Category:	Academic and Instructional
Approved By:	Board of Governors
Approval Date:	January 20, 2016
Effective Date:	January 27, 2016
Revised Date(s):	
Policy Sponsor:	Provost and Vice President Academic
Policy Administrator:	Dean Centre for Teaching, Learning and Innovation

Academic Program Policy

Purpose

The purpose of this policy is to establish common principles for the development, revision, and review of academic programs at Lethbridge College to ensure program relevancy, quality standards and responsiveness to industry and educational needs.

Scope / Limits

This policy applies to credit based programs.

Definitions

Broker is a process where one post-secondary institution delivers a program on behalf of another.

Curriculum refers to the learning outcomes, activities, resources and assessments that make up a course or program.

Outcome(s) refers to statements identifying the knowledge, skills and attitudes students are expected to acquire as a result of the learning process. Outcomes can be identified at a lesson, module/unit, course, program and college-wide level.

Program means a formal grouping of courses which leads to an approved credential.

Work-integrated Learning is experience in an authentic or simulated environment in which a learner applies the theory and skills learned in his / her program of studies and in which he/she extends employability skills.
- **authentic work-site experience** is experiential learning within industry generally off campus. These experiences may include clinical experience, practicum, field work, service learning, and apprenticeships.
- **simulated work-site experience** is experiential learning gained in simulations of workplace environments, generally on campus.

Policy Statements

1. All proposals for new programs and program revisions follow a systematic development and formal approval process.

2. College-wide outcomes are integrated into program curriculum.

3. All programs undergo an annual consultation process engaging stakeholders to advise on such matters as program expectations, curricula, employment trends and standards.

4. All programs are evaluated regularly to ensure program relevancy, quality standards and responsiveness to the needs of the learner, the economy and society. At least every five to seven years, programs will conduct a full program review with an external peer review forming a significant part for all applied degrees.

5. All credit programs make work-integrated learning available to their students. The proportion of authentic work-site experience is determined by the needs of the program and or accrediting/approval bodies.

6. The college enters into agreements to share/receive, sell/buy, and broker to/from other post-secondary institutions' curriculum either in part or in entirety, when it is in the best interests of Lethbridge College. This is done on a case-by-case basis following an approved process.

7. Curriculum is outcome based.

8. Decisions regarding suspension and termination of a program follow an approved process.

A: Policy Supports

Academic Program Development, Revision and Approval Procedures (Appendix A)
Academic Program Consultation Process (Appendix B)
Academic Program Review Procedures (Appendix C)
Work-integrated Learning Procedures (Appendix D)
Academic Program Suspension and Termination Procedures (Appendix E)

B: Legislated References

C: Other References

Academic Decision Making Matrix

D: Related Policies

Assessment
Course Outline Standards
Grading
Student Rights and Responsibilities
Board of Governors Executive Limitations:
      EL-10 Access to Education

Parent Policy:	Academic Programs
Effective Date:	November 1, 2014
Revised Date(s):	
Policy Sponsor:	Provost and Vice President Academic
Policy Administrator:	Dean Centre for Teaching, Learning and Innovation
Appendix A	

Program Development, Revision and Approval Procedures

Planning for a new or revised program will be carried out in accordance with the Academic Programs policy, alignment with the Lethbridge College's Comprehensive Institutional Plan, and criteria set by the Minister responsible for Advanced Education in Alberta.

A systematic staged process with clear decision points and necessary resources guides the program development, revision, approval and implementation process.

The development team should start to fill in the Provider and Programs Registry System (PAPRS) proposal form in stage 1 and then expand the depth and breadth throughout the process. This will assist the team in developing an awareness of the information needed for submitting a proposal to Advanced Education at the end of stage 3.

Stage 1: Pre-development

Program ideas may come from an established program area, faculty, staff, students, administration, advisory committees, environmental scanning and community/regional members. Based on sufficient evidence to form an initial opportunity assessment, program ideas deemed worthy of further development are generally supported at the school and centre level. If there is a resource requirement at this stage, the developer consults the dean. Generally, a dean brings the programming idea forward. Executive approval of a new program idea or an idea for significant program change is required before proceeding to Stage 2.

This stage includes the following considerations:
- type of program (length, credential, delivery method)
- alignment with the Comprehensive Institutional Plan
- potential student demand
- economic demand (market/job prospects)
- name of centre to offer the program
- initial and/or anticipated stakeholder support
- implications for the college

Recommendation: Centre Leadership Team
Advising: Dean's Council (appropriate chair to attend)
Principal authority: Provost and Vice-President Academic
Decision: To proceed to Stage 2 with an appropriate plan and resources under the direction of a dean.

Stage 2: Concept Validation Proposal

The primary purpose of this stage is to collect sufficient evidence to determine the feasibility of investing further institutional resources for program development. The length of time required for this stage can vary dramatically depending on the availability of information, implications to

Lethbridge College, and the complexity of the program idea. In some situations a discussion with key stakeholders may be sufficient, while in other situations significant college resources may be required to explore the validity of the concept.

The chair/dean will form an internal task team consisting of representatives from the CTLI curriculum team, faculty, industry (subject matter expert), Finance, Institutional Planning, and the Registrar's Office committed to assist in the development. This task team will meet together on a regular basis throughout the program development process and will continue to develop the PAPRS program proposal form.

