

PROGRAM REVIEW			
Effective Date	October 28, 2021	Policy Type	Academic
Responsibility	Vice President Academic and Research	Cross-Reference	Academic Council Bylaws Campus Alberta Quality Council Handbook Program Review Committee Terms of Reference Program Advisory Committee Policy Conflict of Interest Policy
Approver	Board of Governors	Appendices	Appendix 1 – Annual Review Procedures Appendix 2 – Comprehensive Review Procedures Appendix 3 – Forms
Review Schedule	3 years		

1. Policy Statement

- 1.1. The institution will maintain a regular and systematic program review process that facilitates the ongoing improvement of the quality and effectiveness of academic programs and their relevance in supporting the institutional mandate, vision, mission, and values.

2. Background

- 2.1. The Program Review Policy supports academic offerings that ensures relevancy with industry demands, student demands, and academic quality standards. Routine program review supports curriculum and program improvement to meet the current and future needs of the community.

3. Policy Objective

- 3.1. Program reviews will examine program strengths and areas for improvement, the efficacy of curriculum and instruction, and program relevance and viability within the discipline/sector.

4. Scope

- 4.1. This Policy applies to all credential programs approved by the Ministry of Advanced Education and/or the Alberta Board of Skilled Trades.¹

5. Definitions

- 5.1. **Action Plan:** An action plan is one of the main outcomes of the comprehensive review process. It documents the steps needed to reach established goals. Action plans clarify the timelines, tasks, and investments needed to respond to approved recommendations received during the comprehensive review process and annually affirmed and prioritized by the program Chair and Dean.

¹ This reflects the pending legislation and may need to be adjusted.

- 5.2. **Degree Program:** Any Ministry approved program that meets the criteria for Baccalaureate level studies or higher in Alberta's Credential Framework.
- 5.3. **Program Review Committee:** A sub-committee of Academic Council.
- 5.4. **Self Study:** A reflective document that considers the impact of changes implemented from the previous review; evidence that graduates meet the standards for their credential as specified in the Alberta Credential Framework; recent enrolment, retention, and graduation trends; graduate employment and satisfaction; stakeholder feedback; labour market trends; and changes in the field/discipline to identify strengths and weaknesses and make recommendations for improvement.
- 5.5. **Annual Review:** Program Review completed annually.
- 5.6. **Comprehensive Review:** Program Review completed every five years.

6. Guiding Principles

- 6.1. Program Review is an academic-driven process that is intentionally collaborative and flexible enough to meet the unique needs of the institution's diverse programs and disciplines.
- 6.2. The program review process demonstrates accountability through the development and implementation of evidence-informed action plans and presentation of those plans to planning and governance committees.
- 6.3. The institution recognizes the mutually reinforcing relationship between internal quality assurance and external accreditation and will, wherever possible, harmonize internal and external processes.
- 6.4. Similar or linked programs, especially those with common courses and/or faculty members may be grouped together in one program review. Related Certificate and Diploma programs should be reviewed together. In cases where non-credit or micro-credentials may serve as an alternate entry stream to a given program, they should be included in the program review.
- 6.5. Curriculum alignment and renewal processes will provide a basis for judgments regarding the continuation, suspension, termination, or reactivation of programs.
- 6.6. Annual Program Reviews provide timely updates to ensure programs are responding to the needs of students and employers.
- 6.7. Programs will complete a Comprehensive Program Review at least once every five years.
- 6.8. Degree programs will comply with Campus Alberta Quality Council cyclical review guidelines.
- 6.9. All Program Review Forms are available from the Vice President Academic and Research Office and the Program Review shared site.
 - 6.9.1. For Annual Reviews:
 - 6.9.1.1. Form A: Annual Program Review
 - 6.9.1.2. Form B: Program Profile Data
 - 6.9.1.3. Form C: Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan
 - 6.9.2. For Comprehensive Reviews:
 - 6.9.2.1. Form D: Self Study Template
 - 6.9.2.2. Form E: Program Action Plan

PROGRAM REVIEW POLICY



7. Roles and Responsibilities

Stakeholder	Responsibilities
Board of Governors	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Approve and formally support this policy.
Academic Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Review and formally support this policy.
Vice-President, Academics and Research	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Review and formally support this policy.
Program Review Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Support and implement this policy.• Review completed reviews

8. Exceptions to the Policy

8.1. Exceptions to this policy must be approved by the Board of Governors.

9. Inquiries

9.1. Inquiries to this policy can be directed to the Vice President Academic and Research.

10. Amendments (Revision History)

First Effective: July 1, 1998

Reaffirmed by Academic Council: February 8, 2001

Revised by Academic Council: February 13, 2003

Revised and Approved by Academic Council: April 27, 2006

Revised and Approved by Academic Council: October 14, 2010

Revised and Approved by Academic Council: November 7, 2016

Revised and Recommended by Academic Council: October 14, 2021

Approved by Board of Governors: October 28, 2021

Appendix 1 – Annual Review Procedures

1. Purpose:
 - 1.1. Annual program reviews are conducted to ensure that the content and delivery of credit programs continues to be responsive, current, and relevant in meeting learner, community, and employer needs.
 - 1.2. The review is an evidence informed process that helps programs maintain their alignment with the institution’s mission, mandate, strategic initiatives, and priorities.
2. Principles:
 - 2.1. Program review and renewal is a collaborative process whereby data informs meaningful discussions to build on a program’s strengths and successes through clear action plans.
 - 2.2. The review processes provide an opportunity for the program to learn more about itself by engaging with Stakeholders.
 - 2.3. The process should be flexible enough to accommodate the diverse program offerings of the institution. This includes allowing linked credentials and/or common disciplines to be grouped together for reviews with the expectation that any divergent trends will be analyzed.
 - 2.4. Annual program reviews are formative, not summative, in nature but results may indicate a more comprehensive review is required.
 - 2.5. Program Review is not intended to evaluate performance of individual faculty, staff, or administrators.

