



23 July 2020

From: Okanagan and Vancouver Senate Curriculum Committees

To: Okanagan and Vancouver Senates

Re: Future State of Subject and Course Codes in Workday

The Okanagan and Vancouver Senate Curriculum Committees met jointly with members of the Integrated Renewal Program (IRP) to consider the future state of subject and course codes in UBC's new student information system, Workday. The Committees were provided with an overview of the issues to be resolved, decisions to be made, analysis conducted by the IRP team, and options to be considered. The discussion spanned two meetings. The first meeting resulted in requests for further analysis by the IRP team, and the second resulted in the recommendation that appears below.

Identified Issue

UBC has historically allowed each campus Senate to approve courses with the same subject code and course number (i.e. course code) whether or not they are aligned in subject, content, or course requirements. While new shared course codes are no longer approved, many such courses still exist and are offered on both campuses. Some courses that share a course code are exactly the same, some are similar, and some are completely different. Workday is being established as one student information system for all of UBC. Within the system, each course must have a unique course code. Therefore, the Committees were tasked with resolving the issue of the courses on each campus that share a course code.

Required Decisions

The Committees were asked to jointly consider two decisions:

1. an approach for differentiating shared course codes;
2. the scope of codes that the approach should be applied to.

For decision 1, the IRP team initially recommended appending a standard differentiator (e.g. O, V, or other identifier) to either all existing subject codes or the shared subject codes on both campuses (e.g. ENGLO or ENGLV).

For decision 2, the IRP team did not make a recommendation and instead presented the Committees with the options of changing all subject codes on both campuses, changing only those subject codes that are used on both campuses, or changing only those subject codes used on both campuses and have course numbers used on both campuses. An analysis of the change impacts and implementation effort for each option was provided.



The following principles guided the Committees' decision-making:

- Prioritize student experience and their ability to achieve desired outcomes
- Seek logical consistency in approach
- Seek a solution that can adapt to change and accommodate growth (“futureproofing”)
- Support individual units to achieve local objectives related to course codes
- Take an equitable approach across the two campuses
- Consider the effort required to enact an solution in relation to its long-term value

Analysis

For the first meeting, the IRP team provided the Committees with its initial analysis of code approaches and scope options. The discussion that ensued resulted in requests for further analysis of possibilities for decision 1. For the second meeting, the IRP team provided follow up analysis of the specific suggestions made by Committee members; only one suggestion was recommended.

Taking into consideration the full scope of analysis, and guided by the decision principles that appear above, the Committees ultimately made the following decisions:

1. Course codes are to be differentiated by an underscore followed by the campus identifier (i.e.. ENGL_O and ENGL_V)
2. The approach is to be applied to all subject codes on both campuses

Recommendation

That Senate approve in principle the differentiation of course codes by a campus identifier following the subject code, and that such approach be applied to all course codes on both campuses at UBC.

INTEGRATED RENEWAL PROGRAM

Future State of Course Codes – Part II

Joint Senates Curriculum Committees

June 11, 2020



REVIEW OF REQUIRED DECISIONS

In the future, each UBC course must have a unique course code (subject code + course number). Therefore, the courses that currently share a code across the two campuses must be differentiated.

The two Senates have been asked to jointly consider two decisions:

1. An approach for differentiating shared course codes.
2. The scope of codes that the approach should be applied to



DECISION PRINCIPLES

- Prioritize student experience and their ability to achieve desired outcomes
- Seek logical consistency in approach
- Seek a solution that can adapt to change and accommodate growth (“futureproofing”)
- Support individual units to achieve local objectives related to course codes
- Take an equitable approach across the two campuses
- Consider the effort required to enact an solution in relation to its long-term value



DECISION 1: HOW TO DIFFERENTIATE COURSE CODES

Recap of discussion from May 12th Joint SCC meeting:

Key considerations raised by committee:

- Importance of providing clarity for students about course subjects
- Importance of maintaining disciplinary identity as represented through subject code
- Importance of not inadvertently creating subject codes that are undesirable (e.g. “CHEMO”; “POLIO”)
- Some members favored changing the course numbering system rather than the subject code

Key considerations raised by IRP team:

- Course codes are used to support logic/processes in Workday (e.g. academic rules/requirements, search functions); some coding options may have adverse impacts on system functionality/usability
- Course codes are ‘consumed’ by many other systems which will integrate with Workday (e.g. Scientia, BCCAT, Canvas, local applications); some coding options may have adverse impacts on functionality/usability of these systems
- Course codes are generally visible to users as configured throughout the system
- Executive guidance has suggested that units on the two campuses should not be put in a position where they need to negotiate with each other to arrive at a solution

DECISION 1: COMMITTEE SUGGESTIONS

The committees raised several potential options for differentiating course codes.

Subject Code suggestions	Course number suggestions
Revisit the possibility of using special characters to separate the course code and campus identifier (e.g. hyphen: CHEM-O; “at” sign: CHEM@O). <i>Both of these options were supported as acceptable in a straw poll.</i>	Move to a 4 digit numbering system, with one number serving as a campus identifier; potentially utilizing a decimal as a way to differentiate between campuses (e.g. CHEM 1.221 and CHEM 2.221)
Start existing course codes with the campus identifier (e.g. VCHEM; OCHEM)	Have each campus use exclusively even or odd course numbers
Create an option to signify when courses are identical on both campuses (e.g. APSC-U)	Add a campus-identifying letter to either the beginning or end of the course number
General suggestions	
Leave it to the affected units to differentiate course numbers by changing some courses to a new number	

DECISION 1: FOLLOW UP ANALYSIS – SUBJECT CODES

The IRP Student team pursued subsequent analysis with Workday on several options related to subject codes.

OPTION	Hyphen	“At”	Underscore, before or after subject code		O/V before subject code
Examples	POLI-O ITAL-V	POLI@O ITAL@V	POLI_O ITAL_V	O_POLI V_ITAL	OPOLI VITAL
Considerations	Hyphen is read as minus/exclusion in WD and other systems, does not return appropriate search results	@ may result in hyperlinking or other embedded meaning when exporting codes into other docs or integrating with other systems	Preferred for integrations with other systems and data conversions. Is generally read as “space” with no inherent meaning for other systems.		No major functionality concerns, but may create some less desirable codes or readability issues
Recommendation	No	Not recommended, but possible	Yes – considered best option for subject code differentiation		Not recommended, but possible

DECISION 1: FOLLOW UP ANALYSIS – COURSE NUMBERS

The IRP Student team pursued subsequent analysis with Workday on options related to course numbers.

Options	Four digit numbering with one number representing campus	Four digit numbering utilizing decimal and campus-identifier number
<p>Examples CHEM 234 becomes:</p>	<p>CHEM 2341 and CHEM 2342 (trailing digit) OR CHEM 2134 and CHEM 2234 (second digit)</p>	<p>CHEM 1.234 and CHEM 2.234</p>
<p>Considerations</p>	<p>Cannot accurately represent ranges of courses that could meet academic requirements. This would require presenting long lists of eligible courses, creating a poor user experience.</p> <p>Maintaining both historical 3 digit course numbers and new 4 digit course numbers to support academic requirements, pre-requisites, and other eligibility rules, will add a magnitude of complexity to implementation and maintenance while also affecting the readability of rules for students.</p>	<p>Decimal is a non-standard character in Workday course number field; high risk of introducing academic requirement configuration problems, and issues with each product release/upgrade. Canvas is likely to have difficulty utilizing course numbers with a decimal.</p>
	<p>Changing course numbers in general has an extremely high change impact and maintenance impact compared with changing course subject codes. Every active course would have to be re-numbered, as opposed to a change to the subject codes, which would be applied to all relevant courses at the subject level.</p>	
<p>Recommendation</p>	<p>Resolving the shared course code issue through a change to numbering approach is NOT RECOMMENDED.</p>	

DECISION 1: DIFFERENTIATING COURSE CODES

What should be the approach to differentiating course codes?