This stage includes the following considerations:
- Program description (consult with curriculum team and Registrar's Office)
  - potential name of program
  - type of program (length, credential, delivery)
  - general structure of program (admission requirements, courses, teaching/learning methods)
  - program outcomes
  - alignment with the Comprehensive Institutional Plan
  - relationship to existing programs at Lethbridge College
  - relationship to similar programs in Alberta
- Anticipated student demand and enrolment (consult with Institutional Planning/SEM)
  - rough enrolment projections and assumptions (FLES, headcount, retention) including phase-in and established
  - student demand and demographic analysis
  - student demand influencers (economic environment, system capacity, credential/institution credibility, college initiatives)
- Economic demand (consult with Institutional Planning)
  - regional/provincial demand for graduates in workforce
  - regional/provincial potential related to further education
  - economic demand influencers (economic environment, system capacity, acceptance of credential)
- Evidence of support (consult with external community)
  - industry/employers
  - high schools
  - professional/regulatory bodies
  - receiving institutions – transfer or laddering opportunities
- Budget and funding sources estimate (consult with Finance)
  - revenue and expenses during phase in and established periods
  - one time implementation expenses
  - sources of revenue (base grant, new Alberta government funds, other government sources, student sources, private sources)
  - impact on internal resources (e.g. staffing, facilities, curriculum development, etc.)
- Institutional capacity (consult with College Leadership Council members)
  - personnel (experience and expertise)
  - existing development resources

- o additional development resources required (partnerships, donations, institutional funds)
- o capital requirements and facilities
- o short and long term impact on college

Recommendation:	Centre Leadership Team
Advising:	Dean's Council (appropriate chair to attend)
Recommendation:	College Leadership Council (in principle)
Principal authority:	Provost and Vice President Academic
Decision:	To proceed to Stage 3 Full Proposal with an appropriate plan and resources under the direction of a dean.

Stage 3: Full Proposal and Approvals

This stage includes the detailed development of the proposal needed to move forward through the various recommending and approval bodies of the college and government such as the College Leadership Council, the Minister responsible for advanced education and Campus Alberta Quality Council for degree programs. This stage can range from refinement of the concept validation proposal to a much higher level of engagement such as extensive system consultation, program outcome development, curriculum development, and community/regional consultation. The internal task team formed in Stage 2 continues to work on the development of the full proposal.

The chair/dean identifies the appropriate stakeholder groups for the proposed program. Stakeholder groups may include:
- employers or potential employers of program
- public sector representatives
- program graduates
- work-site experience hosts
- community members-at-large
- personnel from other college programs/departments

Representatives from these stakeholders groups could be potential members of the Advisory Committee for the new program.

The approval process for any new or revised program will follow the Academic Council Matrix (available on the Forms website). When a new program or significant program change is proposed for a credit program (Lethbridge College and/or government approved) credential, the proposal form that was initiated in stage 2 and fully drafted in stage 3 above, continues to be revised based on feedback from stakeholders.

Stage 3 Actions:

1. The dean / chair present the finalized proposal to the College Leadership Council (CLC) to determine fit with strategic direction and approval for use of college resources (e.g. financial, space, people).

2. Following the CLC recommendation to go forward, the dean and / or chair complete the appropriate Academic Council forms.   These forms would include data from the

PAPRS proposal form along with any additional information required by Academic Council.

3. The chair/deans will invite feedback from the appropriate departments and administrative teams (as outlined in the Academic Decision Making Matrix) prior to finalizing the documents.

4. Following the Academic Council recommendation to go forward, the recommendation is submitted to the Board of Governors for approval.

5. The Board of Governors will provide their decision for one of the following:
   - final approval of college approved programs
   - submission of the proposal to the Alberta Minister responsible for advanced education for their approval.

6. The Institutional Planning department is responsible for submitting proposals to government on behalf of the college.

Recommendation: Centre Leadership Team
Advising: Dean's Council
Approval to proceed: College Leadership Team
Recommendation: Academic Council
Recommendation: Board of Governors
Principal authority: Alberta government Minister responsible for Advanced Education. The authority for a LC approved credential is Lethbridge College.

Note: Degree proposals go through a two-stage approval process. After the system review and ministerial approval, additional criteria is required by Campus Alberta Quality Council for final review and approval by the Minister.

A summary of steps 1, 2, and 3 can be found on schedule 1 of this document.

Stage 4: Program Planning and Implementation

This is the formal planning stage for organizing to implement new programming. Further information is collected and planning details related to course development, student recruitment, scheduling, staffing, and financing are fully defined. This level of planning normally begins following a decision by the Minister to approve the program. The Dean may proceed with planning some components of Stage 4 prior to formal approvals.

The Dean reviews the membership of the internal task team formed in Stage 2 and adjusts accordingly, realizing that representation from other stakeholder groups may need to be added (i.e., staff from Marketing and /or Human Resources)

This stage includes the following considerations:
- Program and Curriculum Development (consult with curriculum team and Registrar's Office)
  - admission requirements
  - graduation requirements
  - program outcomes
  - courses and course outlines

- curriculum map
- choosing and developing appropriate work site based experience
- establish program advisory committee

- Marketing and Recruitment (consult with Marketing/Student Services)
  - recruitment plan
  - publications
  - publicity and launch

- Resources (consult with Physical Resource Committee/Human Resources/CTLI)
  - facility preparation
  - equipment purchases and installation
  - faculty/staff recruitment, hiring, and orientation
  - faculty development
  - learning resource acquisition

- College orientation to new program
  - Management Op's

Recommendation:	Program Development Task Team for program details and implementation plan
Recommendation:	Dean's Council for program details and implementation plan
Recommendation:	Academic Council for program and course details
Principal authority:	Dean for implementation planning and college orientation to new program
Principal authority:	College Leadership Council for overall budget and resource allocation
Principal authority:	CLC members for areas of responsibility (e.g. marketing, recruitment)
Decision:	To proceed with detailed program planning and implementation.

