

## Chapter 3

# PROGRAM REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Working Group Members:

- Rachael Donovan
- Joan Connors
- Ralph McPherson
- Colleen Fitzpatrick
- Ed Morrice
- Mary Applegate

## **INTRODUCTION - REVIEW PROCESS**

The Committee who studied the program review process was composed of representatives from faculty, support staff and administration. A total of six people attended. The Committee held two formal meetings; an introductory one hour meeting to decide how to conduct the study and a longer three hour meeting to get feedback. The committee members spent approximately 50 hours on the study.

In addition to the committee members, five Deans and four Regional Managers and two Community and Continuing Education people provided input on the implementation of recommendations of program reviews and on how continuing and community education programs conduct reviews. This entailed approximately eight person hours. It is difficult to determine the cost of the review. There were no direct costs other than people's time and photocopying which we did not track.

The feedback the committee provided on the SCOEA process and material is that initially there was a great deal of confusion on what was expected. People had to read the material a few times and discuss it at the first meeting before expectations became clear. Part of the reason for the confusion is that the information is dispersed throughout the materials. It would be helpful for instance to have all the information on program reviews in one area (eg. The check list, requirements for an effective educational program review, guidelines for annual review and periodic in depth review). Some of the terminology needs clarification (eg. Outputs - immediate products and non-products - what are the products? Students? - what are non products? Under input - what does material and energy mean?). The expectation of wide participation was seen as positive otherwise the focus would be too narrow.

## **Annual Process**

### ***Inputs:***

Annually, the following are reviewed: enrollment data, workload assignments, costs of programs, both human and other costs. If materials means capital equipment and supplies these are reviewed annually by both programs and the College as a whole. We were not sure what energy resources are so did not comment on this area. Information on applications, registration and wait lists is collected and reviewed each year. From an access perspective we examine student demand, regional offerings and distributed learning courses.

It was noted that every program review is approved by Education Council and its appropriate committees. Once approved an implementation plan is developed and is to be monitored by Education Council. The annual monitoring of the implementation is not done on a regular basis. A process to do this needs to be established.

Most programs review their courses on an informal basis annually. The programs may look at resources on an ongoing basis but do not necessarily look at the environment. For instance, while the College examines utilization rates it does not necessarily review the labs, shops and classrooms and their suitability. Some programs do this informally and there are mechanisms through departments and divisions to have problems addressed. The work of the College Computer Committee in examining the hardware / software needs of program areas has been very helpful.

***Outputs / Outcomes:***

We were not clear on the distinction between outputs and outcomes so will report on data we collect and review annually both formally and informally.

A main source of information for the College is the provincial student outcomes data. As a college, we review this data to identify how well our programs are being received. While this data is reviewed regularly by senior administration and the Board, it is not always reviewed by individual departments.

In the last two years the College has been focusing on retention of students in our programs, particularly in second year University Transfer and Business. The college wide Recruitment and Retention Committee has played a major role in examining recruitment and retention strategies for our programs.

Course outcomes are reviewed by individual programs by examining the success rate of students. This is done on an informal basis rather than formally. Each year information on basic skill preparation for job performance is provided through feedback from employees particularly in Co-op Education programs. Programs with practicums and work experience receive feedback from employees on the effectiveness of student performance. This tends to happen more informally than formally.

Each year student transfer data for CNC produced by BCCAT is reviewed and published internally. In addition data regarding students who continue their education in other college programs is examined by some programs (eg. College and Career Prep).

Anecdotal data on student employment, and feedback from employers is discussed annually in some departments.

The long term impacts of our programs on students, the institution and the community, while not necessarily reviewed annually, are reviewed during the program review process. Some program advisory committees regularly have discussions about the program and if it continues to meet community needs. Local labour market data is used

to decide if programs need to be suspended for a period of time; this is especially true at our regional campuses.

When the college annually examines its FTE utilization rate we do review the cost/revenue efficiency of programs. In our Community and Continuing Education programs, the cost/revenue efficiency of the program is examined regularly to make decisions about whether or not they will be offered in the future.

### **Schedule For Conducting Reviews**

Listed below are the reviews conducted in the past seven years. Each year the Educational Administrative Team during their annual planning days identify what programs are to be reviewed in the coming year. Perhaps it is time to schedule these reviews on a larger term basis. Education Council is informed of the reviews to be conducted during the year.

