|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **DRAFT Value Stream Charter** | |
| Value Stream: | Quality Assurance Process Phase 1) Curriculum Renewal |
| Start Date: | January 30, 2015 |
| Expected Completion: | April 30, 2015 |
| **Team:** | |
| Executive Sponsor: | Laurel Schollen |
| Value Stream Leader: | Trudy Heffernan |
| Members and Roles[1] (as related to participation in this initiative): | |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Member** | **Role** | | Kristine McBride | Consultant | | Pauline Smiley | Consultant | | Sharon Archibald | Consultant | | Kari –Draker-Fortis | Consultant | | Maxine Mann | Dean | | Sandra Dupret | Dean | | Molly Westland | Chair | | Silvana MacDonald | Chair | | Mary Ann Fader | Chair | | Deb Holts | Chair | | Cindy Gervais | Coordinator(s) | | Wendy Morgan/Trish O’Connor | Facilitators | |
| **Value Stream / Initiative Summary:** | |
| **Goals (of the initiative):** | |
| The goals for this initiatives are to:  1) design a process to engage more stakeholders (esp. faculty) in curriculum renewal  2) making the process more efficient  3) to make the process more actively part of a continuous improvement cycle—and have stakeholders see the value of the process  4) to better connect curriculum renewal with program review so that it feeds a comprehensive and circular quality assurance process.  5) to make more visual, automate and systemize curriculum renewal results | |
| **Problem Statement:** | |
| Curriculum renewal is not consistently undertaken across the schools and this creates a problem for both quality and the quality assurance process. Though designed in principle to be an integrative part of the broader program review process, in application, curriculum renewal does not always connect with the more substantive review. | |
| **Project Scope (where does your value stream start and stop?):** | |
| The scope of the project starts at the beginning of the annual cycle for curriculum renewal and ends at the end of the annual curriculum renewal cycle. We will look at a one year planning horizon with the view to better understanding how it connects to the five year program review. | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Other Relevant Background (on issue / problem to be addressed, anticipated time commitment):** | | | | | | |
| The college has embarked on an integrated program planning initiative, informed by an IPP tool that collects relevant metrics to be considered as part of the quality assurance process. How this information is used during curriculum renewal will be part of the process map.  The IPP information will also drive decisions around the status of programs with low financial and/or quality scores and will require Deans to develop mitigation plans. This curriculum renewal process needs to be connected to these mitigation plans.  Some redesign work has occurred in the past year using “Lean Thinking” tools and the lessons learned from this pilot will be considered in the design process. | | | | | | |
| **Other Factors: (Challenges/strengths, special resources, capacity/readiness) :** | | | | | | |
| The college’s quality assurance process has both an annual element through curriculum renewal as well as the program review process which is scheduled on a five year cycle. Curriculum renewal needs to be an integral part of program review – Phase 2 of this initiative will be the redesign of program review.  The college will be required to undergo an accreditation process as part of the new Ministry mandated quality assurance policy. Non-standard application of the college policy must be addressed to ensure no loss of college status or reputation.  Curriculum renewal and identified activities need to be effectively utilized during the annual spring block development timeframe.  Active and regular (by semester) reflection on curriculum delivery is part of continuous improvement and reflective practice for faculty – this should be recognized as a key component of curriculum renewal. Making this tacit knowledge more explicit – through documentation, is an important element of this project. | | | | | | |
| **Anticipated Activity Milestones (e.g., Key dates timelines):** | | | | | | |
| Activity | | Timeframe | | Deliverable | | |
| Current State Mapping | | January 30/2015 | | Develop a map that reflects the “should be” state of curriculum renewal, note exceptions – collect metrics | | |
| Future State Mapping and Implementation Plan | | Winter/2015 | | The implementation plan should be a pilot for the spring 2015 development in one school (minimally). | | |
| Evaluate pilot and continue with completion of the implementation plan -Kaizens to remove obstacles as required | | Spring-Fall, 2015 | | New process should be implemented for September 2015 . | | |
| **Evaluation Criteria:** | | | | | | |
| Affects KPI’s | Return on Investments | Cost | Strategic Direction | Morale | Resource Availability | Overall Rating/comments |
| Yes | Quality |  | Yes | Yes | Yes-facilitators internal | High |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Impact is rated as high, medium, low or don’t know.** | | | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approved by |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Value Stream Leader |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Executive Sponsor |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lean Consultant |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EOLT Sponsor |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |