revisions to the Business Administration Diploma for Senate's approval.

Attached: Revised course listing for the Business Administration Diploma

For Approval: THAT Senate approve the revision to the required courses for the Business Administration Diploma.
DATE: October 29, 2012
TO: Senate
FROM: David Wiens, Chair School of Business Curriculum Committee
RE: Revision of Business Administration Diploma program

We are seeking approval for the revision of the Business Administration Diploma program. The proposed implementation date for this program change is January 1, 2013 and will cause no detriment to students in the program.

This program change has previously been approved by the School of Business Curriculum Committee at the June 8, 2012 meeting, Faculty Council at the June 22, 2012 meeting and SSCC at the September 5, 2012 meeting.

**Business Administration Diploma Program Change**

Revision requested: We are asking for approval of the addition of the BUQU 1230 as an alternative to MATH 2341 in the Business Administration Diploma program.

**Rationale and Support**

BUQU 1230 is the recommended course for the KPU BBA programs. Adding BUQU 1230 as an alternative to MATH 2341 would help those students who choose to continue their education at Kwantlen. Also the Business Administration Diploma Program was created at a time when KPU didn’t have its own degree programs. Therefore, the program was aligned with the first two years of the SFU’s Business Administration program; therefore, MATH 2341 was chosen as the Business Statistics requirements.

**Impact on Students**

Adding BUQU 1230 as an alternative to MATH 2341 will provide students with more options. Moreover, this information will be disseminated to all students via the academic calendar – not just to those students who happen to ask- or to be told by a business advisor.

**Implementation Date**

We are seeking an implementation date of January 2013.
The diploma requires the following courses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Group A** | ACCT 1110 Principles of Accounting I  
ACCT 1210 Principles of Accounting II  
OR  
ACCT 2293 Intro. to Financial Accounting |
| **Group B** - All of: | ACCT 3320 Introductory Management Accounting  
BUSI 1215 Organizational Behaviour I  
CBSY 2205 Computers and Information Processing  
ECON 1150 Principles of Microeconomics  
ECON 1250 Principles of Macroeconomics  
ECON 2350 Intermediate Microeconomics  
ENGL 1100 Writing, Reading and Thinking: An Introduction  
MATH 1140 Calculus I (Business Applications) Note: MATH 1120 or MATH 1130 can be substituted for MATH 1140  
MATH 2341 Introduction to Statistics for Business |
| **Group C** - One of: | ECON 2208 History of Economic Thought  
ECON 2210 Money and Banking  
ECON 2260 Environmental Economics  
ECON 2280 Labour Economics  
ECON 2255 Globalization in an Economic Framework |
| **Group D** - One of: | ENGL 1202 Reading and Writing about Selected Topics: An Introduction to Literature  
PHIL 1100 Introduction to Philosophy  
PHIL 1110 Confronting Moral Issues: Ethics  
PHIL 1145 Critical Thinking |

Note: Students wishing to transfer BUQU 1230 to SFU should consult an SFU advisor.
SENATE

MEETING DATE: October 29, 2012
AGENDA #: 7.1
PRESENTED BY: Alan Davis

Issue: Change of Qualifications for Faculty Members – Psychology

For Information: The Senate Executive Committee (SEC) considered the request to revise the faculty qualifications for the Psychology Department at its October 16, 2012 meeting. The Committee recommended the revisions to Senate for approval pending approval of the Faculty of Arts Faculty Council, as per the policy, Qualifications for Faculty Members (G7). Subsequent to the SEC meeting, the Faculty of Arts Faculty Council met on October 19, 2012 and approved the change to faculty qualifications for Psychology as recommended unanimously by the Psychology Department at their February 2012 meeting. For reference, please link to the policy, Qualifications for Faculty Members (G7) and the related procedures.

For Approval: THAT Senate approve changes to faculty qualifications for the Department of Psychology from “PhD Required” to “PhD in Psychology or an area approved by the Psychology Department”.
SENATE
MEETING DATE: October 29, 2012
AGENDA #: 10
PRESENTED BY: Wade Deisman

Issue: Senate Governance Committee

For Information: The Committee met on Monday, October 1st and addressed the following items:

1. In regard to the work involved in constituting the Task Force on Copyright Modernization, in its initial round of discussion on this item, the committee made note of some of the vagaries and jurisdictional complexities in regard to questions of scope, mandate and membership. Sensing that some of the trouble may stem from the grandiosity of a term like ‘modernization’, it was agreed that what is really required is more in the nature of a needs assessment which would explore the applicability and appropriateness of the two dominant approaches to protecting intellectual and creative property. The Committee has asked Todd Mundle to attend the next meeting to get input and feedback regarding terms of reference.

2. Regarding the question of audio recording at Senate meetings - the Committee has been intent to canvas practices at other institutions. Sandi Klassen sent out a solicitation for information in this regard and we have had quite a few responses back. I will be meeting with Dr. Davis in the weeks ahead to discuss the process of webcasting at Empire State. I will also be meeting with Sandi Klassen and Shelley Wrean for a more in-depth discussion of some of the legal issues that may be in play.

3. The Committee also discussed the issue of the review of the Senate standing committee’s mandates and memberships. The processes associated with the review ground to a halt last year, with the outcome that several much needed changes were never approved. The review process will be restarted shortly. All Senate committee’s will receive a copy of the changes being proposed to the membership and/or modifications to their mandate – and additional input, feedback and suggestion will be sought. The review process will be overseen by the Governance committee itself. The overall time frame for the revisions package coming to Senate is likely to be January.

4. The Committee also discussed the issue of the removal of the time release from the Senate Vice-Chair – and explored larger questions around the time commitments and expectations associated with serving as a committee chair. Concerns were voiced about continuity across committees and the loss of a significant part of the Senate budget for the operationalization of committee work. I will be following up on this issue with the President in the few next weeks.
Issue: Revision to Senate Bylaw 2.04, 2.12.2

For Information: The Senate Governance Committee reviewed Senate Bylaw 2.04 at its September 10, 2012 meeting and recommended revisions to Senate for approval.

Revision to Existing:
2.04: A simple majority of members present and voting is required to carry a motion.

It currently reads:
2.04 A simple majority of the voting members present is required to carry a motion.

Bylaw 2.12.2 would also require revision as it relates to the revision to Bylaw 2.04.

Revision to Existing:
2.12.2: Voting at a subsequent Senate meeting with a two-thirds majority vote of those present and voting; and

It currently reads:
2.12.2: Voting at a subsequent Senate meeting with a two-thirds majority vote of those present; and

Rationale for Revision:
As the Bylaw currently reads, if a member wishes to abstain, their vote is counted in the negative (voting members present). Therefore they are unable to remain neutral on the subject at hand by abstaining, which is their intent. If a majority is based on the number of people voting (and not on the voting members present), then an abstention allows the member to remain neutral in the matter being voted on. Robert’s Rules recommends the wording “present and voting”.

A Notice of Motion was given at the September 24, 2012 Senate meeting.

Attached: Senate Bylaws with revisions

For Approval: THAT Senate approve the revisions to Senate Bylaws 2.04 and 2.12.2.
SENATE BYLAWS
(Revised October 6, 2008
Revised January 30, 2012
Revised June 25, 2012)

1. Terms and Conditions of Membership on Senate

1.01 Members of Senate, in their function as members of this body, do not act as
delegates of the bodies or constituencies from which they were drawn; rather, as
members, all must endeavour to serve the interest of the entire University to the
best of their ability.

1.02 The terms and office for voting members shall be consistent with the University Act.

1.03 Faculty, professional support staff, and student elections for Senate will be held in
the Spring semester each year.

1.04 The term of each elected faculty, staff, or student or appointed member shall
normally begin on September 1.

1.05 An elected member may resign from the Senate by giving the Chair notice in writing.

1.06 The seat of a member who leaves the constituency from which that member has
been elected shall be declared vacant.

1.07 Any member who will be absent from a meeting will notify the University Secretariat
prior to the meeting.

1.07.1 Voting by alternates is not permitted.

1.08 The seat of any elected member who fails to attend three meetings of Senate
between September 1 and August 31 may be declared vacant by the Chair.

1.09 In the event a seat of an elected member becomes vacant it shall be filled by the
candidate who received the most votes among those who were nominated but not
elected in the most recent election. In the event the seat was filled by acclamation,
the following steps will occur. If the seat is declared vacant between the months of
February and September, a by-election will take place in the fall to find a
replacement. If the seat is declared vacant between the months of October and
January and the remainder of the term is less than one year in length, a regular
election will occur in the spring and the outstanding months remaining on the
vacant term will be added to term of office for the seat up for election. If all the
seats in a given constituency are acclaimed, a random selection from the acclaimed
candidates will occur to assign the remaining term of office. If more than one seat is
being elected in this grouping, then the candidate who receives the most votes will
be awarded the extended term of office. If the remainder of the term is more than
one year, a by-election will occur.

1.10 Members of Senate shall commit to serving on a minimum number of its
committees, as set from time to time by Senate.
2. Operational Procedures of the Senate

2.01 All proceedings of the Senate shall be governed by the most recent revision of Robert’s Rules of Order, except as otherwise provided.

2.02 A quorum of the Senate shall consist of 50 percent plus one of the voting members.

2.03 Any business conducted at a meeting (regular or otherwise) where there is no quorum present will be considered as unofficial and subject to ratification at the next meeting held where a quorum is present. Any communication coming out of a meeting where no quorum was present shall be prefaced with a clear indication the communication is subject to ratification.