<b><u>Program</u></b>	<b><u>Date</u></b>
Accounting & Finance	1999 - in progress
Adult Basic Education	1996
Business Office Admin	1990
Business Office Admin Legal Secretary	1999 - in progress
Computer Info Systems	1994
Dental Assisting	1998
Dental Hygiene	1998
Electronics Engineering Technology	1996
Engineering Design Technology	1997
(** Review conducted as part of ASTTBC accreditation)	
Forest Resource Tech.	1997
Marketing & Management	1995
Northern Collaborative Baccalaureate	
Nursing Program (CNC/UNBC)	1998
Power Engineering	1999 - in progress
Social Services Training Program	1999 - in progress

## **Compliance With SCOEA's Criteria For Program Reviews**

The College revised its Program Review Policy in April of 1996. Prior to this revision a number of programs had commenced their reviews and used a combination of the old policy and the new revised policy. The programs presently under review are using the revised policy. This revised policy was used in determining if the College is meeting SCOEA's criteria.

Each member on the Committee has been involved with at least one of the following program reviews: Computer Information Systems, Accounting, College and Career Prep, Forestry, Electronics, and Marketing & Management. Each member reviewed the criteria and their assessment is:

- 1 Goals and objectives are explicit and all programs under review are asked to examine goals and objectives.
- 2 Strategic Plan - The College does not have a strategic plan as such. It does have Board Goals and Objectives, an Academic Plan and a Five Year Financial Plan. The policy is consistent with these documents. From a program perspective, there is some awareness of the above plans but this is not wide spread in the institution. All agreed that program goals and objectives are consistent with the College Mission and Goal Statements.
- 3 All agreed that goals and objectives are developed in consultation with stakeholders (eg. Advisory Committees, faculty and administration). It was noted that it is very difficult to obtain consistent student input. The development of the policy for Program Reviews had wide input, all program committees, Education Council and Board.
- 4 Program goals and objectives are written in broad terms so they do not have to be changed regularly. Changing program goals and objectives is a substantial undertaking. However individual course objectives may change more regularly in response to student, employer, and advisory committee feedback. When program goals and objectives are changed they are usually the result of a program review and implicitly annual indicators and trends have been considered as well as feedback from a variety of sources.
- 5 The detailed guidelines for Annual Reviews were covered in the review of annual processes.
- 6 All agreed that the main focus of a program review is to examine curricular, breadth, relevance, appropriateness, delivery, method and assessment of student learning.
- 7 The program review policy speaks to resources available in the program. While the College on an annual basis examines the fiscal management of programs the program review does not. The people involved in program review believe that they are more free to say what needs to occur without considering what financial resources are available to implement the recommendations. During the annual budget process the costs for implementation of recommendations is considered. For example, following the electronics program review, the College allocated considerable funds to implement the

new program. Funding is allocated to conduct the reviews. The annual budget for this is \$18,000.

- 8 The program review involves consultation with advisory committees, faculty, staff, students, administration and members of the community. The final report and implementation plan is published and is widely circulated.
- 9 Every program review has a clear summary of the findings and recommendations of the review.

In addition each program review committee develops an implementation plan that is approved by Education Council.

### **Use of Findings and Recommendations of Program Reviews**

Each Dean was asked to provide an update on the implementation of recommendations from program reviews. Recommendations that require major changes to courses and / or programs are approved by Education Council. Attached to this document are copies of Minutes from Education Council noting their approval (Appendix K). Often the costs for course changes are covered in existing department / program budgets by reallocating money within the budget. For instance an extra section of a course may not be offered due to low enrollment and the money is reallocated to a new course. Development time for new courses is also covered in existing budgets.

Major changes, for example the electronics program, were reviewed at budget time and a decision made to allocate the resources to the new program. No minutes are kept of these meetings - changes are simply made to the budget.

Implementation of recommendations for the most part have been successful. However, there has been no formal review of the implementation by Education Council.

Following are the updates of Implementation of Recommendations by Program.

a) ***Program Review of the Computer Information Systems Diploma***

The review began in 1992 and was completed in 1994. Implementation took place over a two-year period from 1995 to 1997. There were 33 recommendations in the final report for the review. An implementation plan was necessary to co-ordinate the changes for the program to meet the recommendations. All 33 recommendations have been implemented to one degree or another.

b) ***Program Review of the Marketing/Management Diploma***

The Marketing/Management review was unique in that most of the changes related to courses outside of the actual Management or Marketing courses making

implementation more challenging. One of the reasons for this may be that most curriculum related survey questions related to course numbers and titles with which former students and employers may not be familiar.

