Program Review & Quality Assurance Policy			
Revision Number	2	**Accountability**	Chief Academic Officer (CAO)
Policy Number	726	**Operational Responsibility**	Program Directors
Date of Approval	April 30, 2025	**Last Reviewed**	April 22, 2025
Approval Authority	Board of Directors	**Next Review**	April 2030

Objectives

LaSalle College Vancouver is committed to providing all students with high quality academic programs that are current, aligned with industry requirements, integrated within the BC education system, and adapted to new teaching and learning methods. It also commits to meeting the regulatory standards for post-secondary institutions in British Columbia. To uphold these commitments, the College has established an ongoing renewal process. The Program Review and Quality Assurance Policy guides the protocol for systematic, rigorous, and reliable review of academic degree programs.

Specifically, program review objectives are:

- To report on the state and implementation of programs of study;
- To identify the strengths, challenges, and opportunities of a program;
- To seek and implement recommendations from external experts;
- To identify appropriate program changes or areas for development;
- To meet regulatory expectations for post-secondary institutions;
- To publicly verify the quality of the program.

Scope

This policy applies to LaSalle College Vancouver's Degree programs regardless of location and mode of delivery.

Exclusions

Diploma, certificate, and non-credit programs are to be reviewed in accordance with the current PTIRU Policy Manual and are excluded from this Policy.

Provisions

LaSalle College Vancouver's Program Evaluation & Quality Assurance Policy is based on the following guiding principles:

a. Our practices and processes are consistent with best practices for quality in higher education and consistent with provincial standards and directives;

b. We engage in regular annual and 5-year comprehensive reviews of programs and implement evidence-based analysis to facilitate positive change;

c. We disseminate Self-Study reports to stakeholders for their input and include the feedback in the final report;

d. We establish internal mechanisms (such as Curriculum Committees, Program Advisory Committees, Annual Review Template) for review and recommendation of new and modified curricula in the approval process;

e. When designing the standards for our self-assessments, we align with the expectations of regulatory authorities and, where appropriate, external accreditation bodies or industry groups that set standards for our fields of study.

Context

Program reviews simultaneously address educational and training objectives, resources, processes and results. They are carried out through collecting information pertaining to priority questions that are to be examined, analyzing and accurately interpreting such information and devising a list of recommendations once the evaluations have been completed. Program evaluations are managed by the collaborative work of all parties involved, such as the academic leadership, faculty, students, graduates, external reviewers/subject matter experts, and employers in the disciplines of the programs to be reviewed.

Categories for Program Reviews

There are two categories of program reviews:

1. Annual Program Reviews
2. Comprehensive 5-Year Program Reviews

Evaluation Criteria

Program reviews will consider program relevance, consistency of pedagogical structures and delivery, relevance of curricular resources, program effectiveness and management, student experience, industry trends and innovations, adequacy of human and material resources, quality of program management, student retention and success rates as well as employability, and institutional strategic mandates. Key indicators for these criteria are listed in Appendix A (Evaluation Criteria Indicators).

Supporting Procedures

Process of the Program Review and Quality Assurance

Annual Program Reviews must be submitted to the CAO and the Curriculum Committee of the Education Council. They consist of the following:

1. The Annual Program Review and Action Plan Template, completed by the Program Director or Delegate.
2. Minutes of Program Advisory Committee Meetings.
3. Minutes of Annual Faculty Program Review Meeting.

Program Directors will oversee the implementation of the Action Plan and report completion to the Chief Academic Officer.

Comprehensive Program Evaluation Process for 5-Year Reviews

This evaluation process involves the following steps:

1. *Forming Program Evaluation Committees*

The Program Director establishes and coordinates Program Evaluation Committees. Program Evaluation Committees are comprised of the following members:

- The Program Director;
- One (1) to three (3) faculty members of the program under review, selected by the Program Director.

The Registrar, Librarian, IT, Career Services, other faculty members, student representatives, graduates and Program Advisory Committee members may constitute guest or permanent members of Program Evaluation Committees.

The Program Evaluation Committee may invite an external expert, or any other individual required to obtain the necessary evaluation information.

2. *Program Evaluation Plan*

The Program Evaluation Committee, in collaboration with the Chief Academic Officer (or his or her designate), identifies the strengths, challenges, opportunities, and threats related to the given program. Then, the committee prepares the Program Evaluation Plan, which must consist of the following elements:

- The names of the Program Evaluation Committee members;
- A statement of purpose of the program evaluation and an explanation of the project's specific context;
- A description of the current state of the program offered;
- The chosen evaluation criteria and associated indicators;
- The evaluation methodology for a self-study: roles of each Committee member, data sources and collection tools, ethical precautions, timeframe and budget (if applicable).

Following the writing of the Program Evaluation Plan, the Chief Academic Officer must approve the content contained within the document.

3. *Development and Validation of Data Collection Tools*

Following approval of the Program Evaluation Plan, the Program Evaluation Committee develops qualitative and quantitative data collection tools to carry out the self-study.

Data collection tools are designed in accordance with the Code of Ethics and Research Ethics Policies.

4. *Self-Study*

The Program Director or Designate collects data according to the Evaluation Plan and composes a self-study report in compliance with the Code of Ethics and Research Ethics Policy. The Self-Study document must contain the following essential elements:

- A demonstration of the satisfaction of the evaluation criteria (i.e. presentation, data obtained, analysis and program strengths and weaknesses for each evaluation criterion used);
- A conclusion (general satisfaction with program quality);
- Recommendations and follow-up (course of action for each evaluation criterion, action plans, responsibilities, deadlines and follow-up);
- Documents considered pertinent compiled in an appendix.

Following the writing of the evaluation report, the members of the Program Evaluation Committee review the report and make any necessary changes.

5. *Presentation of the Self-Study*

Once the Program Evaluation Committee has revised the report, it is submitted to the Faculty members of the concerned program and the CAO, who may suggest additional changes. Should the report require these modifications, it will be re-submitted to the Program Evaluation Committee for approval.

6. *External Review*

Once the Self-Study has been presented to relevant internal stakeholders, it is submitted for external review. The review panel includes at least three members who are external to LCV and qualified under the Selection Criteria for External Reviewers (Appendix B). They are selected by the CAO from a list of nominees presented by the Program Evaluation Committee.

The External Review panel conducts a site visit after reviewing the Self-Study to seek feedback and recommendations from key stakeholders including students, alumni, faculty, and staff.

After the site visit, the review panel will prepare and submit a report outlining key findings and recommendations.

7. Final Report

Upon receipt of the External Review report, the Program Evaluation Committee prepares a final report that includes the initial Self-Study, the External Review report, the committee's response to the External Review Report, and the resulting recommendations for the program. It is presented for review to the Curriculum Committee and CAO or Designate.

8. *Education Council and Education Committee of the Board*

Once the final report has been approved by the Curriculum Committee and CAO, it is presented as an item to Education Council and the Education Committee of the Board of Directors.

9. *Program Evaluation Follow-Up*

The Program Director is responsible for creating and implementing an Action Plan that responds to the recommendations of the review. An update should be made to Education Council one year after the completion of the review.

Appendix A

Program Evaluation Criteria Indicators

Evaluation Criteria	Indicators
1) Program Relevance Mapping program objectives and content to socio-economic demands and the College's	• Connection between the program, the workplace and demands of the field;

educational aims.	• Conformity of program with government standards, the College's mission and job market standards; • System integration and transferability; • Program evolution; • Graduate satisfaction.
2) Consistency of Pedagogical Organization Analysis of the cohesion of program components and their logical progression, mapping objectives to assessments, and reviewing pedagogical approaches and methods.	• Program engineering; • Pedagogical organization of programs; • Types, methods and timing for assessment practices • Student learning experience.
3) Adequacy of Human and Material Resources Assessment of the quality, quantity and motivation of human resources assigned to the program by the College and with the conformity of material resources (quality and quantity) to training and guidance demands.	• Mapping of human resources with educational and training demands; • Program staffing and student support mechanisms; • Evaluation, selection, and implementation of material resources with student educational, training and support needs.
4) Program Effectiveness Mapping program admission requirements, program outcomes with student learning as it relates to employability and industry readiness.	• Program admission requirements; • Students' learning and competencies; • Graduate satisfaction; • Alumni outcomes; • Employer satisfaction with graduates hired.
5) Quality of Program Management Analysis of program management methods, structures and organizational context and academic processes.	• Program management methods, structures and organizational context; • Quality of program outlines and feedback loops as program communication, reference and management tools; • Faculty and staff development and support mechanisms.

Appendix B

Selection Criteria for External Reviewers

External reviewers serve to provide independent and objective evaluations of our programs, departments, and the institution as a whole. They serve a crucial role in the quality assurance and improvement processes of our institution by providing impartial feedback and expertise. They also play a role in our ongoing accreditation processes.

The CAO and relevant Program Director will nominate external reviewers using the following criteria:
- External reviewers must be respected peers with relevant expertise in the subject area or program under review. This expertise will usually be evidenced through teaching and administrative experience at a respected post-secondary institution. Relevant experience could include academic leadership and curriculum or program development. Prior involvement in academic reviews are also desired qualities.
- The academic and professional credentials of reviewers should reflect the subject and level of the program under review. Attainment of a terminal degree is required for Degree-level programming, with a Ph.D. for Liberal Studies and theoretical subjects, and a Master's for applied and professional programming. A mix of professional and academic qualifications for Diploma and Certificate-level programming is required, always meeting or exceeding the minimum standards set out in the PTIB Policy Manual.
- Reviewers should have the experience required to understand and reasonably evaluate college operations and program strengths and weaknesses. They should have knowledge of similar programs at other comparable institutions.

- • Any perceived or actual conflict of interest must be avoided. Close personal friends of committee members, former mentors, and current LCV employees are not eligible to serve as External Reviewers.

LaSalle College Vancouver
2665 Renfrew Street
Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada V5M 0A7

Telephone: 604 683-9200
lasallecollegevancouver.com

LCI Education

BEST MANAGED COMPANIES