
PROGRAM AND SERVICE REVIEW

POLICY NUMBER	BRD 08-3
APPROVAL DATE	DECEMBER 12, 2003
LAST AMENDMENT	
REVIEW DATE	DECEMBER, 2008
AUTHORITY	BOARD OF GOVERNORS
PRIMARY CONTACT	VICE-PRESIDENTS, DEANS, DIRECTORS

POLICY

DEFINITION AND PURPOSE OF PROGRAM AND SERVICE EVALUATION:

Accountability requires an institutional plan for and evaluation of its programs and services on an ongoing basis. At Thompson Rivers University (TRU), in-depth program and service review is one of three linked elements of institutional evaluation: annual self-scrutiny of each operational unit, regular program review and periodic institutional evaluation.

Program review provides a sound basis for change and adaption of the institution's programs and services. The objectives of program and service reviews at TRU are:

- To assist University staff with the improvement of programs and services;
- To provide assurance to the Ministry, the public and the program or service clientele that quality control procedures are in place;
- To provide cumulative results which may indicate trends;
- To assess past and recent innovations or changes;
- To clarify the role of the program or services within the institution;
- To stimulate interest and awareness about the program or service;
- To provide information to other groups as appropriate, e.g. programs and services affected by the reviewed area and interested external agencies.

REGULATIONS

I. SCOPE

TRU intends to review every instructional program and all educational and general support services once every ten years.

a. Philosophy and Guiding Principles:

- Constructiveness: In-depth program reviews are conducted on the assumption that the program or service under review will receive an honest, constructive critique of its operations.
- Consistency: In-depth program and service reviews are coordinated by the Office of Institutional Research and Planning to ensure standards of comprehensiveness, reliability and consistency in their conduct.
- Ownership: In-depth program and service reviews are conducted in such a way as to encourage stakeholder “buy-in” and ownership of the process and results.

II. SEQUENCE OF EVENTS IN PROGRAM AND SERVICE REVIEW PROCESS

In-depth program and service reviews normally consist of five phases: *selection, planning, data collection, analysis and evaluation, and action.*

	Fall/Winter Series	Winter/Spring Series
<p>SELECTION:</p> <p>A list of programs to be reviewed will be drawn up by the Vice-Presidents, Deans and Directors, in conjunction with the Director, Institutional Research; the schedule for each academic year will be determined by May of that year. While not mandatory, the development of five-year divisional rotations of programs to be reviewed is encouraged to assist deans, directors and Vice-Presidents in strategic planning.</p>	May	May
<p>PLANNING:</p> <p>The Director, Institutional Research and Planning or his/her delegate will meet with program or service unit members to identify the focus, issues and processes for review. The planning phase will normally last up to a month, and will include determination of what data are to be collected from whom, the design of the questionnaires, and information on the process for selecting the Evaluation Committee.</p>	May/June	September/ October

<p>DATA COLLECTION:</p> <p>The collection of data for the Evaluation Committee, including administration of survey questionnaires, by Institutional Research Office will normally take up to three months; during this phase, the Evaluation Committee for programs or services under review will be appointed and its members notified by letter. The Evaluation Committee will receive summarized copies of the data collected on the program or service under review no later than two weeks before its scheduled meetings so that members can familiarize themselves with the data.</p>	September – November	January – March
<p>ANALYSIS & EVALUATION:</p> <p>The Evaluation Committee will meet, analyze the data, and interview stakeholders in the program or service, normally over a period of two days, by the end of which it will have identified issues it wishes to address in its report. The Committee chair, the assistant chair and the external representative(s) will draft their findings and recommendations, normally within the next four weeks. The Director, Institutional Research and Planning, will then send the draft report to all members of the Evaluation Committee, to the faculty of the program or the members of the service unit under review, and to the appropriate Dean or Director.</p>	December – February	April – June
<p>The program faculty or service unit members will review the draft report for inaccuracies and may respond to the Director, Institutional Research and Planning, within three weeks.</p>	January – March	May – June
<p>The Director, Institutional Research and Planning, will apprise the Evaluation Committee Chair, Assistant Chair and external representative(s) of any corrections and changes suggested by members of the program or service under review, and where the Committee sees fit, those changes will be incorporated into the report. A final report will be produced by the Evaluation Committee normally within two weeks of receiving those changes. The final report will be proofed, printed and distributed by the Office of Institutional Research.</p>	February – March	June – July