2.03.1 While this provision covers a meeting called knowing there will likely be no quorum, it is possible for a regular meeting without a quorum to continue under this same provision, providing all members present are in agreement.

2.04 A simple majority of the voting members present and voting is required to carry a motion.

2.05 The Senate shall establish such committees, consisting of members or non-members, as the Senate from time to time may think fit and may specify the duties to be performed by such committees. Committees of the Senate may not assume any of the powers of the Senate and are restricted to making recommendations to the Senate unless otherwise tasked by Senate.

2.06 Members of the Kwantlen Polytechnic University community shall be encouraged to attend and observe meetings of the Senate. Observers will have no speaking or voting privileges.

2.07 From time to time the Senate may invite guests to make presentations to Senate meetings and to answer questions related to their presentations.

2.08 If a topic on the agenda contains material of a private or confidential nature, the Senate will have the right to close to observers that portion of the meeting in which that topic is discussed.

2.09 The Senate may hold such additional special meetings as are deemed necessary by the Senate or Executive Committee after serving notice of not fewer than five working days to Senate members.

2.10 A proposed agenda and supporting material for any meeting shall be circulated to Senate members not fewer than two working days prior to any meetings.

2.11 Approved minutes of the Senate will be made public and readily accessible.

2.12 Senate bylaws may be amended by:

2.12.1 Giving notice of a motion to amend bylaws at a Senate Meeting;
2.12.2 Voting at a subsequent Senate meeting with a two-thirds majority vote of those present and voting; and

2.12.3 Fulfilling any other legislated requirements.

3. Conflict of Interest

3.01 A conflict of interest arises when a Senate member’s private interests supersede or compete with his or her dedication to the interests of the University. This could arise from a real, potential, or apparent conflict of interest for a Senate member or related persons and may be financial or otherwise. For this purpose:

3.01.1 A ‘real conflict of interest’ occurs when a Senate member exercises an official power or performs an official duty or function and at the same time, knows that in the performance of this duty or function or in the exercise of power there is the opportunity to further a private interest.

3.01.2 A ‘potential conflict of interest’ occurs when there exists some private interest that could influence the performance of a member’s duty or function or in the exercise of power provided that he or she has not yet exercised that duty or function.

3.01.3 An ‘apparent conflict of interest’ exists when there is a reasonable apprehension which reasonably well-informed persons could properly have that a Real Conflict of Interest exists on the part of the member.

3.02 Senate members must arrange their private affairs and conduct themselves in a manner to avoid conflict of interest. In cases where conflict cannot be avoided, a Senate member has an obligation to declare a conflict of interest prior to discussion or decision of an issue. Upon declaration of a conflict the person recording the events of the meeting should duly note the declaration and the Senate member must refrain from discussion or voting on that particular matter, contract or arrangement.

3.03 Where a Senate member is unsure whether he or she is in conflict, that member should raise the perceived potential conflict with the Senate, and the Senate should determine by majority vote whether or not a conflict of interest exists. The member perceived to be in conflict should refrain from voting on the issues. Where a conflict of interest is discovered after consideration of a matter, the conflict must be declared to the Senate and appropriately recorded at first opportunity. If the Senate determines that involvement of said member influenced the decision of the matter, the Senate shall re-examine the matter and may rescind, vary, or confirm its decision.

3.04 Any Senate member who perceives another member to be in conflict of interest in a matter under consideration must identify the perceived conflict to the Senate at the first opportunity. The Senate should determine by majority vote whether or not a conflict of interest exists and the member perceived to be in conflict should refrain from voting.
3.05 At its discretion, the Senate may invite the member in conflict to state his or her position on the issue in question prior to absenting himself or herself.
4. **Vice Chairs**

4.01 Each year at the April meeting, voting members of the Senate will elect a Vice Chair from within the Senate’s voting membership.

4.02 The Vice-Chair will fulfill the duties of the Chair in the Chair’s absence and will assist in the performance of the Chair’s duties.
SENATE

MEETING DATE: October 29, 2012
AGENDA #: 11
PREPARED BY: Mary Androsiuk

Issue: Approval of new members of Senate Standing Committees

For Information: At its September 29, 2012 meeting, the Senate Nominating Committee made the following recommendations for membership to Senate Standing Committees:

For Approval: The Senate Nominating Committee recommends that Senate approve the following as members of Senate Standing Committees:

Senate Executive Committee
  • Wayne Tebb, Faculty of Business, Dean

Senate Governance Committee
  • Henry Reiser, Faculty of Trades and Technology, Dean

Senate Standing Committee on the University Budget
  • Wayne Tebb, Faculty of Business, Dean
  • Seema Ahluwalia, Faculty of Arts, faculty

Senate Standing Committee on Policy Articulation
  • Betty Cunnin, Faculty of Science and Horticulture, faculty

Senate Standing Committee on Curriculum
  • Carolyn Robertson, Faculty of Community and Health Studies, Associate Dean

Senate Task Force on Academic Rank and Advancement
  • Kevin Hamilton, Faculty of Arts, faculty
  • Heather Hamilton, Faculty of Arts, faculty
1. **September 14<sup>th</sup>, 2012.**

Following adoption of the agenda and approval of previous minutes, the election for a chairperson was held. Robert Wood was elected and subsequently endorsed by the September meeting of Senate on September 22<sup>nd</sup>. A discussion followed about the further development of AP & P Priorities. It was determined that with the 2013/2014 Budgeting process already under way it was not feasible to consider any amendments to the existing list for this budget cycle. It was agreed that to be effective in advising the budget process priorities must be available by the end of the Spring semester for consideration in the budget cycle which begins in the fall of the same year. It was agreed that the chair would develop a preliminary draft schedule for the development of the 2014/2015 priorities. In addition it was agreed that it was necessary to develop a process to involve Faculty Councils in the development of AP&P Priorities. These two items are to be discussed at the October 12<sup>th</sup> meeting.

After a brief discussion on the current activity related to Strategic Planning and an update on research and Scholarship activity, the question of committee composition and voting privileges was held. At the conclusion of the discussion it was agreed that a request for the current status of SSC Governance review of our previous request should be made to determine our next steps in this matter.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:15 AM.

Editorial addition: As not all members of Senate may be aware of the work undertaken last spring to enhance the previous definition of priorities, two documents are attached. First is the memo to the AP&P meeting of June 15th summarizing the results of the three questions posed to Faculty Councils earlier. The three questions that were put to Faculty Councils were:

- What are the top three priorities (as defined at the end of 2010 by AP&P) for your Faculty?
What should be the top three priorities for the University?

What should the top three priorities be for Kwantlen to be a Polytechnic University?

In addition to the memo, there is a spreadsheet outlining the scores provided in feedback and a copy of the original priority document to which the questions related.

In summary, the top three overall were:

a) Knowledge and Skills Development

b) Enhanced Student Experience

c) Growth of Innovation and Application.

2. **October 12th, 2012.**

The first item following the usual administrative items at the beginning of the meeting was a presentation by Ariana Arguello of the institutional Strategic Planning exercise which was recently begun. As there has been a number of announcements through Kwantlen email and other media and there is adequate material available for perusal by members of the Kwantlen community I will not elaborate further at this time. Suffice to conclude by saying that I believe we are encouraged by the pulse of activity to date and the inclusive nature of the process. Following the discussion of Strategic planning the Provost provided a short overview of his current thinking as to the development of an Academic plan which logically is driven by the Institutional Strategic Plan, and naturally informs the development of Academic Priorities from AP & P.

The meeting then discussed the proposed schedule for the development of the priorities for the 2014/2015 Budget. The draft outline distributed prior to the meeting was reviewed and in conclusion the following was agreed to:

1. At our November 9th AP&P meeting a workshop will be held to confirm both the schedule and process for developing AP&P Priorities. This workshop will involve AP&P members and a member of each Faculty Council and a member from the Faculty without a Faculty community.

2. Depending on the availability of the draft goals and strategies from the Strategic Planning Task Force project, we will produce a draft list of priorities for review by Faculty Council and AP&P in either the March/April time frame.

3. It is our intention to complete a list of priorities and present them to Senate for ratification no later than the June 24th, 2013 meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:20 AM.
To: Senate AP & P Committee
CC:
From: Robert Wood
Date: 10/23/2012
Re: Ranking of Academic Priorities

Attached to this memo are two spreadsheets* which summarize the ranking recently completed by six of the seven Faculties as well as two support areas (Student Life and Strategic Enrollment).

In preparing this analysis the following judgments were made in respect of the feedback received.

1. Academic and Career Advancement stated that their third priority for question 1 was: “Support for Education and Business Technologies (themes D+F+G)”. As there was no mechanism in the analysis to include three themes, theme F was chosen.

2. New Priorities were added for the School of Business (all three questions) and Academic and Career Advancement (Question 2).

Total Scores were calculated by assigning values of 3 to priority 1, 2 to priority 2 and 1 to priority 3. The overall position of the Priority themes was then determined from these scores.

Sheet 1 includes the ranking received from the academic faculties only. Sheet 2 adds in the scores for the Student Life and Strategic Enrollment support areas that were received. Explanatory notes are included.

Summarizing the results from sheet 1, the first priority overall to each question is theme A – Knowledge and Skills Development. Priority 2 for each question is theme F – Growth of Innovation and Application. Priority 3 for the first two questions is theme B- Improved Student Experience, while for question 3 it is a new priority – “Fund Programs to Meet Market Demand.”

Thank you.