Stage 5: Program Implementation Review

This stage is focused on launching and monitoring the program implementation during its first three years. Program staff implement the program. CTLI, in collaboration with the program chair and dean, use the key performance measures identified in the proposal to monitor the program during its first three years and make recommendations for program adjustments. The purpose of this review is to identify program strengths and areas for improvement or change during early implementation to maximize program/student success.

Recommendation:	CTLI, in collaboration with the program chair and dean
Principal authority:	Provost and Vice President Academic
Decision:	To make program adjustments based on analysis of relevant data.

Program Development Matrix – Schedule 1

The following table identifies all of the elements of a program proposal (new or significant change) that are required by IAE and CLC for approval of the initiative. A comparison to the proposed Lethbridge College Program Development Procedure (Appendix A) is identified to the right in Stage 1, 2, 3). The procedure does not require substantive additional information (see bottom of table for LC specific data) to what is identified in the criteria set by IAE but it does fall short in identifying fully the requirements by IAE.

Category	IAE Proposal Element	Stage 1 Pre-Development VP Approval	Stage 2 Concept Validation Proposal CLC appr. In-principle	Stage 3 Full Proposal and Approval CLC, AC, Board and IAE Approval
SECTION 1: PROGRAM OVER	**1.1 Type of Initiative** *New Certificate, Diploma or Non-credential program; or new specialization(s) in existing program.*	Fully Developed	Included	Included
	1.2 Program Description *(Include Name)* *Provide a brief (1-2 paragraphs) description of the program, summarizing its intended purpose, curriculum design, and methods of delivery and highlighting distinctive attributes. Attach as an Appendix a complete list of courses, including credit values, instructional hours and brief (calendar style) course descriptions. For elective options, specify course selection parameters. Identify new courses to be developed for this program.*	Started Includes length, delivery method	Partially developed Includes more detail but not fully developed (courses etc.)	Fully Developed
	1.3 Enrolment Plan *Include assumptions and explanatory notes (e.g., attrition, part-time enrolment). Also:* • *If program implementation will occur over a number of years, provide data for each year to full implementation.* ○ *If internal reallocation of existing resources is proposed, describe any anticipated decrease in enrolment in other programs that would result.*		Fully Developed	Included
SECTION 2: DEMAND	**2.1 Student Demand Analysis** *Analysis should be supported by relevant data for the region and for Campus*	Started Includes Initial potential	Fully Developed	Included

Category	IAE Proposal Element	Stage 1 Pre-Development VP Approval	Stage 2 Concept Validation Proposal CLC appr. In- principle	Stage 3 Full Proposal and Approval CLC, AC, Board and IAE Approval
	Alberta, as might be derived from: systematic questionnaire surveys of target audiences; application and enrolment summaries and trends for similar programs currently offered by other institutions; tabulations of unsolicited student inquiries and/or expressions of interest obtained at student recruitment events; demographic projections for relevant sub-populations			
	2.2 Labour Market Analysis *Analysis should be supported by relevant data and placed in the context of the target occupational/regional labour market(s). Relevant data sources include systematic surveys of prospective employers; occupational supply/demand projections from government or industry sources; tabulations of job postings/'help wanted' advertising; surveys of recruitment and graduate employment rates of similar programs; and demographic projections (i.e. for relevant regions and sub-populations.) Describe anticipated employment outcomes*	Started Includes initial analysis	Fully Developed	Included
	2.3 Support *Provide evidence of consultation with and approval/support from relevant professional organizations, regulatory bodies, advisory committees, employers, and/or industry.*	Started Includes Initial and anticipated	Fully Developed	Incl.
	2.4 Clinical or Work Experience *If clinical or work experience is an essential part of program delivery:* *2.4.1 Provide evidence that the placements will be available when needed.* *2.4.2 Describe the student's role in securing placements.* *2.4.3 Explain how the institution will supervise/monitor the learning experience of students in off-site settings?*			Fully Developed

Category	IAE Proposal Element	Stage 1 Pre-Development VP Approval	Stage 2 Concept Validation Proposal CLC appr. In-principle	Stage 3 Full Proposal and Approval CLC, AC, Board and IAE Approval
	2.4.4 Identify potential employer/employee liability related to this aspect of the program, and how the institution intends to manage this liability.			
SECTION 3: INSTITUTIONAL AND SYSTEM CONTEXT	**3.1 Institutional Strategy** *How does the proposed program align with the institution's strategic priorities and the Comprehensive Institutional Plan?*	Started Includes Alignment	Fully Developed	Included
	3.2 Institutional Programs *Explain how the proposed program fits with existing programs at the institution, and the anticipated positive or negative impacts on other programs.*		Fully Developed	Included
	3.3 Internal Review and Approval *Provide a brief description of the internal review and approval process followed in developing the proposal.*			Included
	3.4 Campus Alberta Programs/Initiatives *Discuss the relationships (similarity, complementarity, transfer, competition) of the proposed program to other programs or initiatives in Campus Alberta and explain what the proposed program would add to the system. If the proposed program would duplicate existing programs, explain why that duplication is warranted.*		Started Includes high level details	Fully developed
	3.5 Consultation *Summarize the type and outcomes of consultations with other institutions offering related programs. Attach copies of relevant documents (e.g. letters, meeting summaries). Discuss the potential for inter-institutional collaboration.*		*Not specifically identified in procedure*	Fully developed
	3.6 Learner Pathways *3.6.1 Identify potential pathways from work to school (where applicable).*		Started Includes high level details	Fully developed

