



AGENDA Web Copy

SENATE MEETING

Wednesday, March 5, 2025 9:30 am – 11:20 am Main Boardroom (D2315)

Webinar: <https://emilycarru.zoom.us/j/64898136137?pwd=a57xW1zL3fiNjprnTwAWf1VLTj5IOy.1>

Webinar ID: 648 9813 6137

Passcode: 571402

***Territorial Acknowledgement:** We respectfully acknowledge that Emily Carr University is situated on the unceded, traditional and ancestral territories of the Musqueam, Squamish and Tsleil-Waututh Nations.*

I. ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS

1. Call to Order T. Kelly, Chair
2. **MOTION:** To approve the Agenda, as circulated Chair
3. **MOTION:** To approve the January 29, 2025, Senate Meeting Minutes, as circulated Chair
 - **Attachment:** *Draft Minutes of the January 29, 2025, Senate Meeting (pp. 3-8)*

II. BUSINESS

1. Chair's Remarks and Report Chair
2. INFORMATION: Governance Committee Report C. Martin
3. INFORMATION: Academic Planning + Priorities Committee Report J. Turner
 - **Attachment:** *APP Committee Report (p. 9)*
4. APPROVAL: Program Review Policy and Procedures J. Turner / H. Fitzgerald
 - **Attachment:** *APP Committee Recommendation Form (pp. 10-11)*
 - *Draft Program Review Policy (pp. 12-14)*
 - *Draft Program Review Procedures with Amendment (pp. 15-21)*
 - *Summary of Feedback on Policy Drafts (pp. 22-24)*
 - *Program Review Policy Rationale (pp. 25-27)*

MOTION: That Senate, on the recommendation of the Academic Planning and Priorities Committee, approve the proposed Program Review Policy and its accompanying Procedures as a new academic policy.

5. APPROVAL: Summer 2026 – Spring 2029 Academic Schedule J. Turner / K. Verkerk
- **Attachment:** APP Committee Recommendation Form (pp. 28-29)
 - Proposed Summer 2026 – Spring 2029 Academic Schedule (pp. 30-36)

MOTION: That Senate, on the recommendation of the Academic Planning and Priorities Committee, approve the academic schedule for Summer 2026 to Spring 2029.

6. INFORMATION: Curriculum Planning + Review Committee Report C. Cartiere
- **Attachment:** CPR Committee Report (p. 37)
7. APPROVAL: Curriculum Planning + Review Committee Recommendations C. Cartiere
- **Attachments:** CPR Committee Recommendation Form (pp. 38-39)
 - CRAM 2XX – Ceramics Processes: Topic - **New Course Proposal** (pp. 40-42)
 - 3DAN 200 – 3D Computer Animation II - Course Change Proposal (pp. 43-45)
 - 3DAN 300 – Preproduction for 3D - Course Change Proposal (pp. 46-48)
 - 3DAN 2XX (proposed 210) – Core Studio in 3D Animation - New Course Proposal (pp. 49-51)
 - 3D Computer Animation Program Requirement Worksheet and Cover Sheet (pp. 52-55)

To be presented by K. Mallett and C. Martin

MOTION: That Senate, on the recommendation of the Curriculum Planning and Review Committee, approve the following as presented:

Faculty of Art

- **New course proposal:** CRAM 2XX – Ceramics Processes: Topic

Faculty of Design + Dynamic Media

- **Course change proposal: 3DAN 200 – 3D Computer Animation II**
(changes to name, credits, description, learning objectives, and outcomes)
- **Course change proposal: 3DAN 300 – Preproduction for 3D Animation**
(changes to credits, description, learning objectives, and outcomes)
- **New course proposal: 3DAN 2XX (proposed 210) – Core Studio in 3D Animation**
- **3D Computer Animation Program Requirement Worksheet and Cover Sheet**

8. INFORMATION: Presentation on ECU Policy Framework N. Himer
- **Attachments:** [QAPA – Presentation to Senate \(Nov 6, 2024\)](#)
 - [QAPA - Institution Report](#)
 - [QAPA - Assessor's Report](#)
 - [QAPA - Final Report](#)

III. OPEN FORUM

IV. NEXT MEETING: April 9, 2025

V. ADJOURNMENT



SENATE MINUTES – OPEN SESSION

Wednesday, January 29, 2025, 9:30 a.m. – 10:40 a.m.
ECU Boardroom / *Online via Zoom webinar

ATTENDANCE

Trish Kelly (Chair + Vice-Chancellor)	Haig Armen
Diyan Achjadi (Vice-Chair)	Mark Johnsen
Jacqueline Turner	Beth Howe
Celeste Martin	Ishita Arora
Kyla Mallett	Stuti Gulati
Justin Langlois	Anoushka Nair
Vanessa Kam	Shawn Choi
Cameron Cartiere	Laszlo Hollander
Adriana Jaroszewicz	Micaela Kwiatkowski
Helene Day Fraser	Eknoor Madharoo (non-voting)
Kathryn Verkerk	Alex Philipps

Regrets: Carleen Thomas, Mimi Gellman

Guests/Support: Natasha Himer (University Secretary), Sonia Orlu (Senate Support), Alex Muir (Technical Support),

LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I. ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS

1. Call to Order – D. Achjadi, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:36 a.m.
2. Agenda Approval

The agenda was adjusted to accommodate President Kelly's late arrival, due to a last-minute meeting with Deputy Minister Trevor Hughes.

- Chair's Remarks, President's Report, and the Vice-President Academic & Provost Report were moved to later in the meeting.
- The closed session was moved to the end of the meeting.

Moved / Seconded that the Agenda of the January 29, 2025, Senate meeting be approved as amended.

Carried.

3. Past Minutes

The following amendments were proposed:

- N. Himer and K. Mallett requested a correction regarding the CPR recommendations for course change proposals in the previous minutes.

- The minutes originally implied the process had not started, whereas work was already underway.
- Minutes should reflect that the working group had already begun the process. Specifically, the statement

“She indicated she would lead a review of the forms to clarify expectations around these requirements, among other changes.”

should be revised to

“She indicated she is currently leading a review of the forms to clarify expectations around these requirements, among other changes.”

- A senator raised a concern that a previously mentioned comment on space expansion was not included in the minutes. They had recalled that, during an all-university meeting at the Granville Island campus, the then-President had stated the new campus would provide approximately 30% more space.
 - N. Himer noted that the minutes could reflect that the senator had noted this as their own recollection of a commitment rather than confirming it as an official statement.
- Attendance correction: Alex Phillips and Sanvi Bhatt should be recorded as present, and Stutti Gulatti should be recorded as absent.

Moved / Seconded that Senate approve the Minutes of the Senate Meeting of December 11, 2024, as amended.

Carried.

II. BUSINESS

1. Chair's Remarks + Report

Key Updates from the Deputy Minister Meeting:

- T. Kelly had a productive meeting with the Deputy Minister Trevor Hughes before the Senate meeting.
- Provincial budget updates are expected in the coming weeks.
- The government is prioritizing funding for housing and economic growth initiatives, and universities are expected to align their programs with labor market needs.
- Deputy Minister Hughes was interested in and remarked on Emily Carr's contributions to social innovation and reconciliation efforts.
- T. Kelly noted that:
 - ECU is well positioned to demonstrate its economic impact and graduate employment outcomes, and referenced a prior report on this impact, Emsi's *The Economic Value of Emily Carr University of Art + Design* (2019).

There was discussion and T. Kelly emphasized the University is proactively engaged with the ministry in key areas, such as:

- Building stronger industry partnerships to demonstrate ECU's role in job creation.
- Advocating for student housing initiatives.

Ministerial Visit with Minister Anne Kang (Post-Secondary Education):

- Minister Kang also visited ECU for the first time, and was accompanied by Parliamentary Secretary for International Credentials, Sunita Dhir, and MLA for Vancouver-Strathcona, Joan Phillip.

- The visit agenda included:
 - A tour of the Health Design Lab and Material Matters Research Center.
 - Meetings with faculty, student representatives, and administration.
 - Discussions on student housing, international student caps, and the role of art and design education in economic development.
- The Minister was highly engaged and impressed with ECU's approach.
- The Ministry has not yet issued a mandate letter to ECU, but the visit provided insights into government priorities.

Vice President Academic & Provost Hiring Process

- The search for a new VP Academic + Provost is ongoing. Candidate applications are being reviewed.
- Interviews will take place in February.

2. Interim Vice President, Academic + Provost's Report

D. Achjadi provided the following updates:

- Provincial Attestation Letters (PALs) have been distributed for 2024-25; issued late due to federal delays.
- ECU's international student allocation decreased by ~7-8% but reflect the actual PALs used and visas issued last year. Applications demand remains stable.
- New regulations include graduate student allocations, which were based on our data from the past 2-3 years.
 - Students must pay a deposit before receiving a PAL to prevent over-allocation.
 - Some of the MDes streams have been heavily subscribed by international students; strategies are being developed to increase domestic enrollment via scholarships.

Senators inquired about the following and there was discussion:

- Visa delays affecting enrollment:
 - Students report longer wait times for visas.
 - The government is revising processing timelines, but there is no immediate fix.
- New work restrictions reinstated:
 - The government has set an up to 24 hours per weekwork limit for international students.
 - Some senators worried this reduces the appeal of studying in Canada.
- Future uncertainty in allocations:
 - Allocations will be reviewed annually, making long-term planning difficult for programs relying on international students.

3. INFORMATION: Academic Planning + Priorities Committee Report

J. Turner, Chair, referred to the committee report in the meeting materials. Key updates include:

- Academic Schedule (Summer 2026 – Spring 2027): Two draft versions will be reviewed at the February 5 APP meeting, with a final version presented to Senate in March.
- Program Review Policy & Procedures: Initial draft has been completed. Final review expected at next APP meeting before moving to Senate for approval.
- Clarity was sought on how procedures differ from policies:
 - N. Himer explained that policy outlines overarching principles and delegation of authority, while procedures focus on implementation.
 - Some members felt the distinction was unclear and suggested a Senate presentation on the topic in the future.

4. APPROVAL: Addition of Registrar to APP Committee Membership

N. Himer, University Secretary, explained that the recommended addition reinstates the Registrar + Executive Director of Enrollment as a voting member of the APP Committee.

This role exists on equivalent committees at other universities and ensures enrollment policies are aligned with academic planning.

Moved / Seconded that the Senate, on the recommendation of the Academic Planning and Priorities (APP) Committee, and the Senate Governance Committee, approve the addition of the Registrar + Executive Director of Enrollment as a voting member of the APP Committee, effective immediately.

