



<b>Category:</b> Education	<b>Responsible Owner:</b> Academic Board	<b>Effective Date:</b> July 2023
<b>Policy Number:</b> 2.1	<b>Approval Body:</b> Board of Governors	<b>Policy Name:</b> Program Review Policy and Procedure

**A. POLICY:**

Columbia College is committed to providing high quality, current and relevant. This commitment requires consistent, cyclical review of programs to ensure that teaching standards remain high and student experiences remain exceptional and meaningful.

**PURPOSE/COMMITMENT:**

1. To ensure students receive a meaningful and relevant education
2. To adapt quickly to change in subject-area practice, pedagogy or curriculum.
3. To ensure students graduate with flexible transitions, through the convocation of degrees that are well-regarded by public-sector institutions and have currency in the job market
4. To formalize the process of program review and ensure continuous improvement in service delivery
5. To ensure that the Columbia College community recognizes their roles and responsibilities in the program review process
6. To ensure the College effectively engages or exceeds the expectations of the Degree Quality Assessment Board and the Ministry of Advanced Education, Skills and Training in offering educational programming to Columbia College students.
7. Assess student and program outcomes that lead to data-informed, student-centered decisions regarding improvements in courses, curricula, and methodology or to support requests for additional program resources.
8. Provide faculty and administrators a wider perspective on the program

**SCOPE:**

This Policy applies to all Academic Divisions. It is to be overseen by the Academic Board and led by the VP – Academic, Deans and Departmental Chairs. Support in the completion of this policy will also require active engagement from Student Services.

Program review is intended to review areas of concentration and individual subject areas to ensure quality, up-to-date offerings. It is not a mechanism for review of instructors in said concentrations or subject areas.

**WHEN TO USE THE POLICY:**

Subject areas are to use this policy annually in the manner specified below. Every 5 years a subject area is to undertake a major review, as per the schedule attached below in appendix I and repeating until such time as this policy is replaced.

**DEFINITIONS:**

Dean: The Dean or Delegate. A delegate must be a regular or tenured member of faculty.

Program Chair: The Chair of a subject area, or where one does not exist, a regular or tenured faculty appointed to this position in order to complete the report.

**Category:**

2.0 Education

**B. PROCESSES and PROCEDURES:****Processes (Annual Review of Courses):**

Internal review once per year (annual report) undertaken by Department Chair, report to the Dean and Academic Board upon its completion (unless major concerns identified, this is a simple report).

- Brief interim update on progress towards departmental goals within the structure of the Academic Plan
- Student registration numbers at registration and withdrawal date (section, course and total): Minimum 3 year term-by-term
- Associate Degree's completed (if applicable)
- UT transfers
- Student Success: Failure Rates/Withdrawal Rates/N Grades
- Course Outline Discussion for review of continued relevance (timing tbd)
- Teaching faculty update, status, qualifications, 5 year review completed
- Articulation report
- Student feedback
- Departmental Meeting Report
- Quality of Instruction Metric as per Student Satisfaction Survey (by department)

Can trigger a Major Review

- Significant loss of students and/or sections, over a 3 semester period (relative to student population)
- Written student complaints
- Lack of articulation of courses (new or old) at major BC Research Universities
- Exogenous shocks on the program
  - Changes to pedagogical best-practice, job market evolution
- A request from the Dean/Department Chair

**Process (Major Review of Associate Degrees and Concentrations):**

Major Review once every 5 years undertaken by Department Chair, Dean and VPA (additional external academic/private sector representative if possible or relevant); presented to the Academic Board and reported in the Board's minutes. Where concerns are noted, the Academic Board can review the plan for pathways to address the problem and request additional data and planning from the department. The Self-Study Report will be reviewed by an external reviewer. The following is required every 5 years at a minimum:

- Program Background (overview & history)
- Program Purpose (Program Goals, Program Learning Outcomes, program goal alignment with the Academic Plan and the provincial Associate Degree Requirements)
  - Develop new 5-year department goals: Development of departmental "action plan"
- Program review: mapping of course learning outcomes to program goals, review of course content, curriculum review, course outline review, evaluation methodology
- Program delivery methods & teaching, learning and assessment methodologies
  - Mode of delivery
  - Evaluation methodology
  - Academic integrity
- Structure, Admission and Enrolment