3. Definitions:

Term	Definition
Credit Programs	A program of study that is approved by Alberta Advanced Education and leads to a credential defined in Alberta’s Credential Framework.
Action Plan	An action plan is the outcome the comprehensive review process. It documents the steps needed to reach established goals. Action plans clarify the timelines, tasks, and investments needed to respond to approved recommendations received during the comprehensive review process and annually affirmed and prioritized by the program Chair and Dean.
Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan	An ongoing process through which faculty members can assure that senior students are demonstrating expected knowledge, skills, and abilities (graduate attributes). These rolling multi-year plans identify the outcomes to be examined, specific targets, results, and the department’s response to the assessment.
Challenge Questions	Questions designed to elicit an analytic response that engages with relevant data.
Program Profile Data	A common set of quantitative measures used as evidence in the analysis of program effectiveness. Trends in program demand, student success, and the use of resources will be tracked along with other key performance indicators. Each data element in the program profile will be clearly defined.

4. Roles and Responsibilities

- 4.1. Academic Council:

- 4.1.1. Has the overall responsibility for regulating program offerings and ensuring effective processes are in place for continuous quality improvements to the curriculum in order to promote student success.
- 4.2. Vice President Academic and Research:
 - 4.2.1. In consultation with the Deans and Program Chairs, will monitor the operational requirements for the review processes and allocate necessary resources to support the annual and comprehensive program reviews including sponsoring relevant faculty development workshops.
 - 4.2.2. In collaboration with the Deans, the Vice President Academic and Research will confirm the institutional priorities and the related challenge questions to be included on the annual form.
 - 4.2.3. The Vice President Academic and Research will approve the program action plan updates and provide them to the Program Review Committee for information.
- 4.3. Deans:
 - 4.3.1. Will review all the annual program review reports for their area and may make suggestions for revisions prior to forwarding the reports to the Vice President Academic and Research for approval.
 - 4.3.2. The Deans may use the annual program updates to inform business cases for resource allocation/re-allocation. Deans monitor the activities of the Program Advisory Councils and the involvement of other relevant stakeholders in the quality assurance processes.
- 4.4. Program Chairs:
 - 4.4.1. Are primarily responsible for engaging colleagues in the review of the evidence provided from learning outcomes assessments and the program profile data to respond to the challenge questions in the review form.
 - 4.4.2. Program Chairs are also responsible for managing stakeholder engagement, including Program Advisory Council meetings.
 - 4.4.3. Program Chairs will submit their program review reports on the required forms at the end of term and will respond to suggestions and recommendations from the relevant Dean.
- 4.5. Program Faculty Members and Staff:
 - 4.5.1. Actively participate in review activities including providing access course materials to assist with curriculum review and mapping, examining trends in the profile data, championing recommendations for improving student success, and contributing to action plans.
- 4.6. Program Review Committee:
 - 4.6.1. Is a standing committee of Academic Council that reviews the completed annual program review forms and updated program actions plans and makes recommendations to Academic Council.
 - 4.6.2. It also monitors the rolling schedule of reviews and makes provisions for linked and/or similar programs to be reviewed together.
 - 4.6.3. Will assess the annual review forms and data elements. The committee will make recommendations on forms and dashboard organization as well as the combination of programs that can be reviewed together. They may also identify common themes from the Action Plan updates which require further investigation.
- 4.7. Institutional Planning and Research (IPR):
 - 4.7.1. Will work with members of Academic and Research Council to develop standard data packages for program profiles that are clearly defined, timely, accurate, and relevant.