Carried.

5. INFORMATION: Curriculum Planning + Review (CPR) Committee Report

C. Cartiere, Chair, referred to the committee report in the meeting materials. She drew specific attention to the Program Review Policy and Procedures draft, highlighting that while the policy itself is straightforward, the accompanying procedures deserve particular scrutiny. Senators were encouraged to review both separately to avoid conflating governance with implementation and be ready to provide thorough, detailed feedback on these procedures once they are presented to Senate.

Some clarity was sought on the following:

- How do procedures differ from policies?
 - N. Himer explained that policy outlines overarching principles and delegation of authority, while procedures focus on implementation.
 - Some members felt the distinction was unclear and suggested a Senate presentation on the topic in the future.
- Are procedures easier to amend than policies?
 - N. Himer clarified that procedures are adaptable, but policy should be more stable.

6. APPROVAL: Curriculum Planning + Review Committee Recommendations

a) Faculty of Graduate Studies: Change to MFA Low Residency Program Requirement Worksheet

J. Langlois presented the proposed changes to the PRW that would move GSMA 652 (6 credits) from second-year fall semester to second-year summer semester to better align student thesis development and administrative processes.

Key points on this change:

- The move would ensure that students remain full-time status and maintain access to necessary services.
- Change will take effect Fall 2025 for second-year students.

The following discussion ensued:

- Why change this now?
 - Administrative issues have arisen because the course is listed as a Spring semester extension rather than a formal summer course.
 - The change will align thesis work with when students actually complete it.
- Impact on faculty workload
 - Some senators questioned whether supervisors would now work longer with students.

- Clarification: Supervisor workload remains the same, but thesis work is better distributed.
- Concerns about tuition
 - Some members asked whether this change affects tuition fees.
 - J. Langlois confirmed that there would be no increase in credits or tuition.
- Alignment with MDes Program
 - The MDes program finishes earlier than the MFA program.
 - No major impact expected as MFA Low Residency follows a different timeline.

Moved / Seconded that Senate, on the recommendation of the Curriculum Planning and Review Committee, approve the change to MFA Low Residency Program Requirement Worksheet, as presented.

Carried.

b) Faculty of Design and Dynamic Media Changes

C. Martin presented the updated course change proposals for:

- COMD 304: Typographic Systems
- COMD 314: Complex Typography
- COMD 404: Advanced Typography
- COMD 420: Type Design

The changes:

- Update course names, descriptions, learning objectives, and prerequisites.
- Align with industry expectations and program accreditation standards.

Moved / Seconded that Senate, on the recommendation of the Curriculum Planning and Review Committee, approve the following course change proposals as presented:

- i) **COMD 304 Typographic Systems**
(change to name, description, add learning objectives)
- ii) **COMD 314 Complex Typography**
(change to name, description, add learning objectives)
- iii) **COMD 404 Advanced Typography**
(change to name, prerequisites, description, learning objectives)
- iv) **COMD 420 Type Design**
(change to description, add learning objectives)

Carried.

7. INFORMATION: Senate Governance Committee Report

C. Martin provided an update on the committee's work:

- Currently review draft operating principles for Senate subcommittees.
- This work and the operating principles will help to standardize committee operations, clarify practices and will serve as a basis for updating committee terms of reference. . Draft guidelines have been reviewed in January 2024, and further discussions are ongoing.
- This work will be brought to Senate in due course.

III. OPEN FORUM

Exchange Program Credit Issues:

- A senator inquired about how often exchange agreements and course equivalencies are updated and whether there is a process for reviewing them. They cited an example of a student on exchange who was required to take more courses than they would at Emily Carr to receive equivalent credit.
- It was noted that exchange agreements vary by institution, and each agreement is reviewed as it expires.
- The Senate International Development Committee reviews these terms, especially regarding credit structures at partner institutions.
- Within BC, many courses are covered under the BC Transfer Guide. However, new or out-of-province courses undergo an internal review in Student Services, sometimes in consultation with Deans.
- K. Verkerk acknowledged that the current process works but needs updating, particularly in how equivalency information is published (e.g., the BC Transfer Guide and the university website).
- The Registrar's Office and Student Services are working on streamlining the process for transferring credits, especially in the Visual Arts area, to prevent students from taking extra courses unnecessarily.
- Course substitutions can be approved by the Dean if a course labeled "general studio" meets a core requirement.
- Students encountering issues on exchange should contact the Exchange Office for support. The office maintains close communication with students to address credit and course concerns as they arise.

IV. NEXT MEETING – March 5, 2025

V. MOTION: ADJOURN – The meeting was adjourned at 10:40 a.m.



Senate Committee Report Form

Committee:	Academic Planning + Priorities (APP) Committee
Meeting Date:	March 5, 2025
Presenter(s):	Jacqueline Turner

Chair’s Summary:

APP Committee covered the following agenda items at the February 5, 2025 meeting:

1. Academic Schedule: Academic Years 2026 – 2028

The committee discussed two versions of academic schedules for 2026 – 2028. The committee moved a motion for approval of version 2.

MOTION: APP approves Academic Schedule 2026 – 2028 version 2 and recommends the change to Senate. Motion Passed.

Please see the recommendation form.

2. Program Review Policy + Procedures

H. Fitzgerald provided an update on the program review policy process such as:

- Consultation process
- How the policy and procedures came about – ensures compliance with Degree Quality Audit (DQA)
- Development Team: Heather Fitzgerald, Natasha Himer, Diyan Achjadi (policy holder)
- Timeline: Fall 2023 – present
- Summary of feedback

MOTION: APP approves the Program Review Policy and Procedures and recommends approval to Senate with friendly amendments. Motion Passed.

Please see the recommendation form.

3. J. Turner shared with the committee that Senate approved the addition to APP’s membership. Registrar and Executive Director of Enrolment, K. Verkerk is now a voting member of APP.

Signature: Jacqueline Turner

Date: February 10, 2025



Senate Committee Recommendation Form

Committee:	Academic Planning + Priorities (APP) Committee
Meeting Date:	March 5, 2025
Presenter(s):	Jacqueline Turner
Guest(s):	Heather Fitzgerald

Subject: Program Review Policy and Procedures

Recommendation:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Motion to approve / <input type="checkbox"/> Discussion / <input type="checkbox"/> For Information
-----------------	--

Resolution:	That Senate, on the recommendation of the Academic Planning and Priorities Committee, approve the proposed Program Review Policy and its accompanying Procedures as a new academic policy.
-------------	--

Purpose:

This policy and accompanying procedures

- Addresses a gap in our academic policy space
- Ensures we are compliant with Degree Quality Assessment Board requirements
- Responds to Quality Assurance Process Audit recommendations
- Helps us ensure a more transparent and consistent process for programs

Rationale:

To date, Emily Carr has not had a formal Senate-approved policy governing the process for program review. While the process of program review has historically been reviewed and approved by Senate, we are out of compliance with provincial regulations by not having a Senate-approved policy and procedures. Developing a formal policy was also one of the key recommendations from the external reviewers in our Quality Assurance Process Audit.

Analysis and discussion:

Timeline of Policy Development:

Spring and Fall 2023: Provincial sector scan and consultations about current ECU processes

Spring and Fall 2024: Draft policy and procedures developed in discussion with University Secretary and VP Academic and Provost (policy holder)

Fall 2024: Draft policy and procedures circulated for discussion at APP, Academic Affairs, Deans and Assistant Deans, and Faculty meetings

Nov. 27, 2024 – Jan. 6, 2025: Open Community Consultation (via email)

Jan. 8: Moved into the Senate approvals process via APP

Feb. 5, 2025: Approved by APP

Feb. 10, 2025: Approved by Senate Governance

Summary of feedback received on policy drafts:

- Faculty workload and additional duties of program review
- Resourcing program review in University budgets
- Clarifying the respective roles of faculty and administrators in initiating, conducting and overseeing program review
- Involvement of non-teaching faculty, staff, students and other departments in program review
- Clarifying who, how and what re. data collection
- Clarifying approvals processes for formal reports

Consultation:

Fall 2024: Discussions of policy draft at meetings of

- Academic Affairs
- APP
- Deans and Assistant Deans
- Faculties

Nov. 27, 2024 – Jan. 6, 2025: Open Community Consultation on draft policy and procedures (via email)

Jan. 8, 2025: Revised draft of policy and procedures presented for discussion at APP and CPR

Jan. 8 - 22, 2025: Feedback from APP and CPR members via email, incorporated into final draft presented to APP for approval

Feb. 5, 2025: Friendly amendments to policy based on feedback from APP members and other community members approved by APP.

Resource requirements:

Support from University Secretariat

Attachments:

- Program Review Policy Draft
- Program Review Procedures Draft
- Summary of Feedback Received

Signature: Jacqueline Turner

Date: 2025-02-10



Policy Number	[TBC]
Approval Body	Board of Governors, on recommendation of Senate
Policy Officer	VP Academic and Provost
Approval Date	X-2024 2025

PROGRAM REVIEW POLICY. XX

ENABLING LEGISLATION + LINKED POLICIES

University Act

University Act Section 35.2(6): 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 following matters: (f) the evaluation of programs and educational services.

Related University Policies including:

- o *Policy 4.3 Program and Curriculum Change*

OBJECTIVE

The purpose of this Policy is to define the process of program review at the University.

SCOPE + APPLICATION

The University is required to have a policy governing program review under its obligations to the Degree Quality Assessment Board. This Policy applies to all University programs at the undergraduate or graduate level; the Policy does not apply to programs offered by the University through Continuing Studies. For the purposes of this Policy, a program is defined as an integrated group of courses and learning activities leading to learning outcomes in a particular field of study, including Majors, Minors, Foundation and degree programs at the Bachelor's and Master's levels.

POLICY STATEMENT

The University is committed to providing excellent learning experiences for students in art, media and design. Regular and rigorous review of our programs is essential to ensure that we continue to meet the evolving needs of our students and the fields in which they practice and participate.

Program review is an ongoing and cyclical process of curriculum review and revision. Program review seeks to determine whether standards of education, scholarship, and infrastructure are in place to support student success and continuous quality improvement. Program review and revision enables faculty to maintain the quality and integrity of their programs over time.

For the purposes of this Policy and the related procedures, **program review** refers to the 5-7-year cycle of review that programs undergo in accordance with requirements set by the Degree Quality Assessment Board; **formal program review** refers to the first two years of this cycle that involves internal review of the program (self-study), external review of the program, and the creation of an action plan to guide the work of curricular development and reform in the following three to five years.