Category	IAE Proposal Element	Stage 1 Pre-Development VP Approval	Stage 2 Concept Validation Proposal CLC appr. In- principle	Stage 3 Full Proposal and Approval CLC, AC, Board and IAE Approval
	3.6.2 Identify potential opportunities for transfer/laddering <u>into</u> the proposed program from other institutions or other programs within the institution; and for transfer/laddering <u>from</u> the proposed program to other programs within the institution or at other institutions. List any formal agreements for internal or inter-institutional transfer/laddering that have been negotiated to this point. *3.6.3 Estimate the portion of graduates who can be expected to proceed to further education directly at a later stage in their careers. What types of programs/credentials would they be most likely to pursue?*			
SECTION 4: FINANCIAL VIABILITY AND SUSTAINABILITY	**4.1 Annual Budget and Funding Sources** *Identify annual and one-time expenditures and annual revenue for the program in the budget tables below. If program implementation will take place over more than one year, provide estimates for each year until full implementation. Provide explanatory notes for all budget assumptions, such as inflation and per student tuition.*		Started Includes Initial estimates	Refined and fully developed
	4.2 Impact *4.2.1 Compare the proposed tuition rate with that of similar programs in Campus Alberta.* *4.2.2 Discuss the financial impact on students and the learner funding system, taking into account the costs of education and the potential debt burden relative to post-graduation earning capacity.* *4.2.3 If program funding includes internal reallocation, evaluate the impact of this reallocation on the institution's operations and overall financial position.*		Not specifically identified in procedure except for 4.2.3	Fully developed

Category	IAE Proposal Element	Stage 1 Pre-Development VP Approval	Stage 2 Concept Validation Proposal CLC appr. In- principle	Stage 3 Full Proposal and Approval CLC, AC, Board and IAE Approval
SECTION 5: QUALITY ASSESSMENT	**5.1 Institutional Capacity** 5.1.1 List instructional positions that would support the proposed program, specifying position title, credential and experience requirements, and areas of expertise. Distinguish between new and existing positions; and regular and sessional appointments. Describe mechanisms (existing and planned) to develop and ensure currency of teaching skills and disciplinary expertise. 5.1.2 List instructional support positions (e.g. lab technicians, tutors) related to the proposed program. 5.1.3 Describe facilities, equipment and information resources (existing and planned) that would house and support delivery of the proposed program. 5.1.4 Discuss the anticipated impacts of the proposed program on student support services.		Started Includes high level details	Fully developed
	5.2 Curriculum Describe the process of development and validation of curriculum for the proposed program. If available, please attach external review documents.		Not specifically identified in procedure	Fully developed
	5.3 Academic Standards List the requirements for admission and any alternate routes to admission; for residency; for academic progression; and for graduation. Compare these requirements to those for similar programs.		Fully Developed	Included
	5.4 Learning Outcomes		Started Includes program outcomes	Fully Developed

Category	IAE Proposal Element	Stage 1 Pre-Development VP Approval	Stage 2 Concept Validation Proposal CLC appr. In- principle	Stage 3 Full Proposal and Approval CLC, AC, Board and IAE Approval
	5.4.1 Summarize the learning outcomes of the proposed program (e.g. career-specific knowledge and skills, employability skills). *5.4.2 Describe the consultative process with employers, industry/professional bodies or advisory groups that helped formulate these learning outcomes.* *5.4.3 Provide evidence of alignment/compliance with regulatory, industry, program accreditation and professional accreditation standards relevant to the program.*			
	5.5 Institutional Quality Assurance *5.5.1 Describe the criteria and methods for evaluating the success of the program and achieving continuous quality improvement. Include expected outcomes, key performance indicators and performance targets for the program.* *5.5.2 Indicate whether a program advisory committee is planned or in place and, if so, comment on the role of the committee in program quality assurance.*			Fully developed
LC Specific Data	Implications for the college Centre to implement	Incl.	Incl.	Incl.

Parent Policy:	Academic Programs
Effective Date:	November 13, 2013
Revised Date(s):	
Policy Sponsor:	**Provost and Vice President Academic**
Policy Administrator:	**Dean Centre for Teaching, Learning and Innovation**
Appendix B	

Academic Program Consultation Process

Lethbridge College supports and encourages the development of effective communication links between itself and relevant stakeholders including business, industry, and the community at large. All programs undergo an annual consultation process engaging stakeholders to advise on such matters as program expectations, curricula, employment trends and standards.

1. The chair will make recommendations to the dean on appropriate stakeholder groups for the academic program. Stakeholder groups may include:
   - employers or potential employers of program graduates
   - public sector representatives
   - program students, from each year of the program
   - program graduates
   - practicum hosts
   - community members-at-large

2. The program personnel and chair will recommend appropriate individuals to represent the stakeholder groups to the dean.