- 4.7.2. IPR staff will provide training for academic staff on the uses of dashboards and/or forms and identify limitations of available data.
 - 4.7.3. IPR will also make relevant comparator data available including the institutional completion rates, labour force demand metrics, and institutional enrolment projections.
5. Procedures:
- 5.1. Annual Program Review Form
 - 5.1.1. This program summary should be a succinct (4 to 5 page) analysis of the standard program profile data package, ongoing learning outcomes assessments, stakeholder feedback, student and faculty achievements, and the implementation of the program action plan.
 - 5.1.2. Form A: Annual Program Review includes a program description section along with questions on relevance and currency, student success, faculty qualifications and workloads, program resources, institutional priorities, changes in the operating environment, and recommendations for the coming year. Suggested evidence is listed for each section.
 - 5.2. Timing of Reports:
 - 5.2.1. Annual Program Review Reports should be compiled by the designated program chair and submitted to the relevant Dean for review within six weeks of the end of the spring term.
 - 5.2.2. The reports should reflect on activities, including curriculum mapping, course outline audits, learning outcomes assessments, and any stakeholder engagements that have taken place through out the year.
 - 5.3. Program profile data:
 - 5.3.1. A standard data package Form B: Program Profile Data will include tracking of program demand, student success, and use of resources.
 - 5.3.2. This will be made available by Institutional Planning and Research at the end of the spring term.
 - 5.3.3. The data elements will include key performance indicators for the institution and other identified priorities.
 - 5.4. Learning Outcome Assessment Plans:
 - 5.4.1. Each year Form C: Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan should be appended as evidence that the curriculum is up-to-date, and that due consideration has been given to student achievement on selected attributes.
 - 5.4.2. Discipline-specific and credential-level knowledge and skills should be tracked using predominantly direct evidence. Providing the crossovers with the Alberta Credential Framework are well documented, externally accredited programs can substitute their discipline-specific assurances of learning and/or demonstrations of required competencies.
 - 5.5. Institutional priorities and challenge questions:
 - 5.5.1. The annual program review process provides opportunities for programs to demonstrate their alignment to institutional priorities. This gives the Deans and Vice President Academic and Research insight to how different program initiatives contribute to the overall success of the institution.
 - 5.5.2. Each January, the Deans and Vice President Academic and Research should discuss the challenge questions to be placed in the institutional priority section of the form and, in consultation with the Chairs and Institutional Planning and Research, determine available sources of evidence. Results of these consultations should be shared widely with faculty members so they can contribute to data collection and analysis.

- 5.6. Stakeholder engagement:
 - 5.6.1. The quality assurance process relies on input from both internal and external stakeholders.
 - 5.6.2. Faculty and staff should be given opportunities to contribute to the analysis and priority setting activities that are summarized in the review.
 - 5.6.3. Recent graduates and/or students may also contribute insights from their experience in the program. Short surveys can be used but focus groups often provide for more dynamic engagement.
 - 5.6.4. External community and industry representatives should have experience and/or credentials that will allow them to comment on the relevance of the program. Feedback can be gathered through facilitated meetings or virtual focus group sessions that can take place at any point during the year. The question prompts should be designed to encourage a solutions-focused discussion.

- 5.7. Action Plan Updates:
 - 5.7.1. Implementation of the program action plans are fundamental for continuous quality improvement. The action plan may include changes such as the introduction, revision, or removal of a course; calendar changes; or adjustments to administrative practices.
 - 5.7.2. Major program changes may need additional approvals and be subject to other external review processes. Any additional approvals should be noted in the action plan.
 - 5.7.3. If a current program action plan is not available, the program chair should draw on the most recent curriculum mapping/course outline audits, learning outcomes assessments, previous annual reviews, and resource plan proposals to determine if there are outstanding issues and priority actions to be tracked.

- 6. Exceptions:
 - 6.1. Programs that have completed comprehensive reviews during the current academic year do not complete an Annual Program Review until the following spring.

Appendix 2 – Comprehensive Review Procedures

1. Purpose:
 - 1.1. Comprehensive program reviews are conducted every five years to assess the overall quality and effectiveness of a credit program including the currency of the curriculum, expected outcomes, and methods of delivery.
 - 1.2. External feedback is an essential step in validating the curriculum and demonstrating accountability. This can be gathered through a team visit from external peer reviewers for degree programs or a desk review by qualified industry representatives for certificates and diplomas.

2. Principles:
 - 2.1. Comprehensive program review is a collaborative process whereby data informs meaningful discussions to build on a program’s strengths and successes through clear action plans.
 - 2.2. The program review methodology is comprehensive, well communicated, and understood by all the stakeholders.
 - 2.3. The process should be flexible enough to accommodate the diverse program offerings of the institution. This includes allowing linked credentials and/or common disciplines to be grouped together for reviews with the expectation that any divergent trends will be analyzed.
 - 2.4. The comprehensive program review should integrate external and internal accreditation and/or certification processes.
 - 2.5. The review processes provide an opportunity for the program to learn more about itself by engaging with stakeholders.
 - 2.6. Implementing changes to respond to findings during the comprehensive review does not have to wait until the completion of the review. The program may wish to begin implementation while the review is in progress if additional approvals have been obtained.
 - 2.7. Program Review is not intended to evaluate performance of individual faculty, staff, or administrators.

3. Definitions:

Term	Definition
Credit Programs	A program of study that is approved by Alberta Advanced Education and leads to a credential defined in Alberta’s Credential Framework.
Degree Program	Any Ministerial approved program that meets the criteria for baccalaureate level, or higher, studies in Alberta’s Credential Framework.
Desk Review	An examination of relevant data and reports to provide an understanding of program operations and outcomes and the evidence underpinning the recommendations in the self-study. An orientation meeting and/or debriefing may be facilitated remotely, but the primary analysis explores available documentation.
Action Plan	An action plan is the one of the main outcomes of the comprehensive review process. It documents the steps needed to reach established goals. Action plans clarify the timelines, tasks, and investments needed to respond to approved recommendations received during the comprehensive review process and annually affirmed and prioritized by the program Chair and Dean.

Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan	An ongoing process through which faculty members can assure that students are demonstrating expected knowledge, skills, and abilities (graduate attributes). These rolling multi-year plans identify the outcomes to be examined, specific targets, results, and the department's response to the assessment.
Self Study	A reflective document that considers the impact of changes implemented from the previous review; evidence that graduates meet the standards for their credential as specified in the Alberta Credential Framework; recent enrolment, retention, and graduation trends; graduate employment and satisfaction; stakeholder feedback; labour market trends; and changes in the field/discipline to identify strengths and weaknesses and make recommendations for improvement.
Program Profile Data	A common set of quantitative measures used as evidence in the analysis of program effectiveness. Trends in program demand, student success, and the use of resources will be tracked along with other key performance indicators. Each data element in the program profile will be clearly defined.
Program Review Teams	Members of the program faculty assigned to contribute to the development of the self study, respond to the external review report, and contribute to the program's action plan.
Independent External Reviewers	Appropriately qualified academic, professional, or industry representatives asked to provide advice to the program based on materials provided and interactions with stakeholders. External reviewers should have an arms-length relationship to the program. They should not have been employed by, served on the Board of Governors for, or earned their highest credential from, the institution. They should not have served as a mentor, supervisor, research collaborator, co-author, or external examiner to a program faculty, Chair, or Dean. They must not be in a close family relationship with a member of the program under review.

4. Roles and Responsibilities:

4.1. Academic Council:

4.1.1. Has the overall responsibility for regulating program offerings and ensuring effective processes are in place for continuous quality improvements to the curriculum in order to promote student success.

4.2. Vice President Academic and Research:

4.2.1. In consultation with the Deans and Program Chairs, will monitor the operational requirements for the review processes and allocate necessary resources to support the comprehensive program reviews, including sponsoring relevant faculty development workshops.

4.2.2. The Vice President Academic and Research will review the self study and its recommendations before the materials are circulated externally and will meet with the external visiting team chair at the beginning and end of their visits.

- 4.2.3. The Vice President Academic and Research will review the External Review report for accuracy and completeness.
- 4.2.4. The Vice President Academic and Research will approve the program action plan and provide it to the Program Review Committee for information.
- 4.3. Deans:
 - 4.3.1. Will confirm the appointment of the program review team members, manage the invitations and scheduling of the external reviewers, review the self-study and the external team report, and assist with the development of the program action plan.
 - 4.3.2. Deans will oversee the implementation of the program action plans in their areas.
- 4.4. Program Chairs:
 - 4.4.1. Are primarily responsible for providing the logistical supports to the program review and external reviewers.
- 4.5. Program Faculty Members and Staff:
 - 4.5.1. Actively participate in review activities including providing access to course materials to assist with curriculum review and mapping, examining trends in the profile data, championing recommendations for improving student success, and contributing to action plans.
- 4.6. Program Review Committee:
 - 4.6.1. Is a standing committee of Academic Council that approves the self study form and comprehensive review scope and schedule.
 - 4.6.2. Monitors the rolling schedule of reviews and makes provisions for linked and/or similar programs to be reviewed together.
- 4.7. Program Review Team:
 - 4.7.1. Undertakes the program's self-study. This includes developing a project plan that identifies the schedule deliverables and each member's responsibilities in the analysis, writing, and review of the report which addresses the questions in the template and such other matters that may be relevant to understand the program's strengths and areas for improvement.
 - 4.7.2. Program Review Team members will be available to meet with stakeholders and external reviewers. They contribute to the response to the External Review Report and the development of the program's action plan.
- 4.8. Institutional Planning and Research:
 - 4.8.1. Will work with the Program Review Team and provide a program profile with clearly defined, timely, accurate, and relevant data.
 - 4.8.2. IPR staff will provide training for academic staff on the uses of dashboards and/or templates and limitations of available data.
 - 4.8.3. IPR will also make relevant comparator data available including the institutional completion rates, labour force demand metrics, and institutional enrolment projections.
- 5. Procedures
 - 5.1. Figure 1 offers an overview of the Comprehensive Program Review process. The steps include: formation and orientation of the review team; creation of a project plan to guide the data

collection and analysis in the self-study; identification of external reviewers, gathering of stakeholder feedback, completion of the self study document; getting external feedback on the program and the recommendations to improve it; and development of an action plan that will be reviewed and renewed in the Annual Program Review process.

5.2. The key elements in the process are as follows:

5.2.1. Schedule of Comprehensive Reviews

- 5.2.1.1. The Program Review Committee maintains a rolling five-year schedule of comprehensive program reviews
- 5.2.1.2. The schedule will take into consideration external accreditation requirements so that internal and external processes can be harmonized.
- 5.2.1.3. Where the results from the Annual Program Review warrant, the Program Review Committee may determine that a program or cluster of related programs should initiate a Comprehensive Program Review with a focus on a particular opportunity or concern.
- 5.2.1.4. New academic programs should have their first Comprehensive Program Review scheduled after the completion of their first graduating cohorts. The schedule will be reconfirmed each fall and the Deans and Institutional Planning and Research will be given notice of the programs expected to commence the comprehensive program reviews in the Spring.

