Program Review (G-13.3)

College-Protected Document: changes to be initiated by policy manager(s)

Policy Manager(s): provost and dean

Last Reviewed and Approved: February 17, 2026, Education Committee; February 18, 2026, Executive Committee

Next Due for Review: February 2029

Related Policies: Institutional Research and Effectiveness (G-11.1)

Related Forms and Documents: Department Head Term Report Template; Department Head Annual Report Template; Annual Report Guidelines and Template for Consent Holders Under the Degree Authorization Act (April 2024); Alexander College Self-Study Template for 5-Year Program Renewal; Ministry of Post-Secondary Education and Future Skills Quality Assessment Process and Criteria: Private and Out-of-Province Public Post-Secondary Institutions (September 2024)

1. Introduction

As part of its commitment to provide effective educational programs, the College fosters an environment that supports constructive internal evaluation and continuous improvement. The main purpose of all program review activities is to assess the appropriateness and effectiveness of Alexander College programs, including curriculum, policies, and procedures. Review activities may result in recommendations about improving any aspect of programming or any aspect of the evaluation process itself. As a vital means of quality assurance, program review assists the College with educational planning.

Program review activities include consideration of student input, faculty input and professional development needs, and input from program advisory committees. These activities occur on three timelines: (1) end-of-term reviews; (2) annual reviews; and (3) in-depth program reviews that are completed at least once every five years as part of the DQAB reconsent process. Depending on the program, review by professional accreditation bodies may also be relevant.

2. Program Advisory Committees

Program advisory committees (PACs) for Alexander College's degree programs perform an essential role in maintaining effective dialogue with industry and community partners. By accessing current industry and community feedback, AC can further build on program strengths while responding to the changing needs of students. Indeed, input from PACs provides an understanding of the skills and

abilities employers and communities are likely to require in the future, the potential effects of technological change, and various other issues affecting the college and its mandate.

Accordingly, formal mechanisms are designed to ensure that advice provided by program advisory committees receives due internal consideration. Department heads and deans/associate deans are responsible for presenting PAC observations and recommendations to the Education Committee and to other College committees as applicable. Moreover, department heads and deans/associate deans ensure that program advisory committees are consulted in all stages of program review that are outlined below.

3. End-of-Term Reviews
Course Archives

The Deans' Office maintains a course archive folder for every course section taught by the College. These archives are updated at the end of every term that the course is taught, with the following information:

- Dates, times, and room number of the section offered.
- Name of the instructor.
- Course Syllabi.
- Course Exams.
- Summary of student feedback from the relevant Student Course Evaluation form.
- List of students with grades for each assessment and final grades.
- Any other information or reports that may be relevant to a particular iteration of the course, including observations from department heads, program advisory committee members, and the instructor.

Faculty Course Assessment Reviews (FCARs)

In consultation with department heads, continuing- and limited-term faculty are expected to regularly conduct Faculty Curriculum Assessment Reviews (FCARs). FCARs are a form of self-reflective pedagogy in which faculty assess student attainment of a particular course learning outcome. FCAR results are discussed with department heads and tracked in department head term reports (see below).

Department Head Term Reports

At the end of each term, department heads use course archiving data, FCARs, and additional institutional research data to prepare term reports that address multiple aspects of programming in their departments.

Deans' Office Follow-Up

After reviewing department head term reports, the Deans' Office may make recommendations to the Education Committee or to other College committees as appropriate.

4. Annual Course and Program Review
DQAB Annual Reports

In July of every year, the College prepares an Annual Report for DQAB, to fulfill requirements established by the Ministry of Advanced Education and Skills Training. The purpose of the Annual Report is to ensure the accountability of institutions that have obtained consent under the *Degree Authorization Act* (the *Act*). This report includes a consideration of factors related to programming, such as student support, faculty complements, and academic policies. This external reporting process informs internal analysis and review.

Deep Faculty Curriculum Assessment Reviews (DFCARs)
In consultation with department heads, continuing- and limited-term faculty are expected to regularly participate in Deep Faculty Curriculum Assessment Reviews (DFCARs). DFCARs are organized by the associate dean responsible for program assessment and examine program learning outcomes on an annual, cyclical basis. Outcomes are reported to the Education Committee and to the Academic Strategy Committee.