POLICY PRINCIPLES

1. Program review is undertaken with the assumption that the quality of teaching and learning in all programs can be improved through critical review, reflection and consultation.
2. Formal program review provides an opportunity for a program to:
 - Assess whether programs are in alignment with provincial degree standards (for degree programs);
 - Assess whether programs align with University strategic priorities and provincial mandate;
 - Ensure that program learning outcomes and priorities reflect current student, industry and community needs;
 - Assess whether program curriculum, activities and assessments enable students to meet program learning outcomes;
 - Reflect on the program as a whole and identify areas that are working well for students and those that might need improvement;
 - Assess how and whether curricular support areas such as Technical Services, the Library, the Gallery and the Writing Centre support program learning outcomes;
 - Get feedback on the program from external reviewers familiar with the discipline or area; and
 - Plan for future curricular developments and changes that will be undertaken in the next three to five years.
3. Program review needs to be informed by all key constituents in a program, including students, alumni, faculty, staff, external partners (where appropriate) and academic administrators.
4. Program review supports the University in long-term planning and is connected to University governance and planning processes.

5. Program review demonstrates accountability to our community and government through the development and implementation of action plans and through the ongoing gathering of feedback and data to verify the progress of those plans.
6. Program review is a faculty-led process supported by academic administration.

DEFINITIONS

In this Policy and the related Procedures:

Bachelor's Degree: An undergraduate degree normally requiring four years of full-time study (120 credits) (see Handbook from DQAB)

Formal Program Review: The first two years of the Program Review cycle which includes Self-Study, an External Review and Site Visit, and the creation of a Final Report and Action Plan.

Foundation: A one-year required interdisciplinary program of study (30 credits) for first-year undergraduate students.

Major: A primary specialization in an undergraduate degree (for example, a Bachelor of Fine Arts with a Major in Illustration; a Bachelor of Media Arts with a Major in 3D Animation) requiring completion of, at minimum, 30 credits of upper-level courses in the subject area of the Major.

Master's degree: A graduate degree that normally follows an undergraduate degree and which typically requires one to three years to complete.

Minor: At ECU, a secondary specialization in a subject area within either the primary or a secondary degree program (for example, a BFA in Visual Arts with a Minor in Curatorial Studies; or a BDES in Communication Design with a Minor in Social Practice and Community and Engagement). Minors typically require 18 credits from a list of required and elective courses related to the subject area.

Program: An integrated group of courses and learning activities leading to learning outcomes in a particular field of study, including Majors, Minors, Foundation and degree programs at the Bachelor's and Master's levels.

Program Review: The five- to seven-year cycle which includes Formal Program Review as well as ongoing curriculum renewal, evaluation and reflection.

The Degree Quality Assessment Board: the independent advisory board that ensures legislated quality assurance requirements are met for post-secondary education in BC.

University: Emily Carr University of Art + Design



Policy Number	[TBC]
Approval Body	Senate
Policy Officer	VP Academic and Provost
Approval Date	2025


PROGRAM REVIEW PROCEDURES 4.XX DRAFT

[Linked to Program Review Policy 4.XX](#)

DESCRIPTION

Program Review is an ongoing and cyclical process of curriculum review and revision that enables the University to maintain the quality and integrity of their programs over time. For the purposes of this policy, Program Review refers to the 5-7-year cycle of review that programs undertake to maintain our obligations to students and the provincial Degree Quality Assessment Board.

This Procedures document outlines the formal elements of the Program Review cycle—including the two years of formal Program Review and the annual accountability updates; it also identifies critical roles and responsibilities for these processes. More detailed information to support the formal Program Review process can be found in the Program Review Handbook overseen by the office of the VP Academic and Provost.



DEFINITIONS

The **Program Review Team** includes three (3) or more faculty members who represent or are familiar with all core (required) curriculum in the program area; in most programs, this will include faculty who teach both Studio and Critical Studies curriculum. Because graduate programs do not have dedicated faculty, a representative from the Graduate Studies office should be included as a consulting member of the program review team to contribute wholistic knowledge of the program over time. The program review team is assembled by the Dean responsible for the program area in consultation with Assistant and/or Associate Deans and program faculty.

Program Review Groups: Where appropriate, the VP Academic and Provost may choose to group smaller or similar programs for the purpose of Formal Program Review. In this case, the Program Review Team will be composed of faculty members from all program areas in the Program Review Group.

Self-Study is a faculty-driven, evidence-based research process conducted by the Program Review Team. The Program Review Team reviews information provided by the University along with information gathered by the program area, including from current program students, to answer questions about the relevancy and currency of program curriculum, delivery and resources. The Program Review Team is supported by several areas to identify, gather and analyze information, including Academic Affairs, the Teaching and Learning Centre, Institutional Research, and, in the case of Graduate programs, the Graduate Studies office.

The **Self-Study Report** is a written summary of the Self-Study research process that articulates the key findings of the research. The Self-Study Report is written by the Program Review Team using a template provided by the University, with guidance and support from the Dean.

The **External Review Team** consists of three faculty members or administrators from comparable post-secondary institutions or programs who understand the program curriculum and delivery. Where appropriate, one member of the External Review Team may come from industry or another related context. The composition of the External Review Team is determined by the VP Academic and Provost in consultation with the Dean and Program Review Team.

The **Site Visit** is an opportunity for the External Review Team to visit the university campus and consult with a range of program stakeholders, in particular program faculty and current program students.

The **External Review Report** is written by the External Review Team using a template provided by the University; it includes a summary of External Review and Site Visit activities as well as key findings and recommendations for the program area(s).

The **Final Report** is completed by the Program Review Team using a template provided by the University; it summarizes and evaluates information from both the internal Self-Study and External Review Report. The Final Report provides the basis for the Action Plan.

The **Action Plan** details the specific actions, with timelines, that the program area(s) will undertake to improve program quality. The Action Plan is prepared by the Program Review Team using a template provided by the University; it is submitted for review and approval with the Final Report.

Accountability Updates refer to the formal annual reports that Deans provide to Senate during years 3-7 of the program review cycle to update the institution on a program's progress toward goals identified in the Action Plan. Updates will be prepared by the Assistant or Associate Dean using a template provided by the University in consultation with the program area, and presented to Senate by the Dean or designate.

ROLES + RESPONSIBILITY

The VP Academic and Provost is responsible for overall program quality at the University. The VP Academic and Provost sets the schedule for formal Program Review; determines the composition of the External Review Team; and reviews and approves all documents (including Self-Study Reports, Final Reports and Action Plans) emerging from formal Program Review.

The Dean overseeing the program area(s) is responsible for assembling the program review team, ensuring that the work of formal Program Review takes place as scheduled; supporting faculty in the completion of the formal review stages; reviewing and approving all reports and action plans; forwarding a list of potential External Reviewers to the VP Academic and Provost; and providing annual reports to Senate on implementation of the Action Plan.

The Assistant or Associate Dean in the program area(s) are responsible for determining the composition of the Program Review Team (in consultation with the Dean); consulting with faculty to develop a list of potential External Reviewers; leading the work of Self-Study; preparing the Self-Study Report; engaging in Site Visit meetings; and preparing the Final Report and Action Plan (in consultation with program faculty and the Dean). Time releases from other duties for the Assistant or Associate Dean will be determined by the VP Academic in consultation with the Dean.

The Program Review Team is responsible for conducting the work of Self-Study, contributing to the writing of the Self-Study Report, participating in the Site Visit meetings, reviewing the External Review Report, and reviewing the Final Report and Action Plan. Time releases from other duties for members of the Program Review Team will be determined by the VP Academic in consultation with the Dean.

All Regular Faculty in the program area are responsible for participating in the work of Self-Study; contributing to and reviewing the Self-Study Report; engaging in Site Visit meetings; and contributing to and reviewing the Final Report and Action Plan.

The Office of Operations, Planning, and Strategic Analysis is responsible for supporting Program Review Teams in various ways by, for example: collecting and synthesizing University data; assisting with data analysis and external research, as needed; supporting the collection of student work; providing institutional information for external reviewers; scheduling site visit meetings; and managing timelines for the formal program review process.

Institutional Research is responsible for the collection, management, analysis, organization and interpretation of University data such as student records, enrolment statistics, student progression and retention, student use of University services, etc.

The Graduate Studies Office currently collects and maintains data on student admission, enrolment, progression and retention in graduate programs.

The Teaching and Learning Centre is responsible for maintaining program review templates for reports and annual updates and orienting new program review teams to the work of program review. TLC staff is also available to support Program Review Teams, as needed, with the work of identifying and conducting consultations with program stakeholders; mapping curriculum and defining/reviewing learning outcomes;

developing self-study research questions; writing self-study reports; responding to external feedback; and developing final reports and action plans.

The University Senate is responsible for approving educational policy related to the evaluation of programs; approving the schedule of formal Program Reviews developed by the VP Academic and Provost; approving all Final Reports and Action Plans; and logging annual accountability updates provided by the Dean.

The Board of Governors is responsible for approving, on the advice of Senate, educational policy related to the evaluation of programs; and ensuring that University budgets allocate appropriate resources to the necessary work of ongoing Program Review and renewal.

FORMAL PROGRAM REVIEW SCHEDULE & TEAM

The schedule for formal Program Review each year is determined by the VP Academic and Provost in consultation with Deans and program area faculty.

Using the schedule provided by the VP Academic and Provost, the Dean responsible for the program area(s) works with Associate and/or Assistant Deans to map a detailed timeline for the formal Program Review process and the composition of the Program Review Team.

The Program Review Team should include 3 or more faculty members who represent or are familiar with all core (required) curriculum in the program; in most programs, this will require both Studio and Critical Studies faculty representation. The Program Review Team organizes the activities of the Self-Study, writes the Self-Study Report, participates in External Review, and writes the Final Report and Action Plan. The Program Review Team is chaired by an Assistant or Associate Dean.

FORMAL PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS

The formal Program Review process will typically unfold over four academic terms.

TERM 1: DATA GATHERING & ANALYSIS

To assess the quality of a program, program areas need high quality data, both quantitative and qualitative. **Quantitative data** may include information such as student admissions and enrolment data, student demographics, class fill rates, retention rates, course evaluation scores across the program, usage of academic support services by students in the program area, etc. The Office of Operations, Planning and Strategic Analysis is responsible for collecting and synthesizing University data to support the Program Review Team, as well as helping to gather other information such as comparator scans of similar programs, samples of recent student work, current CVs from regular program area faculty, information from industry for industry-aligned programs, and anything else a program area may need to analyze their curriculum.