5.3. Program Review Team

- 5.3.1. The formation of the Program Review Team marks the beginning of the Comprehensive Review process.
- 5.3.2. The review team should include all continuing faculty members from within the program.
- 5.3.3. The relevant Dean, in consultation with the program review team, will appoint one member to lead the self study process.
- 5.3.4. The program review team will have an orientation meeting with the Dean and Institutional Planning and Research to discuss the Self Study Template (Form D) and available information. They will consider supplementary research questions and data requests.
- 5.3.5. Program Review Teams are expected to rely primarily on existing documentation including the external report, recommendations, and action plan from the previous comprehensive review; the previous annual program review documents; the program's curriculum map; and learning outcomes assessment plan.
- 5.3.6. The Program Review Team will develop a project plan for the self study identifying key milestones and responsibilities for analysis and reporting. The project plan should indicate how key stakeholders will be involved in the review process.
- 5.3.7. The Program Review Team will contribute to the analysis of the questions in the self study and the team lead consolidate the findings. The completed internal self-study report will be provided to the relevant Dean for review. The Dean may provide feedback and/or suggested revisions to the Program Review Team.
- 5.3.8. The Program Review Team will be expected to meet with the external reviewers and respond to their questions about the substance and process of developing the self-study.

PROGRAM REVIEW POLICY



Figure 1: Comprehensive Review Workflow



5.4. Curriculum Review Workshop:

- 5.4.1. One of the benefits of the Comprehensive Program Review is the opportunity to take a holistic view of the program and its curriculum.
- 5.4.2. This will be facilitated through a faculty workshop that examines course outlines and the program curriculum map as well as course sequencing and the cumulative impact of the Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan.
- 5.4.3. The faculty may also consider comparisons with benchmark programs at other institutions.

5.5. Stakeholder engagement:

- 5.5.1. The quality assurance process relies on input from both internal and external stakeholders. Recent graduates and/or students can contribute insights from their experience in the program. Short surveys can be used, but focus groups often provide for more dynamic engagement. External community and industry representatives should have experience and/or credentials that will allow them to comment on the relevance of the program. Feedback can be gathered through facilitated in-person or virtual meetings or focus group sessions. The question prompts should be designed to encourage a solutions-focused discussion (see suggested focus group questions).

5.6. Self Study Report:

- 5.6.1. The aims of the self study should be to understand, evaluate, and enhance the program. It should be analytic and forward looking with key recommendations supported by evidence.
- 5.6.2. The Program Review Team should try to maximize existing documentation and standard data sources to respond to the prompts in the Self Study Template (Form D: Self Study Template).
- 5.6.3. If the Program Review Team has supplemental questions, the necessary data sources need to be identified during the project planning stage of the review process.
- 5.6.4. Not every question will be resolved over the course of the self study and additional investigations may become part of the program's future action plan.
- 5.6.5. All program faculty and staff should be given the opportunity to provide feedback on the self study and its key recommendations.
- 5.6.6. The Program Advisory Committee should also be given an opportunity to provide suggestions regarding the key findings and recommendations in the report.
- 5.6.7. The relevant Dean will also review the self study and may have suggestions or require revisions.
- 5.6.8. The Vice President Academic and Research's approval is needed before the Self Study is circulated to external reviewers.

5.7. External Review for Degree Programs:

- 5.7.1. The External Review Team for Degree Programs is normally composed of two independent academic experts and one reviewer internal to the institution but external to the academic unit.
- 5.7.2. The External Review Team will participate in the evaluation of the degree program by reviewing the self-study, visiting the campus to conduct on-site interviews, and preparing a report.
- 5.7.3. Independent academic experts should hold terminal degrees in their fields and hold senior academic appointments at institutions similar in nature to GPRC.

- 5.7.4. An internal-external member (a senior GPRC faculty member from a different division than the program under review) will be a full participant on the review team and will help with interpreting institutional contexts.
- 5.7.5. The External Review Teams for professional programs should include at least one expert active outside of academia.
- 5.7.5.1. The Program Chair will submit a list of six to eight potential reviewers to the Dean's office for approval.
- 5.7.5.1.1. A brief rationale should be provided for each potential reviewer, and any potential conflicts of interest should be disclosed.
- 5.7.5.2. The Dean's office will confirm selection of the independent experts based on their availability and arms-length relationship to the program.
- 5.7.5.2.1. The Dean's office will also determine the best times for the external review to take place.
- 5.7.5.3. The Vice President Academic and Research will invite the external reviewers.
- 5.7.5.4. The agenda for the site visit will be developed in collaboration with the Dean and Program Chair.
- 5.7.5.4.1. It will normally begin with a meeting with the Vice President Academic and Research to answer general questions about the institution and to reiterate the purpose and structure of the review process.
- 5.7.5.4.2. The External Review Team will then have meetings with the Program Review Team, part-time and contracted instructors, students and alumni, and staff members as appropriate.
- 5.7.5.4.3. With students' permission, samples of assessed capstone projects or other significant assignments will also be made available to the External Review Team during their site visit.
- 5.7.5.5. The External Review Team will be asked to assess the program's compliance with Campus Alberta Quality Council's Program Quality Assessment Standards, and the Alberta Credential Framework expectations for degree programs.
- 5.7.5.5.1. The report should also address questions raised by the Program Review Team in the self-study and offer such commendations and recommendations that the External Review Team deems appropriate.
- 5.7.6. External Review for Certificate and Diploma Programs:
- 5.7.6.1. The External Review Team for certificate and diploma programs will consist of one independent academic reviewer and one industry reviewer who will conduct a desk review of the program.
- 5.7.6.1.1. The industry reviewers should hold a recognized credential and/or certification in an industry area or discipline that is closely related to the program under review and be actively employed in a relevant industry position.
- 5.7.6.1.2. The academic reviewer should be a senior academic from a post-secondary institution similar in size and scope and hold the highest possible credential in a discipline that is the same as, or closely related to, the program under review.
- 5.7.6.2. The Program Chair will submit a list of six to eight potential reviewers with rationale to the Dean's office for approval. Any potential conflicts of interest should be disclosed.

