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Introduction

This handbook was developed to provide information about the program review process at Langara College and outlines the steps and procedures included in the review. Programs undergoing review are assisted by Program Review Facilitators, Curriculum Development Consultants, and a Technical Writer working in the Teaching and Curriculum Development Centre (TCDC).

All British Columbia public post-secondary institutions are required to review their programs, as per the Colleges and Institutes Act. Langara’s Academic Program Review and Renewal Policy (F1006- http://langara.ca/about-langara/policies/pdf/F1006.pdf) supports this requirement.

Frequently Asked Questions

What is the purpose of Program Review?
Program Review provides Langara College with an ongoing process for systematic, evidence-based assessment, planning, and improvements for our programs and departments, to ensure that students are provided with the best educational experience possible. Program Review contributes to overall planning efforts at all academic levels of the college.

How is a program/department selected for review?
The Provost and VP Academic and Students’ Office works with the Deans to set a schedule of review for each department or program. The process is cyclical, with each department engaging in a review every five or six years. When appropriate, the review will be scheduled to coincide with a program or department’s external review/accreditation schedule.

How long will a review take?
The review process will normally be completed within 12 months of its commencement.

What does the Program Review process involve?
The Program Review Facilitator will work with each program/department to prepare a Self-Study Report. Other College resources, including Institutional Research, will support this process. Meetings will be held regularly with faculty, and student involvement is critical. External Reviewers will be involved for degree programs. A final report, written by the Facilitator and approved by the Division Chair and Department Chair/Coordinator, will include recommendations and an action plan. Details are included in this Handbook.

How do we carry out the Self-Study?
The Program Review handbook provides an outline to guide departments through the process, and there will be ongoing support and guidance from the Program Review Facilitator. Departments may work collectively on the report, or break the sections down and work in sub-groups. Each section is intended to prompt reflection and discussion among participating faculty. Not all sections will be relevant to every department or program, and although each review will be unique, it is anticipated that the general framework will be followed. The final report, written by the Program Review Facilitator, will follow a basic format to allow for consistency across the College.

The Review Process
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This guide will assist programs, departments and schools as they become involved in the program review and renewal process. It is one of many resources available to programs that embark on the review process. It is recommended that you review the handbook and become familiar with the process prior to your program’s scheduled review. Please consult the Langara Teaching and Curriculum Development Centre website for details (iweb.langara.bc.ca/tcdc/).

In most instances, all the programs offered by a particular department/school will be reviewed together. In addition, the administrative setting, the scholarly activities of the faculty members, the material resources and physical infrastructure, and the governance mechanisms are normally included in a review as they contribute to the academic quality of the program and the educational experience of students.

Some programs currently undergo extensive reviews by external accrediting bodies in accordance with the requirements of those organizations. The Program Review Facilitator will work with the team preparing for the external accreditation to identify common elements of the review processes. Information gathered for the purpose of accreditation will be used for the purposes of program review, wherever possible. These decisions will be made on a case-by-case basis after review by the Program Facilitator in collaboration with the program/department/Division Chair, and approval by the Dean. It is recognized that this may require some deviation from the five to six-year review cycle.

Further advice on all aspects of the review process can be obtained from the Office of the Provost and Vice-President, Academic and Students or delegate (Director, Academic Innovation), the Dean of your Faculty, your Division Chair, and the Program Review Facilitator. Working through the Program Review Facilitator, the College’s Institutional Research office (and other departments as deemed necessary) will provide assistance and data in support of the review.

**Purpose of the Reviews**

The purpose of the program review and renewal process is to examine strengths and challenges, review accomplishments, identify future goals and develop strategies to achieve them. The program review process at Langara is evidence-based and primarily led by the department/school responsible for delivering the program (and for degree programs, submitted for independent external review). Programs must also ensure that their outcomes are aligned with the College’s core values, and Strategic and Academic Plans. This process is supported by the Program Review Facilitators, Curriculum Development Consultants, and a Technical Writer.

Program reviews are designed to:

- Determine the coherence of the program design, learning outcomes, and goals.
- Review the alignment of the program’s goals and learning outcomes with the general goals of the institution (as well as external standards, as they apply).
- Determine whether the program has been designed, structured and delivered to enable student success relative to the learning outcomes.
- Determine the appropriateness of the admission requirements and practices of the method of delivery for achieving the learning outcomes.
• Determine the appropriateness of the specific curricular and pedagogical policies and practices of the program in relation to the learning outcomes.
• Determine the appropriateness of the methods used for the assessment and evaluation of the student progress.
• Determine that the number and expertise of the faculty and staff are sufficient to enable student success.
• Evaluate the administrative policies and practices of the department/school delivering the program, and its efficient and effective utilization of human/physical/financial resources.
• Where necessary, suggest improvements for effectiveness and efficiency.
• Suggest solutions to existing or anticipated challenges.
• Develop recommendations to enhance and improve program delivery.

