

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 53.5 d and isn imthe ir estaeoiP.

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.

<u>Program</u>	<u>Date</u>
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”

Σ the major contact with employers is through the program Advisory Committee.

- Σ 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”

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

Recommendation 3: “Give more written and oral training”

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

Recommendation 4: “Update Course Content”

- Σ suggested changes in Economics (micro in place of macro) have not occurred.
- Σ a suggested specialized Managerial Accounting course for Marketing students have not been developed.
- Σ suggested courses in Management can be substituted in the program with the permission of

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.

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:

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,

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.