Robert Wood, MBA
604-618-9160

*for Senate purposes, only one spreadsheet has been attached.*
### Senate AP & P Priorities - Ranking by Faculties and Support Areas.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Trades &amp; Technology</th>
<th>ACA</th>
<th>CMHS</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>School of Business</th>
<th>Science &amp; Horticulture</th>
<th>Student Life</th>
<th>Strategic Enrollment</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Trades &amp; Technology</th>
<th>ACA</th>
<th>CMHS</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>School of Business</th>
<th>Science &amp; Horticulture</th>
<th>Student Life</th>
<th>Strategic Enrollment</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Knowledge and Skills Development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Improved Student Experience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Quality Improvement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1**</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Increased Enrolments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1**</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3**</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2**</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Improved Collegial &amp; Supportive Working Environment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Growth of Innovation and Application</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2**</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5**</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Improved Infrastructure</td>
<td>2**</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3**</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Community Engagement and Outreach</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Priorities**

- Fund Programs to meet market demand: 1 3 5 1 3 6 1 3 6 3 6
- Provide Leaner Support that facilitates success by polytechnic Students: 2 2 6 2 2 9 2 2 7
- Attract, develop and retain faculty capable of delivering on priorities 1 and 2: 3 1 9 3 1 11 3 1 9
- Increase Developmental Education FTE's to meet ministry targets: 3 6

**Agenda item 5 AP & P Meeting June 15th, 2012**

* Improve technology Infrastructure
** Increased International enrollments
*** Improved Student Information System - Banner
**** Priority 3 Stated "Financial Aid and Award leveraging.

Please note that Question 1 hash total is one less than Questions 2 and 3 because SEM’s third priority could not be assigned.
SENATE
MEETING DATE: October 29, 2012
AGENDA #: 13
PRESENTED BY: Robert Wood

**Issue:** Senate Standing Committee on the Library

**For Information:** This report covers the meeting on September 26th, 2012.

The meeting began at 10:20 AM with motions to accept the Agenda and minutes of the February 16th, 2012 meeting.

The next item of business was the election of Robert Wood as chair, pending ratification by Senate.

The following items were reviewed through reports from the University Librarian.

1. New Library guides will be in place very soon for all subject areas. If any previously available links are not reflected in the new scheme, a librarian should be contacted to report the missing link. This change has been adopted because of the flexibility of the new system and the ease with which changes can be made.

2. Resourcing the Reference desk is being reviewed. Some of the responsibilities of the reference desk personnel may be reallocated and the use of the “Ask AWAY” service is being considered to provide additional support.

3. A PD grant was obtained to permit research into the availability of an online tutorial on plagiarism. The project is underway.

4. A small amount of work was completed in the summer on the Langley Library renovation. It is hoped that the remaining work including the delivery of new desks and other furniture will be completed in the fall. It is hoped that within a year the floor of the library will be recovered.

5. The Learning centre is now reporting to the library. A process for combining services is being looked at to ensure that best practices are being followed and that services for students are top notch.

6. There are a number of new digital resources available: Oxford Music on Line, Science on Line, Canadian Publisher Collection, DMTI (used for GIS applications), Films on Demand – and a streaming video service in Trades and Social Sciences (replaces older
video cassette series.)

7. Copyright – this has been taking up a lot of time as we move out of the old license. October sessions are being postponed until November and will include both the incoming act and the Supreme Court decision. There is also a plan to develop a longer term education program around copyright so everyone on campus understands how the legislation affects them.

8. Meeting dates were set for November 7th, 2012 and January 16th / April 23rd 2013. All meetings beginning at 10 AM. Location to be determined.

The meeting adjourned at 11:15 AM.
Issue: Approval of Chair for the Senate Standing Committee on Library

For Information: At its September 26, 2012 meeting the Senate Standing Committee on Library elected Robert Wood as chair and requests Senate's approval of the appointment.

For Approval: THAT Senate approve Robert Wood as the Chair of the Senate Standing Committee on Library.
Issue: Senate Standing Committee on Policy Articulation

For Information: The Senate Standing Committee on Policy Articulation met on October 22, 2012.

The committee approved Bob Davis as chair.

The committee reviewed the proposed 2013/2014 Academic Schedule and found that it is in compliance with Policy B1 and recommends it to Senate for approval.
Issue: Approval of Chair for the Senate Standing Committee on Policy Articulation

For Information: At its October 22, 2012 meeting the Senate Standing Committee on Policy Articulation elected Bob Davis as chair and requests Senate's approval of the appointment.

For Approval: THAT Senate approve Bob Davis as the Chair of the Senate Standing Committee on Policy Articulation.
Issue: Approval of the Academic Schedule 2013/2014

For Information: At its October 22, 2012 meeting the Senate Standing Committee on Policy Articulation reviewed the Academic Schedule 2013/2014 and ensured that it was in compliance with Policy B1, Academic Schedule and therefore recommends it to Senate for approval.

Attached are:
1) Draft Academic Schedule 2013/2014
2) Policy B1 Academic Schedule
3) Policy B4 Final Examinations and Grade Reporting for Courses

For Approval: THAT Senate approve Kwantlen Polytechnic University's 2013/2014 Academic Schedule.
TO: Senate
CC: Warren Stokes, Shannon Kloet
FROM: Robert Hensley
DATE: October 23, 2012
SUBJECT: Academic Schedule 2013-14

The academic schedule for the Fall 2013, Spring 2014 and Summer 2014 is presented for approval per policy B.1. Each term extends for 14 weeks of instruction including the Monday of the 15th week to make up for the Mondays missed due to statutory holidays. There is a one day break between the last scheduled day of classes and the beginning of the final exam period. The exam period runs for eight working days. A detailed breakdown follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
<th>Spring 2014</th>
<th>Summer 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructional Days</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First day of classes</td>
<td>Tue, Sep 03</td>
<td>Mon, Jan 06</td>
<td>Mon, May 05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading break</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thu, Feb 20 to Fri, Feb 21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last day to withdraw</td>
<td>Mon, Oct 28</td>
<td>Mon, Mar 03</td>
<td>Mon, Jun 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last day of classes</td>
<td>Mon, Dec 09</td>
<td>Sat, Apr 12</td>
<td>Sat, Aug 09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exam Period</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final exams start</td>
<td>Wed, Dec 11</td>
<td>Mon, Apr 14</td>
<td>Mon, Aug 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final exams end</td>
<td>Thu, Dec 19</td>
<td>Fri, Apr 25</td>
<td>Tue, Aug 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Grades Due and Submitted</strong></td>
<td>Thu, Dec 27</td>
<td>Wed, Apr 30</td>
<td>Fri, Aug 22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th>Summer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mondays</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesdays</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesdays</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursdays</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fridays</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exam days</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following holidays and closures are included in the analysis of instructional days.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Holidays and Closures</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
<th>Spring 2014</th>
<th>Summer 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labour Day</td>
<td>Mon, Sep 02, 2013</td>
<td>New Year’s Day</td>
<td>Wed, Jan 01, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thanksgiving</td>
<td>Mon, Oct 14, 2013</td>
<td>Family Day</td>
<td>Mon, Feb 10, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remembrance Day</td>
<td>Mon, Nov 11, 2013</td>
<td>Good Friday</td>
<td>Fri, Apr 18, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christmas Eve (closure)</td>
<td>Tue, Dec 24, 2013</td>
<td>Easter Monday</td>
<td>Mon, Apr 21, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boxing Day</td>
<td>Thu, Dec 26, 2013</td>
<td>Canada Day</td>
<td>Tue, Jul 01, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Year’s Eve (closure)</td>
<td>Tue, Dec 31, 2013</td>
<td>BC Day</td>
<td>Mon, Aug 04, 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Re: Summer Semester

In addition to the regular semester dates, I recommend that the Senate also establish standard dates for the summer courses that only run for half the semester. This recommendation requires two approvals:

1. Definition of a common name for the half-semesters. Following the definition found in Policy B.4, I am recommending the half-semesters be referred to formally as “Session One” and “Session Two”. This terminology will be reflected in the Academic Calendar, Registration Guide, and any other communications material referring to the half-semester activity.

2. Approve the assumptions for choosing dates. They are proposed as:
   a. First day of classes for Session One should normally be the first day of classes for the Full semester.
   b. Last day of exams of Session Two should normally be the last day of exams of the Full semester.
   c. Intersession exam periods are 2 days.
   d. There should be a minimum one calendar day break between classes and exams.
   e. Total of Session One plus Session Two instructional days is less than the total Full semester instructional days.

Assuming these recommendations, the Session One and Session Two dates for the 2014 Summer Semester are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session One – Summer 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructional Days</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First day of classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last day to withdraw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last day of classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exam Period</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final exams start</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final exams end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Grades Submitted</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session Two – Summer 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructional Days</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First day of classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last day to withdraw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last day of classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exam Period</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final exams start</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final exams end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Grades Submitted</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Session One</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session Two</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Faculty grade submission deadlines are defined in Policy B.4 - Final Examinations and Grade Reporting for Courses - normally by the end of the third working day after the last exam or class. Students can normally access grades one business day after faculty submit them.*

Respectfully submitted,

Robert Hensley
University Registrar
POLICY

TITLE: Academic Schedule

APPROVED BY: Board of Governors

EFFECTIVE: June 2005

PURPOSE

The purpose of this policy is to assist in the establishment of an academic schedule that meets the needs of the educational programming at Kwantlen Polytechnic University. The University Act Section 35.2(6)(h) states that “The senate of a special purpose teaching university must advise the board, and the board must seek advice from the senate, on the development of educational policy for the setting of the academic schedule.”

