

Curriculum Development and Renewal

Step 3 Check List, Self-Assessment

Actions 7 - 10	Good signs	Warning signs
<p>Action 7</p> <p>What about learning do we need to know first to design an educationally effective curriculum?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Curriculum committee and associated working groups have some touchstone learning principles ✓ Opportunities for improved engagement, inclusion and wellness among students are identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⊗ There has been no consideration of current student perspectives or insights about how learning works ⊗ Committees do not see the curriculum as an opportunity to positively impact engagement, inclusion, and wellness
<p>Action 8</p> <p>What do we need to understand about our existing program in order to make decisions?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Student input is included since they are the people who experience the full curriculum ✓ Curriculum mapping has informed decisions ✓ A summary document that shows curriculum mapping results exists ✓ Opportunities are taken to assess areas of shared university priority, like Indigenization, wellness, inclusion, sustainability, internationalization, among others 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⊗ No student input, or if there has been input it has been dismissed ⊗ Superficial or no attention to alignment ⊗ Curricular goals, practical requirements are not being actively and explicitly incorporated into discussions ⊗ There has been no systematic assessment of what can be kept or adapted from an existing curriculum ⊗ Curriculum mapping has become more elaborate and extensive than necessary, slowing the process
<p>Action 9</p> <p>How will we sequence the learning activities to achieve the curricular competencies/program goals?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ A sequence for decisions has been presented to those who will work on the design ✓ Design process is logical and allows for iteration ✓ Learning outcomes, first. ✓ “Backwards plan”, meaning to begin design with end of program, not the start 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⊗ Superficial or no attention to alignment ⊗ Curricular goals, practical requirements are not being actively and explicitly incorporated into discussions ⊗ Focus on topics to cover rather than learning outcomes. ⊗ Faculty are proposing courses or contact hours as a first step rather than defining learning outcomes by year, term first
<p>Action 10</p> <p>How can we be successful in the approval process(es)?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Communication specialists in the academic unit are providing support or advice ✓ Regular communication processes established in Step 1 have been followed or adjusted and followed ✓ Consults with Governance Office, other academic units, or other process advisors have occurred in advance ✓ Faculty are expecting the design they are provided, and it meets the criteria that were established for function and feasibility (See Step 2, Action 4) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⊗ Proposal documents are not under development until now ⊗ Faculty are surprised by the design, or key elements ⊗ Consultations with other academic units that are implicated in your design have not occurred well in advance of their letter of support