Qualitative data may include written surveys and/or consultations with:

- current students (**required**),
- alumni (**recommended**),
- studio and shop technicians (**required for Studio programs**),
- staff attached to the program under review (required for Foundation and graduate programs), non-regular faculty teaching in the program area (**required**),
- Aboriginal Advisory committee (**recommended**),
- curricular support areas such as the Library, the Gallery and the Writing Centre (recommended)
- faculty teaching in related or adjacent programs, including Foundation (**recommended**),
- external partners, such as industry representatives, research partners, etc.
- any other groups that program areas feel would be relevant to their review.

When possible, program review teams are encouraged to solicit input from program stakeholders with diverse identities, backgrounds, lived experiences, and perspectives to enable richer insights into the program's effectiveness. The Teaching and Learning Centre can work with Program Review Teams to identify, schedule and facilitate surveys and consultations with program stakeholders.

TERM 2: SELF-STUDY

During the Self-Study, the Program Review Team analyzes available data to review the effectiveness and relevance of program curriculum. Using student work samples, the Team analyzes how well program curriculum and assessments reflect:

- program outcomes,
- provincial degree standards (for degree programs),
- institutional strategic priorities as represented in the institutional Strategic Plan,
- the University's provincial mandate, and
- any changes in the discipline since the previous review.

The findings of the Self-Study are documented in the Self-Study Report, which is prepared by the Program Review Team using a template provided by the University. The Self-Study Report is reviewed by the Dean responsible for the

program area to ensure alignment with strategic institutional priorities before moving forward for approval by the VP Academic and Provost. Time releases for faculty leading out on the work of Self-Study will be determined by the VP Academic and Provost in consultation with the Dean.

TERM 3: EXTERNAL REVIEW AND SITE VISIT

The VP Academic and Provost determines the composition of the External Review Team in consultation with the Dean and based on recommendations from the Program Review Team. External Review Teams include three faculty or administrators from comparable institutions or programs who understand the program curriculum and delivery. Where appropriate, one member of the External Review Team may come from industry or another related context.

Remuneration for External Reviewers is at the discretion of the VP Academic and Provost.

In advance of the Site Visit, External Review Teams are sent the Self-Study Report and other institutional documents by the office of the VP Academic and Provost.

The Site Visit will be scheduled to ensure that External Reviewers have an opportunity to tour the program facilities and meet with:

- The VP Academic and Provost and Dean responsible for the program
- The Program Review Team
- Program area faculty (if not fully represented on the Program Review Team)
- Current students in the program, and recent alumni if available
- Shop or studio technicians that support the program
- Non-teaching faculty from the Library, Writing Centre and/or Teaching and Learning Centre who liaise with the program area
- Members of other departments that support program students, such as the Aboriginal Gathering Place, the Gallery, Counselling and Wellness, Accessibility, Career + WIL, Academic Advising, the Library and Archives, etc.
- Any other members of the University community that would be relevant to the External Review.

Following the Site Visit, the External Review Team writes a report using a template provided by the University which includes recommendations for the program based on both the Self-Study Report and the Site Visit. This report is sent to the VP Academic and Provost who reviews it before sharing it with the Dean for distribution to the program area.

TERM 4: FINAL REPORT AND ACTION PLAN

In response to the External Review Report and the findings of the Self-Study, the Assistant or Associate Dean, in consultation with the Program Review Team and other program faculty, drafts a Final Report and Action Plan using a template provided by the University to outline the work of program development and revision for the next three to five years.

The Final Report allows program areas to contextualize, correct or corroborate findings from the External Review Report. This document should clearly explain how and why any recommendations in the External Review Report would not be included in the Action Plan.

The Action Plan creates a roadmap for curricular and program change and development for the upcoming 3-5 years. Action Plan items should include a clear and specific outcome and timeline. The Action Plan should also clearly indicate any items that are beyond the scope of the faculty to accomplish or that require budgetary approval (e.g., the hiring of

new faculty, buying new equipment, acquiring additional space, etc.). Time releases for faculty leading out on the work of writing the Final Report and Action Plan will be determined by the VP Academic and Provost in consultation with the Dean.

Final Reports and Action Plans must be:

- Reviewed by faculty and staff in the program area;
- Reviewed by the Faculty in which the program resides;
- Reviewed and approved by the Dean responsible for the program to ensure alignment with institutional priorities;
- Reviewed by the Office of Planning and Strategic Analysis to ensure any budgetary requests are logged;
- Reviewed and approved by the VP Academic and Provost;
- Reviewed and approved by the Academic Planning and Priorities Committee;
- Reviewed and approved by Senate (or assigned committee).

Approved action items with budgetary implications will be documented by the Dean and included in University budget planning processes.

Full Program Review packages, including the Self-Study Report, the External Report, and the Final Report and Action Plan, will be provided to the Board for information by the VP Academic and Provost, and made available to the University community via a shared repository.

ANNUAL ACCOUNTABILITY UPDATES

Every year after the submission and approval of the Final Report and Action Plan, the Assistant or Associate Dean responsible for the program area, in consultation with program faculty and the Dean, will write an Accountability Update that articulates

- work on Action Plan items to date, including any completed items,
- a plan of work for the upcoming year(s) to complete remaining goals, and
- any barriers, changes or new goals emerging.

This report will be approved by the Dean responsible for the program area.

Approved reports are presented to Senate for information by the Dean or designate. On the recommendation of Senate, the VP Academic and Provost may request additional accountability updates.

Summary of Feedback on Policy Drafts

Compiled by Heather Fitzgerald, February 26, 2025

Sources of Feedback

- Consultations with Deans and Assistant/Associate Deans
- University-wide feedback (faculty and staff) via email: Nov. 27, 2024 – Jan. 6, 2025
- Feedback from CPR: Jan. 8 – Jan. 22, 2025
- Feedback from APP: Jan. 8 – Jan. 22, 2025
- President’s Executive Council: Feb. 4, 2025
- Senate Governance: February 10, 2025
- Feedback from Chair of the Aboriginal Advisory Council: Feb. 26, 2025

Feedback Themes

Overall, there were very few comments on the Policy document itself. Most of the comments, questions and suggestions centred on the Procedures. To protect the privacy of those who submitted feedback, we will summarize the key themes that emerged.

Faculty workload and additional duties of program review

This theme came up from almost every faculty member who reviewed these documents, in person and in writing. Everyone recognizes the value of a robust program review process, but many faculty members expressed concern or even fear that without time releases or additional supports, it would be very difficult to manage the level of work that these Procedures demand alongside existing teaching and administrative commitments.

There were also questions about how non-regular faculty could be supported for their participation in the program review process.

While this policy will (and should) not contain specific information about remuneration, it has become clear that for these Procedures to function as intended, we need to include greater detail about how faculty will be resourced and supported in the work of program review. To that end, we have included explicit information about how and when other departments will support program review teams and how and when time releases for faculty and Assistant / Associate Deans may be available.

Questions around resourcing program review in University budgets

Connecting to the above concern, many feedback providers requested clarification for how program review would connect to University budget processes and priorities. To address this concern, we have added information about how resource requests that emerge in the final report and action plan will be funneled into University budget planning via the program Dean. We have also added a note in the Roles and Responsibilities section about the role of the Board in ensuring that program review is appropriately resourced in University budgets.

A request for clarity about the respective roles of faculty and administrators in initiating, conducting and overseeing the work of program review

While both our external reviewers and DQAB are clear that program review should be a faculty-led process, it is also true that University administrators, particularly Deans and the VP Academic, are responsible for ensuring that program review happens in a timely and consistent manner. This tension emerged in the feedback, with some respondents emphasizing the critical and central role of faculty, while others pointed to the pivotal role of Deans and other administrators. To address this tension and respect the principles of collegial governance, we have added further detail and explanation to the Roles and Responsibilities section of the Procedures and revised the approvals process for the final reports and action plans (under the heading *Term 4*).

Questions about the involvement of non-teaching faculty, staff, students and other departments in program review

Many respondents had questions about how program review, especially in the self-study and external review phases, would include the voices and perspectives of groups beyond the program faculty. Some expressed a desire to see more explicit consultation or inclusion of program or Technical Services staff; others wanted to see more engagement with academic support areas or Student Services. Still others asked pointed questions about the role and place of students in the process. To address these concerns, we have revised the list of required and recommended

consultations in the self-study phase; we have made explicit reference to the groups that external reviewers will consult; and in the case of Graduate Studies which has no permanent faculty, we have recommended that a representative from program staff be included as a consulting member of the program review team.

Requests for clarification about data collection

There were several requests for clarification about how and which data would be collected, by whom, and how much faculty would be responsible for collecting themselves. While some of this information is not yet available because institutional research is an active area of development for the institution, we have attempted to provide more detail in the Roles and Responsibility section about which areas will be providing data to faculty and which areas will be supporting faculty to collect data. This will be an area of the Procedures that will need to be revisited as our Institutional Research department and systems are developed.

Requests for clarification about approvals processes

There were several questions and suggestions in the final section of the Procedures document about the approvals process for final reports and action plans. Several respondents correctly pointed out that we had not included program faculty as one of the reviewers and/or approvers of these documents; we have now corrected that oversight. But our first attempt at correction – wherein we suggested that program faculty review and approve these documents – generated more questions, as we don't currently have formal or consistent approvals processes at the program or Faculty level. Until such time as we address this governance issue, we have amended the Procedures to suggest that 1) program staff and faculty, and 2) the wider Faculty must review these documents before they move into the formal approvals processes.

Rationale for a new Program Review Policy and Procedures for ECUAD

1. *Is this a new policy or what does it replace?*

This is a new policy created to fill a gap in our academic policy framework. ECUAD is required by the Degree Quality Assessment Board to have an approved policy and procedures governing academic program review. According to the provincial [Quality Assurance Process Audit Handbook](#), all BC post-secondary institutions should have “evidence of a formal, institutionally approved policy and procedure for the periodic review of programs against published standards” (p. 9)

Further, our external assessment during the Quality Assurance Process Audit (QAPA) in 2022/23 clearly identified the development of policy relating to academic quality assurance among their recommendations: “We recommend (12) that a comprehensive set of policy and procedures – inclusive of roles, responsibilities and accountabilities - be developed in support of academic quality assurance and reflective of bi-cameral governance” (ECUAD [Assessor’s Report Workbook](#), p. 6).