DECISION 2: SCOPE OF NEW COURSE CODES

Recap of discussion from May 12th Joint SCC meeting. The committees considered three options:

Option 1	Option 2	Option 3 (recommended by IRP)
Change <u>all</u> subject codes on both campuses	Change <u>only</u> those subject codes that are used on both campuses	Change <u>only</u> those subject codes used on both campuses that have shared course numbers
353 subject codes (278/75); 11,000+ courses	47 subject codes/campus; 4,968 courses	33 subject codes/campus; 4,257 courses
Implementation/change effort - XXL	Implementation/change effort - XL	Implementation/change effort - XL

Key considerations raised by committee:

- Comprehensive, consistent approach was seen to have high value for students

Key considerations raised by IRP team:

- UBC will need to implement and maintain both 'original' and 'new' codes and all related eligibility rules until all active students with original course codes become inactive – the more codes changed, the greater the effort. Changing all codes is an exponentially greater effort, introducing risk to timely implementation.
- Change effort for impacted academic units and Senate & Curriculum Services will be significant.

DECISION 2: SCOPE OF NEW COURSE CODES

To which courses should the new course code be applied?





25 March 2021

To: Okanagan Senate
From: Senate Curriculum Committee
Re: Effective Date for Course Code Changes (approval)

The Okanagan and Vancouver Senate Curriculum Committees met jointly to consider a proposal from the IRP Student, Records & Advising Team. In July 2020 the Senates approved in principle the differentiation of course codes by a campus identifier following the subject code, and that such approach be applied to all course codes on both campuses at UBC effective as of the date of the launch of Workday Student. However, further analysis by the IRP Student group determined this effective date resulted in various negative downstream impacts to students, examples of which are included in the attached memo. After exploring a number of options, it was decided that backdating the course code change in Workday Student to July 1, 2005 would result in the fewest negative impacts.

The following is recommended to Senate:

Motion: *“That the addition of _O and _V to course codes from July 1, 2005 onwards be approved.”*

Respectfully submitted,

Dr. Yves Lucet
Chair, Curriculum Committee



8 February 2021

To: Okanagan & Vancouver Senate Curriculum Committees

From: IRP Student, Records & Advising Team

Re: *Effective date for course code changes*

The IRP Student team is seeking approval from the Okanagan and Vancouver Senate Curriculum Committees to backdate, in the Workday system only, the addition of `_O` and `_V` to course codes to July 1, 2005.

The Senate Curriculum Committees previously approved the addition of `_O` and `_V` to the end of all course codes, effective as of the date of the launch of Workday Student. (Note: the course code field in the current SIS is not able to handle enough characters to accommodate the change prior to Workday going live.) With this arrangement, in Workday where currently a course exists on each campus that uses the same subject code and number, the *historical* versions of both of those courses would be mapped to a single course definition. As of the go live date of Workday and onwards, those courses would each have their own course definition as the subject codes would be differentiated with the `_O` and `_V`.

As the IRP Student team continued to prototype with the above assumptions, negative downstream impacts were discovered including: inaccurate academic requirements, inaccurate course requisites, inaccurate grade replacements, impacts on course repeatability rules, and more administrative work to perform overrides (eligibility, academic requirements, repeats, returning historical students). After exploring a number of options, it was decided that backdating the course code change in Workday to July 1, 2005 would have the least negative impact to students.

One disadvantage of this backdating is that it technically changes the historical record. Student records containing these courses will not match the Academic Calendar archives; a process for handling this may need to be developed. The IRP Student team and those consulted (including Kate Ross, Fred Vogt, and Chris Eaton) did not feel that this outweighed the issues that would be encountered with the current decision including.