- 5.7.6.3. The Dean's office will contact the independent academic experts and confirm their availability and arms-length relationship to the program.
- 5.7.6.4. The External Review Team for certificate and diploma programs will be provided with the self study report along with the criteria for program quality and Campus Alberta Quality Council standards.
 - 5.7.6.4.1. They will be given orientation material about the process and provided with the opportunity to request additional information and/or clarifications from the program review team.
 - 5.7.6.4.2. They may also request the opportunity to connect virtually with other program stakeholders.
 - 5.7.6.4.3. Their assessment and recommendations should be based on the materials provided and informed by their knowledge of the industry trends and/or benchmark programs.

- 5.7.7. Evaluation of the External Report
 - 5.7.7.1. The External Review Team's report should be provided to the Vice President Academic and Research within 30 days of the on site or virtual visit and will be made available to the relevant Dean, Program Chair, and Program Review Team.
 - 5.7.7.2. The Vice President Academic and Research will review the External Reviewer Team's report and, if necessary, ask the reviewers to provide any omitted components and/or to correct factual errors.
 - 5.7.7.3. Once the Vice President Academic and Research is satisfied with the external review report, they will forward it to the Program Review Team and the relevant Dean.
 - 5.7.7.4. Program Response to the External Review Report:
 - 5.7.7.4.1. The Program Review Team respond to the concerns and areas for improvement identified in the External Review Report and prioritize potential actions.
 - 5.7.7.5. Dean's Response:
 - 5.7.7.5.1. The Dean will receive the External Review Report and the Program Review Team's response and work with the Program Chair to confirm the Program's Action Plan (Form E: Program Action Plan).
 - 5.7.7.5.2. The External Review Report, Program Review Team Response, and the Program's Action Plan will be forwarded to the Vice President Academic and Research for Approval and then to the Program Review Committee for information.

- 5.7.8. Action Plan:
 - 5.7.8.1. Implementation of the program action plans are fundamental for continuous quality improvement.
 - 5.7.8.2. The action plan may include changes such as the introduction, revision or removal of a course; calendar changes; or adjustments to administrative practices.
 - 5.7.8.3. Major program changes may need additional approvals and be subject to other external review processes. Any additional approval requirements should be noted in the action plan.

- 5.8. Exceptions:

PROGRAM REVIEW POLICY



5.8.1. Programs with external accreditation requirements will provide a gap analysis between the required external processes and the expectations for meeting the institution's policies and procedures.

PROGRAM REVIEW POLICY



Appendix 3 – Forms

Form A – Annual Program Review Summary

Review Elements	References	
	Department Provided	Common Data Package /Program Dashboard
1. Program Description		
Program(s) reviewed	Link to calendar descriptions	
Expected career pathways and occupational outlooks	Links for labour market projections	
2. How well is the program maintaining its relevance and currency? Use specified evidence to discuss strengths and weaknesses in the following areas.		
Evidence of student demand		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Application and Registration trends</i> • <i>Applicant yield ratio comparisons</i> • <i>Program fill rate</i> • <i>Student diversity measures for underrepresented groups</i>
Evidence the curriculum is up to date	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learning outcomes assessed • Provincial and/or institutional curriculum committee recommendations addressed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Number of calendar courses by category (offered, not offered, discontinued, revised, new)</i>
Evidence of employer demand	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feedback from business and industry representatives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Graduate employment and employment related to field of study*</i> • <i>Employer perceptions of graduates</i> • <i>Evidence of successful graduate industry freelance and consultants</i>
Impact of community engagement activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program advisory consultations • Outreach activities and events 	

Review Element	References	
3. How does the program monitor and enhance student success?		
Analysis of retention and completion trends		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Comparative course pass rates</i> • <i>Retention/persistence rates* by program stage</i> • <i>Graduation rates*</i>

PROGRAM REVIEW POLICY



		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diversity differentials for underrepresented groups.
Analysis of student engagement and satisfaction trends		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student engagement survey results • Student satisfaction with instruction and support services • Graduates who would recommend the program
Special initiatives and achievements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact of special initiatives • Summary of student awards and recognition 	
4. What are the faculty qualifications and workloads?		
What is the faculty complement? What are the regular teaching loads? Have there been significant changes?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number, rank, demographics for contracted and continuing, full-time, and part-time instructors. • Sections taught /workload* • Student-faculty ratios
What professional development/ scholarly activities have faculty engaged in?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brief description of workshops attended/presentations made/publications/ and applied research grants 	
5. Are program resources being used efficiently and effectively?		
What are the comparative costs for the program and explanations for any significant variances from the disciplinary and/or institutional averages?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Special operational considerations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Direct and total costs per FLE comparisons • One-time and annual costs
Are there any offsetting program revenues?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Differential fees, collaborations, grants, industry partnerships 	

PROGRAM REVIEW POLICY



Review Element	References	
6. How is the program responding to institutional priorities?		
What steps have been taken in the past year to improve student connections to the labour market?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Department initiatives to enhance graduate outcomes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Work integrated learning (WIL)*</i> <i>Students accessing career and employment services*</i>
What initiatives have been undertaken to respond to the TRC's calls to action?	TBD	TBD
What training has been undertaken for improving staff and student wellness and mental health?	TBD	TBD
7. What have been the most significant changes in the program and its operating environment during the past year?		
8. What are the key recommendations for the coming year?		
Based on the above, are there any areas which need additional research and/or consultation?		
What activities will be undertaken by faculty within the department?		
What recommendations should be incorporated in the program's action plan?		