Department Head Annual Reports
In October of every year, department heads use course archiving data, course evaluations, and additional institutional research data to prepare annual reports that address multiple aspects of programming in their departments during the previous academic year.

Student Input
Beyond term-based course evaluations, Alexander College engages in three forms of student consultation that inform annual program review activities:

- Student Success Surveys comprise a 29-question assessment that is conducted each winter. The intent is to understand and gauge students' experiences, students' academic and personal goals, and their overall satisfaction with the institution.
- Student focus groups, typically involving approximately ten students, are held at least once each year. Through facilitated discussion, these focus groups provide important insights into the student experience.
- Student Graduation Surveys are annually distributed to students who graduated two years previously. The Graduation Surveys provide a means of tracking alumni outcomes.

Results from the student outreach activities described here are considered by all members of the College administrative team, including program department heads and the Deans' Office.

Deans' Office Follow-Up
After reviewing annual reporting materials, the Deans' Office may make recommendations to the Education Committee or to other College committees as applicable. In particular, the Deans' Office is responsible for designing a strategic response to DFCAR results.

5. In-Depth, Five-Year Program Review
In-depth program reviews, overseen by the vice-president academic, may be conducted at any time but are normally undertaken to prepare for external five-year reporting requirements established by the Ministry of Post-Secondary Education and Future Skills.

Self-Study

In-depth program reviews begin with the formation of a Self-Study committee that includes administrators, faculty, program advisory committee members, and students. Self-Studies are comprehensive documents that consider the following:

- Admission requirements: an explanation and rationale for program admission requirements.
- Course requirements: an explanation and rationale for the requirements for each course, highlighting any special requirements.
- Transferability: an annotated list of articulation agreements.
- Student course selection: samples of student course selection, illustrating the most chosen programs and the range of course choices available to students.
- Instructors: a list of instructors hired in the last five years indicating their qualifications, courses taught, and all assessment information available. Also included are comments on the success and availability of instructors in each subject area, differential salaries, mobility, staffing projections, and any other relevant information. In compiling instructor information for their area, department heads invite feedback from instructors themselves.
- Administrative Staff: a list of administrative staff members with their positions, qualifications, and effectiveness.
- Facilities: a diagram and list of classrooms, laboratories, student study and meeting areas, with surface area and comments concerning the amount of use each location receives. Comments and recommendations for improvements to the use of space are included.
- Equipment: a list of all instructional and non-instructional A/V, computer, and laboratory equipment available in the College.
- Library: a full description of the library mission, holdings by subject area, space, staff, facilities, and equipment. Comments and recommendations for improvements to the library are included.
- Any other matters deemed necessary.

College-Appointed External Review Panel

The next stage of an in-depth review involves the selection of an external reviewer (or an external review panel). College-facilitated external reviews provide an independent, comprehensive assessment of the Self-Study and all other relevant college documents, including the *Academic Calendar*. The work of the external reviewer (or review panel) culminates in a report. The institution then prepares a summary and response to the external review. Responses are prepared by the relevant program unit and by the dean or provost. The institutional summary and responses are made available on the College website.

Preparation of Documents for the Degree Quality Assurance Board (DQAB)

The in-depth program review process culminates in material that is submitted to the Degree Quality Assurance Board, including a program review (or application for renewed consent) and an organizational review where required. Program reviews are uploaded to the Post-Secondary Institutional

Proposal System (PSIPS) for provincial consideration. Following DQAB guidelines, Alexander College provides a summary of (and response to) DQAB panel reviews for each program.

6. External Professional Accreditation Reports

Where applicable, academic programs may be subject to external review or accreditation by professional, disciplinary, or industry-based bodies that establish standards for professional recognition, licensure, or practice. Such professional accreditation processes are distinct from, and complementary to, provincial regulatory approval requirements administered by the Ministry of Post-Secondary Education and Future Skills and the Degree Quality Assessment Board (DQAB).

When a program seeks, maintains, or renews professional accreditation, the institution may prepare program-specific accreditation reports or self-studies in accordance with the standards, criteria, and timelines established by the relevant external body. These reviews may require additional data collection, analysis, or consultation beyond the institution's regular program review cycle. Outcomes and recommendations arising from professional accreditation processes shall be considered, as appropriate, within institutional quality assurance and continuous improvement activities.