The policy and accompanying procedures are foundational pieces in ECUAD’s quality assurance policy framework. Additional policies governing New Program Development, Program and Curriculum Change, and the Discontinuance or Sunsetting of Programs will also be developed in due course.

2. *What is the scope?*

The Program Review Policy identifies key priorities and guiding principles in academic program review at ECUAD. The accompanying Procedures document defines key terms, identifies key roles and responsibilities, and provides an overview of how the work of formal program review and ongoing accountability unfolds operationally.

3. *Any major changes to flag? New thresholds? Something that should be noted for the Board and a decision point/option?*

This policy and procedures formalize program review processes for the university, including reflecting existing practices and bringing these into alignment with provincial requirements for assessment, accountability and good practice.

Academic program review should be the major driver of curricular innovation and change. By regularly reviewing programs through an evidence-informed process, ECU can identify where and how curriculum is effective and where it may need to be updated, strengthened, revised or developed to respond to changing student, institutional and provincial priorities.

This information will then inform university decision-making at all levels: from curricular to operational, from recruitment to budgetary.

4. *Was a sector scan conducted and how does it compare?*

The policy and procedures were developed to respond to specific Ministry requirements. Comparable policies at other Special Purpose Teaching Universities and similarly sized colleges in BC were reviewed, in particular, Kwantlen Polytechnic University, Capilano University, Vancouver Island University, and North Island College.

The draft policy aligns with other provincial institutions in terms of the overall procedures of formal program review. The policy diverges from other institutions in the recommended procedures for approvals and ongoing accountability to reflect differences in ECU's governance structures. Many comparable institutions have formal approving bodies at the Faculty level or specific Senate sub-committees devoted to academic quality assurance. As ECUAD does not share this structure, we recommend that approvals for final reports and action plans move from the program level (with review by program faculty and the Faculty) to formal approval by the Dean and the VP Academic and Provost, before moving into the Senate approvals process via Academic Planning and Priorities. At the present time, these are the appropriate governance bodies to hold responsibilities in the process. In time, if and as ECU's governance structures evolve, corresponding roles and responsibilities can be updated.

We have also taken steps to ensure that this proposed policy responds to all (seven of twelve) recommendations from the QAPA external assessors that relate directly to program review :

- (1) draft appropriate policy at the Board and Senate levels to make the accountabilities and responsibilities clear;
- (4) look at additional ways to on-board or orient internal and external reviewers to the university in general as well as the process;
- (5) be more explicit with guidance to the type of external reviewer that they deem to be most appropriate for the program or Faculty under review;
- (6) investigate approaches to decolonize the external review, to maximize the reviewers' interaction with key constituents to produce a more effective review;
- (8) explore how voices external to the institution could be brought into the review process that would add value to the programs;
- (10) re-examine how grouping programs and creative scheduling could result in better satisfaction with the process and potentially better outcomes;
- (11) explicitly include [strategic planning] priorities in the program review process.

5. *Is a legal review required/advisable? Are there any legal requirements that impact on the policy?*

Legal review was not deemed necessary for the policy and procedures.

6. *Why is this policy coming to PEC?*

While this policy and procedures will sit under the VP Academic and Provost, it is important for PEC to be aware of this policy as, going forward, academic program review will be used to inform and guide operational decisions such as infrastructure development, space allocations, resource priorities, etc. In turn, findings from strategic planning processes will also inform academic program review.

7. *Will this involve any change management?*

The policy and procedures will result in a substantial change in academic review and planning processes. Processes that were previously partially or wholly internal to Faculties will now move formally into Senate and Board decision-making frameworks. In return, findings from academic program review will also now more directly inform institutional planning processes.

8. *Anything else that is noteworthy or relevant to know?*

The external assessors flagged the role of the Board of Governors in ensuring there are appropriate policies governing and guiding academic quality assurance and decision-making on introducing programs, revising programs and discontinuing programs:

35.2(6) 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 following matters [...]

(b) the establishment, revision or discontinuance of courses and programs at the special purpose, teaching university [...]

(f) the evaluation of programs and educational services [...]



Senate Committee Recommendation Form

Committee:	Academic Planning + Priorities (APP) Committee
Meeting Date:	March 5, 2025
Presenter(s):	Jacqueline Turner / Kathryn Verkerk
Guest(s):	

Subject: Approval of the Summer 2026 – Spring 2029 Academic Schedule

Recommendation:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Motion to approve / <input type="checkbox"/> Discussion / <input type="checkbox"/> For Information
-----------------	--

Resolution:	That Senate, on the recommendation of the Academic Planning and Priorities Committee, approve the academic schedule for Summer 2026 to Spring 2029.
-------------	---

Purpose:

The academic schedule (previously referred to as the academic calendar) for the upcoming academic years (Summer 2026 to Spring 2029) requires approval.

Rationale:

The Fall 2026/27/28 academic schedules include a shift of Reading Week to align with Remembrance Day and a reduction of one day (i.e. Reading Week is 3 days + Remembrance Day) to ensure there are 60 teaching days per term.

In addition, the make-up day(s) is to be scheduled during the term, but this was not possible in Fall 2026 and 2027; those days are at the end of term.

Please note, the APP approved schedule included two make-up days in the Fall 2028 schedule (one during the term, one at the end) but this was an oversight and was adjusted to include only one.

Dates of note:

	Reading Week	Make Up Days
Fall 2026	November 10-13 (3 days + 1 stat)	Tuesday, December 8 (Wednesday class)
Fall 2027	November 9-12 (3 days + 1 stat)	Tuesday, December 7 (Thursday class)
Fall 2028	November 14-16 (3 days + 1 stat)	Friday, October 13 (Monday class) and Tuesday, December 5 (Monday class)

Like Spring 2026’s recently approved schedule, teaching in the spring semester will begin one week later in January to provide staff, faculty, and students with additional preparation time following the university closure. Consequently, Convocation in May has also been moved one week later to accommodate this adjustment.

Analysis and discussion:

After consulting with all faculties, APP wanted the Reading Week to be four days (including Remembrance Day) instead of three. This meant that the intended make-up day for this week was unable to be accommodated (as noted in the previous memo form that came to Senate). In future iterations of the academic schedule, where possible, make-up days will be scheduled either at the end of the term (no more than one day) and/or during the week of Thanksgiving (where possible).

As noted previously, the next step will be to bring an Academic Schedule Policy to Senate for approval. In addition, the Board must be advised on the development of educational policy of the setting of an academic schedule policy (*University Act 35.2(6)(h)*).

An academic schedule policy proposal will be brought to Senate based on the recently approved schedules in the coming meetings.

Consultation:

All faculties and APP, Communications + Marketing, Registrar's Office


Attachments: *Proposed Summer 2026 – Spring 2029 Academic Schedule*

Signature: Jacqueline Turner


Date: 2025-02-27

Monday Tuesday Wednesday Thursday Friday
 Monday Tuesday Wednesday Thursday Friday
 Monday Tuesday Wednesday Thursday Friday
 Monday Tuesday Wednesday Thursday Friday
 Monday Tuesday Wednesday Thursday Friday
 Monday Tuesday Wednesday Thursday Friday
 Monday Tuesday Wednesday Thursday Friday


Summer 2026




Fall 2026/Spring 2027/Summer 2027







Fall 2027/Spring 2028/Summer 2028
(leap year)





Fall 2028/Spring 2029





- = Statutory holiday/institutional closure
- = Make up day
- = First day of instruction
- = Instructional day
- = Non-instructional day
- = Assessment period
- = Remaining unscheduled days between terms
- = Reading Break
- = Christmas Closure
- WD = Withdraw deadline
- AD = Add/Drop deadline
- F = Final grades due
- MT = 100 level, mid-term grades due
- R = Thursday













Senate Committee Report Form

Committee:	CPR
Meeting Date:	March 5, 2025
Presenter(s):	Kyla and Celeste

Chair's Summary:

At the February 5, 2025 meeting:

- 1) Kyla Mallett presented a new course proposal CRAM 2XX Ceramics Processes: Topic which was approved unanimously as presented.
- 2) Celeste Martin presented course change proposals for 3DAN 200 and 3DAN 300, new course proposal 3DAN 2XX (requesting 210) and updates to the 3D Computer Animation Major PRW form. The proposed changes are meant as a cleanup of the existing program. All proposals were approved unanimously.

There were concerns that the amount of course changes on the proposed 3D Computer Animation PRW form would count as a new program by the DQAB's new guidelines for program development, but we don't know. More clarity around the new guidelines is needed.

There were questions as to why SOCS 201 is not a requirement for the 3D Computer Animation Major and without it where there was evidence of criticality within the program. Aspects of criticality are written into the course learning objectives and outcomes and embedded throughout the program instead of focusing on criticality within one course. Celeste said that this allows flexibility and expansion of topics to support student projects.

Signature: Cameron Cartiere

Date: Feb 18, 2025



Senate Committee Recommendation Form

Committee:	CPR Committee
Meeting Date:	March 5, 2025
Presenter(s):	Kyla Mallett and Celeste Martin
Guest(s):	

Subject:

1. New course proposal

CRAM 2XX Ceramics Processes: Topic
Presenter: Kyla Mallett

2. DDM - Course change proposals, new course proposal and PRW changes:

- 3DAN 200 3D Computer Animation II
(change to name, credits, description, learning objectives, add outcomes)
- 3DAN 300 Preproduction for 3D Animation
(change to credits, description, learning objectives, add outcomes)
- 3DAN 2XX (requesting 210) Core Studio in 3D Animation
- 3D Computer Animation Program Requirement Worksheets and Cover Sheet

Presenter: Celeste Martin

Recommendation:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Motion to approve / <input type="checkbox"/> Discussion / <input type="checkbox"/> For Information
------------------------	---

Resolution:	<p>That Senate, on the recommendation of the Curriculum Planning and Review Committee, approve the following as presented:</p> <p>Faculty of Art</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New course proposal: CRAM 2XX – <i>Ceramics Processes: Topic</i> <p>Faculty of Design + Dynamic Media</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Course change proposal: 3DAN 200 – <i>3D Computer Animation II</i> (changes to name, credits, description, learning objectives, and outcomes) • Course change proposal: 3DAN 300 – <i>Preproduction for 3D Animation</i> (changes to credits, description, learning objectives, and outcomes) • New course proposal: 3DAN 2XX (proposed 210) – <i>Core Studio in 3D Animation</i> • <i>3D Computer Animation Program Requirement Worksheet and Cover Sheet</i>
--------------------	---

Purpose:

- **CRAM 2XX** - Because Ceramics spans a wide range of processes and skills, and traverses the realms of contemporary art, as well as the applied and decorative arts, the curriculum necessitates diversification.