SCOPE

This policy applies to all students enrolled in Kwantlen Polytechnic University courses or programs while engaged in educational activity either on or off campus.

PRINCIPLES

The following principles should be considered in setting the academic schedule.

Length or Duration

1. The number of working days between the end of one teaching period, including exams, and the beginning of the next teaching period will normally be a determining factor used in making recommendations on the academic schedule.
2. For semester-based programs or courses the length or duration of the semester may reflect the provincial range for similar program types.

3. For non semester-based programs or courses the length or duration of the program/course may reflect the provincial range for similar program types.

Exam Schedule

1. For semester-based programs or courses final exams should be scheduled commencing after a one (1) day break between the last scheduled day of classes and run for eight (8) working days (including Saturdays).

2. For non semester-based programs or courses final exams should be scheduled according to program requirements.

Reading Break

A reading break, scheduled in the spring semester, will not normally result in a lengthening of that semester.

Statutory Holidays

The impact of statutory holidays in any given semester should be considered when establishing the length of programs and courses.

Other

1. An effort will be made to include dates important to students, such as withdrawal dates.

2. The academic schedule will be developed by the Office of the Registrar based on the principles herein. On behalf of the Board of Governors, the Senate, through the Policy Review Committee, will monitor the academic schedule for the purpose of affirming that it aligns with the principles identified in the policy.

3. The academic schedule for the following academic year will normally be presented to the Policy Review Committee in September and reported on at the October meeting of Senate and the Board of Governors.
TITLE: Final Examinations and Grade Reporting for Courses

APPROVED BY: The President

EFFECTIVE: 12 April 1990

REVISED: November 2006

RELATED POLICIES:
C.20 Student Evaluation and Grading
B.17 Final Examinations and Overloads

PURPOSE

Many University courses include a final examination as a component of the evaluation system. This policy is a framework for the requesting and scheduling of final examinations.

This policy also specifies a framework for the reporting and for the verifying of final grades.

SCOPE

This policy applies to courses taught at the University and to faculty teaching these courses.

PRINCIPLES

1. Final Examinations
   a. Final grades are issued for all courses taught at the University.
   b. A formal final examination period will be scheduled at the end of each semester or session.
   c. Final examinations may only be scheduled during the formal final examination period.
   d. With or without a final exam, the sum of all assignments, tests or examinations cannot be worth more than 10% of the final grade, if administered in class during the last two (2) weeks prior to the formal final examination period for a semester or the last one (1) week prior to the formal final examination period for a session.
   e. Enrolment and Registrar Services Office is responsible for scheduling final examinations.
   f. Instructors may not schedule their own final examinations or change the days/time/rooms of their examinations as posted.
   g. Final examinations for classes offered in the daytime will normally be scheduled during the day from Monday to Saturday and evenings from Monday to Friday.
h. Final examinations for evening classes will normally be scheduled on the same night that the class is held.
i. Final examinations for Saturday classes will be scheduled on Saturday.

2. **Grade Reporting**
   a. Final grades for courses with no final examination must be submitted to the Enrolment and Registrar Services Office by the end of the third working day after the last day of classes for a semester or session.
   b. Final grades for courses in which there is a final examination must be submitted by the end of the third working day after the writing of the final examination.
   c. Exceptions to these deadlines may be granted at the discretion of the appropriate Dean who will notify the Enrolment and Registrar Services Office.
   d. Final grades will be submitted using the on-line service. Faxed grade lists will not be accepted unless verified by the appropriate Dean.
   e. The assignment of final grades shall be in accordance with the provisions of Policy C.20 Student Evaluation and Grading.
   f. For each student who has been assigned an incomplete (I) grade, an Incomplete Grade Contract must be submitted along with the final grade submission list. The final grade for a student who has been assigned an "I" grade must be submitted on a Grade Reporting Form.

**DEFINITIONS**

1. **Semester:** a period of study lasting approximately four (4) months that usually commences in September, January and May.
2. **Session:** a period of study lasting approximately two (2) months (half a semester) that usually commences in September, November, January, March, May and July or a duration determined appropriate by a certifying body.

**PROCEDURES**

1. **Final Examinations**
   a. Faculty requests for Final Examinations must accompany the submission of the course scheduling for that term.
   b. Final examination dates will be published with the on-line registration timetable.
   c. Timetables, class lists and Final Examination dates are available for faculty download using the Web for Faculty on-line self-service.
2. **Grade Reporting**
   a. Grades will be submitted on-line using the Web for Faculty service. Instructors are expected to verify the final grades for students in their classes by logging into the Web for Faculty service the following business day.
   b. If the instructor has made an error in entering grades on-line or has changed a grade subsequent to the original submission of final grades, a Grade Reporting form must be submitted to the Enrolment and Registrar Services Office. These forms are available for pick-up in the Enrolment and Registrar Services Office.
   c. Instructors are not to post final grade lists on campus due to potential breaches of confidentiality.
Issue: Approval of the 2014 Academic Summer Schedule

For Information: At its October 22, 2012 meeting the Senate Standing Committee on Policy Articulation reviewed the 2014 Academic Summer Schedule, ensured it was in compliance with Policy B1, Academic Schedule and Policy B4, Final Examinations and Grade Reporting for Courses and accepted the definition of Session one and Session two as they apply to condensed Summer courses.

For Approval: THAT Senate approve the Kwantlen Polytechnic University's 2014 Academic Summer Schedule.
Issue: Senate Standing Committee on Program Review

For Information: Faculty of Science and Horticulture
- School of Horticulture Program Review is in process

Department of Modern Languages
- Submitted a funding request for implementation of their Action Plan

Program Review Draft Manual
- Program Review Draft Manual was submitted to the VP and AVP Academic, Gordon Lee and Jane Fee, for review
- The Draft Manual will then be reviewed by the Program Review Committee
SENATE
MEETING DATE: October 29, 2012
AGENDA #: 16
PRESENTED BY: Christine Crowe

Issue: Senate Standing Committee on Tributes

For Information: The Senate Standing Committee on Tributes met on October 17, 2012 to review nominations for Honorary Degrees, Distinguished Service and Distinguished Teaching awards. The nominations are included in the October 29, 2012 Senate In camera meeting agenda package.

There was discussion at the meeting that the Distinguished Service Award be revisited. Presently this award is funded by the Foundation Board for one recipient.

The SSCT proposes that this award
- be either split to allow for an award for both staff and faculty, or
- be funded to allow one award each for staff and faculty, or
- be funded to allow one award each for staff, faculty and administration.

The SSCT welcomes Senate’s input on this matter.
SENATE

MEETING DATE: October 29, 2012
AGENDA #: 17
PRESENTED BY: Robert Hensley

Issue: Approval of graduates to October 29, 2012

For approval: THAT Senate approve the graduates to October 29, 2012
Graduates for Senate Approval

SENATE MEETING: Monday, 29-Oct-2012

Graduates from the Faculty of Arts

Baccalaureate Degree

Bachelor of Applied Arts in Psychology - Honours
Niloufar Saffari
  With Distinction

Associate Degree

Associate of Arts Degree in Criminology
Abjot Singh Boparai

Diploma

Diploma in General Studies
Binbin Ye

Graduates from the Faculty of Business

Baccalaureate Degree

Bachelor of Business Administration in Accounting
Jordan Leung Wah Suen

Bachelor of Business Administration in Entrepreneurial Leadership
Deborah Miriam Wyss

Bachelor of Business Administration in Human Resources Management
Jason Arnie Burger

Bachelor of Technology in Information Technology
Akashdeep Singh Gill

Diploma

Diploma in Accounting
Tiffany Shannon Ferns
  Luveleen Kaur
  Saranpreet Singh Pannu
  BinJia Yang

Diploma in Business Management
Kai Lin Yen

Certificate

Certificate in Accounting
  Puneet Singh Brar

Certificate in General Business Studies
  Sean Michael Mitchell
Graduates from the Faculty of Trades and Technology

Certificate

Certificate in Welding - Level C
Gurwinder Badesha
Kyle Wesley Hunter
Brandon Tyler Klein
   With Distinction
Craig Arthur Marshall
   With Distinction
Tyler Reid Morris
   With Distinction
Rhyon Olson
Gregory Randall Reed
   With Distinction
Ryan Michael Wagner
   With Distinction
Rebecca Grace Williams

Certificate in Welding - Level C (ACE-IT)
Nathan Erik Brian Balzer

Citation

Citation in Carpentry/Building Construction (ACE-IT)
Jonathan Daniel Boicey
Mitchell Adam McGarvey

Citation in Plumbing (ACE-IT)
Kody Jerimy Butchko
   With Distinction
Bryce Luis Coloma
Taylor Allan Corsie
John Kenneth Bruce Francis
Jordan Gurdas Gill
Grayson Alexander Glenn Hudson
   With Distinction
Chad Lee Glenn James
Sho William MacDonald
Jaret Bain McLean
Christopher David Porter
Neel James Sahai
William Walter Noel Talley
Kol Johan Wace
For Information: Presentation of the Dean’s Honour Roll recipients for Fall 2012

As per Policy L.3 Dean’s Honour Roll

Principles
1. A student in a semester-based or term-based program who meets all of the following conditions will be placed on the Dean’s Honour Roll: a. The student has completed fifteen (15) or more semester credit hours at Kwantlen Polytechnic University.

b. The student has a CGPA of 3.75 or greater.

c. The student has a TGPA of 3.5 or greater for the semester being evaluated.

Assessment for determining placement on the Dean’s Honour Roll will occur at the end of each semester or term, as appropriate.