The proposed date was chosen as it holds meaning and historical relevance with the opening of the Okanagan Campus. By the time Workday Student is live, there will be few active students that would have pre-2005 courses on their record. Consideration was given to backdate the change to 1992 when student records became electronic, but the additional number of students it would advantage was thought to be few. Also, since rules in Workday will not be configured back earlier than 2005, backdating to 1992 would not improve the issues around rules and requirements.



20 May 2021

To: Okanagan Senate
From: Curriculum Committee
Re: Variable Credit Courses – c, d, / (approval)

The Okanagan and Vancouver Senate Curriculum Committees met jointly to consider a proposal from the IRP Student, Records & Advising Team, with respect to variable credit courses. Currently, variable credit courses indicate whether the credit is decided by the department (*d*) or in consultation with the student (*c*). Additionally, - or / indicates whether the minimum and maximum credit values form a range of possible credit values for a given course offering, or if a course will be offered for either the minimum or the maximum credit value.

Workday Student does not supply a field to indicate whether a variable credit course is *c* or *d*, nor does it interpret the concept of either/or credit values (/). Accordingly, the Committees were asked to consider the ongoing notions and use of *c*, *d*, and /, and how else to communicate course credit details to students.

The Committees were advised that *c* or *d* are not intrinsically-required elements of a course and there are other means for conveying the same credit details (course descriptions could contain guiding information) and creating the same tailored learning experiences (like directed studies). The Committees first considered only discontinuing the use of *c*; however, discontinuing one notation would render the other unnecessary, and thus they considered discontinuing both.

The following is recommended to Senate:

Motion: *“That the use of ‘c’ and ‘d’ designation for variable credit courses not continue when Workday Student is implemented.”*

AND

“That the use of ‘/’ designation for variable credit courses not continue when Workday Student is implemented and that the course credit details be visible to students via other course information sources.”

Respectfully submitted,

Dr. Yves Lucet, Chair
Senate Curriculum Committee



8 February 2021

To: Okanagan & Vancouver Senate Curriculum Committees

From: IRP Student, Records & Advising Team

Re: *Variable Credit Courses – ‘c’ and ‘/’*

All current variable credit courses indicate whether the credit is decided by the department (‘d’) or in consultation with the student (‘c’). In addition, a ‘-’ or ‘/’ is used to indicate whether the minimum and maximum credit values form a range of possible credit values for a given course offering, or if a course will be offered for *either* the minimum or the maximum credit value. These attributes of variable credit courses are contained within separate fields in the current curriculum management system, and when extracted display as ASIA 270 (3/6) d, for example.

Workday does not supply a field to indicate whether a variable credit course is ‘c’ or ‘d’. In addition, Workday does not have a concept of ‘either/or’ credit values (‘/’); the minimum and maximum credit values always represent the low and high ends of a range of possible credit values for a course.

A small group of timetable representatives were consulted to begin to explore the potential impact of not being able to indicate the above in Workday as is currently done. The feedback included that the concept of ‘c’ and ‘d’ is not always well understood by faculty, staff, and students. There is a possibility that this has led to inaccurate tagging of some courses. In terms of variable credit courses only being a range of credits, some concern arose around the possibility of choosing a credit value for a course that would not fit well with student programs (i.e., leaving a student 1 credit short for graduation).

The IRP Student team has identified possibilities of continuing to have these notions in Workday and proposes the following options:

1. Regarding ‘c’ and ‘d’ credits, the assumption will be that all variable credit courses are ‘d’ – credit value is determined by the department – unless otherwise noted in the course description. Where the desire is to have the student consulted on the credit value of a particular course offering, the following sentence will be included at the end of the course description: “The credit value for this course will be determined in consultation with the student prior to registration.”
2. For courses that are intended to have a “/” credit value, a note will be included in the Private Notes field so that timetable reps would know the intent and could ensure that the credit value matches that intent. However, there would not be a way to enforce this notion in the system and the full credit range could always be chosen.