The third-year Special Topics offering CRAM 303 has allowed us to introduce a variety of specialized approaches to the benefit of that constituency, and a topics-based course at the second-year level will serve similarly, but at an earlier point in the study. The introduction of highly focused material at the second year offers students a longer period in which to develop the attendant skills and ideas prior to graduation.

Unlike other second-year ceramics courses, this class will require a prerequisite of FNDD 127 or CRAM (3 credits) or INDD 230 (6 credits). We believe that by focusing on a specific topic in ceramics, students will still need a foundational understanding of working with the material, allowing the class to emphasize the topic rather than ceramic fundamentals.

- **3DAN 2XX (requesting 210)** - This course consolidates two courses, 3DAN 207 Character Creation and 3DAN 217 Adv Character Model & Texture. This aims to clearly identify core curriculum in 3D Animation, avoid redundancy and allow students to integrate different aspects of their practice and provide the time and support in the creation of their body of work. This 6-credit core studio will be piloted by co-listing the above-mentioned courses in Spring 2025.

Rationale:

- **3DAN 200** - This course consolidates two previous courses, 3DAN 200 Computer Animation II and 3DAN 205 Lighting and Rendering. This aims to clearly identify core curriculum in 3D Animation and allow students to integrate different aspects of their practice and provide the time and support in the creation of their body of work. This 6-credit core studio has been already piloted by co-listing the above-mentioned courses.
- **3DAN 300** - Following program review and student feedback, 3D Animation is moving towards identifying core curriculum through 6 credits core production studios. This supports curricular integration and instruction time for students to develop their short stories and articulate various approaches of 3D Computer Animation production workflows. Changing this course to 6 credits will ensure continuity and support to continue building their body of work.
- **3D Computer Animation PRW changes** - 3DAN is responding to program review’s action plan, specifically recommendations 5 and 6:
 - Recommendation 5: **Review curricular structure and flow**, articulate Animation pathways and increase the number of elective options to support greater curricular breadth.
 - Recommendation 6: Continue to support integration on EDI perspectives in the Animation curriculum, operations, and faculty representation.

Analysis and discussion:

There was a discussion regarding the number of changes proposed on the 3D Computer Animation PRW as it could potentially spark a program change according to the DQAB, but more clarification is needed on the DQAB’s new guidelines for program development.

Does this matter respond to any of the strategies in the institutional strategic plan (2024-2030)?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Elevating Teaching + Learning	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Expanding Research + Practice	<input type="checkbox"/> Supporting People + Culture	<input type="checkbox"/> Stewarding Places + Spaces	<input type="checkbox"/> Strengthening Systems + Supports
---	---	--	---	---

Attachments: CRAM 2XX, 3DAN 200, 3DAN 300, 3DAN 2XX (210), 3D Computer Animation PRW

Signature: Cameron Cartiere

Date: Feb 18, 2025



NEW COURSE PROPOSAL

NAME OF COURSE: *Ceramics Processes: Topic* COURSE MNEMONIC: CRAM 2XX

NUMBER OF CREDITS: 6 PREREQUISITE: FNDD 127, Any 200 level
CRAM or INDD-230 Intro to Ceramic Design

STUDIO ACADEMIC SPACE REQUIRED: SEMINAR LECTURE
 LAB

EFFECTIVE DATE: Spring 2025

Proposed Course Description:

Students will develop their craft while responding to a specific cultural context or the unique implications of one approach to the medium. Merging critical inquiry with manual skill-building, this course will integrate a specialized focus with an investigation of broader poetic concerns of ceramic practice. Topics will vary in topic from section to section, and will span sculptural approaches, utilitarian design, and practices that bridge both.

Purpose of the Course:

Because Ceramics spans a wide range of processes and skills, and traverses the realms of contemporary art, as well as the applied and decorative arts, the curriculum necessitates diversification.

The third-year Special Topics offering CRAM 303 has allowed us to introduce a variety of specialized approaches to the benefit of that constituency, and a topics-based course at the second-year level will serve similarly, but at an earlier point in the study. The introduction of highly focused material at the second year offers students a longer period in which to develop the attendant skills and ideas prior to graduation.

Unlike other second-year ceramics courses, this class will require a prerequisite of FNDD 127 or CRAM (3 credits) or INDD 230 (6 credits). We believe that by focusing on a specific topic in ceramics, students will still need a foundational understanding of working with the material, allowing the class to emphasize the topic rather than ceramic fundamentals.

Learning Objectives (5-10):

- Students will engage with a diverse range of concepts and ideas related to ceramics, drawing from the presented topics.
- Acquire and expand, specific to the topic, technical framework, encompassing various materials, processes, and equipment used in the creation of ceramics.
- Enhance making skills by demonstrating advanced handling and control of materials.
- Build a body of work through systematic experimentation and employ research methods.
- Develop a deeper conceptual and critical approach to creative practices within the ceramic topic.

- Cultivate a broader understanding of ceramics within the contemporary art and design context.
- Engage in meaningful dialogue about ones work in relationship to broader contexts.

Questions to consider:

Does this course contribute to decolonizing the curriculum? How so?

Instructors will be encouraged and supported to deliver their curriculum through a decolonized lens. Efforts will be made to diversify contemporary and historical precedence, de-centralize in class structures, and create a safe and inclusive environment for all.

Does this course address the climate crisis? How so?

Careful Consideration will be placed on what work is seen through the firing process, striking a careful balance between productive learning and redundant making.

Will this course replace an existing course?

Yes No

Name of course replaced by new course:

<Click to enter if applicable>

Is this course required for Graduation?

Yes No

If required, in which program will this course be a required component?

Degree: BFA

Major: Art Majors

Is this course an elective?

Yes No

Is registration priority given to Majors?

Yes No

Is this course repeatable for credit?

Yes No

Could this course be credited through PLA?

Yes No

This course will be offered:

From time to time as required

Regularly Fall Spring

Online

Course Proposal Submission Information:

PREPARED FOR SUBMISSION BY: Julie York

DATE: 11/01/224

ASSISTANT DEAN: Julie York

DATE: 1/21/2025

DEAN: Kyla Mallett

DATE: 1/21/2025

If proposal involves other Faculty's curriculum please provide additional signatures of the appropriate deans and assistant deans:

ASSISTANT DEAN: <Click to enter>

DATE: <select>

DEAN: <Click to enter>

DATE: <select>

Committee Consideration of the Proposal:

CURRICULUM AREA:

DATE: <select>

CONSULTATION WITH TECHNICAL SERVICES: <enter>

DATE: <select>

CPR: Passed

DATE: 2/5/2025

SENATE: <office use only>

DATE: <select>



COURSE CHANGE PROPOSAL

Current Course Information:

NAME OF COURSE: 3D Computer Animation II	COURSE MNEMONIC: 3DAN 200
NUMBER OF CREDITS: 3	PREREQUISITE: Completion of 21 credits
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> STUDIO <input type="checkbox"/> ACADEMIC	REPEATABLE FOR CREDIT: No

Changes to the current course info – changes only:

NAME OF COURSE: Core Studio in 3D Animation	COURSE NUMBER: <Leave blank if no changes>
COURSE MNEMONIC: <Leave blank if no changes>	PREREQUISITE: <Leave blank if no changes>
NUMBER OF CREDITS: 6	NEW DESCRIPTION: Yes
EFFECTIVE DATE: Fall 2025	REPEATABLE FOR CREDIT: <Leave blank if no changes>

Current Course Description:

Study of modeling, texturing, lighting, camera and animation for 3D computer animation. A series of short assignments promotes technical skill development through aesthetic exploration. Students become proficient within the 3D environment and begin to develop an individual aesthetic within the medium.

Proposed Course Description:

This course is designed to introduce students to a general understanding of all the aspects of 3D Computer Animation, from conception of an idea to production. The course encourages students to experiment with the various specialized areas of 3D Computer Animation and develop introductory skillsets. Students engage with assigned and self-directed projects to further their interests and explore their artistic goals. Class demonstrations and presentations address various 3D Computer Animation production topics and foster dialogue within the discipline. The course structure includes lectures, hands-on demonstrations, discussions, and critiques.

Current Learning Objectives:

- Produce short sequences of 3d animation output to video with sound
- Set up folders for Project organization, naming and storage of 3D scene related files.
- Create 3d objects using various methods of mesh creation (object modeling, patch modelling, and sculpting), Organic vs. Hard surface modelling. Planning for good topology results.
- Prepare UVs for layout and Texturing, utilizing UV space for more efficient mapping
- Basic use of Materials, Lighting and Rendering for output of 3D elements to be composited.
- Rigging – Forward kinematics vs. inverse kinematics; skeletons, binding, deformers and constraints

- Character animation- basic body mechanics including walking, dialogue and interacting with other 3d elements.
- Use procedural animation (simulations) to obtain results for clothing, fluids and volumetrics.
- Outputting for presentation – render layers and compositing including characters over backgrounds and placing titles
- Trouble shooting – being able to analyze common 3D problems and start to resolve the issues.

Critical Inquiry

- Explore various techniques and new innovations to achieve desired effects
- Back up work and organize efficiently
- Learn to recognize issues that may affect production pipelines
- Work with audio to accentuate the production
- Experiment to create effects that are non-narrative projects but accentuate the production.

Technical

- Becoming familiar with the various aspects of 3d – modelling, texturing, rigging, animating, lighting, rendering and FX.
- Working with sound
- Blending 3D and 2D elements

Professional Practice

- Conceptualization, planning, and pre-visualization as well as recognizing potential problems before they happen and developing workarounds to overcome issues.
- Learn to give and take critical feedback on work in progress.
- Develop the ability to recognize work of high and low quality and assess personal work growth.
- Self-motivation to complete project milestones
- Develop and work with production pipelines to complete 3D productions

Proposed Learning Objectives (5-10)

1. Discuss reference, such as observation, photography, painting, architecture, and other art forms as influences in 3D Computer Animation art direction.
2. Prompt a range of perspectives in concept development that taps into personal heritage and histories.
3. Discuss and describe the application of the various 3D Computer animation pipeline stages in relation to their directed projects.
4. Introduce the various techniques and specialized areas of 3D Computer Animation.
5. Cover project management methods to address project needs and deadlines.
6. Introduce sound considerations in relation to animated projects.