2. A student in a program for which only grades of MAS and NCG are assigned (e.g. trades, vocational, health sciences, adult basic education) will be placed on the Dean’s Honour Roll at the completion of her/his program upon the recommendation of the program coordinator/instructor in recognition of outstanding achievement or performance.

Procedure
1. Names will be recommended to the dean for approval.

2. The official transcript of a student placed on the Dean’s Honour Roll will include the phrase DEAN’S HONOUR ROLL immediately following the entry for each enrolment period in which this distinction was earned.

3. Each student placed on the Dean’s Honour Roll will receive a letter of commendation from the dean.

4. In addition, a list of the names of those honoured may be presented to the University Senate and published on the University web site.
Dean's Honour Roll

Dean's Honour Roll for 201220

Faculty of Arts

Bachelor of Arts - General Studies
  Tania Maria Leiva
  Maxim Rudakov
  Andrew John Toth
  Sarah Ameera Wootton

Bachelor of Arts - Major in Anthropology
  Sasha Carmen Lasanen
  Nadine Patricia Martin

Bachelor of Arts - Major in Anthropology, Minor in Criminology
  Amarjit Besla

Bachelor of Arts - Major in Creative Writing
  John Cameron Doyle

Bachelor of Arts - Major in Criminology
  Navjeet Bhupal
  Jaswant Padda
  Jaspreet Kaur Grewal
  Nicole Colleen Regnier
  Viktoriia Kovalska
  Jamie Lynne Thomas
  Katrina Jane Magno

Bachelor of Arts - Major in Criminology, Minor in Psychology
  Isabel Megan Sarah Scheuneman Scott

Bachelor of Arts - Major in English
  Macaela Naomi MacWilliams

Bachelor of Arts - Major in History
  Rebecca Erin Deutschmann
  Kristina Simpson

Bachelor of Arts - Major in Philosophy
  Nicholas Andrew Meyers

Bachelor of Arts - Major in Psychology
  Navjot Bains
  Alexandria Lee Parsons
  Jennifer Aileen Clark
  Megan Danielle Richardson
  Christina Janine Erickson
  Christopher Michael Seiler
  Darren Grey MacKenzie
  Sheridan Anne Taylor

Bachelor of Arts - Major in Psychology - Honours
  Brooke Jacwelyn Knowlton

Bachelor of Arts - Major in Psychology, Minor in Counselling
  Jordan Gruenhage
  Michele Lana Gruenhage

Bachelor of Arts - Major in Psychology, Minor in Criminology
  Natalie Jean Rousseau

Bachelor of Arts - Major in Psychology, Minor in Philosophy
  Seyed Saeid Haeri
  Eric Yetsing Mah

Bachelor of Fine Arts, Visual Arts
  Katie Ruffell

Associate of Arts Degree in Creative Writing
  Jessica Alva Ross
Associate of Arts Degree in Criminology
  Sadia Rajput
  Andrew Reuben Thomas

Associate of Arts Degree in General Studies
  Troy Kasimir Robert Dakiniewich
  Lison Daubigeon
  Bendago Tell Farrell
  Megha Suri
  Anny Yuen Yan Tsui
  Kristin Unger

Associate of Arts Degree in Philosophy
  Steven George Button

Associate of Arts Degree in Psychology
  Richard Edward Hogg
  Kristopher Reginald Franc Potter
  Ashley Paige Purvis
  Gregory Cameron Young

Faculty of Business

Post Baccalaureate Diploma in Human Resources Management
  Erin Kathleen Thompson

Bachelor of Business Administration in Accounting
  Rachael Ann-Marie Boucher
  Andrew William Code
  Virpal Kaur Dhaliwal
  Jagjit Singh Dhesi
  Peter Jacob Dyck
  Gurpreet Singh Ghuman
  Akshdeep Singh Gill
  Larisa Gorodetsky
  Si Qin He

Bachelor of Business Administration in Accounting, Cooperative Education Option
  Michael Steven Lawrence

Bachelor of Business Administration in Entrepreneurial Leadership
  David Cercel
  Andrea Maria Danyluk
  Fung Siu Lai

Bachelor of Business Administration in Human Resources Management
  Noelia Kostur

Bachelor of Business Administration in Marketing Management
  Alexandria Barboutis

Associate of Arts Degree in Economics
  Jaclyn Gayle MacKendrick

Diploma in Accounting
  Ming Hao Chen
  Ying Ping Lin
  Gurpreet Rai

Diploma in Business Administration
  Daljinder Kaur

Diploma in Business Management
  Joe Chun Shing Ng
Diploma in General Business Studies
  Ji Su Lee
  Christian Retureta

Diploma in Marketing Management
  Amanda Ashley Bryan

Diploma in Public Relations
  Sonam Ram

Certificate in Accounting
  Darryl Richard Mann
  Kamalpreet Kaur Saggu

Certificate in Computer Information Systems
  Balraj Kahlon

Faculty of Community and Health Studies

Bachelor of Psychiatric Nursing
  Sundee Aklwalia
  Kristina Victoria Balce
  Maria Angelina Sarmiento Bautista
  Jessica Rae DeLacherois
  Christine Joelle Dobin
  Amanda Michelle Farrand
  Jennifer Gianine Hampel
  Emily Jocelyn Hinman
  Stephanie Michelle Juckes
  Baldeep Mangat
  Eryn Alexis Cole Moore
  April Louise Nicholls
  Marizeth Z Samson
  Deanne Victoria Smith
  Zenaida Corliss Telfair
  Ching Lun Tsai
  Jennifer Christina Voitic

Bachelor of Science in Nursing
  Nitu Ahmed
  Dayle Rene Beatty
  Teshla Vanessa Bellavance
  Haramarjot Kaur Bhullar
  Gurkeerat Kaur Bring
  Allison Marie Connell
  Lucy Melinda Dominak
  Kristin Nicole Elias
  Jennifer Alexandra Fast
  Elyse Marie Frost
  Kayla Leanne Goll
  Harjothe Kaur Grewal
  Harpreet Kaur Hafer
  Simratpal Kaur Johal
  Jasbir Kaur Khaira
  Jessica Paige Kyle
  Megan Elizabeth Lum
  Carissa Anne Milaney
  Annie Carole Elizabeth Parry
  Isabella Peggi
  Amanda Lise Reimer
  Erica Fay Sheen
  Anuraj Sidhu
  Sheng Hsiung Wang
  Nicolette Tan Wee

Certificate in Graduate Nurse, Internationally Educated Re-entry
  Iluminada Bagara Apurado
  Zenaida Magtuloy Gonzales
  Neda Hosseinian
  Sukhjit Kaur
  Mitra Moazzam
  Biju Varghese Ukken

Certificate in Health Unit Coordinator
  Kirsten Montana Agnew
  Bobbie-Joe Harron
  Melissa Anne Holloway
  Diana Le
  Taranjeet Kaur Sandhu
  Roxanne Allison Toole
Faculty of Design

Bachelor of Interior Design
  Lorin Neal Bordeville
Diploma in Fashion Marketing
  Stephanie Bales

Faculty of Science and Horticulture

Associate of Science Degree in Biology
  Giulia Haedar Oghli
  Ibrahim Saidiy

Associate of Science Degree in General Science
  Raman Rattanpal
  Martin Gabriel Vane-Hunt
  Miki Wong
  Levana Vanseur Yang

Diploma of Technology in Environmental Protection, Cooperative Education Option
  Mark D Hulme
  Frida Shabrang

Certificate in Engineering
  Dale Arthur Hoban
  Qun Xiang Hu

Faculty of Trades and Technology

Diploma in Computer Aided Design and Drafting - Architectural
  Ronald Mitchell de Roy van Zuydewyn
  Kirandeep Singh Khandel
  Amanpreet Singh
  The Kiet Tran
  Jason Douglas van Rhyn

Diploma in Computer Aided Design and Drafting - Mechanical
  John Andrew Sauz de Grano
  Anda Madaras
  Dale Thomas Mar
  John Andrew Samson
  Kurtis Joel Schouten
  Oliver Wackenreuther
  Shenesse Breneigh Walker
Issue: Board Procedures as Final Appeal Board – Non-academic Misconduct

For Information: As per the University Act Section 35.2(6)(j)

(6) “The senate of special purpose, teaching university must advise the board, and the board must seek advice from the senate, on the development of educational policy for the following matters:

(j) the adjudication procedure for appealable matters of student discipline;”

The Board of Governors seeks the advice of Senate regarding the attached document.
Appendix E

Board Procedures as Final Appeal Board – Non-academic Misconduct

A General Procedures

1 These procedures govern an appeal of the President’s decision to discipline a student for non-academic misconduct, made under Policy C.21 or under s. 61(1) of the University Act.

2 The composition of the Appeals Tribunal is described in the Terms of Reference.

3 A student (the “Student”) may request an appeal of a disciplinary decision by the President within 21 days of issuance of the President’s decision by delivering a Notice of Appeal to the attention of the Chair of the Appeals Tribunal, c/o the University Secretary, and to the Office of Student Judicial Affairs (“OSJA”).

4 All communications by the Student or the OSJA to the Chair or Appeals Tribunal are to be made through the University Secretary unless specifically directed otherwise by the Chair of the Appeals Tribunal.

5 The grounds of appeal are:
   a. there was a procedural error that significantly prejudiced the decision;
   b. new information is made available, which could not have been available at the time of the original investigation, and that could reasonably reverse the outcome of the case; or,
   c. the Student disagrees with the decision on the grounds that it is excessive, unreasonable or unfair.