Responsibility
Reviews are carried out under the general supervision of the Provost and Vice-President, Academic and Students or delegate (Director, Academic Innovation) in consultation with the Dean and Division Chair responsible for the program. However, the primary responsibility for carrying out the review, particularly the conduct of the self-study, rests with the program/department/school with the assistance of the Program Review Facilitators.

An Executive Summary including a summary of the self-study, any external report, and recommendations will be publicly available. The final version of the self-study report will be available through the Office of the Provost.

Main Steps in the Review Process
The main steps in the program review process are outlined below. The entire process, as part of a broader continuous improvement process, should lead to the implementation of the recommendations or revitalization identified during the review.

1 — PLANNING STAGE
The process begins with an orientation session by the Program Review Facilitator where the relevant policy, program review handbook, and other supporting information are presented. The session will include a discussion of the self-study process, general timelines for the review, and an opportunity for all participants to ask questions about the process. The Institutional Research office will be represented at the meeting and will review the various data requirements of the self-study, and what data is available.

Program-specific questions that the review should address will be identified. Student participation in the review process, such as focus groups and surveys, will need to be determined at this stage.

The subject librarian will also be present at the planning meeting to describe their role, which includes preparing a final Library and Learning Commons report. This report details resources and activities in support of the program’s goals as stated in the self-study (see Appendix D).

Normally, all members of the program, including the Division Chair, are expected to attend the planning meeting.
This stage will inform all the other stages of the review process.

**Appointment of Self-Study committee**
The program establishes a committee to prepare its self-study report. In most cases, this committee will include the Division Chair. Where appropriate, the committee may include or seek the advice of others such as students, representatives of industry, professions, the Program Advisory Committee and alumni.

**Appointment of External Review committee (for degree programs)**
The External Review committee normally consists of one member from the College (outside of the department/school being reviewed) and two members from outside of the College. The Department Chair/Coordinator, in consultation with faculty, will generate a list of potential external team members (see Appendix F). The External Review Team will consist of at least three members chosen from the list by the Dean, approved by the VPA&P (or delegate) and will include:

- Two external experts, both of whom are academic peers from other post-secondary institutions or one academic peer from another postsecondary institution and an industry/employer representative, depending upon the nature of the program under review.
- A Langara College faculty member from a different department/program, not currently under review, and with no affiliation to the program under review.

**Review Plan**
The Division Chair will submit to the Dean and Director, Academic Innovation, a brief memo outlining the scope of the review including a statement indicating which programs will be covered, any special questions identified as needing to be addressed by the review, proposed timeline, membership of self-study group, details of student and alumni involvement in the review process, and a description of data collection requirements (i.e. focus groups, special reports from Institutional Research) and if additional funding support will be required.

**2 — SELF-STUDY STAGE**
The self-study stage of the process is the most demanding and crucial stage of the whole review process. The internal self-study will be undertaken by a departmental self-study committee consisting of the chair/Coordinator, faculty of the program engaging in review, and a program review facilitator. Where appropriate, staff members may also be included. Internal review of the program will be based on evidence relating to program performance, including strengths and challenges, student outcomes, desired improvements, and future directions. Where appropriate, the committee may include or seek external advice of others, such as representatives of professions and industry. The self-study takes into account:

- Continuing appropriateness of the program’s structure, admissions requirements, method of delivery and curriculum for the programs’ educational goals and standards;
- Adequacy and effective use of resources (physical, technological, financial and human);
- Faculty currency in the field of specialization;
- Learning outcomes achieved by students/graduates relative to the program’s stated goals;
• Learning outcomes relative to the non-degree program standards, or degree level standards;
• Learning outcomes, where appropriate, relative to the standards of any related regulatory, accrediting or professional association;
• Continuing adequacy of the methods used for evaluating student progress and achievement to ensure that the non-degree and degree level standards have been achieved.
• Where appropriate, the graduate employment rates, satisfaction levels of graduates, employers, advisory boards, students, and graduation rates.
• Other pertinent data such as enrolment patterns, student retention and student progression

Student involvement is a critical component of program review (i.e. surveys, focus groups), and their inclusion in the process needs to be documented in the self-study report.