<p>ACTION:</p> <p>In consultation with their Dean or Director, program or service unit members will prepare an Action Plan in response to recommendations contained in the final report. Normally up to two months will be allowed for this phase.</p>	February – April	June – August
<p>(a) INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM AND EDUCATIONAL SERVICE REVIEWS:</p> <p>In the case of instructional program and educational support service reviews, the coordinator or chair or manager or director of the program or service under review will submit the final report and the Action Plan to the Educational Planning and Program Review (EPPR) Committee for scrutiny and approval. The Chair of the EPPR will notify the University Council and the Board of those programs reviewed.</p>	March - June	June - November
<p>(b) GENERAL SERVICE REVIEWS</p> <p>In the case of general service reviews, the final report and the Action Plan will be forwarded to the Vice-President of the area in which the service is located.</p>		
<p>ONE-YEAR FOLLOW-UP:</p> <p>The coordinator or chair or manager or director of the program or service under review will make a follow-up report on Action Plan implementation to EPPR for instructional and educational reviews, to the appropriate Vice-President for general service reviews, one year after the initial approval of the Action Plan.</p>	March – June + 1 year	June – November + 1 year

III. DATA COLLECTED FOR INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM REVIEWS AT TRU

- a description of the program's objectives, admission requirements, promotion policies, course requirements and graduation requirements;
- copies of all course outlines for the current academic year, and back copies of courses offered on rotation;
- enrolment, waiting list, seat utilization, retention/attrition, completion/ graduation and grade distribution data;

- faculty and student assessment of physical facilities (via questionnaires);
- assessment of library holdings;
- graduate employment, transfer and grad/professional school data;
- resumes of full and part-time faculty, and those delivering service courses for the program;
- A SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats) analysis of the program;
- program budgets for three to five years;
- information on faculty scholarly activity, professional development and pedagogical upgrading;
- summarized responses (including verbatim comments) of questionnaires sent to the following constituent groups: former students (four year span); current students; program faculty; employers (where appropriate); program advisory committees (where appropriate). The intent of these questionnaires is to obtain ratings on program organization and content, delivery, facilities, and its usefulness as a preparation for transfer, further studies or employment.
- any further data or information suggested by the program under review or requested by the Evaluation Committee.

IV. DATA COLLECTED FOR EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT SERVICES AND GENERAL SUPPORT SERVICES REVIEWS

For Educational Support Services and General Support Service Reviews, the kinds of data collected will be adjusted to reflect measures appropriate to the unit. They may include:

- copies of the service unit's mission statement, goals and objectives, service benchmarks, and any other planning documentation;
- a SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats) analysis of the service;
- measures of client demand, service volume, and client satisfaction;
- measurements against established regulatory and professional standards where appropriate
- cost/client ratios and employee/client ratios;
- fiscal data for three to five years;

- any further data or information suggested by the service under review or requested by the Evaluation Committee.

V. EVALUATION COMMITTEE

- a) An Evaluation Committee for each program or service under review will be appointed by the Director, Institutional Research and Planning, in consultation with the Vice-President in whose area the program or service is located, and the Dean or Director of program or service under review. The Committee will normally consist of:
- the Chairperson: a departmental chairperson, program coordinator, experienced faculty member, dean, director or assistant director from a division other than that to which the program or service under review belongs will chair the Committee meetings, analyze the data provided, interview program or service unit stakeholders, and draft the evaluation report.
 - an Assistant Chairperson: a faculty or service unit member or administrator who does not belong to the program or service under review will participate in the review process and the analysis and interpretation of data, and help the Chairperson write the report. This person will act as recording secretary for Committee meetings, and will keep a record of the proceedings.
 - external representative(s): these may be either faculty members or administrators from a similar program at another institution, or former students from the program under review, or (where appropriate) members of the Program Advisory Committee, or any combination of the above. The number of external representatives will be determined by the Director, Institutional Research and Planning in consultation with the program's or service's personnel.
 - the Director, Institutional Research and Planning: The Director, Institutional Research and Planning, or his/her delegate will collect and marshal the data for the review; distribute the data to the Evaluation Committee members; organize meetings of the Committee; act as facilitator of and resource person to the Committee; and be responsible for the production and distribution of the evaluation report in its final form.
- b) In addition, the following may be invited to attend the committee meetings in an informational capacity:
- program resource persons: one of two people from the program or service under review will act as resource persons and assist the Committee in interpreting and analyzing the data. To ensure confidentiality, program resource persons will not be present with the Committee interviews program faculty and students, or members of the service unit.
 - the Dean or Director of the Division/Faculty/School of the program or service under review: the Dean, director or Assistant Director of the program or service under review

may attend Committee meetings ex-officio.

VI. INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM REVIEW CRITERIA

A standard set of questions may be directed to each instructional program under review. These are neither definitive nor exhaustive, but are illustrations designed to cover elements common to most instructional programs. In the case of educational and general services, criteria should be developed that are specifically appropriate to the service under review.

Basic Criteria for Instructional Program Review

I. CURRICULUM

a. Program Objectives

1. Are the program objectives clearly stated and readily available to faculty and students (e.g. in the TRU Calendar)?
2. Are they consistent with TRU mission, goals and objectives?
3. Do they adequately define the range and depth of knowledge and skill required for successful completion of the program (i.e. are they realistic)?

b. Program Description and Comprehensiveness

1. Is the program clearly described in publications available to the student (e.g. brochure, calendar)? Does the description include program length, number of courses, credits, etc?
2. Is the program length determined by the objectives and the level of skill required for completion?
3. To what extent are the individual courses linked to program objectives?
4. Are the courses structured and sequenced rationally (or are there gaps and overlaps)?
5. What elements of general education are part of the program, e.g. communications, general science?

c. Instructional Method and Technology

1. Are the instructional methods (e.g. tests, hand-outs, lectures, demonstrations, audio visual support materials, etc.) appropriate to the students?
2. Is the learning sequence linked to the course objectives?

3. Are the assessment methods linked to the course objectives and appropriate in terms of frequency and level?

d. Curriculum Revision

1. What changes have been made in the last three years, why were they made, and how successful have they been?
2. What curriculum review work is currently in progress?

II. STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS

1. What is the 'target population' of the program?
Did they use the program?
What groups did not use the program?
2. What are the demographics of the student body in terms of age, gender, residency, etc.?
3. What are the criteria for admission to the program? Are they clearly stated in publicly available material? Are they appropriate prerequisites to the level of skills/knowledge that the student is expected to reach in the program?
4. Is the admission procedure equitable and fair (e.g. are admissions made on the same basis by the same admissions committee; are interviews conducted equitably)?

III. INPUTS AND OUTCOMES

a. DEMAND

1. What has the enrolment pattern been over the last three years?
2. What has the unmet demand been? (Ratio or percentage of those who apply but are not accepted compared to program capacity.)
3. What is the current and long-term marketplace demand for program graduates? (Is there a continued need for the program?)

b. GRADE PROFILE OF STUDENTS

1. what is the grade distribution (by program and by course) for the last three years?
2. What is the withdrawal profile (by program, by course) over the last three years?
3. What is the number of program completions over the last three years?

c. FOLLOW-UP/JOB PLACEMENT

1. what institutional and/or program mechanisms are in place to help graduating students find jobs?
2. What is the job placement record of the program over the last three years? (both in training related jobs and non-training related jobs)
3. What happens to graduates not currently employed?

IV. RESOURCES**a. FACULTY**

1. What are the number, status/qualifications and workload profiles of the faculty?
2. Are these congruent with the task at hand? (i.e. are there enough well qualified faculty? Are they over or under-worked?)
3. What is the faculty/student ratio?
4. What professional development or upgrading have faculty been engaging in over the last three years?
5. How available are faculty to students?

b. SUPPORT STAFF

1. How adequate are the number and quality of support staff to the program?
2. What other institutional services are used by the students (e.g. library, computer labs)?
3. Are the services adequate to student needs?

c. ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Is such a committee in place? Is it actively involved in the program? Is its composition representative of employers, professional associations, etc., outside the institution?

V. FACILITIES/EQUIPMENT/FINANCIAL SUPPORT**a. EQUIPMENT**

1. Is the program equipment adequate for, and relevant to, the program, and sufficiently up-to-date to provide the students with a grounding for employment in their field?
2. To what extent is the equipment shared with other programs?

b. FACILITIES

What are the quantity, quality, adequacy and age of the instructional space used by the program, and of faculty offices?

c. BUDGET

1. What are the amounts of operating and capital budget for the last three fiscal years (including the current fiscal)?
2. What are the costs per student (or other unit cost comparison, such as student contact hours) in relation to other programs in the division, and similar programs at other institutions.
3. In what ways might budget be better deployed? (e.g. five year equipment replacement planning, alternative suppliers – even alternate instructional modes).