- Student registration numbers at registration and withdrawal date (section, course and total): 3 year term-by-term
- Atypical enrolments
- Associate Degree's completed (if applicable)
- Student Success: Grade distribution trends, atypical student progression trends
- Student Satisfaction
  - Student Pathways, Student Success and Student Feedback
- External connections
- Articulation reports (concerns on transferability in or out)
- Non-Instructional department feedback
- Departmental Meeting Report
- Quality of Instruction Metric as per Student Satisfaction Survey (by department)
- Benchmarking
- Program Risks
- Comparison of past review
- Faculty Development and Resources (PD, status, qualifications, resources, facilities)
- Faculty Satisfaction
- Recommendations for improvement

**Process (Non-Associate Degree Areas – Major Review):**

Many departments at the College do not have formalized concentrations. However, the success of these courses informs the success of the Associate Degrees at Columbia College. As such, each non-concentration department will be required to do a major review, timed to be in-line with the review for the Associate of Arts (General) of the Associate of Science (General). These will be coordinated through the Dean, Assistant Dean or VP-Academic. Where concerns are noted, the Academic Board can review the plan for pathways to address the problem and request additional data and planning from the department. The Report will be reviewed by an internal reviewer. The following is required every 5 years at a minimum:

- Program Background (overview & history)
- Program Purpose (Program Goals, Program Learning Outcomes)
- Program review: mapping of course learning outcomes to program goals, review of course content, curriculum review, course outline review, evaluation methodology
- Program delivery methods & teaching, learning and assessment methodologies
  - Mode of delivery
  - Evaluation methodology
  - Academic integrity
- Structure, Admission and Enrolment
  - Student registration numbers at registration and withdrawal date (section, course and total): 3 year term-by-term
  - Atypical enrolments
  - Associate Degree's completed (if applicable)
  - Student Success: Grade distribution trends, atypical student progression trends
- Student Satisfaction
  - Student Pathways, Student Success and Student Feedback
- External connections
- Articulation reports (concerns on transferability in or out)
- Non-Instructional department feedback
- Departmental Meeting Report
- Quality of Instruction Metric as per Student Satisfaction Survey (by department)

- Departmental Risks
- Comparison of past review
- Faculty Development and Resources (PD, status, qualifications, resources, facilities)
- Faculty Satisfaction
- Recommendations for improvement

Procedure:

Phase One: Review notifications issued to the department that will undergo next program review. Department assigns the Self-Study Coordinator (SSC). The Coordinator meets with the Internal Review Supervisor (IRS) and the VP Academic and maps out a preliminary timeline for the self-study.

Phase Two: The agreement on the scope of the review is prepared and the SSC begins preparations of the self-study report, including an initial meeting with the IRS to discuss their data template.

Phase Three: The SSC, with assistance and guidance from the IRS, begins to collect internal and external data (student survey, faculty survey, registration and enrollment data, PD records, consultations, market analysis). The SSC begins to analyze the gathered data.

Phase Four: The SSC drafts its self-study report. The SSC schedules a meeting with the VP Academic and the IRS to review the draft of the self-study report, if it is a non-concentration program review. The final draft is handed over to the VP Academic and the IRS. The IRS writes an internal review report. VP Academic schedules a meeting with the Academic Board/the Deans.

For a concentration program review, the college assigns an external program reviewer to write an external review report on the self-study report, at the end of Phase 4. The External Program Reviewer's report is presented to the Academic Board, the VP Academic, and the IRS in Phase 5.

Phase Five: The Academic Board/Deans meet with the VP Academic, the IRS, and the SSC to review the self-study report, the internal review report and approve of the 5-year Action Plan.

Phase Six: The Department is given the 5-year Action Plan. The Department submits a response committing to the Action Plan.

**LINKS TO SUPPORTING FORMS, DOCUMENTS, WEBSITE:**

n/a

**REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT AGREEMENT CLAUSES:**

n/a

**REFERENCE TO BYLAWS:**

n/a

**RELATED ACTS AND REGULATIONS:**

n/a

**RELATED POLICIES:**

**APPROVALS:**

**IF APPLICABLE:**

<b>Chair, Academic Board</b>	<b>Date:</b>
<b>Chair, Marketing and Recruitment Committee:</b>	<b>Date:</b>
<b>Chair, Finance Committee:</b>	<b>Date:</b>

**APPROVAL FOR ALL POLICIES:**

<b>Responsible Owner:</b>	<b>Date:</b>
<b>Principal or Designate:</b>	<b>Date:</b>
<b>Chair, Board of Governors:</b>	<b>Date:</b>

<b>Proposed Review Date:</b> July 2023	<b>Dates(s) revised:</b> January 2019	<b>Replaces Policy Number:</b> January 2019
---	--	--