Collection and presentation of data by the Institutional Research office
The Institutional Research office provides data to programs to support the self-study process (Appendix C). The program review facilitator and the IR department will discuss the need for any additional data.

Completion of the self-study report
A guideline for the self-study report is provided in Appendix A of this guide. Some deviation from the guideline is certainly to be expected based on the nature of the program(s) being reviewed, the scope of the review and the nature and amount of program data available. The final self-study report will be written by the Program Review Facilitator in collaboration with the Department Chair/Coordinator to be reviewed by Director, Academic Innovation.

Submission of the report to the Dean
The Department Chair/Coordinator will submit the self-study report to the Division Chair who either accepts or returns the report to the program for revisions or clarifications. If accepted, the Division Chair will forward the report to the Dean, who either accepts or returns the report to the program for revisions or clarifications. When accepted, the Dean formally submits the report to the Provost and Vice-President, Academic and Students or delegate (Director, Academic Innovation).

Executive summary
The Executive summary and list of recommendations will be pulled from the self-study report into a separate document for public distribution.

The full self-study report will be made available through the Office of the Provost.
3 – EXTERNAL REVIEW: DEGREE PROGRAMS (OR OTHERS WITH APPROVAL)

External Reviews are required for all bachelor degree programs and any other programs designated by the Dean or Provost and Vice-President, Academic and Students. The external review normally includes a site visit by the committee, a report with their assessment of program quality and recommendations, and an institutional response to the findings and recommendations of the external review committee. The responsibility and organization of External Reviews rests with the program’s Dean and Department Chair.

Report submitted to the External Review committee
The Dean communicates the self-study report to the External Review committee. The self-study report is reviewed and assessed by the External Review committee within the time period agreed to by the Dean and members of that committee. The committee may ask the program for further information, which, if available, should be provided expeditiously to the committee.

Site visit
A site visit will be organized for the External Review committee that will include an opportunity to meet with the Dean, the Division Chair, members of the self-study committee, program faculty, students, and others. The purpose of the site visit is to provide an opportunity for the External Review committee to examine physical facilities and to conduct interviews with faculty, students, staff and others who are best placed to provide informed comments about the programs.

Report of the External Review committee
The External Review committee submits its confidential report to the Dean within a set period of time after the site visit. The Dean, in consultation with the Division Chair, shares the report with the program leadership together with suggested time lines for preparing and submitting the program’s response normally within 60 days of receipt of the external review report.

Program response
The program leader prepares, within the time allocated, its response to the report of the External Review committee, including a proposed plan of action for addressing the recommendations of the report.

Executive summary
After consultation with the Provost and Vice-President, Academic and Students and the program leadership, the Dean will draft a 1-2 page Executive Summary that includes: a) a summary of the self-study report; b) a summary of the external reviewers’ report; c) a summary of the program’s response, and d) his/her comments, as well as an action plan for implementing the recommendations emerging from the review.
4 — SUBMISSION TO EDUCATION COUNCIL (EDCO)

All recommendations that involve program or curriculum changes must be submitted to Deans and Division Chairs (DDC) and Education Council EdCo reviews and decides whether to accept the recommendations submitted.

- For programs without external review, the executive summary and list of recommendations is submitted by the Division Chair.
- For programs with external review, the Executive Summary is submitted by the Dean.

Course, curricula or program additions or changes follow the established and formal Education Council approval process.

5 — RECOMMENDATIONS AND ACTION PLAN: REVIEW

The Program Review Facilitator, in collaboration with the Division Chair and the Department Chair/Coordinator, will be responsible for following-up on the plan of action, as outlined in the self-study report.
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The Langara College self-study plan is reflective, self-critical and analytical, and is the primary document on which the review is based. The self-study consists of two parts: a narrative that addresses key areas, and appendices that include the data and information that form the basis for the narrative. The self-study plan is a crucial part of the process and it must therefore involve the active participation of the program’s faculty, staff and students.

The self-study serves descriptive, explanatory, evaluative and formative functions. The program may find it useful to appoint a small committee to lead the work required for the study, but the study should not become the product of a small group of individuals. Student involvement is critical and the process should include students’ input wherever appropriate (i.e. focus groups and student surveys). The report itself should document the involvement of the faculty and staff responsible for the program and of the students.

Ideally, the self-study report will show sensitivity to the context, mission, and goals of the program and to any of the special circumstances or limitations within which it is delivered. It will offer an honest and critical assessment of the program(s) against rigorous academic standards. It should express opportunities for improvements in the program and associate it strongly with the College’s Strategic and Academic Plans.

The Institutional Research office will provide a statistical package that will be essential for grounding the self-study in sound and up-to-date empirical evidence. However, the primary responsibility for the self-study remains with the program itself. Appendix C lists the data the program can normally expect to receive from the Institutional Research office for the self-study report.

MAIN ELEMENTS OF THE SELF-STUDY REPORT

**Executive Summary**

Provide a brief summary of the program, list of recommendations (title only), and a conclusion (1-2 pages)

1. **Program Title**

Provide the name of the program, and the department/school within which it is situated.

2. **Program History**

Provide a brief history of the program’s development, when it was created, and any major changes of significance (i.e. part-time to full-time, new credentials and specializations). This can include changes in the discipline or emerging trends.

3. **Program Description**

Provide the credential description the program offers (if applicable). Describe the program in terms of the course structure, credits, etc. Describe any transfer agreements available to students (programs that
transfer into this one; whether this program transfers into others at Langara). There is no need to provide detailed articulation information; this can be referenced and included in the Appendix if appropriate.

4. **Program Goals and Program Learning Outcomes**
   A statement of the program goals and program learning outcomes and their consistency with:
   - [Langara’s Strategic Plan](#)
   - [Langara’s vision, mission and values](#)
   - [Langara’s Academic Plan](#)

5. **Development since previous Program Review**
   A report on how the program has addressed the recommendations of the previous Program Review, and the outcomes of the previous action plan.

6. **Community/Industry Need**
   - A description of current and anticipated community/industry need for graduates; and
   - An assessment of existing and anticipated student demand.

7. **Admission Criteria**
   - A statement of admission requirements indicating their alignment with the learning outcomes of the program; and
   - The continuing appropriateness of admission requirements (i.e. achievement level, subject preparation) for the program’s goals and learning outcomes.

8. **Academic Design**
   - A description of the program curriculum and structure, including the relationship of the individual courses to the program goals and learning outcomes (note: include Degree-Level Standards for degree programs, available at [http://www.aved.gov.bc.ca/degree-authorization/documents/degree-program-criteria.pdf](http://www.aved.gov.bc.ca/degree-authorization/documents/degree-program-criteria.pdf)).
   - The continuing appropriateness of the program’s structure and curriculum for its goals and learning outcomes.
   - A description of how existing program goals and learning outcomes are consistent with the original design of the program.
   - A description of how the curriculum reflects the current state of the discipline or area of study and, where appropriate, evidence of revisions made to adapt to changes.
   - A description of how the curriculum addresses diversity and inclusion.
   - A description of how the curriculum incorporatesor models Langara’s Academic Plan priorities:
     - indigenous worldviews;
     - intercultural competencies;
     - environmental, financial, and social sustainability.
   - Evidence of any significant innovation or creativity in the content and/or delivery of the program relative to other such programs.
• An analysis and evaluation of the appropriateness and effectiveness of the method of delivery (including, where applicable, distributed education) to meet the program’s goals and learning outcomes.
• The appropriateness and effectiveness of the methods of assessing student progress and achievement of the learning outcomes (and degree learning expectations).
• Demonstration that students are informed in a systematic and timely way of their progress in their courses and, where appropriate, in their program of study (consistent with the intent of Langara’s Assessment of Academic Progress Policy F1005).
• The learning outcome achievements of students/graduates by comparison with:
  o the program’s stated goals and learning outcomes;
  o the opinions of employers (where available) students/graduates;
  o the standards of any related regulatory, accrediting or professional association.
• A summary and evaluation of any partnership or collaborative agreements with other institutions.
• A summary of the role of Program Advisory Committees, including frequency of meetings, if applicable.
• A summary and evaluation of any experiential learning opportunities (i.e. in-class activities where students can demonstrate apply their knowledge, labs, student research projects, practicum placements, co-op experiences and international field schools).
• The quality of field work, work-integrated learning or practica.
• A summary of the scholarly and research opportunities for students, if applicable.
• A summary and evaluation of resources and services available from the Library and Learning Commons; report to be included in appendices.

9. **Data Analysis** (Please DO NOT contact Institutional Research (IR) directly. Consult with TCDC.)
Work with the Program Review Facilitator to gather the following:

**DEPARTMENT**
• Faculty currency/expertise in the field of specialization
• Scholarly activities
• Percentage of classes taught by full and part-time faculty
• If the program under review has restrictions on time to completion, discuss mechanisms in place to monitor the student’s progression and inform them of limits.

**INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH**
• Program Retention includes:
  o Retention rate
  o Seats taken by program
  o Graduation rate (% who graduate within 150% of expected completion time)
  o CGPA in graduation term (Graduation GPA no longer available)

• Student Outcomes Indicators (previous five years) contains:
  o Credentials awarded
  o Employment outcomes
Further education outcomes (From students who pursue other education opportunities at Langara or at another institution)
Former student ratings of program

TEACHING AND CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT CENTRE
- Class size and seats taken outside of program (IR and myLangara dashboards)
- Employer satisfaction level (with CO-OP if appropriate)
- Employer feedback surveys/focus groups (where appropriate)
- Student feedback on program surveys and focus groups

REGISTRAR AND ENROLMENT SERVICES
- Number of applications (program applicants data page) and registrations
- Academic awards (Financial Aid) – Department only recommends students

10. Reporting Data
Organize summary and analysis for the data in the body of the report as follows:

FACULTY
- Faculty currency/expertise in the field of specialization
- Scholarly activities
- Class size
- Percentage of classes taught by full and part-time faculty

STUDENTS
- Number of applications and registrations
- Retention rate
- Seats taken by program and seats taken outside of program
- Time to completion: If the program under review has time to completion limits, discuss the mechanisms in place to monitor the student’s progression and inform them of the limits.
- CGPA in graduation term
- Graduation rate
- A summary and analysis of the results of student surveys/focus groups, including the quality of support to students and general student satisfaction with the program.
- Academic awards

GRADUATES
- Program Indicators (graduate employment rates)
- Credentials awarded
- Graduate satisfaction level

---

1 Numbers may not reflect true intentions of students.
• Employer satisfaction level
• Further education outcomes (From students who pursue other education opportunities at Langara or at another institution)
• Results of employer survey/focus groups (where appropriate)

| CO-OP: Involved when appropriate (i.e. Program has CO-OP placements) |
| Department: Department under review from own files or through additional surveys via TCDC |
| IR: Institutional Research (TCDC will request data from IR on your behalf for program review or curriculum development) |
| RES: Registrar and Enrolment Services |
| TCDC: Teaching & Curriculum Development Centre |

11. Resources
An analysis and evaluation of the appropriateness and effectiveness of the use of existing human, physical and technological resources, (e.g. laboratory, studio and computer facilities and space, respecting Langara’s autonomy to determine priorities for funding, space, and faculty allocation) to support the program.

12. Strengths, Challenges and Opportunities
A self-critical analysis of the strengths, challenges and opportunities of the program, addressing:
• Academic content based on the elements in sections 6-8 above;
• Opportunities for program improvement and enhancement;
• The ability of the program to meet its goals and learning outcomes and
• Recommendations for improvement and future directions

13. Recommendations and Action Plan
A three to five year action plan including:
• Priorities for implementation of the recommendations;
• Relationship of the priorities to the College, Academic Plan, and department/school/program; and
• Timeline for implementation

APPENDIX — SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS
The Self-Study Appendix should include the following information:
• Institutional Research data
• Library and Learning Commons report
• Program Advisory details
• Survey instruments
• Community/Industry need research
• Academic awards
• Curriculum mapping/matrix (if indicated)
• Program and course level learning outcomes
Appendix B - Program Review Steps

1. VP Academic (or designate), in consultation with Deans/Div Chairs, designates program/department/degree for review

2. Planning Stage: Division Chair, Program Review Facilitator, Library Liaison and Institutional Research meet with all faculty in program

3. Appointment of self-study committee; Appointment of External Review Committee (if applicable)

4. Self-study report started. Student engagement initiated (surveys, interviews, panel discussions)

5. Regular scheduled meetings with Program Review Facilitator, the Division Chair and departmental faculty

6. Program Review Facilitator prepares self-study report in consultation with Department

7. Degrees only: External Review Team: site visit, review self-study report, submit their findings/report

8. Program Review Report reviewed by Director, Academic Innovation, then presented through the Division Chair to the Dean

9. Recommendations presented to DDC and/or EdCo for information and approval

10. One year later: Follow-up on review recommendations
Appendix C - Outcomes Data

OUTCOMES DATA AVAILABLE FOR DIPLOMA ASSOCIATE DEGREE & CERTIFICATE STUDENTS

The following data is collected annually by Institutional Research. The questions with an asterisk (*) are generated annually and are available on the IR website: http://www.langara.bc.ca/about-langara/institutional-research/surveys/index.html
The other responses are available by request, in advance of the start of the program review.

