

Procedure Name:	Program Review Procedures
Approval Date:	June 15, 2018
Procedure Holder	Education Council
Procedure number:	EDU-017P



PROGRAM REVIEW PROCEDURES

6.00 DEFINITIONS

6.01 For a list of all definitions related to Educational Policies see: [Education Council Policy and Procedures Definitions](#)

7.00 PROGRAM REVIEW PROCEDURES

7.01 **Program Review Schedules:** The Dean in consultation with Academic Head/Coordinator/Chair, will establish a three year plan for which programs will be reviewed. This will be revisited annually so there is always a three year plan. It is recommended that each program be reviewed with a frequency of 5-7 years.

7.02 **Initiate Self-Study Team (SST):** The Dean or Associate Dean or Director (AD&D) will identify the SST, which will consist of the Dean (or AD&D), the Academic Head/Coordinator/Chair and one or more program instructors. The SST work will be led by the program champion (typically the Academic Head/Coordinator/Chair, but may be a different program instructor as decided by the SST) who, preferably, has some historical knowledge of the program.

7.03 **First SST Meeting:** The first meeting of the SST is led by the Centre of Learning Transformation (COLT), who will outline the purpose and process for program review, resources available, and expectations for reports and timing. This first meeting will establish a schedule for the program review, and identify key questions to explore through the process of review. Additional meetings are scheduled by the SST.

7.04 **Data Collection:** To inform the Self-Study Report, the SST collects readily available information, reports, and other data from Cluster meeting minutes, course outlines, learner data, faculty research or reports, the IR Office, and data and information gathered through survey instruments (using standard survey templates as a basis) and/or focus groups. Stakeholders involved in program review include students, alumni, industry and community, and instructors and staff. The SST review the data collected, and use it to create the Self-Study Report.

7.05 **Self-Study Report:** The SST works in consultation with COLT and IR to collect data and produce the Self-Study Report, which creates an overall perspective of the program reflecting the program learning outcomes. The self-study report is based on evidence relating to program performance including strengths, opportunities for improvement,

desired improvements, and future directions. The report systematically looks at key components including, but not limited to the following:

- i. Educational design, scheduling, alignment with program and college purpose and goals
- ii. Any external standards or accreditation
- iii. Program-specific educational experiences, student and graduate achievement
- iv. Admission, teaching and evaluation practices
- v. Program-specific services
- vi. Resources and facilities
- vii. Relationships with other programs and the community
- viii. Comparisons with similar programs and incorporation of experiential place-based learning, including active learning, project/problem based learning, community based learning and integrated learning.

7.06 The report includes eight (8) sections:

- i. Program Overview
- ii. Educational Design Quality
- iii. Educational Experience Quality
- iv. Services, Resources and Facilities Quality
- v. Program Pathways and Connections
- vi. Comparison, as applicable, with Previous Reviews
- vii. Benchmarking with Comparable Programs
- viii. Conclusions, Recommendations, and Future Directions

7.07 The **Program Review Manual** describes each section in detail, outlining the types of questions to address during the review. The SST should use the self-study report template when writing the report.

7.08 **External Review:** An External Review Panel (ERP) is nominated by the SST, and appointed by VP, ESSI. This is a panel of three experts who will conduct an external review of the program. One panelist is a College instructor from a different Cluster than the program under review. One panelist must be an academic peer from another post-secondary institution with relevant expertise and experience. The third panelist should either be an academic peer external to the College, or be an expert in the field from outside the post-secondary system. One of the three panelists - not directly employed by the College - will chair the ERP.

The point of the external review is to validate the self-study report and provide additional information regarding program strengths and opportunities to improve. The external review will include a site visit, typically one (1) to one and a half (1½) days in duration, during which panel members will gather relevant information about the program by meeting with faculty, current and/or past students, and administrators.

The chair of the ERP will write the final External Review report with recommendations agreed to, and signed off by, all ERP members. COLT is responsible for overseeing all aspects of the External Review.