Form B: Program Profile Data – to be provided by Institutional Research and Planning Office

PROGRAM REVIEW POLICY



Form C: Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan

Year	Program Goal/Outcome Assessed	Method of assessment	Target	Result	Response

Form D: Self Study Template

This template should be used by programs undergoing Comprehensive Program Review. The aims of the self study should be to understand, evaluate, and enhance educational offerings. It should be analytic and forward looking and supported by evidence.

The suggested questions in each section should prompt reflection on common data accumulated through regular annual updates, curriculum mapping, and outcomes assessments. The self-study should strive for both brevity and substance with a recommended length of **no more** than 15 double spaced pages in the self study report and no more than 25 pages of apparatus.

The review process starts with the formation of the review team and confirmation of the data collection strategies and should not take more than eight months to complete. Stakeholders should be consulted early in the data collection and analysis phase of the review. Since the comprehensive review is one stage in the ongoing curriculum assessment and alignment processes, the program should maximize the use of existing documentation and focus their efforts on analysis rather than customized data collection.

The self-study and supporting documentation will be provided to a panel of external experts who will undertake a peer review of the program. Approved recommendations will inform the program's action plan which will be tracked in subsequent annual updates.

Programs with external accreditation processes should do a gap analysis between the standards of their disciplines and the guided reflections in each section of this document.

Please note: program reviews are meant to focus on overall effectiveness of academic programming and are not, in themselves, business cases for expansion or reallocation of resources.

Self Study Contents

Executive Summary	
1. Program Background	
2. Learner Experiences	
3. Curriculum Design and Assessment.....	
4. Alignment and Community Engagement	
5. Resources	
6. Program Self-evaluation.....	
7. Recommendations and Future Directions.....	
Appendix A: Status of Previous Program Action Plan	
Appendix B: Student Demographics, Retention, and Graduate Rates	
Appendix C: Graduate Pathways and Shared Course Analysis	
Appendix D: Analysis of Student and Alumni Feedback	
Appendix E: Curriculum Map for Alberta’s Credential Framework Standards for Knowledge and Skills	
Appendix F: Curriculum Map for Discipline-Specific Competencies.....	
Appendix G: Learning Outcomes Assessment Tracking	
Appendix H: Program Advisory Committee (PAC) Membership	
Appendix I: Faculty Qualifications and Currency	

Executive Summary

What are the main highlights from the program review? What are the most significant recommendations? What focus questions should be considered by external reviewers?

1. Program Background

1 a. Program Record What is the program/specialization name in Program and Provider Registry System (PAPRS)? What is the credential type? What is the full load/length? What is the actual load/length?

1 b. Program Description What are the objectives and characteristics of the program? What aspects are unique provincially and nationally? If different programs have been grouped together, what are similarities and linkages between the programs under review?

1.c. Administrative Structure How does the program fit into the division/school? What is the overall department and staff complement?

1.d. Program Development Background (Reference *Appendix A and the most recent annual update*) When did the program open? What is the program capacity and how well does it meet student demand (consider fill rates, wait lists, etc.)? What curricular revisions have been undertaken since the previous comprehensive review? What other changes or innovations are in progress?

1.e. Review Process. Who participated on the review team? What data sources were used? How were internal and external stakeholders involved?

2. Learner Experiences

2 a. Student Characteristics (Reference Appendix B) Who is the program intended to serve? Who does the program serve? What are the demographic characteristics of the current student body? What initiatives have been undertaken to improve balance and inclusion of underrepresented groups? What are the admission requirements and what evidence demonstrates that these requirements contribute to student success? Which schools/institutions do students come from and are their significant differences in their academic preparation?

2 b. Student Success Initiatives What efforts have been made by the program to create an intellectual and social climate that fosters student development? How do program students connect to student supports including academic advising, learner supports, and career counseling? What co-curricular activities are available? How do work experiences and/or service opportunities impact student learning and success?

2 c. Retention and Pathways (Reference *Appendix C*) Have there been changes in retention and graduation rates during the period of this review? What is the impact of prerequisites and/or gatekeeper courses on learner progress? What are the most common service courses offered (or taken) by students in other departments? Are there any particular areas of concern, remediation needs, and/or special advisement? What transfer credit or prior learning assessment and recognition options have been used?

2 d. Satisfaction and Graduate Employment (*Reference Appendix D*) What are the employment outcomes of recent graduates and how do these compare with regional and disciplinary benchmarks? What do students and alumni say about the quality of the program and its relevance to their career goals?

2 e. Student Achievements Have there been any notable achievements by program students in the past three years? (Please note these highlights should not be more than one page of text).

3. Curriculum Design and Assessment

3 a. Accreditation Standards or Comparison to Benchmark Programs What professional standards or external accreditation requirements apply to the program? What was the outcome of the most recent external review? If not externally accredited, how does this program compare to similar offerings at like institutions (include a brief explanation of benchmark comparators)?

3 b. Program Structure, Objectives, and Coherence (*Appendices E and F*) What is the overall logic of the curriculum and the key points where core concepts are introduced, practiced, and proficiencies demonstrated? How well do course outlines align with the curriculum map? Do regulation waivers and/or student appeals suggest areas that need to be addressed? What are the laddering and/or collaborative opportunities for students to further their education and/or achieve professional certifications?

3 c. Assessment (*Appendix G*) Which direct measure of learning outcomes have been examined (e.g., graduate performance on licensure examinations, analysis of capstone assignments, and feedback on placements)? Which indirect measures of learning outcomes have been examined (e.g., grade analysis and satisfaction with instruction)? What curriculum adjustments were made as a result of assessment review?

4. Alignment and Community Engagement

4 a. Strategic Alignment How does the program align with the mandate and mission of the institution and its overall academic plan? How does program contribute to achieving institutional goals?

4 b. Program Relevance What is the evidence of employer demand for the skills and knowledge acquired by graduates? What further education and training do graduates pursue and how well prepared are they to advance? How is this program connected to the standards of the profession?

4 c. Outreach and Community Engagement (*Appendix H*) How does the program liaise with the external community and how do these activities contribute to the program?

5. Resources

5 a. Faculty Complement and Performance (*Appendix I – degree programs should also address relevant CAQC standards*) How many continuing and contracted (full and part-time) instructors support the department? What are their respective roles? What efforts have been made to improve diversity and inclusion? How do faculty demonstrate currency and engagement

with their discipline? What professional development is needed for faculty development in the program? How do the professional practice innovations and/or scholarly activities of the faculty relate to teaching and learning in the program?

5 b. Physical and Technological Resources What library resources, facilities, and equipment are available to support the program? Are the resources being used effectively? Are the available resources adequate to meet disciplinary expectations for the program?

5 c. Budget Trends (*Reference annual program updates*) What are recent trends in program expenses and revenues? How do program costs compare with provincial averages in the discipline? What factors might contribute to deviations from the provincial average? Consider credit hours, class sizes, salaries, and workloads. What cost reduction and/or revenue generating initiatives have been undertaken during the period of this review? What potential is there for obtaining external funds?

6. Program Self-evaluation

6 a. Previous Recommendations What recommendations were made during the last review and what has been achieved?

6 b. Current Program Strengths Based on information in the previous sections, what does the program identify as its strengths?

6 c. Areas of Concern Considering environment and outlook, what are areas of concern for this program?

7. Recommendations and Future Directions

As a result of this self-study, what changes are recommended to improve overall program quality and effectiveness? What is the rationale for each recommendation? Are there recommendations that require additional follow-up?

Appendix A: Status of Previous Program Action Plan

Proposed Action	Current Status	Comment
<i>e.g., Collaboration agreement renewal</i>	<i>On Hold</i>	<i>Partnership agreement and risk analysis templates under review in current year.</i>

Appendix B: Student Demographics, Retention Rates, and Graduate Rates (provided by Institutional Research and Planning Office)

Appendix C: Graduate Pathways and Shared Course Analysis

- a. heat map of number of courses by semester and completion category for recent graduates (based on graduation date).
- b. network visualization of courses/specializations by department

Appendix D: Analysis of Student and Alumni Feedback (narrative)

Appendix E: Curriculum Map for Alberta's Credential Framework Standards for Knowledge and Skills

Courses in which standards I – Introduced P – Practiced D - Demonstrated	Depth and Breadth of Knowledge	Conceptional Awareness and/or knowledge of Research	Communication Skills	Application of Knowledge	Professional Capacity/Autonomy	Awareness of Limits of Knowledge

Appendix F: Curriculum Map for Discipline Specific Competencies

Courses where competencies: I – Introduced (Keystone) P – Practiced (Corner Stone) D –Demonstrated (Capstone)	Discipline specific competency	Discipline specific competency	Discipline specific competency	Discipline specific competency

Appendix G: Learning Outcome Assessment Tracking

Assessment Plan Summary

Year	Program Goal/Outcome Assessed	Method of Assessment*	Target	Result	Response

* multiple rater matrix scores for capstone assignment, relevant item scores on standard examinations, etc.

Follow-up on prior year(s) responses

Goal/Outcome	Action Plan /Improvements Implemented	Impact

Appendix H: Program Advisory Committee (PAC) Membership

PAC Member	Industry Segment	Company/Association	Position/Professional Certification/Academic Qualification	Community/ Location	Dates Attended In Past 3 Years

Appendix I: Faculty Qualifications and Currency

Faculty Members	Professional Certification/Academic Qualification	Professional Development/Scholarly Activity (since last comprehensive review)	Relevant Industry Experience (since last comprehensive review)	Years of Teaching Experience	Role/Position in Program/Area of Expertise

Form E: Program Action Plan

Department: _____

Date: _____

Program: _____

Completed by (name) _____

Proposed actions to be achieved through internal resource allocations	Issue or concern to be addressed (evidence of continuing need)	Expected Outcome	Rank/ Priority

Proposed actions requiring business case development	Institutional priority or risk to be addressed	Expected Outcome	Rank/ Priority

Reviewed by Faculty Council on (Date) _____

Approved by _____ (Date) _____

Approved by _____ (Date) _____