SURVEY QUESTIONS

Employment

- In the labour force
- Employed
- Employed in a training-related job
- Employed full time*
- Employed part time
- Median hourly wage (Collected hourly wage data since 2005)
- Are you currently working at a job or business?
- Are you looking for work?
- You said you are not currently working. What is the main reason?
- How many jobs do you currently have?
- How many paid hours do you work on average, each week?
- Are you a paid worker employed by someone else or are you self-employed at your main job?
- Did you have this same main job before or while you were attending our institution?
- How many months did you spend actively looking for this job?*
- Is your main job temporary or permanent?
- How related is your main job to your studies?*
- Why are you not in a main job which is more related to your training at our institution?
- How many paid hours do you work on average, each week at your main job?*
- What is your gross hourly wage from your main job before deductions?
- How useful was your education in getting your job?
- How useful have the knowledge and skills you gained been in performing your job?

Education

- Graduate Status (institution-reported)
- To what extent did you achieve your most important objective in enrolling?
- How satisfied are you with the education you received from your program?
- Average Skills Rating (average of asterisked items from the following questions)
- To what extent did the program provide you with the opportunity to develop the following skills?
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• Analyze & think critically*
• Resolve issues or problems*
• Work effectively with others*
• Use mathematics (not asked in 2012)*
• Speak effectively*
• Read & comprehend materials*
• Learn on your own*
• Use computers (not asked in 2012)
• Use other tools & equipment (not asked in 2012)
• Write clearly & concisely*
• Find information appropriate to field
• Understand more about yourself
• Decide career/education direction
• Manage work effectively

How would you rate the following aspects of your program?

• Library materials (not asked in 2012)*
• Quality of computers & software (not asked in 2012)
• Quality of other tools/equipment (not asked in 2012)
• Organization of program
• Amount of practical experience*
• Quality of instruction*
• Textbooks & learning materials (not asked in 2012)*

How well would you rate your program courses in the following areas?

• Courses were up to date*
• Covered topics relevant to your field*
• Covered standards used in your field

Further Education

• Taken further studies since leaving program, including still attending same institution*
• Currently studying
• Expected transfer credits (Asked of respondents who have taken further studies.)
• Satisfied with transfer experience *
• Are you a full-time or a part-time student?
• How related to your program at your institution were/are your further studies?*
• How well did the program at our institution prepare you for your further studies?*
• Where did you take further studies?
• Further studies institution type
• Further studies public or private institution
OUTCOMES DATA AVAILABLE FOR BACCALAUREATE STUDENTS

The following data is collected annually by IR for Baccalaureate students.

Demographics

- Gender
- Disabled
- Visible Minority
- Aboriginal
- Age
- Area of Residence

Education Evaluation & Skill Development

- Usefulness of Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities Acquired during Program in Work
- Usefulness of Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities Acquired during Program in Day-to-day Life
- Program Satisfaction

Would you select the same program again?

- No, because interests have changed
- No, because courses were not practical
- No, because there are little or no career opportunities
- Quality of Instruction
- Comprehensiveness of Core Courses
- Course Availability

Financial Constraints

- Had to interrupt studies for financial reasons
- Had to take all/part of program part-time for financial reasons

To what degree did program help you develop the following skills?

- Written Communication
- Oral Communication
- Reading and Comprehension
- Group Collaboration
- Critical Analysis
- Problem Resolution
- Use of Mathematics Appropriate to Field
- Use of Computers Appropriate to Field (not asked after 2011)
• Conduct research (new in 2012)
• Learning On Your Own

Further Education
• Took further education since graduation
• Type of Formal Post-Secondary Education

Employment
• Labour Force Status
• Employment Status of those IN Labour Force
• Status of Graduates NOT in Labour Force
• Employment Type (paid worker/self-employed)
• Holding >1 job?
• Working full-time in main job
• How related is your main job to your program?
• Under-employment Assessment
• Gross Annual Income from Main Job
• Median Annual Income (full-time)
• Average Annual Income (full-time)
• NOC (National Occupational Classification) Skill Type of Main Job
• NOC (National Occupational Classification) Skill Level of Main Job

How useful are the following skills and abilities in doing your main job?
• Written Communication
• Oral Communication
• Reading and Comprehension
• Group Collaboration
• Critical Analysis
• Problem Resolution
• Use of Mathematics Appropriate to Field
• Use of Computers Appropriate to Field (not asked after 2011)
• Conduct research (new in 2012)
• Learning On Your Own

Education Financing
• Education Funding Sources
• Financial Debt Incurred to Finance Bacc. Education
• Financial Debt Amount
• Government-Sponsored Student Loan Debt Amount
• Outstanding Gov’t-Sponsored Loan Debt Amount

Other data (not available through Outcomes Survey)
• Credentials awarded *
Appendix D - Library and Learning Commons Report Template

The mission of Langara Library and Learning Commons is to be a vital partner in academic excellence and student success. Our vision is that of a progressive academic library, fully integrated with the teaching, learning and research at Langara College.