The Senate Curriculum Committees are asked to consider:

- Should the notion of ‘c’ continue to be indicated in some way on the course and in the Academic Calendars?
 - For courses that are eligible to be offered in 2020W, there are 304 courses on the Vancouver Campus that use ‘c’ and 30 on the Okanagan Campus.
- The wording of the proposed sentence to be included in course descriptions to represent the notion of ‘c’.
- Should the faculties be asked to review their variable credit courses to confirm that the current ‘c’ and ‘d’ operators are accurate and so that the data could be cleaned up prior to going live with Workday?

- Whether the notion of the '/' is still needed.
 - If so, is indicating this in the private notes enough? Or, should students be made aware if the intent is to only offer the course at the minimum or maximum credit value, and therefore a statement should be included in the course description.
 - How great is the concern that a course could be scheduled for a credit value that could negatively impact a student's program? (Note: it may be possible to set up a report in Workday that could identify, for example, any courses that do not have a credit value of 3 or 6 (the most common credit values) in an attempt to catch such situations).

- How to move forward with messaging to the UBC community around the changes to the attributes of variable credit courses in Workday:
 - Timing (changes could be implemented in the current system)
 - Academic Calendar changes (including the Introduction section to the Course Description sections)
 - Curriculum Guideline updates



29 September 2022

To: Okanagan Senate
From: Senate Curriculum Committee
Re: September Curriculum Proposals – Workday Student (approval)

The Okanagan and Vancouver Senate Curriculum Committees have jointly reviewed the materials forwarded to them by the Office of the Senate. These materials include: (1) proposals for a variety of administrative shell courses required to enable certain functionalities in Workday Student; and (2) a proposal to print cumulative average and cumulative credits on future transcripts. The Okanagan Committee encloses those proposals it deems as ready for approval.

The following is recommended to Senate:

Motion: *“That administrative shell courses (ADMIN 000, GRTU_O 001, SUPL_O 001) are approved, and that cumulative average and cumulative credits are printed on transcripts effective upon implementation of Workday Student.”*

Respectfully submitted,

Dr. Yves Lucet
Chair, Senate Curriculum Committee



May 10, 2022

To: Okanagan and Vancouver Senate Curriculum Committees

From: Office of the Senate

Re: **Administrative Shell Courses**

Administrative shell courses are used in order to enable certain functionality in the current Student Information System (SIS). For example, PHRM 455 is a shell course that is used for assessing fees when Pharmacy students are partaking in a residency. There are shell courses that hold a student's registration at UBC while they are attending Sciences Po as part of the dual degree program. There are also shell courses that allow the assessment of fees for visiting research students.

In Workday Student, administrative shell courses will be used in a similar manner to how they are used in the current SIS. Some of the existing administrative shell courses will be brought into Workday Student while others will be replaced by other functionality. The need for a number of new shell courses in Workday Student has been identified. Proposals for those courses with specific rationales have been included for your approval.

Recommendations:

THAT THE Okanagan Senate Curriculum Committee approve Administrative Course Shells (ADMIN 000, GRTU_O 001, SUPL_O 001), as presented.

THAT THE Vancouver Senate Curriculum Committee approve Administrative Course Shells (ADMIN 000, GRTU_V 001, SUPL 001, SUPL_V 001), as presented.



Curriculum Proposal Form New/Change to Course/Program – Okanagan campus

Category: 1	
Unit: Enrolment Services Senate & Curriculum Services Effective Academic Year: Effective upon implementation of Workday Student	Date: May 10, 2022 Contact Person: Jessica Iverson Email: jessica.iverson@ubc.ca
Type of Action: New administrative shell course	
Rationale: ADMIN 000 is an administrative shell course being proposed to use as a placeholder in academic requirements when a student is required to meet with an advisor to determine which courses can be used to satisfy the requirement. To prevent any course from automatically being used to satisfy the requirement, the shell course is needed to allow the creation of the specific requirements in the Academic Progress Report and to prevent students from automatically satisfying it with another course. Once the advisor meets with the student, they would add in the specific course(s) that the student can use to satisfy the requirement and ADMIN 000 would be replaced. This course is intended to be used by both campuses – allowed location will be set to both Vancouver and Okanagan. ADMIN 000 will not appear in the Academic Calendars nor on the transcript.	
Proposed Academic Calendar Entry: ADMIN 000 (0) Administrative Shell Course *Not to be published in the Academic Calendar	Draft Academic Calendar URL: N/A Present Academic Calendar Entry: N/A