Recommendation 1: “Marketing/Management faculty should increase their contact with potential employers”

- the major contact with employers is through the program Advisory Committee.
- additional contact occurs during a ‘Career Night’ that has occurred both in 1998 and 1999 which featured local employers making brief presentation and meeting informally with faculty and students.

Recommendation 2: “Increase the opportunities for on-the-job training for Marketing/ Management students”

- added the Co-op coordinator to the Program Advisory Committee as a regular committee appointment.
- this is an area that needs further work.

Recommendation 3: “Give more written and oral training”

- both the required English courses contain a substantial public speaking requirements for students.
- any students wishing to transfer English courses to the program are required to complete a public speaking component.

Recommendation 4: “Update Course Content”

- suggested changes in Economics (micro in place of macro) have not occurred.
- a suggested specialized Managerial Accounting course for Marketing students have not been developed.
- suggested courses in Management can be substituted in the program with the permission of the Dean but are not part of the regular Marketing program; subsequent discussions to implement a Management option ended in deadlock over required versus optional courses and have not progressed.

The recommendations below are generic to many programs at the College and have been addressed by the creation of the Recruitment and Retention Committee. Ron Ryan of the Marketing/Management Program has played a very active role in the R&R Committee since its inception.

Recommendation 5: “Identify and target the most desirable student and employer markets”

Recommendation 6: “Identify the reasons for attrition”

Recommendation 7: “Evaluate our promotional activities, in order to increase effectiveness in reaching target markets and efficiency in the allocation of promotional dollars”

While the above recommendations have been implemented as indicated the implementation plan for the Marketing/Management program was not approved by Education Council.

**c) Program Review of College & Career Prep**

The program review identified 15 recommendations. The recommendations were grouped into 4 areas:

- 1) Sponsors: An advisory committee was not set up. For the past several years the Ministry has been trying to establish community committees to deal with the competition aspect of adult upgrading. We were waiting for these so we would not duplicate our efforts.

We have held meetings with various sponsors although we have not had an annual workshop. The coordinator has been instrumental in determining which sponsor group needs individual counseling regarding the enrollment of their students.

We have maintained a list of current sponsors but we have not provided them with a bi-annual newsletter.

- Student Satisfaction: Through additional funds available, such as IBT, we were able to offer students the option of a wider selection of continuous intake courses. We have offered courses in the summer but only in Math. Evening offerings have increased to include higher levels of math as well.
- Student Success: We have not developed a better tracking system for students who require more than one semester to finish a course. We do have an earlier start up to allow for more of an orientation for students but it seems that the students who could most benefit from this time do not show up until after Labour day, so the orientation does not help them. All English classes have scheduled computer time and we have timetabled a second section of Computer Studies 045.
- Patterns & Trends: This area of recommendations stemmed from the lower enrollments we were experiencing at the time. Since the fees for CCP (ABE) have been eliminated we no longer have this problem. In our placement test orientation we encourage students to combine programs and in fact we have increased the number of students enrolled in dual programs. Our fundamental enrollment has also increased and this may be because of the work being done in VALT and the Cost/Shared literacy programs. The co-ordinators of these programs have really encouraged their clients to learn more about literacy and have promoted the lower level courses whenever possible. Finally, we have changed the name of our program to College and Career Preparation. I think that this was mainly our concern; perhaps the

connotation we felt was there was not something shared by students. However, the name is there and it has not taken the students long to come to terms with it; faculty on the other hand are still struggling!

1) ***Program Review of the Electronics Programs***

As a result of the review of the Electronics Engineering Technology Program, the new Electronics Technician Common Core Program was introduced in September, 1997. The graduates of that intake were eligible to enter one of the following in September, 1998:

- **Computer/Network Electronics Technician Program** - this program was offered for the first time in September, 1998;
- **Electronics Technology Bridge Program** - This program was offered for the first time in September, 1998;

The Electronics Engineering Technology Program was offered in January, 1999 to those students who had completed the Electronics Technology Bridge Program in December, 1998. The second intake of 37 students was admitted to the Electronics Technician Common Core Program in September, 1998. Thus, the implementation of the recommendations of the Electronics Program Review is now complete.

2) ***Program Review of the Forest Resource Technology Program***

The review of the Forest Resource Technology Program, completed in 1997, was partially implemented when students were admitted to the new first year in September, 1998. The new second year courses will be introduced in September, 1999 to those students. The students presently in their second year will graduate under the former regulations in May, 1999.