6 The Notice of Appeal must be in writing, signed by the Student, and include:
   a. the decision being appealed;
   b. the grounds for the appeal;
   c. the facts relied upon;
   d. the relief sought;
   e. whether the Student wishes to conduct the appeal based upon written submissions or seeks an in-person hearing;
   f. if the Student seeks an in-person hearing, the names of any witnesses the Student wishes to call; and
   g. copies of any documents upon which the Student wishes to rely in the appeal.

7 Within 21 days of receipt of the request for appeal, the OSJA prepares and delivers to the Chair of the Appeals Tribunal and to the Student a Response to the Student’s Notice of Appeal. The Response must be in writing and include:
   a. a copy of the President’s decision;
   b. a copy of the final report of the OSJA concerning the matter giving rise to the decision that is the subject of the appeal, if applicable;
   c. whether the OSJA wishes to conduct the appeal based upon written submissions or seeks an in-person hearing;
   d. if the OSJA seeks an in-person hearing, the names of any witnesses the OSJA wishes to call; and
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e. copies of any documents or electronic records upon which the OSJA wishes to rely.

8 Within 7 days of receipt of the Response, the Student may deliver a Reply.

9 If the Appeals Tribunal concludes at any time that the appeal has no reasonable prospect of success, the appeal may be immediately dismissed.

10 The Appeals Tribunal may determine the practice and procedure to be followed in an appeal, including modifying any procedure described herein. Procedural matters in the discretion of the Appeals Tribunal include:
   a. whether to extend any time limits set out herein;
   b. whether to require disclosure or production of documents by one party to another;
   c. whether the appeal or any part of it shall be conducted on the basis of written submissions or by electronic means instead of an in-person hearing; and
   d. if an appeal is to be conducted by an in-person hearing, whether support persons or observers may attend the hearing of appeal, and whether the proceedings will be recorded by court reporter or other audio or visual means.

11 The Chair of the Appeals Tribunal may determine any preliminary or procedural issues or designate another member of the Appeals Tribunal to do so, and a pre-hearing conference attended by the Student and the OSJA may be conducted for this purpose.

12 Following receipt of the Notice of Appeal, Response, and any Reply and after consulting the Student and the OSJA, the Chair of the Appeals Tribunal sets the hearing date or the schedule for delivery of written submissions and notifies the Student and the OSJA.

13 The Student and the OSJA are entitled to legal representation throughout the appeal, including a hearing of appeal. The Appeals Tribunal may have separate counsel.

14 If the Student or the OSJA fails to comply with a deadline under these procedures, fails to comply with an order of the Chair or a designated member of the Appeals Tribunal or fails to attend an oral hearing, the Appeals Tribunal may proceed to conduct the appeal or dismiss the appeal.
B Procedure at a Hearing of Appeal

1 The Chair introduces the Appeals Tribunal members and outlines the procedures to be followed.

2 The hearing of the appeal (the “Hearing”) is to be conducted in private and in confidence. The Hearing will, therefore, be held in camera, except as otherwise permitted or required by the Appeals Tribunal hearing the appeal. Except for the purposes of obtaining legal advice about any aspect of the appeal and for such other purposes as may be permitted or required by the Appeals Tribunal hearing the appeal, the parties to the appeal, members of the Appeals Tribunal, and others properly in attendance at the Hearing should not discuss the content of the Hearing with anyone who is not in attendance.

Witnesses will be excluded except as required to present evidence.

3 The Student and the OSJA (or their legal counsel) may each provide a brief opening statement.

4 The Student may then present evidence.

5 Once the Student has completed his or her presentation of evidence, the OSJA may present evidence.

6 In the event a Hearing is conducted with the attendance of witnesses, the questioning of witnesses is conducted as follows:
   a. the party calling the witness addresses questions to the witness (“examination”);
   b. the other party may then address questions to the witness (“cross-examination”);
   c. the party calling the witness may re-examine the witness; on any issues arising in cross-examination of that witness;
   d. the Appeals Tribunal may then address questions to the witness;
   e. the Student and the OSJA may then address further questions to the witness arising from the Appeals Tribunal members’ questions.

7 After the presentation of evidence by the Student and the OSJA, each may make closing submissions. The Student may reply to the OSJA’s submissions.

8 In the event a party fails to attend a Hearing despite having had notice of the scheduled date and time of the Hearing, the Appeals Tribunal may proceed with the appeal in the absence of the party.
C  The Decision

1  The Appeals Tribunal may
   a. allow the appeal in whole or in part;
   b. make any decision that the President could make with respect to the matter appealed;
   c. refer the matter to the President or to the OSJA with or without directions for reconsideration or investigation; or
   d. dismiss the appeal.

2  The Appeals Tribunal arrives at its decision on the basis of a majority vote of the members participating in the hearing.

3  A decision is rendered in writing, signed by the members of the Appeals Tribunal. Where a member of the Appeals Tribunal does not agree with the decision of the majority, he or she shall provide written reasons for the dissent.

4  The decision and any dissenting reasons will be delivered to the Student and to the OSJA.

5  If a Student is expelled or suspended, the OSJA will so inform the Registrar, the Registrar’s assistant, the Manager of Operations, Security, the Deans and their Operation Managers of which course the Student was attending and the Instructors.

6  A copy of the decision of the Appeals Tribunal together with any dissent shall be kept in the Student Conduct Record.
**SENATE**

MEETING DATE: October 29, 2012

AGENDA #: 20.1

PRESENTED BY: Alan Davis

**Issue:** Baccalaureate Registered Nursing Program Review

**For Information:** The College of Registered Nurses of British Columbia (CRNBC) conducted a review of the Baccalaureate Registered Nurse Program.

The CRNBC report is attached for information.
July 3, 2012

Dr. John McKendry
President and Vice Chancellor
Kwantlen Polytechnic University
12666 72nd Avenue
Surrey, BC V3W 2M8

Dear Dr. McKendry:

The College of Registered Nurses of British Columbia (CRNBC) Education Program Review Committee (EPRC) recently conducted a full review of the Bachelor of Registered Nurse Program offered by Kwantlen Polytechnic University. I am pleased to advise you that, on behalf of the CRNBC Board, I have recognized this program until June 30, 2019 on the terms and conditions that an interim report be submitted in the Fall of 2015. A full program review with site visit is to be completed before June 30, 2019.

I will be reporting to the CRNBC Board at its September 28, 2012 meeting the action I have taken to recognize the program on its behalf as authorized by Board policy. I therefore request that public media announcements you may wish to make about this decision be made after September 28, 2012.

The enclosed EPRC report provides details about the program review process and findings, including the EPRC recommendation for recognition. I have also enclosed Education Program and Course Review Policy 7 about New or Substantially Changed Nursing Education Programs. Please note that CRNBC expects educational institutions to submit a letter of intent if substantial changes are made to nursing education programs during the recognition period. The EPRC appreciated the 2010 letter of intent about the program changes implemented with the students admitted in January 2012.

On behalf of the CRNBC, I thank the senior academic and administrative personnel who met with the site visitors in May 2012. I extend special thanks to Dr. Tru Freeman, Jean Nicolson-Church, and Judy Lee for their extensive participation in the program review process. I acknowledge the important role played by other nursing faculty, students, staff, preceptors, and nurses in practice who supported and participated in the program review process.
Follow-up consultation to discuss the report and plan for future reviews is available from Dr. Joyce Black, Education Consultant at 1-800-565-6505, ext. 309, or 604-736-7331. I send best wishes for continued successful implementation of baccalaureate entry-level registered nurse education so that the graduates are eligible to proceed in the registration process with CRNBC.

Sincerely,

Cynthia Johansen, BA, MAL
Registrar/Chief Executive Officer

cc: Dr. Tru Freeman, Dean, Faculty of Community and Health Studies
Jean Nicolson-Church, Associate Dean, Faculty of Community and Health Studies
Judy Lee, Nursing Faculty, BSN Program Coordinator, Community and Health Studies.

Encl: as above.
Program Characteristics:
The origins of Kwantlen Polytechnic University (KPU) created in 2008, date back to 1981 when Kwantlen College was established in Surrey, B.C. and offered entry-level registered nurse education initially at the diploma level. Kwantlen College was granted University College status in 1995 and in 1998 Kwantlen University College obtained Ministerial consent to offer a baccalaureate credential in nursing, named the Bachelor of Science in Nursing (BSN) program. The founding College and University College were involved in offering a baccalaureate curriculum as part of the Collaborative Nursing Program in B.C. (CNPBC) until it disbanded in 2004.

The BSN is one of nine programs offered through the Faculty of Community and Health Studies (CAHS). In September 2012, the program location will relocate from the Surrey Campus to new facilities on the Langley Campus of KPU along with the entire Faculty of CAHS.

KPU continued to use the curriculum developed by the CNPBC with regular updates until January 2012 when students were admitted to a substantially changed curriculum that was duly reviewed separately by the University and CRNBC. KPU admits 32 students to the BSN program twice a year in May and January. The program is offered over eight semesters with most classroom and laboratory courses offered on-site. Practice courses involve clinical health care facilities and other agencies across the Lower Mainland.