Curriculum Proposal Form New/Change to Course/Program – Okanagan campus

Category: 1	
Unit: Enrolment Services Senate & Curriculum Services Effective Academic Year: Effective upon implementation of Workday Student	Date: May 10, 2022 Contact Person: Jessica Iverson Email: jessica.iverson@ubc.ca
Type of Action: New administrative shell course	
Rationale: This administrative shell course is being proposed to enable all continuing graduate students to be charged fees, when appropriate. The shell course will not carry a specific fee value; the student will be charged according to the fee structure for the program in which they are enrolled.	
Proposed Academic Calendar Entry: GRTU_O 001 (0) Continuous Enrolment for Tuition Instalment *Not to be published in the Academic Calendar	Draft Academic Calendar URL: N/A Present Academic Calendar Entry: N/A



Curriculum Proposal Form New/Change to Course/Program – Okanagan campus

Category: 1	
Unit: Enrolment Services Senate & Curriculum Services Effective Academic Year: Effective upon implementation of Workday Student	Date: May 10, 2022 Contact Person: Jessica Iverson Email: jessica.iverson@ubc.ca
Type of Action: New administrative shell course	
Rationale: The SUPL_O administrative shell course is being proposed along with a policy change to the supplemental examination policy (which is being considered by the Okanagan and Vancouver Senate Academic Policy Committees). With the policy change, the course for which the supplemental examination was granted will display the original percentage grade received and a course standing of Supplemental (S). The pass/fail result of the supplemental examination will be shown on the student’s record under the SUPL shell course.	
Proposed Academic Calendar Entry: SUPL_O 001 (0) Supplemental Pass/Fail *Not to be published in the Academic Calendar	Draft Academic Calendar URL: N/A Present Academic Calendar Entry: N/A



May 10, 2022

To: Okanagan and Vancouver Senate Curriculum Committees

From: Office of the Senate

Re: **Cumulative Average and Credits Earned on Future Transcripts**

A recommendation is being put forward to include cumulative average and cumulative credits earned and attempted on unofficial transcripts and cumulative average and cumulative credits earned on official transcripts. The transcript will continue to include the sessional average and sessional credits. This proposal has support from Enrolment Services leadership, Advising Directors, the IRP Student Process & Outcomes Committee, and the IRP Academic Model & Transformation Advisory Committee.

It is common in higher education to include cumulative average and cumulative credits on the transcript. Canadian institutions that display cumulative average/GPA on the transcript include: Alberta, Dalhousie, McGill, Queens, Simon Fraser, and Toronto. This practice is also in line with Association of Registrars of the Universities and Colleges of Canada (ARUCC) transcript standards. In addition, many institutions use cumulative average in their admission processes.

Cumulative average and cumulative credits will be visible to students on the Workday Student academic history tab. In Workday Student, the cumulative average and credits earned or attempted will be based on all courses taken within an academic record.

Including these calculations on the transcript will:

- bring UBC into alignment with ARUCC standards and industry common practice;
- enable student mobility by including averages commonly used by receiving institutions;
- align the transcript with averages that will be displayed on the student's academic record.

Recommendations:

THAT THE Okanagan Senate Curriculum Committee approve printing Cumulative Average and Cumulative Credits on Transcripts effective upon implementation of Workday Student.

THAT THE Vancouver Senate Curriculum Committee approve printing Cumulative Average and Cumulative Credits on Transcripts effective upon implementation of Workday Student.