3) ***Program Review of the Engineering Design Technology Program***

As a result of the re-accreditation of the program by the Applied Science Technologists and Technicians of British Columbia (ASTTBC), the program was revised and recommendations implemented in September, 1997.

**Additional Comments**

The Program Review Policy at CNC only applies to base funded programs. When the policy was revised we were not providing the programs we are today in the non-base funded areas. However feedback on how Community and Continuing Education programs and courses are evaluated was received from the Regional Managers and the Department of Community and Continuing Education.



***Community Education Programs:*** (defined as full-time programs and /or services for transitional client groups)

- 4) Mid-program round table discussion between students and the director (for programs longer than 10 weeks). Notes are drafted, reviewed by participants and then finalized for distribution.
- 5) Final written program evaluation for all programs.
- 6) Final round table discussion between students and the director, if requested by the students. Same documentation process as #1.
- 7) External evaluation as per the contract by Ministry of Advanced Education Training and Technology (MAETT) Skills Development Division for their BC Benefits program contracts. This entails discussions with instructors and students regarding the program (not regarding the instructor), and a management audit of the program with the administrators.
- 8) External evaluation as per the contract (either MAETT or Human Resources Development Canada [HRDC]), based on accountabilities i.e. Number of students enrolled, status of completes, incompletes, employed immediately, three, six and 12 months following the end of the program, fiscal accountability. This is done for every contract.
- 9) External evaluation as per specific contracts with HRDC, generally done as a community-wide exercise such as in 1997/98 on the PG Employment Services Network, which includes College Directions.
- 10) External evaluation as per specific contracts done on a provincial basis, including Institutional Based Training (IBT) (College Directions) and Youth Community Action (done annually or bi-annually).
- 11) External evaluation by College choice, to assess program design and delivery, and support further development, such as Dakelh and First Nations Education Support Services (FNESS) evaluations, when Alison MacDonald conducted the evaluation under contract to CNC. This included interviews with current and past students, funders, elders, CNC instructors, CSTC staff, and community members.

For Contract Support Services, C&CE coordinates the program evaluation process with the delivering division. Generally includes #4 and #5 at a minimum.

***Continuing Education Courses:***

Every course is evaluated for every delivery utilizing an internal Course Evaluation tool. The tool is a short one page survey collected in confidence from each student. The program coordinator screens initial results with follow-up involvement by the Manager and instructor as appropriate.

Groups of courses serving certain sectors are evaluated for overall directions, content, etc. at least every five years by industry based focus groups. (i.e. we pull together a focus group from the local chapter of Medical Assistants Association to review our courses in this area.)

The intent is to have Education Council approved Certificate programs be reviewed via the Education Council outlined program review process. However, we have not

delivered any new Education Council approved program for long enough to use this process.

Externally accredited courses (Justice Institute, Purchasing Management Association of Canada, Workers Compensation of BC, Ministry of Environment, Ministry of Forests) have a range of program evaluation tools for each of the deliveries certified by them. CNC Continuing Education meets their individual needs as laid out. (i.e. Justice Institute has room requirements, record keeping standards, instructor certification and refresher standards.)

***Nechako Campus:***

In the Nechako region there are 2 ongoing processes for evaluation of courses and programs. For short term and general interest courses there is a course evaluation form and a feedback form. For credit courses and longer term programs a modified feedback form is used for future program planning and evaluation of the actual offerings.

***Lakes District Campus:***

*Community Education*

A variety of methods are used depending upon the funding agencies involved. Formal evaluation forms are completed by students and input is received from Advisory Committees and funding agencies. In some programs there may be an external evaluation.

*Continuing Education*

A course evaluation form is completed by students who are registered in the programs.

***Quesnel Campus:***

*Community Education*

Programs are evaluated in a variety of ways both formally and informally by students, instructors, and funding agencies.

*Continuing Education*

A course questionnaire is completed by students in the courses.

***Mackenzie Campus:***

*Community Education*

Ongoing evaluation is conducted with the students, often informally, by open discussion with the "How Did We Do?" evaluation form. Also, informal evaluation with the funding agencies is carried out regularly. A formal summative evaluation of the program is conducted and a report provided to the funding agency.

*Continuing Education*

The “How Did We Do?” and Student Evaluation Form is used for continuing education programs and courses. In addition, informal evaluation is carried out with the funding agencies.

Recommendation: Examine the time it takes to complete a program review. The person given release time to lead the review has an enormous responsibility without necessarily having the resources to assist with the responsibility.