This is a summary report of resources and activities that currently support program name and that are necessary to support goals and priorities identified in the review. The report includes descriptive information and where available, statistical data.

**Teaching and learning**
Teaching and learning activities offered by the Library and Learning Commons that support the program. They may include:

- Statistics on the number of classes and students who complete workshops and tutorials offered by the Library, and by Learning Commons partners such as Counselling
- Information on how library instruction is integrated into program and courses
- Scope of relevant workshops presented by subject librarians and Learning Commons partners
- Use of Learning Commons services such as the Writing Centre by students in the specified program
- Use of learning spaces such as group study rooms

**Collection support**
Content and related services available to students, faculty and staff in the program. They may include:

- Statistics by types of materials such as monographs, journals, and streaming media
- Depth and scope of collections relevant to the program and the curriculum
- Identification of key resources in the field
- Use of services such as course reserves, courseware development and interlibrary loans
- Assistance with copyright and licensing permissions for content

**Collaboration and communication**
Library and Learning Common activities that build relationships with students, staff, faculty in the program and relevant external partners. They may include:

- Collaboration initiatives with members of the program
- Relevant committee work
- Advisory work on incorporating print, digital and multimedia content into courses
- Marketing and promotion of library service

**Note** To suit the needs of the program under review, the Library and Learning Commons is open to other reporting templates in consultation with the Self-Study Committee.
Appendix E – Definitions

**Bachelor degree program**: An approved set of courses that lead to a credential at the baccalaureate level. The degree criteria and characteristics are described in the Ministry Degree Program Review Criteria and Guidelines (under revision). Owing to variations among provinces, classroom instruction is typically eight semesters or more in duration (normally 120 credits, or the equivalent) and may be supplemented by required professional experience (such as supervised practica, clinical placements, internships, co-op education and work terms).

**Concentration**: A set of courses required for completion of a separately authorized program of study within an undergraduate degree program. For example, a student may receive a Bachelor of Business Administration with a concentration in Accounting, and the name of the concentration appears on the student’s transcript.

**Credential nomenclature for non-degree programs**: Definitions appearing in the Ministry Guidelines which are generally recognized in the British Columbia post-secondary system. Departments planning to diverge from these generally accepted credential definitions should first consult the Ministry in accordance with direction provided on their website.

- **Certificate**: Certificate programs usually involve one year or less of study.
- **Advanced Certificate**: Offered to students who already have at least a certificate and complete additional specialized courses.
- **Diploma**: Normally involves two years of study in a career, technical, or academic program.
- **Associate of Arts Degree and Associate of Science Degree**: Two-year transfer credentials offered by Colleges and University Colleges (now called special purpose teaching universities) in British Columbia. They consist of two years of prescribed study in university Diploma or Post Diploma transferable academic courses.
- **Advanced Diploma or Post Diploma**: Awarded following an additional year of study after graduation from at least a two-year diploma program.
- **Post Baccalaureate Diploma**: Involves one or two years of specialized study in a certain discipline following the completion of a Bachelor’s degree. (If circumstances warrant it, institutions can waive the degree prerequisite.) This credential is sometimes also called Post-Graduate Diploma, Post-Degree Diploma, and Graduate Diploma

**Indicators**: A general category of data elements to be considered in the review, as developed and gathered by the Office of Institutional Research, approved for review by the VPA&P, and identified in the Handbook. These categories include program completion and success rates; relevance and quality of education; satisfaction with skills development; quality of services, resources, and facilities; employment outcomes; and other data elements which may be included in data reports regularly submitted to the Ministry or as approved by the Provost and Vice-President, Academic and Students.

**Learning outcomes**: Evidence of what the student actually learns or achieves in a course or program.
**Non-degree program:** An approved set of courses that lead to a credential at the level of certificate or diploma, including advanced certificates or diplomas, associate of arts and associate of science degrees, and post-degree certificates and diplomas.

**Program:** A set of courses approved by the Education Council and the College Board for the fulfillment of the requirements of a particular credential or specialization or concentration.

**Program goals:** A statement of what the program expects to achieve for students, Instructors and program/course evaluators.