### Previous CRNBC Reviews of the Program:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type of Review</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before 2005</td>
<td>Prior to CRNBC, regular reviews conducted by RNABC</td>
<td>Program approval status maintained with the regulatory body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Full Review</td>
<td>Recognized until June 30, 2012 without terms or conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>Substantial curriculum change</td>
<td>Retained previous recognition and review schedule for 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Current Review

The College of Registered Nurses of British Columbia (CRNBC) reviewed the Baccalaureate Registered Nurse Program offered by KPU under the authority of the duties and objects of a college set out in the Health Professions Act (2010), Section 16 (2) (c) ....to establish the conditions or requirements for registration of a person as a member of the college. Section 19 (m) allows for the conditions or requirements for registration established by the college to include standards of academic or technical achievement, competencies or other qualifications, and requirements for providing evidence of good character. Section 19 (m.1) provides for the board of the college to specify academic or technical programs that are recognized by the college.
as meeting a standard established under 19 (m) (i). The recognition of registered nurse education programs in British Columbia is determined by program reviews conducted by the Education Program Review Committee (EPRC) established in Bylaw 1.21. The programs recognized by CRNBC are specified in Schedule C of the Bylaws.

The Bylaws of CRNBC approved by government establish the mandate and membership of the Education Program Review Committee (EPRC). For the purposes of this review the EPRC referred to Bylaw 1.21 (3) (a) which states the education program review committee must: review nursing education programs and courses required by applicants for registration under Part 4, in accordance with any applicable criteria established by the board, with a view to reporting to the board and making recommendations about whether the board should recognize those programs and courses, and any terms or conditions of recognition. The EPRC also referred to pertinent CRNBC Education Program and Course Review Policies (2011).

Nursing Education Program Review Process
The EPRC conducted the review as set out in Education Program/Course Review Policy 8 and outlined below.

- On March 30, 2012 the EPRC conducted a preliminary review of the self-evaluation report and instructed the site visit team retained by CRNBC. The team leader for the site visit, Dr. June Anonson, Assistant Dean of Nursing, University of Saskatchewan, attended by teleconference. Sue Carpenter, Consultant/Owner, Carpenter Healthcare Consulting, Canada, served as the second site visitor.

- The site visit was arranged and conducted on May 16 and 17, 2012 in accordance with Policy 9: The Site Visit Component of the Review Process. The site visit team submitted a written report to EPRC and a copy of this confidential report was sent to KPU. In response, KPU forwarded information to clarify and elaborate on several questions and this information was forwarded to and discussed with EPRC as the deliberations began on June 19, 2012.

- The EPRC discussed the site visit report on June 19, 2012 with the team leader, Dr. June Anonson, who attended in-person. After the site visitor left the meeting, the EPRC formulated a tentative recommendation to share with representatives of the educational institution offering the program. The tentative recommendation was to recognize the KPU baccalaureate registered nurse program until June 30, 2019 on the term and condition that an interim program report about program evaluation be submitted in the fall of 2016.

- On June 19, 2012 the EPRC discussed its assessment and tentative recommendation with six KPU representatives who attended the EPRC meeting in-person: Dr. Tru Freeman, Dean, Faculty of Community and Health Studies; Jean Nicolson-Church, Associate Dean, Faculty of Community and Health Studies; Judy Lee, Coordinator BSN Program; June Kaminski, Coordinator BSN-PB Program; Joan Boyce, BSN Faculty; and Jackie Baron, BSN Lab Coordinator.

- After the representatives from the educational institution left the EPRC meeting, the EPRC considered the information obtained in discussion with them and decided upon its final report and recommendation to the CRNBC Board. The EPRC discussed what evidence would reasonably be available about the outcomes of the curriculum being phased out and the revised curriculum in the fall of 2015, 2016 and 2017. The EPRC decided to request the
interim report in the fall of 2015 without changes to the remainder of the tentative recommendation.

Findings
The EPRC referred to Education Program/Course Review Policy 11: Committee Assessment of the Nursing Education Standards to evaluate the program in relation to Policy 5: Nursing Education Standards and Policy 6: Indicators of the Nursing Education Standards as outlined below.

Details of EPRC Evaluation of the Program Against the CRNBC Nursing Education Standards and Indicators.

| Curriculum: The curriculum provides the learning experiences necessary for students to achieve the RN or NP entry-level competencies* and Standards of Practice. |
|---|---|
| *Note: hereafter, the word competencies means entry-level competencies for RNs or NPs applicable to the program/course being reviewed. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators of Curriculum Standard</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completely Addressed</td>
<td>Deficient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) The curriculum is clearly described and its foundations are congruent with the achievement of competencies and Standards of Practice. | ☒ | ☐ |

b) The achievement of the competencies and Standards of Practice are clearly included in the program outcomes / goals / objectives. | ☒ | ☐ |

c) The applicable competencies and three categories of CRNBC Standards of Practice:
   i. Scope of Practice: Standards, Limits & Conditions;
   ii. Professional Standards; and
   iii. Practice Standards; are systematically introduced in nursing courses so that theory and practice learning in one level are built upon in other levels/courses. | ☒ | ☐ |

d) The curriculum requires students to apply RN or NP competencies and Standards of Practice while learning to provide nursing care directly with clients and engaging with interprofessional education and care. | ☒ | ☐ |

e) Processes are used to ensure the ongoing currency and relevance of the curriculum to nursing practice. | ☒ | ☐ |

Comments:
The self-evaluation report outlined the sequence of courses in the substantially changed curriculum studied by the first cohort of students admitted in January 2012. In the fall of 2010 and early 2011, EPRC assessed favorably these substantial curriculum changes prior to their implementation, in compliance with Education Program and Course Review Policy 7 about substantial program changes.

The site visitors collected additional information about how the three types of CRNBC Standards of Practice are introduced and leveled in the courses. KPU submitted supplementary information to augment the site visit report. The leveling of the CRNBC Practice Standard on medication administration, other psychomotor skills, including clinical decision-making, provided excellent
examples. The EPRC commented positively on the integration of nursing informatics in the
curriculum. The curriculum changes include improvements in the sequence of practice courses
during semesters and the consolidated practice experiences (CPEs).

The processes to ensure the currency and relevance of the curriculum are well established and
include institutional program reviews required by KPU every five years. The EPRC commended
the curriculum enhancements for student experiential learning with Aboriginal Communities and
Elders in Residence Programs. The EPRC also noted that the interprofessional Advisory
Committee for CAHS is a positive development.

Evaluation:
The EPRC assessed the CRNBC nursing education standard about Curriculum to be:

Met ☑  Partially Met ☐  Not Met ☐

Continued on page 5........
**Students:** Students demonstrate progress toward the achievement of the competencies and Standards of Practice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators of Students Standard</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Students are informed about the requisite skills and abilities (RSAs) needed to achieve registered nurse entry-level competencies (e.g., English proficiency, mathematical, behavioural, and interpersonal skills) and the RSAs are used to support student achievement of the competencies and Standards of Practice.</td>
<td>☒ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Students receive well-timed formative and summative feedback from faculty about their practice learning to facilitate their achievement of the competencies and Standards of Practice.</td>
<td>☒ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Students demonstrate their ability to provide safe nursing care before they practise directly with clients, through the use of nursing laboratories and other learning modalities.</td>
<td>☒ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Students have access to sufficient learning resources to support their achievement of competencies and Standards of Practice.</td>
<td>☒ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Practice learning experiences are systematically tracked and monitored to ensure all students have sufficient experiences e.g., health status, age groups, and settings to achieve the competencies and Standards of Practice.</td>
<td>☒ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Students and preceptors are supported by the optimum number of qualified faculty.</td>
<td>☒ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Consistent expectations of student performance of competencies and Standards of Practice at different levels in the program/course are upheld through orientation and support strategies for faculty, contract faculty, and preceptors.</td>
<td>☒ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Students are supported to enact evidence-informed practice through the use of research findings, best practices and scholarly activities.</td>
<td>☒ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Faculty decisions to remove students from practice settings or fail students for reasons of safe practice and public protection are supported by policies and resources.</td>
<td>☒ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Student fitness to practice and public protection are considered in progression, failure and readmission decisions.</td>
<td>☒ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k) Students, at program completion, have achieved the competencies and Standards of Practice.</td>
<td>☒ ☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**
The nursing faculty tested out a new framework and language for student practice appraisals that have been standardized and implemented for all practice courses in the revised curriculum.
The site visitors reported evidence about the reasons for the changes and the quality indicators used in the new forms. The revised form is more closely linked to the CRNBC entry-level competencies and the Standards of Practice. The site visitors reviewed examples of the previous and new student performance appraisal forms and observed that they all included student documentation of their performance and faculty feedback with agreed upon learning strategies written at mid-term. The site visitors asked students throughout the program about their experiences with the appraisal forms and other evaluation methods. The students commented positively overall. The site visitors observed that the feedback faculty provided to students on forms, journal and other assignments reviewed was appropriate, concise and supportive.

KPU also provided additional written information about the revised practice appraisal forms, subsequent to the site visit report, that EPRC considered. The EPRC discussed with program representatives the support and development processes for faculty learning to use the new practice appraisal framework and language. The EPRC concluded that sound orientation and continuous discussions to ensure clarity and consistency of use are taking place.

The site visitors toured the nursing laboratories and were present during several scenarios with a group of senior students and faculty. The students were very engaged in the experience and spoke positively about the simulation experience. Faculty are prepared for teaching with human patient simulators. Orientation for faculty and students has been enhanced. Staff support for the simulation laboratory has been increased with permanent staff who have developed the skills and expertise to work effectively with the technology and case scenarios to optimize student learning. The EPRC discussed the use of simulation and other laboratory equipment, e.g., videotaped replay, with program representatives and noted there is the potential to increase these kinds of learning activities in the new Langley campus facilities. The EPRC praised nursing faculty for the careful development of simulated learning and their responsiveness to student feedback about ways to improve this learning strategy.