3. The chair will recommend the method for obtaining input and will be approved by the dean. Methods for consultation may include:
   a. program advisory committee (specific procedures related to the development and operations of program advisory committees are found in the Program Advisory Committee Handbook)
   b. focus groups
   c. survey
   d. interview
   e. other methods to encourage feedback

4. Programs may request support from the Centre for Teaching, Learning and Innovation to assist in facilitating focus groups, surveys, and interviews.

5. Minutes, reports, and recommendations will be reviewed and acted upon where appropriate by the dean of the centre, the chair, and the curriculum consultant assigned to the program.

6. Documentation gathered through the consultation process will be recorded and retained by the office of the dean for a period of 5 years.

Parent Policy:	Academic Program
Effective Date:	January 20, 2016
Revised Date(s):	
Policy Sponsor:	Provost and Vice President Academic
Policy Administrator:	Dean Centre for Teaching, Learning and Innovation
Appendix C	

Academic Program Review Procedures

The purpose of this procedure is to provide direction and clarity with respect to the regular and cyclical review of academic programs to ensure overall program quality which includes program relevancy, quality standards and responsiveness to the needs of the learner, the economy and society.

Part A: Program Reviews - General

1. All credit programs are subject to the following reviews (Summarized in Table 1):
   a. Informal reviews address ongoing development.
   b. Annual General Program Assessments (GPA) assess program health and facilitate the development of future planning.
   c. Implementation reviews assess new or re-designed programs on completion of their first cycle of implementation.
   d. Full program reviews conducted every five to seven years (including external peer reviews for all applied degrees) provide a comprehensive and robust assessment of strategic alignment, quality, relevance and opportunities.

2. The program dean is accountable for the overall health and sustainability of programs ensuring recommendations and implementation plans resulting from review processes are addressed. The program chair is normally the lead for the various types of program reviews with the support of a curriculum sub-committee and the program review steering committee.

3. A program review steering committee is responsible for overseeing a comprehensive program review and developing recommendations. This steering committee consists of the Dean, Chair (lead), an instructor from the program (typically one instructor), an instructor from a different program (required for applied degrees; optional for certificates and diplomas), one to two subject matter experts from industry (including at least one non-LC grad) a curriculum consultant, and writing / administrative support. This steering committee is responsible for the following:
   - initiating the review
   - initiating the data gathering
   - ensuring the work is started and completed on schedule
   - analyzing all the information and writing the report, which includes an executive summary and recommendations
   - ensuring that, in response to the recommendations, action plans are developed and implemented on schedule

This steering committee is also responsible for initiating the external review that is required for applied degrees.

Two sub-committees report to the steering committee and are responsible for the following:

- A curriculum sub-committee is primarily responsible for providing input and feedback into curriculum related aspects of the Program Review. This sub-committee is also responsible for coordinating curriculum related data gathering and analysis procedures, providing the final documentation resulting from these procedures to the overall Program Review documentation, and providing curriculum related recommendations to the steering committee for consideration. This team is led by the Chair in collaboration with a curriculum consultant and also includes representation from the Registrar's office, service courses and at least one current faculty member. Additional members such as industry subject matter experts, finance or alumni representatives may be added for additional insight and expertise at the discretion of the Chair and Dean.

- A program data gathering sub-committee is responsible for gathering all the program related information for the review (excluding what is gathered by the curriculum specific committee.) This sub-committee would include someone from the Institutional Planning and Research office. Refer to specific information included in the Program Review / Self Study section of this document.

4. The Provost and Vice-President Academic is responsible for reviewing and approving the completed Program Review (Internal Review / Self Study), Accreditation Review, Implementation Review, and External Review.

5. The program dean and chair are responsible for presenting the completed executive summary of the review to Academic Council as an information item.

6. A program review schedule is maintained by the Centre for Teaching, Learning and Innovation and reviewed annually by the Academic Leadership Team. Deans in consultation with chairs will confirm by May which programs will be reviewed in the next academic year.

7. To ensure that all data supporting the program review is current, reviews are to be completed within one year.

Part B: Review Procedures

Informal Review

An informal review is led by the Chair / and or designated faculty member and conducted on an as needed basis at the program level to address one or more areas of concern such as enrolment and/or retention, staffing, curriculum, admission requirements, etc. In the event that change is anticipated or required, consideration should be given to other timelines such as deadlines for Academic Council meetings, submission of changes to Innovation and Advanced Education and calendar publishing.

General Program Assessment

A General Program Assessment (GPA) is a formal annual review consisting of the following steps focused primarily on indicators of program health and future planning

1. An annual program health report for all credit programs is generated by the Office of Institutional Planning, Analysis and Risk Services by the end of February. The program health report consists of 11 performance indicators targeted at three key areas: enrolment and costs; student success; and community stakeholders. The results are assessed against institutional targets and show a five year trend.

2. Data is analyzed at the program level and may result in a more in-depth analysis being performed to fully understand opportunities and/or challenges.

3. Using the data and analysis, a three year rolling program plan is developed by May 1 to address opportunities and/or challenges and to inform the development of the college's Comprehensive Institutional Plan and functional plans such as course development, facilities management, finance, human resources, applied research, rural stewardship, recruitment, and marketing.

4. The Chair and Dean are responsible for monitoring and adjusting the program plans throughout the year to ensure that outcomes are being achieved.

Implementation Review

The program chair in collaboration with the curriculum sub-committee completes an implementation review after the first complete program cycle of a new program or a significantly re-designed program. The review may gather data from various sources but focuses on feedback from key stakeholders including faculty and other current industry subject matter experts and students. Feedback is gathered on what is working and what could be improved in the curriculum and the delivery of the learning experience. The data collected is analyzed and evaluated against the program goals identified in the visioning phase of the program development or program review, curriculum standards and expectations of stakeholders.

Based on the analysis, recommendations may be generated and adjustments made to more closely align the program with the goals and needs of the learner community.

Formal Full Program Review

Lethbridge College is committed to delivering quality, sustainable programs that are responsive to Industry and social demand. Ongoing assessment helps to ensure programs remain accountable, sustainable and viable. The formal review addresses the general questions of "is the program fulfilling its educational mission and achieving its goals?" and "how can the program continuously improve and remain relevant in a changing world?" It considers all aspects of service delivery including process, procedures and outcomes.

The Chair with the support of the steering committee and two sub-committees (curriculum and data gathering) will lead the process (internal / self-study and external reviews). Formal program reviews are highly consultative, utilizing input and feedback from multiple stakeholders such as industry, instructors, students, graduates, accrediting bodies, peers and government. Stakeholder input is essential to provide a first-hand view of the role(s), to provide requirements for which students are preparing, and to identify the impact of the program on the community it serves. The college's strategic plan and comprehensive institutional plan provide guidance and alignment to the overall institutional goals and objectives. A project plan

approach is used and includes roles and responsibilities, timelines, deliverables, and a detailed implementation plan.

Final reports for both internal reviews / self-studies and external reviews are reviewed by the steering committee. The dean and chair submit the final report, along with a response and implementation plan within one month of receiving the final report to the Provost and Vice President Academic (for review and approval) and Dean Centre for Teaching, Learning and Innovation (for information only) that addresses each of the recommendations and identified opportunities. The steering committee will develop the implementation plan that includes specific information such as actions, timelines, and roles of the individuals involved in implementing recommendations and opportunities. The Centre for Teaching, Learning and Innovation and the Registrar's office will be engaged in the implementation if curriculum changes are required or if support is needed in course development and professional development for Instructors.

Internal Review / Self-Study

- All programs complete an internal review / self study every five to seven years. Timing and content may be adjusted if programs have partnerships (e.g. two plus two agreements or collaborative degrees) or accreditation requirements, and this needs to be incorporated into the review planning documents and processes. This internal review / self-study may be supplemented by an independent external review. The program review steering committee is responsible for initiating the review; ensuring the work is started and completed on schedule; analyzing all the information; and writing the report, which includes an executive summary and recommendations.

The college's formal program review process is comprehensive in nature, providing a full and robust analysis of the program being evaluated. The following topics and content should guide the facilitation of the internal review / self-study. Topic content is given to provide more clarity and not meant to limit the discussion and analysis. The Internal review / self-study report provides context for external reviewers, and the content may be adapted to meet the specific needs of external reviews (such as an accreditation review).

1. **General program description and goals**
   - program name, objectives, characteristics, strengths, opportunities, uniqueness

2. **Strategic alignment**
   - program alignment with the college's strategic direction, vision, mandate/ mission and regional stewardship requirements
   - how the program meets the needs of learners, the economy and society now and into the future

3. **Program history and future focus**
   - brief description – when and why it was established
   - how it has changed or adapted to changing demographics
   - program maturity level
   - program visibility within the community
   - what's on the horizon and what's happening within industry that needs to be considered

4. **Program demand**
   - external demand
     - i. trend lines of student demand
     - ii. other factors such as the economy that may impact demand
   - internal demand
     - i. interdependence among other programs
     - ii. service to other programs

5. **Partnerships and Collaborative Agreements / Credentials**
   - Specific needs of partners (e.g. content and timing of accreditation reviews)

6. **Size, scope and productivity of the program**
   - number/trends of students, FLES, graduates
   - faculty, staff, and other resources assigned
   - operating efficiencies

7. **Revenue and costs associated with the program**
   - tuition, grants, contract revenues generated, etc.
   - relevant direct and indirect costs
   - ongoing investment in equipment, technology to keep program relevant

8. **Quality of program outcomes**
   - congruence between intended and actual program learning outcomes
   - degree of satisfaction – student, alumni, employer
   - student retention and graduation trends
   - track record of graduates – employment trends and articulation into higher learning
   - program recognition/institutional brand (national, international, etc.)
   - impact of applied research and Scholarship of Teaching and Learning on curriculum

9. **Quality of program curricula, inputs and resources**
   - faculty and staff (profiles, complements, scholarly activities and applied research, professional development activities, evaluation methods, and evidence of faculty and staff effectiveness, future staffing plans)
   - curricula – curriculum mapping, including quality and alignment of learning outcomes and assessments; appropriate for breadth, depth and level of discipline; level of integration of 21st century skills; internationalization; qualification for specialized accreditation
   - alignment of program outcomes with program curriculum
   - impact of applied research and Scholarship of Teaching and Learning on curriculum
   - physical and virtual learning environments; facilities and other resources – currency of equipment, labs
   - adaptability to technology – to advance the learning environment, computer literacy, the extent of online blended learning
   - students attracted to the program and their success rates, admission standards
   - availability of academic and student support services and resources
   - program feedback from stakeholders
   - adaptability to technology – to advance the learning environment, computer literacy, the extent of online blended learning
   - for degree level work – an assessment of elements that support and sustain the offering of degree level work (such as roles, responsibilities and assessment of faculty and applied research / SoTL and its impact on the curriculum)