- 7.09 **Written Response:** In consultation with the program cluster, the SST will provide a written response to the External Review Report.
- 7.10 **Action Plan:** An Action Plan will be created by the SST following the review and response in consultation with the program cluster. The Action Plan must be approved by the VP, ESSI.
- 7.11 **Final Report:** A final comprehensive report, including appendices with copies of all data collected and all four components of program review must be submitted to the VP, ESSI to be presented to Education Council by the appropriate Dean and/or VP, ESSI and be posted publically.
- 7.12 **One Year Status Update:** One year after completion of a review, and in subsequent years if necessary, the SST, Dean and program cluster will provide a progress report on the action plan to Education Council and the VP, ESSI.

8.00 PROGRAM REVIEW OF RELATED PROGRAMS

- 8.01 Where there are several related programs, it is expected that the related programs will be scheduled for program review at the same time, to increase efficiency and integration. Related programs could be at the same or different credential levels.

9.00 PROGRAMS WITH OUTSIDE ACCREDITATION

- 9.01 Programs undergoing review by an external accrediting body are encouraged to coordinate, in terms of timing and reporting, with College program review requirements. This should help minimize any duplication of effort, while ensuring the main areas of the program review are addressed. Completed forms and templates required by the external accrediting body will be used whenever possible. Areas requiring review by the College's program review procedures, but not included in the accrediting body requirements must still be completed to supplement the accreditation review. If the accreditation review requires a site visit, this will usually be considered adequate for the College's program review, and no further site visit will be required.

10.00 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

- 10.01 The College is committed to conducting program reviews in an ethical manner and with due regard for the welfare of those involved in the process, as well as those affected by its results. Specific terms are outlined below.

10.02 CONFLICT OF INTEREST

- i. All external reviewers will conduct themselves in a way so as to preserve the confidence of all stakeholders in their ability to discharge their responsibility properly, carry out their functions in a fair, objective and transparent manner, and accomplish their purpose.
- ii. External reviewers will perform their duties conscientiously, and not put themselves in a position in which their private interests and those of the institution might be perceived to be in conflict. Any relationship or involvement with the unit or program being reviewed must be fully disclosed before participating in any program evaluation.
- iii. There is an apparent conflict of interest when a reasonably well-informed person could perceive that an external reviewer's ability to perform a duty or function of the position

would be biased or otherwise affected by his or her private interests. Private interests mean an economic interest or advantage that could provide a real or tangible benefit to the reviewers or members of their immediate family.

- iv. Integrity, honesty and trust are essential elements of the review process. Any person who is aware of an apparent conflict has a duty to report it. It is also expected that anyone chosen as an external reviewer who is in a conflict of interest will make an initial declaration and withdraw from participating in the panel.
- v. If an apparent conflict of interest is disclosed, the VP, ESSI will be informed and will establish a process for determining whether a real conflict exists. The VP, ESSI will prepare a written statement regarding the apparent conflict of interest, to become part of the file on the review process, indicating either that no conflict was discovered or that there was a conflict and it was resolved.
- vi. No financial payment or other material compensation will be provided to external reviewers in return for their services as reviewers. However, the College will reimburse reasonable travel, hospitality, and other out-of-pocket expenses related to the conduct of a review and a site visit. All such expenses must be authorized in advance by the VP, ESSI.

10.03 DISPOSITION OF REPORTS: Final program review reports and any attached materials become the property of the College. Reviewers will hold their deliberations and preliminary reports in confidence. Final review reports may be made public by the College. Any documents, notes, e-mails, and voice-mail used in the preparation of the above noted reports will be collected by the College and subsequently destroyed.

10.04 CONFIDENTIALITY: The names of individuals, as well as identifying statements, will be removed from final review reports prior to publication. The final reports and plans will be subject to the terms of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.

11.00 RECIPROCAL EXTERNAL REVIEWS

11.01 PARTICIPATION IN EXTERNAL REVIEWS: The College supports the concept of the external review of instructional programs at post-secondary institutions. College instructors and staff are encouraged to serve as external experts when invited to participate in program reviews by other institutions. This is seen to be a benefit to the College as well as to the other institutions involved.