Proposed Student Learning Outcomes (5-10)

By the end of this course, students will:

1. Inform projects with visual and precedent research.
2. Articulate a conceptual and aesthetic approach to their work.
3. Offer constructive feedback to others and receive input on their work.
4. Create organizational structures with naming conventions to store 3D scene related files.
5. Model 3D objects using various methods of mesh creation emphasizing best practices for topology flow and optimization for texture space.
6. Create lighting set ups and rendering settings for output of 3D elements to be composited
7. Prototype basic animation rigs using forward kinematics (FK), inverse kinematics (IK), joints, skin binding, deformers and constraints.
8. Manage and produce a rendered 3D animated short with sound showcasing narrative voice.

Reason:

This course consolidates two previous courses, 3DAN 200 Computer Animation II and 3DAN 205 Lighting and Rendering. This aims to clearly identify core curriculum in 3D Animation and allow students to

integrate different aspects of their practice and provide the time and support in the creation of their body of work. This 6-credit core studio has been already piloted by co-listing the above-mentioned courses.

Questions to consider:

Does this course contribute to decolonizing the curriculum? How so?

Assignments are set up with prompts that invite students to consider heritage, histories and place so that the 3D assignments reflect diverse points of views.

Does this course address the climate crisis? How so?

The faculty teaching this course will emphasize file management, rendering optimization and storage that considers that amount of energy these processes take.

Course Proposal Submission Information:

PREPARED FOR SUBMISSION BY: Adriana Jaroszewicz	DATE: 1/20/2025
ASSISTANT DEAN: Adriana Jaroszewicz	DATE: 1/20/2025
DEAN: Celeste Martin	DATE: 1/20/2025
If proposal involves other Faculty's curriculum please provide additional signatures of the appropriate deans and assistant deans:	
ASSISTANT DEAN: <Click to enter>	DATE: <select>
DEAN: <Click to enter>	DATE: <select>

Committee Consideration of the Proposal:

CURRICULUM AREA: 3D Animation	DATE: 12/9/2024
CPR: Passed	DATE: 2/5/2025
SENATE: <office use only>	DATE: <select>



COURSE CHANGE PROPOSAL

Current Course Information:

NAME OF COURSE: Preproduction of 3D Animation	COURSE MNEMONIC: 3DAN 300
NUMBER OF CREDITS: 3	PREREQUISITE: Completion of 18 credits of 200 level 3D Animation
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> STUDIO <input type="checkbox"/> ACADEMIC	REPEATABLE FOR CREDIT: No

Changes to the current course info – changes only:

NAME OF COURSE: <Leave blank if no changes>	COURSE NUMBER: <Leave blank if no changes>
COURSE MNEMONIC: <Leave blank if no changes>	PREREQUISITE: <Leave blank if no changes>
NUMBER OF CREDITS: 6	NEW DESCRIPTION: Yes
EFFECTIVE DATE: Fall 2025	REPEATABLE FOR CREDIT: <Leave blank if no changes>

Current Course Description:

Working individually or as collaborative teams, students will research 3D computer animation projects and methodologies with the goal of developing story and pre-production artwork for their third year 3D computer animation / digital media productions. Based on their research, they will create concepts through many stages of pre-production, visualization, and iteration of story and experience development. Students will pitch ideas, critique storyboards / animatics / CG layouts, examine 3D computer animation production / digital media methods and techniques, and consider various industry-based scenarios / pre-production hurdles. Following such investigations, individuals and/or groups will submit a proposal for their third year 3D computer animation film / digital media projects, including a statement of intent, production schedule, and CG animation or digital media prototype with sound.

Proposed Course Description:

Working individually or as collaborative teams, students engage in ideation processes and experimentation with a range of approaches to articulate stories and the development of a short 3D computer animation project. Students also research historical and visual references to contextualize and support the production's narrative, vision, and goals. By exploring a range of technical requirements, tools, processes, and relevant 3D production pipeline workflows, students submit a proposal for their third year 3D computer animation film / digital media projects that integrates their findings in a statement of intent, production schedule, and CG animation or digital media prototype with sound. The course structure includes lectures, hands-on demonstrations, discussions, presentations and critiques.

Current Learning Objectives:

1. Develop project concepts, story structures, and production plans;
2. Research technical requirements in computer graphics and 3D computer animation for their projects;
3. Create fully functional 3D characters and develop initial concepts for CG environment assets;
4. Conceptualize look development for the visual treatment of their projects;
5. Offer constructive feedback to others and receive input on their work.
6. Consider and discuss their work in a critical context.

Proposed Learning Objectives (5-10)

1. Introduce students to various approaches to narrative structure in storytelling supported through historical and contemporary examples.
2. Exemplify different approaches and considerations for project's art direction including forms of research, contexts and audience demonstrating the impact of creative choices.
3. Deepen 3D modeling strategies for character and environment development.
4. Expand rigging approaches to characters and props.
5. Build on cinematic language to communicate stories clearly.
6. Cover production management strategies to plan for project milestones and deliverables.
7. Advance communication skills by fostering a community of reciprocity through feedback and sharing of ideas.

Proposed Student Learning Outcomes (5-10)

By the end of this course, students will be able to:

1. Engage in various ideation processes and experiment with a range of approaches to articulate story ideas.
2. Research visual and precedent references to define art direction of projects and articulate project's intent.
3. Design characters and environments that demonstrate awareness and accountability for their impact through informed research and intentional creative choices.
4. Use modeling techniques to translate two-dimensional designs into 3D models.
5. Create working prototypes of character body and facial rigs.
6. Produce an animatic and previsualization of project idea.
7. Create a production schedule with detailed asset information and shot delivery dates.
8. Offer constructive feedback to others and receive input on their work.

Reason:

Following program review and student feedback, 3D Animation is moving towards identifying core curriculum through 6 credits core production studios. This supports curricular integration and instruction time for students to develop their short stories and articulate various approaches of 3D Computer Animation production workflows. Changing this course to 6 credits will ensure continuity and support to continue building their body of work.

Questions to consider:**Does this course contribute to decolonizing the curriculum? How so?**

We intend to foster greater awareness of design choices by engaging in visual and precedent research in story and character development.

Does this course address the climate crisis? How so?

The faculty teaching this course will emphasize file management, rendering optimization and storage that considers that amount of energy these processes take.

Course Proposal Submission Information:

PREPARED FOR SUBMISSION BY: Adriana Jaroszewicz

DATE: 1/20/2025

ASSISTANT DEAN: Adriana Jaroszewicz

DATE: 1/20/2025

DEAN: Celeste Martin

DATE: 1/20/2025

If proposal involves other Faculty's curriculum please provide additional signatures of the appropriate deans and assistant deans:

ASSISTANT DEAN: <Click to enter>

DATE: <select>

DEAN: <Click to enter>

DATE: <select>

Committee Consideration of the Proposal:

CURRICULUM AREA: 3D Computer Animation

DATE: 12/9/2024

CPR: Passed

DATE: 2/5/2025

SENATE: <office use only>

DATE: <select>



NEW COURSE PROPOSAL

NAME OF COURSE: Core Studio in 3D Animation COURSE MNEMONIC: 3DAN 2XX (requesting 210)

NUMBER OF CREDITS: 6 PREREQUISITE: 3DAN-200

STUDIO ACADEMIC SPACE REQUIRED: SEMINAR LECTURE LAB

EFFECTIVE DATE: Spring 2026

Proposed Course Description:

This course introduces the 3D character pipeline, from design to creation, exploring the contexts of representation and impacts of design choices. Using anatomy as a guiding principle, 3D modeling of characters and implementations of skeletons will be conceptualized and applied guided by visual reference. There will be a focus on the aesthetic intent, functionality and texturing of the character design, and the 3D environments and props that support the character's identity. The course structure includes lectures, hands-on demonstrations, discussions, presentations and critiques.

Purpose of the Course:

This course consolidates two courses, 3DAN 207 Character Creation and 3DAN 217 Adv Character Model & Texture. This aims to clearly identify core curriculum in 3D Animation, avoid redundancy and allow students to integrate different aspects of their practice and provide the time and support in the creation of their body of work. This 6-credit core studio will be piloted by co-listing the above-mentioned courses in Spring 2025.

Learning Objectives (5-10):

1. Introduce various approaches to designing 3D characters, environments and props based on visual and precedent research.
2. Introduce the 3D Character pipeline, from conception to creation.
3. Review organic and hard surface modeling, including modeling tools, workflows and optimal topology flow for deformations.
4. Demonstrate best practices for placing skeletal joints for optimal animation control and deformations of the character geometry, both in body and face.
5. Categorize tools that simplify rigging such as autoriggers and scripts to optimize building skeletons and controls.
6. Review rendering techniques and lighting set ups to create appealing character renders.

Student Learning Outcomes (5-10):

By the end of this course, students will be able to:

1. Offer constructive feedback to others and receive input on their work.
2. Create human and more-than-human character designs, considering world view contexts and impacts of those design choices, informed by research.

3. Use various 3D modeling approaches to generate a character, props and environment models.
4. Texture their characters, props and environments based on art direction.
5. Evaluate anatomy of characters to best position joints and create movable and believable rigs.
6. Create control rigs with custom attributes taking into consideration the application and function of those based on character range and needs of movement goals.
7. Produce a short, rendered animation cycle of their own character rig with an environment and prop/s that clearly conveys the identity of the character.

Questions to consider:

Does this course contribute to decolonizing the curriculum? How so?

Assignments are set up with prompts that invite students to consider heritage, histories and place for 3D assignments reflect diverse points of views. Lectures throughout the semester aim to address representation and stereotyping when creating characters and the impacts of those choices.

Does this course address the climate crisis? How so?

The faculty teaching this course will emphasize file management, rendering optimization and storage that considers that amount of energy these processes take.

Will this course replace an existing course?

Yes No

Name of course replaced by new course:

3DAN-207 and 3DAN-217

Is this course required for Graduation?

Yes No

If required, in which program will this course be a required component?

Degree: BMA

Major: 3D Computer Animation

Is this course an elective?

Yes No

Is registration priority given to Majors?

Yes No

Is this course repeatable for credit?

Yes No

Could this course be credited through PLA?