10.Summary – Opportunities and Recommendations
- Program effectiveness, recommendations for changes (including improvements)
- SOAR or SWOT analysis – how the program can seize future opportunities

External Review

External reviews supplement the internal review / self study process, drawing on the work done in the internal review for context in providing an independent and objective assessment of the program under review. The college engages in two types of external reviews:

Accreditation Reviews

A required accreditation review is a formal review of a credentialed program by a governing body. These reviews are a requirement through the approval process by the governing body to offer the credential (i.e. Practical Nursing, Engineering technologies, etc.).The main purpose of the review is to assess the rigor of the program against standards set by the governing body and to assess the ongoing quality and currency of the program. In other cases the college seeks out an accreditation review by an external body to provide assurance that the program meets the standards of a professional and/or accrediting body. This accreditation may provide students with professional benefits upon graduation and/or for furthering their professional or education pathway within the discipline.

External Peer Reviews

The college engages a team of external reviewers to assess the quality of the program in a broader context and provide new and valuable insights into improving quality. While _this is a required review for applied degrees,_ other Lethbridge College programs (diplomas and certificates) may request an external peer review. When external reviews are used, they are incorporated into the overall program review project plan. The program review steering committee is responsible for initiating and coordinating the external review.

An external review team is identified by program leadership and approved through the project plan process. The team consists of at least two members (ideally one from industry and one from a post-secondary institution.) To maintain integrity of the review process, the external reviewers should:
- hold, or have held, academic appointments and have degrees (doctoral or terminal degree in a discipline that is the same as, or closely related to, the program under review. A masters level credential may be considered for external reviews for certificate and diploma programs.
- Campus Alberta Quality Council recommends the following:
  - _In order to avoid conflict of interest and to ensure objective assessments, any connection between an academic expert and the institution must be disclosed. Except in situations noted below, institutions are wise to avoid potential and perceived conflicts by selecting experts who have no connection with the institution or its faculty/administrators, or who are from institutions that are not affiliated with the institution._
  - _Council acknowledges in certain cases the value to institutions of selecting as a reviewer an expert who was involved in the original review of the program (either one selected by the institution during the development of the proposal or one appointed as one of CAQC's reviewers). However, Council advises institutions not to use the same reviewer more than twice.)_

The reviewers are provided with the self-study / internal review report. Based on the findings of a site visit and other research and insights, external reviewers will prepare an <u>External Review Report</u> that includes but is not limited to the following suggested outlines and content:

1. **Overview:** Summary of the findings and recommendations for improvement.

2. **Process:** Details of the process followed to conduct the review including individuals involved, interviews conducted, and other activities.

3. **Strategic alignment:** An analysis of how the program aligns to the overall strategic direction and mandate of the college.

4. **Quality of program inputs and resources:** An analysis of how the program's curricula and learning environments meet disciplinary and institutional standards, an assessment of admission standards, faculty and staff, student support, and other program resources.

5. **Quality of program outputs:** An analysis of student retention and graduation, graduate satisfaction and employment, alignment of learning outcomes with program objectives and industry needs.

6. **Research and scholarship:** An analysis of the applied research and scholarly activities of program faculty, staff and students.

7. **Credential recognition and learning pathways:** Discussion on how the credential awarded is recognized for further study or employment.

8. **Recommendations and commendations:** Recommendations for changes and the continued improvement of the program and commentary on program strengths.

Table 1 – Program Review Summary

Type of Review	Individuals Responsible	Frequency/ Timelines	Description	Approval / Signatures Required	Record Management
Informal Review	Program Review Steering Committee Chair/faculty	• as needed • completion of review to affect change in timely manner (e.g. Academic Council)	An informal review of one or more specific areas of concern (e.g. enrolment, staffing, curriculum, admissions) initiated and coordinated at the program level. Documentation developed: Report (including opportunities and recommendations) and an implementation plan	Chair and Dean	Office of the Chair
General Program Assessment (GPA)	Program Review Steering Committee Dean/Chair	• annually • data provided to deans in February for analysis	A formal annual review of program health for credit programs that utilizes eleven (11) performance indicators and is administered by the Office of Institutional Planning, Analysis and Risk Services (IPAR) Documentation developed: Three Year Rolling Program Plan	Chair and Dean	Office of the Vice President, Academic
Accreditation Review	Program Review Steering Committee Dean/Chair	• as scheduled by accrediting body	A formal voluntary or required program review conducted by an external professional organization or accreditation agency. Documentation developed: Report from Accrediting Body	Chair, Dean and VPA	Dean of respective program area
Implementation Review	Program Review Steering Committee Dean/Chair *Coordination* – Curriculum Sub-Committee	• new programs or substantially revised programs completing their first cycle of implementation	A formal review facilitated by the chair in collaboration with the curriculum sub-committee provides recommendations to new or substantially revised programs (change in more than one-third of the outcomes) completing their first cycle of implementation to maximize success. Documentation developed: Report (including recommendations)	Chair, Dean, and VPA	Dean, CTLI

Type of Review	Individuals Responsible	Frequency/ Timelines	Description	Approval / Signatures Required	Record Management
Program Review (Internal Review / Self Study)	Program Review Steering Committee Dean/Chair *Coordination – Steering Committee*	• normally every five years	A formal review lead by the program chair provides recommendations and opportunities to programs to maximize success; Documentation developed: Internal Review / Self Study report; Response and Implementation Plan; Executive Summary	Chair, Dean, and VPA	Dean, CTLI
External Review	Program Review Steering Committee *Coordination: Steering Committee*	• normally every 5 to 7 years	Required for degree level programs and optional for other credentials. External reviews gather data and then provide analysis and recommendations. Insights are provided with the goal of improving program quality. Documentation Developed: External Review Report	Chair, Dean, and VPA	Dean

Parent Policy:	Academic Programs
Effective Date:	November 1, 2014
Revised Date(s):	
Policy Sponsor:	Provost and Vice President Academic
Policy Administrator:	Dean Centre for Teaching, Learning and Innovation
Appendix D	

Work-integrated Learning

Lethbridge College inspires and facilitates learning and innovation to meet economic and social needs. Accordingly, Lethbridge College is committed to providing work-integrated learning to learners who graduate from Lethbridge College. These experiences will be directed toward the development of employability skills and toward the application of theory and skills to realistic workplace contexts. In some cases, work-integrated learning is available at sites nationally and internationally.

1. The Dean or designate will determine the type of work-integrated learning needed to fulfill learning outcomes of the program.

2. The Dean or designate will facilitate the selection of work sites when applicable.

3. The program area may define conditions for determining learner eligibility to participate in any practice based activity.

4. Only registered students are authorized to participate in or attend work-integrated learning associated with designated courses that are conducted off campus for the purpose of complementing or reinforcing concepts learned in a course.

5. In instances where authentic work-site experience is a program requirement, programs are encouraged to develop alternate experiences in the event available placements or unforeseen circumstances within organizations interfere or prevent the student acquiring the required learning outcomes.

6. The relationship between Lethbridge College and work site host providing a work-integrated learning for learners will always be expressed in writing and will clearly outline the contributions and obligations of both parties.

7. All documentation outlining the relationship between Lethbridge College and the participating institution / agency must be approved and fully executed prior to any learners attending the participating institution/agency.

8. Authority to approve and sign work-integrated learning contracts on behalf of the college will be as follows:

    a. Those using a college approved and unchanged template must be reviewed and approved by the Dean overseeing the respective program to ensure the interests of the college and the learner are protected.

b. Those not using a college approved template or a template that has been changed must be reviewed by the Dean overseeing the respective program and approved by the Vice President, Corporate Services and CFO to ensure the interests of the college and the learner are protected.

9. The authorized approver will sign the contract on behalf of the college prior to sending it the other contracting party for approval.

10. When the fully executed copy is returned, the original will be filed in the office of the Vice President, Corporate Services and CFO, who is the primary record holder. A copy of the contract will be on file in the appropriate Academic Centre.

11. The Dean or designate is responsible to monitor the progress of the contract to ensure that the objectives and targets are being met, and terms/conditions are followed.

12. Each program will provide the work site host and the learner with an orientation to the authentic work-site experience.

13. Programs will maintain current records of the location and placement of students at work sites so that in the event of emergencies, students can be contacted.

Definitions

Work-integrated Learning Experience in an authentic or simulated environment in which a learner applies the theory and skills learned in his / her program of studies and in which he / she extends employability skills.

- **Authentic Work-site Experience** Experiential learning within industry generally off campus. These experiences may include clinical experience, practicum, field work, service learning, and apprenticeships.

- **Simulated Work-site Experience** Experiential learning gained in simulations of workplace environments, generally on campus.

Approved Template a contract template that has been vetted and approved for use by the Vice President, Corporate Services and CFO.

Parent Policy:	Academic Program
Effective Date:	November 21, 2012
Revised Date(s):	
Policy Sponsor:	Provost and Vice President Academic
Policy Administrator:	Dean Centre for Teaching, Learning and Innovation
Appendix E	

Academic Program Suspension and Termination Procedures

1. Prior to program termination, a program will be suspended until the last intake of students has completed the program in the stated time period. Following the suspension period, the decision to terminate a program will be made according to the Academic Council decision making matrix.

2. Programs may be identified for suspension from within the program area or from other administrative committees of the college.

3. Program suspension occurs when a program is deemed no longer viable based on ongoing review and analysis of critical factors including, but not limited to:

   a) industry demand;
   b) student demand (applications and conversions);
   c) labour market studies;
   d) program advisory committee data;
   e) cost effectiveness;
   f) budget implications;
   g) Full Load Equivalency (FLE) implications;
   h) General Program Assessment (GPA) data;
   i) capacity to deliver the program (specialized space or equipment, staffing); and
   j) alignment with institutional priorities and mandate.

4. The Dean will be responsible for the development and implementation of a suspension plan. The plan will be developed in consultation with the relevant college support services and must include:

   a) student considerations, providing opportunities for completion of the credential;
   b) faculty considerations according to the Faculty Association Collective Agreement;
   c) staff considerations according to the AUPE Agreement;
   d) communication strategy to inform students, faculty, staff, Enrolment Management and Learner Services, other programs that may be impacted, Marketing, and industry and community stakeholders; and
   e) a timeline.

5. If a program is suspended, a decision is normally made by October 30 for a suspension to occur in the following academic year.

6. A suspended program may be reinstated if deemed viable based on a review and analysis of critical factors as stated in #3. A decision for reinstatement is normally made by October 30 for a reinstatement to occur in the following academic year.