**Program review facilitators:** Personnel who assist programs undertaking review to meet the requirements of the policies and procedures of the review, and assist programs to implement the guidelines for reviews specified in the ‘Program Review Handbook’.
Appendix F – Action Plan

Action Plan: <Program Name>

Recommendation #<X>

Self-study report, p. <XX(-XX)>

[Goal~optional]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Short/Long Term) Planned Actions</th>
<th>Led by</th>
<th>Begin on</th>
<th>Anticipated Completion</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

A. Within the first three months after the self-study report has been received by the dean
   - Department steering committee reviews recommendations noted in self-study report
   - Department chair initiates discussion with division chair and dean to determine actions required
to evaluate and implement the recommendation
   - Department chair and steering committee complete the action plan document, forwarding the
original to their dean and copy to program review facilitator
   - The action plan will be reviewed and updated during the one-year post-review meeting

B. The following sections including Recommendation #, Report page reference, Goal(optional), and Planned
   Actions table, repeated for each Recommendation.
Appendix G - External Review Team – Candidate Recommendations

Program Name: ____________________________________________________________

Date: _________________________________________________________________

| Internal or External candidate? |
|---------------------------------
| Candidate Name                  |
| Title & Credentials             |
| Contact Information:            |
| (include email, telephone, mailing address) |
| Brief rationale for nomination: |
| Describe any prior contact with |
| the program under review:       |
| Describe any conflict of interest issues |

Notes:

A. The External Review Committee will be comprised of three members (see Program Review Handbook for details):
   1. External academic peer from another post-secondary institution (ideally from a similar program)
   2. External academic peer OR member from industry/community professional
   3. Internal academic (internal to Langara, outside your department and from a program currently not under review)

B. Please complete the form for each individual candidate

C. Programs should put forward 4-6 candidates in total, making sure there are representatives for all 3 categories outlined above. Final Committee members will be selected by the Dean from the list of candidates, and approved by the Provost and Vice-President, Academic and Students (or delegate).
Appendix H - Sample External Review Site Visit Schedule

0845-0900hrs: Coffee
0900-0930hrs: Introductions, review of agenda and process
0930-1000hrs: Meeting with VP Academic, Director of Academic Innovation, Dean of program under review, Division Chair, Department Chair/Coordinator, and Program Review Facilitator
1000-1015hrs: Break
1015-1115hrs: Meeting with Self-Study Team and Program Review Facilitator (Self-Study Report presentation and discussion)
1115-1145hrs: Meeting with program faculty
1145-1300hrs: Lunch
1300-1400hrs: Tour facilities (classrooms, labs, TCDC, Library etc.)
1400-1430hrs: Meet with program students and/or graduates
1430-1445hrs: Break
1445-1515hrs: Meet with other groups as appropriate (Co-op, Advisory Committees, etc.)
1515-1600hrs: External Review Committee drafts a verbal report (Program Review Facilitator and members of the Self-Study team available if requested)
1600-1630hrs: External Review Committee presents verbal report to Self-Study Team
1630hrs: Meeting adjourns
Appendix I – External Review Team Report Template

Langara College Program Review

External Review Team Report

For

(Program name)

Submitted to

(name)

Dean, (Faculty)

Langara College, 100 W. 49th
Vancouver BC
(by)

(name)
(titled, organization)
Academic Representative from Industry

(name)
(titled, organization)
Academic Representative from Post-Secondary Institution

(name)
(titled, organization)
Langara Faculty Member

(List all external review team members)

Note: Identify which member was Chair of the External Review Committee
Introduction
The External Review Team met (date) to review the (program name) Self-Study Report and conduct a site visit, after which a verbal summary of findings and recommendations was provided.
This report is the final step in the external review process.

Overview
The External Review Team, in fulfillment of its responsibilities met with:

- Provost and VP Academic and Students  Ian Humphreys
- Director, Academic Innovation  Patricia Cia
- Dean
- Division Chair
- Department Chair/Coordinator
- Program Review Facilitator
- Students
- Faculty
- Others (list)

The External Review Team focused their review and discussion on the following:

- Whether the Self-Study Report sufficiently addresses the twelve main elements
- Whether the recommendations made by the self-study committee are supported by the findings in the Self-Study Report
- Whether the findings in the Self-Study Report were validated by the External review team during their on-site visit
- Any additional observations or recommendations for the program area to consider.

Summary of Findings

SELF-STUDY REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

- Whether the Self-Study Report sufficiently addresses the twelve main elements
- Whether the recommendations made by the self-study committee are supported by the findings in the Self-Study Report
SITE VISIT FINDINGS

- Whether the findings in the Self-Study Report were validated by the External review team during their on-site visit

ADDITIONAL SUGGESTIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS

- Any additional observations or recommendations for the program area to consider.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

"