Yes No

This course will be offered:

From time to time as required

Regularly Fall Spring

Online

Course Proposal Submission Information:

PREPARED FOR SUBMISSION BY: Adriana Jaroszewicz

DATE: 1/20/2025

ASSISTANT DEAN: Adriana Jaroszewicz

DATE: 1/20/2025

DEAN: Celeste Martin

DATE: 1/20/2025

If proposal involves other Faculty's curriculum please provide additional signatures of the appropriate deans and assistant deans:

ASSISTANT DEAN: <Click to enter>

DATE: <select>

DEAN: <Click to enter>

DATE: <select>

Committee Consideration of the Proposal:

CURRICULUM AREA: 3D Computer Animation

DATE: 12/9/2024

CONSULTATION WITH TECHNICAL SERVICES: <enter>

DATE: <select>

CPR: Passed

DATE: 2/5/2025

SENATE: <office use only>

DATE: <select>



COVER SHEET FOR PROGRAM REQUIREMENT WORKSHEETS

NAME OF PROGRAM: 3D Computer Animation

EFFECTIVE DATE: Fall 2025

Please attach current and proposed program requirement worksheet(s) with changes highlighted.

Rationale:

3DAN is responding to program review's action plan, specifically recommendations 5 and 6:

- Recommendation 5: **Review curricular structure and flow**, articulate Animation pathways and increase the number of elective options to support greater curricular breadth.
- Recommendation 6: Continue to support integration on EDI perspectives in the Animation curriculum, operations, and faculty representation.

Second year changes

We are merging two previous required courses in each Fall and Spring:

- Fall: 3DAN 200 and 3DAN 205 are merging into one 6 credit 3DAN 200 core studio
- Spring: 3DAN 207 and 3DAN 217 are merging into one 6 credit 3DAN 2XX (210) core studio
- In spring, we are replacing 3DAN 213 Intermediate 3D Character Animation with 3DAN 235 CG Layout & Cinematography I. This change aims to better prepare students to tell stories through cinematic language, paving the way for a critical directorial eye, and explore the various technical and artistic aspects of cinematography.

By merging existing courses into core studios, the curriculum can have continuity from one area of practice to another and guided by a single instructor while exploring in greater depth topics of relevance and the impacts of animation and the choices creators make.

- In Fall, 3DAN 203 serves a supporting role for the 3DAN 200 core studio in 3D animation.
 - o 3DAN 200 will focus on the entire world building pipeline while 3DAN 203 will cover the specifics of character animation
- In spring, 3DAN 235, which was an elective course before and now becomes a required course, will support 3DAN 2XX (210) core studio in 3D Animation
 - o 3DAN 2XX (210) will focus on character development and creation, while 3DAN 235 will focus on the cinematic language of how to tell the stories of those characters.

Third year changes

3DAN 305 becomes an elective and 3DAN 300 adds from 3 credits to 6 credits.

- 3DAN 300 will cover a greater breadth of topics as students engage in preproduction for their third-year films.

Fourth year changes

3DAN 403 and 4013 becomes elective courses, recognizing student feedback that not all students will focus on character animation. This also opens up the PRW to support students trajectories in shaping their practice with a wider range of elective options

Course Proposal Submission Information:

PREPARED FOR SUBMISSION BY: Adriana Jaroszewicz

DATE: 1/20/2025

ASSISTANT DEAN: Adriana Jaroszewicz

DATE: 1/20/2025

DEAN: Celeste Martin

DATE: 1/20/2025

If proposal involves other Faculty's curriculum please provide additional signatures of the appropriate deans and assistant deans:

ASSISTANT DEAN: <Click to enter>

DATE: <select>

DEAN: <Click to enter>

DATE: <select>

Motion from Curriculum Areas to be attached before submission to CPR.

Committee consideration of this proposal:

CURRICULUM AREA: 3D Computer Animation

DATE: 12/9/2024

CONSULTATION WITH TECHNICAL SERVICES: <enter>

DATE: <select>

CPR: Passed

DATE: 2/5/2025

SENATE: <office use only>

DATE: <select>

PROGRAM REQUIREMENT WORKSHEET
BACHELOR OF MEDIA ARTS: 3D COMPUTER ANIMATION MAJOR, 120 CREDITS
Students beginning first year in 2024

- Currently enrolled students should consult their Program Evaluation through myEC for the most up-to-date information.
- Course Load: Maximum of 12 credits of studio courses per semester. Maximum of 18 credits overall per semester.
- If a course is indicated in a specific semester it may not be offered in another semester. i.e. MHIS 205 is only offered in Fall, MHIS 206 is only offered in Spring.
- Courses are either 3 or 6 credits as indicated by the bracketed number after the course.

FOUNDATION – 30 CREDITS	
FALL – 15 CREDITS	SPRING – 15 CREDITS
HUMN 100 Academic Core I (6) FNNDT 108 Creative Processes (3) FNNDT 165 Core Interdisciplinary Studio (6)	HUMN 101 Academic Core II (6) Foundation Studio Elective (3) FNNDT 185 Core Studio in Animation (6)
Foundation deficiencies must be made up by the beginning of year 3.	
SECOND YEAR – 30 CREDITS	
FALL – 15 CREDITS	SPRING – 15 CREDITS
3DAN 200 3D Computer Animation II (3) 3DAN 203 Introduction to 3D Character Animation (3) 3DAN 205 Lighting and Rendering (3) MHIS 205 Film + Media Aesthetics (3) Critical Studies Elective 200 level (3)	3DAN 207 3D Character Creation (3) 3DAN 217 Advanced Character Modeling + Texture (3) 3DAN 213 Intermediate 3D Character Animation (3) MHIS 206 Film + Media Culture (3) Open Elective 200 level (3)
THIRD YEAR – 30 CREDITS	
FALL – 15 CREDITS	SPRING – 15 CREDITS
3DAN 300 Pre-production for 3D Computer Animation (3) 3DAN 305 Look Development for 3D Computer Animation (3) MHIS 327 Studies in Animation History (3) Choose 6 credits from: Open Studio Elective 200/300 level (6)* or Critical Studies Elective from 200/300 level (6)	3DAN 310 Intermediate 3D Computer Animation Production (6) Critical Studies Elective 300/400 level (3) Error – please remove, left on there from last year's changes. PROF 311 Professional Practices (3) Choose 6 credits from: Open Studio Elective 200/300 level (6)* or Critical Studies Elective from 200/300 level (6)
FOURTH YEAR – 30 CREDITS	
FALL – 15 CREDITS	SPRING – 15 CREDITS
3DAN 400 Senior 3D Computer Animation Production I (6) 3DAN 403 Advanced 3D Character Animation I (3) Critical Studies Elective 300/400 level (3) Choose 3 credits from: Open Studio Elective 200/300/400 level (3)* or Critical Studies Elective 300/400 level (3)	3DAN 410 Senior 3D Computer Animation Production II (6) 3DAN 415 Lighting and Rendering Projects (3) 3DAN 413 Advanced 3D Character Animation II (3) Critical Studies Elective 300/400 level (3)

PROGRAM REQUIREMENT WORKSHEET
BACHELOR OF MEDIA ARTS: 3D COMPUTER ANIMATION MAJOR, 120 CREDITS
Students beginning first year in 2025

- Currently enrolled students should consult their Program Evaluation through myEC for the most up-to-date information.
- Course Load: Maximum of 12 credits of studio courses per semester. Maximum of 18 credits overall per semester.
- If a course is indicated in a specific semester it may not be offered in another semester. i.e. MHIS 205 is only offered in Fall, MHIS 206 is only offered in Spring.
- Courses are either 3 or 6 credits as indicated by the bracketed number after the course.

FOUNDATION – 30 CREDITS	
FALL – 15 CREDITS	SPRING – 15 CREDITS
HUMN 100 Academic Core I (6) FNNDT 108 Creative Processes (3) FNNDT 165 Core Interdisciplinary Studio (6)	HUMN 101 Academic Core II (6) Foundation Studio Elective (3) FNNDT 185 Core Studio in Animation (6)
Foundation deficiencies must be made up by the beginning of year 3.	
SECOND YEAR – 30 CREDITS	
FALL – 15 CREDITS	SPRING – 15 CREDITS
3DAN 200 Core Studio (6) 3DAN 200 3D Computer Animation II (3) 3DAN 203 Introduction to 3D Character Animation (3) 3DAN 205 Lighting and Rendering (3) MHIS 205 Film + Media Aesthetics (3) Critical Studies Elective 200 level (3)	3DAN 2XX (210) Core Studio (6) 3DAN 235 CG Layout & Cinematography I (3) 3DAN 207 3D Character Creation (3) 3DAN 217 Advanced Character Modeling + Texture (3) 3DAN 213 Intermediate 3D Character Animation (3) MHIS 206 Film + Media Culture (3) Open Elective 200 level (3)
THIRD YEAR – 30 CREDITS	
FALL – 15 CREDITS	SPRING – 15 CREDITS
3DAN 300 Pre-Production for 3D Computer Animation (3 6) 3DAN 305 Look Development for 3D Computer Animation (3) MHIS 327 Studies in Animation History (3) Choose 6 credits from: Open Studio Elective 200/300 level (6)* or Critical Studies Elective from 200/300 level (6)	3DAN 310 Intermediate 3D Computer Animation Production (6) PROF 311 Professional Practices (3) Choose 6 credits from: Open Studio Elective 200/300 level (6)* or Critical Studies Elective from 200/300 level (6)
FOURTH YEAR – 30 CREDITS	
FALL – 15 CREDITS	SPRING – 15 CREDITS
3DAN 400 Senior 3D Computer Animation Production I (6) 3DAN 403 Advanced 3D Character Animation I (3) Open Studio Elective 300/400 level (3) Critical Studies Elective 300/400 level (3) Choose 3 credits from: Open Studio Elective 200/300/400 level (3)* or Critical Studies Elective 300/400 level (3)	3DAN 410 Senior 3D Computer Animation Production II (6) 3DAN 415 Lighting and Rendering Projects (3) 3DAN 413 Advanced 3D Character Animation II (3) Open Studio Elective 300/400 level (3) Critical Studies Elective 300/400 level (3)

*For Bachelor of Media Arts Degree: FNNDT 160 Core Media Studio I (6) may be recognized as equivalent to FNNDT 185 Core Studio in Animation (6)

*Students may take Co-op or Internship in years 3 and 4, to a maximum of 9 credits.

*Critical Studies subject areas include: AHIS, DEST, DHIS, ENGL, HUMN, MHIS, SCIE, SOCS, PROF

*Studio subject areas include: 2DAN, 3DAN, ANIM, CCID, CGIA, COMD, CRAM, DESN, DEST, DRWG, FMSA, FNNDT, FRMS, ILUS, INDD, INTD, MDIA, NMSA, PERF, PNTG, PHOT, PRAX, PRNT, SCLP, SOUN, VAST, WRTG