The site visitors reported the practice learning experiences for each student are well tracked and monitored to ensure there are no gaps. The EPRC found the development and use of the Clinical Teaching Unit and Shared Learning Units are strengths of the program. The site visitors talked with preceptors about their orientation to this role with students. The preceptors indicated they were well prepared and were glad to precept KPU students.

Comprehensive policies are in place to guide student progression decisions, including learning contracts, remedial learning support, failure and removal from the program. Site visitors reported that the students are aware of the policies and/or know how to access them.

**Evaluation:**
The EPRC assessed the CRNBC nursing education standard about Students to be:

- Met ☑  
- Partially Met ☐  
- Not Met ☐
### Graduates: Graduates of the nursing education program achieve the competencies and Standards of Practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators of Graduates Standard</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) An action plan for implementation of formative and summative program evaluation is clearly presented.</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) The results of program evaluation are used in continuing program development to ensure graduates achieve the competencies and Standards of Practice.</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Graduate success rates on the registration examination(s) are monitored, analyzed and used to inform program decisions.</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Graduates have opportunities to provide feedback about how well their education prepared them to practise safely, competently and ethically.</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Managers and nursing practice leaders, or their designates, who are familiar with the practice of graduates, have opportunities to provide feedback about the educational preparation of the graduates to practise safely, competently and ethically.</td>
<td>☐ ☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comments:

The program evaluation is still based on the evaluation plan of the CNPBC and the questionnaires developed by CNPBC are used on-line. The self-evaluation report acknowledged that work is needed to refine the action plan and related materials, including updates to the CNPBC plan (2004). The EPRC was pleased that faculty release time has been arranged for a Program Evaluation Chair. The new Evaluation Chair is formalizing an evaluation action plan to ensure all components are implemented and monitored for all student cohorts.

The EPRC noted that the self-evaluation report included an appendix that was a detailed schedule of data to be collected rather than an overall plan. Student focus groups were scheduled and not conducted. The Evaluation Chair intends to implement focus groups with the 2012 graduates.

The EPRC found evidence that the results of formative evaluation, especially on program completion questionnaires, were used in program development. KPU submitted information to supplement the site visit report about the three step questioning process they take when considering the results: What? So what? And Now What? The EPRC assessed this to be a well deliberated approach.

Historically, the success rate of KPU graduates on the registration examination was high and 100% success was the norm for many cohorts. Since 2008, there has been a decrease in the success rate with a range of 79-93% during this four year period; however, the 79% success occurred with only the August 2010 cohort which had seven failures. The other cohorts had a range of two to four failures each. The site visitors verified that the nursing faculty and program leaders have instituted several strategies to address the success rate. The EPRC discussed the plans with program representatives who elaborated on how the admission criteria (which have been changed) and other factors may have contributed to failures. The evidence indicated that the
program is monitoring and concerned about the success rate of graduates on the registration exam. Furthermore, they are analyzing the results to inform decisions about how to improve success rates.

There have been some gaps in the collection of feedback from the graduates of 2007 and 2008. The new BSN Evaluation Chair is implementing a regular, organized collection of graduate feedback by questionnaires and focus groups or interviews for all future cohorts. The results from cohorts from 2009 to 2011 were positive overall and provided evidence that the graduates are prepared to practice safely, competently and ethically. The EPRC noted that it is important to compare feedback from managers and nursing practice leaders about the preparation of graduates to augment graduate feedback.

The EPRC was alarmed at the significant gap from 2007-2011 in the collection of data from workplaces (indicator e). KPU conducted a very successful initiative in 2012 and obtained input from 31 workplace representatives about the preparation of graduates with favorable results. The EPRC noted that this is the only formal feedback obtained to address indicator (e) of the standard about graduates since the last program review in 2007. The self-evaluation report acknowledged that there is an immediate need to obtain formal feedback from managers and nursing practice leaders on a regular basis and that the Evaluation Chair is taking action to achieve this goal. The EPRC assessed indicator (e) for the standard about graduates as deficient and requested that the results of evaluation plans just initiated be provided in an interim report during the recognition period. The EPRC noted that the results need to be provided within the context of the overall evaluation plan.

The EPRC discussed with program representatives the timing of the interim report in relation to whether the feedback available would be about the graduates from the revised or current curriculum. The EPRC then reconsidered the due date for the interim report. This involved a review of what evidence could be available in 2015, 2016 and 2017 and the basic reason for EPRC concern about the deficiency identified. The EPRC agreed that the concern and deficiency are implementation gaps and the evidence of importance is that the evaluation process is implemented consistently and stabilized. The EPRC concluded that an interim report in the fall of 2015 could provide evidence about graduates from the curriculum being phased out and that continued feedback is important to uphold the integrity of the latter curriculum until all enrolled students have graduated. Additionally, the EPRC concluded that substantial evidence about graduates of the revised curriculum, implemented in January 2012, could be available early in 2019 in time for the next full program review.

**Evaluation:**
The EPRC assessed the CRNBC nursing education standard about **Graduates** to be:

Met □  Partially Met ☒  Not Met □

**Final Deliberations:**
The CRNBC Education Program and Course Review Policies (2011) guided the program review and recommendation. The Committee assessed the nursing education standards about curriculum and students as met because there was sound evidence that all of the indicators for these standards were completely addressed. The EPRC assessed the standard about graduates as partially met due to a deficiency in indicator (e) in particular and the overall context of plans
underway to improve, consistently implement, and stabilize the program evaluation processes.

As required by Policy 11.3 on the assessment of nursing education standards, the EPRC considered the deficiency in light of Policy 13 about risk to the public and concluded that the deficiency does not present a risk because plans are set out to correct the deficiency. Policy 4.2 provides for an interim report to be required during the recognition period to provide evidence of progress in addressing deficiencies identified at the time of the program review. The interim report is a term and condition of the recognition. Policy 4.1 requires that every nursing education program be reviewed at least once every seven years.

The EPRC noted also that Policy 7 about New or Substantially Changed Nursing Education Programs sets out the CRNBC expectation that educational institutions submit a letter of intent if substantial changes are made to nursing education programs during the recognition period. KPU has acted on this requirement before implementing the revised curriculum that was in the first year of implementation at the time of the review. The EPRC decided unanimously on the recommendation below to the CRNBC Board.

**Recommendation:**
Recognize the Kwantlen Polytechnic University baccalaureate registered nurse program until June 30, 2019 on the term and condition that an interim report be submitted in the fall of 2015. A full review with site visit is to be completed before June 30, 2019.

---

APPROVED ON BEHALF OF THE CRNBC BOARD

Cynthia Johnson, BA, MAL
Registrar/Chief Executive Officer

DATE July 3, 2012
Policy 7—Excerpted from Nursing Education Program/Course Review Policies

7. New or Substantially Changed Nursing Education Program/Course

7.1 A Substantial change means the revision of a recognized nursing education program/course which includes a major change, rather than a formative modification, in one or more of the following:

- how the curriculum addresses the competencies and Standards of Practice, including changes in the nature and extent of learning opportunities in the curriculum;
- learning resources to support student achievement of the competencies and Standards of Practice, including laboratory and program learning experiences with clients;
- expectations about overall student academic performance, including evaluation of student practice and policies about safe student performance; or
- any other significant change that will impact on the ability of the students to achieve the requirements to proceed in the registration process with CRNBC following graduation from the program/course.

7.2 An institution proposing to offer a new nursing education program/course, or to make substantial changes to an existing recognized one, is expected to submit a letter of intent to the committee and obtain Board recognition of the program/course prior to offering the new program/course or implementing the change.

7.3 If an educational institution offers a new or substantially changed nursing education program/course before it is reviewed by the committee and recognized by the Board, the educational institution cannot assume that the graduates of the new or substantially changed program/course will be eligible for registration with CRNBC.

7.4 Upon receipt of a letter of intent about a substantial change, the committee determines what evidence it requires to assess the change and whether any further review is required before the next scheduled review.

7.5 Upon receipt of a letter of intent about a new nursing education program/course, the committee determines the appropriate form of review and the extent to which the nursing education standards can be applied to the program/course and

(a) determines if the review should be conducted in phases over a period of years with reports and recommendations to the Board after each phase;
(b) determines that any step in the review process is unnecessary or may be modified to suit the circumstances; and
(c) conducts the review as so determined and sends to the Board its report and recommendations with respect to the recognition of the new program/course.
7.6 Although a full review addresses all of the three nursing education standards comprehensively, a new program/course review is normally conducted in three phases:

(a) a phase one review is conducted before the new program/course begins. The review focuses on the nursing education standard and indicators about curriculum and preliminary plans for the nursing education standard and indicators about students.

(b) a phase two review focuses on evidence of student progress toward achievement of the competencies and Standards of Practice after students are enrolled and have completed part of the program. Detailed plans for addressing follow-up evaluation of graduate performance are also expected;

(c) a phase three review focuses on evidence about the nursing practice of graduates. Evidence about all three nursing education standards is required.

(d) The length of recognition recommended as a result of a phased-in review will be less than the maximum provided for in Policy 4. The maximum length of recognition may be recommended only after a subsequent full review.

7.7 Modified self-evaluation reports are submitted for programs/courses being discontinued. A review may be required to extend the length of recognition needed to enable students currently enrolled and/or the last intake of students to graduate from a recognized program.

(a) A **discontinuing program/course** is one in which the last class of students has been admitted or the date for the last student intake has been established.

(b) The purpose of the discontinuing program review is to ascertain that plans are in place to maintain the integrity of the existing curriculum and to support students to meet CRNIBC competencies and Standards of Practice until the program is phased out.