Special Meeting Agenda

Monday, April 23, 2013
4:30 – 6:30 pm
Paul Boardroom, Lansdowne campus
Please bring your own mug or water bottle.

TIME	ITEM	PRESENTER
4:00	**Call to order and declaration of quorum (1 min.)**	**Carly Hall**
4:01	**Acknowledgement of Coast Salish Territory (1 min.)** *We acknowledge that Camosun College serves the communities of southern Vancouver Island and the south Gulf Islands that are located in the traditional territories of the Esquimalt; Lekwungen; Malahat; Pacheedaht; Pauquachin (Saanich); SC'Ianew; Tsartlip (Saanich); Tsawout (Saanich); Tseycum (Saanich); and T'Sou ke Nations. Camosun College campuses are located on land that is the traditional territory of the Lekwungen, Esquimalt, and Saanich peoples. http://camosun.ca/aboriginal/territory.html*	**Carly Hall**
4:02	**Welcome (1 min.)**	**Carly Hall**
4:03	**Round-Table Check-In (3 min.)**	**Carly Hall**
4:06	**"Program Mix Analysis" (114 min.)**	**John Boraas**

Next Meeting:

> Monday, May 27, 2013
> 4:00-6:00 pm
> CC 321, Interurban

Members *(Quorum = 10)*

Voting Council Members

Anita Ferriss, Administration	Nancy Sly, Faculty
Carly Hall, Faculty	Nicole Greengoe, Administration
Corrine Michel, Faculty	Patricia Gaudreault, Faculty
Cynthia Wrate, Faculty	Paul Brady, Faculty
Gail Baxter, Support Staff	Richard Stride, Administration
Insu Kim, Lansdowne Student Rep	Thea Todd, Faculty
Joanne Cumberland, Support Staff	**Non-Voting Council Members**
John Boraas, Administration	Kathryn Laurin, President
John Gordon, Faculty	Madeline Keller-MacLeod, Board of Governor Rep
Karin Kaercher, Faculty	Shelley Butler & Cindy Kwok, Permanent Secretary
Kathy Tarnai-Lokhorst, Faculty	**Observer**
Mindy Cui Yu Jiang, Student	To be confirmed

For Information:

> **Education Council Executive:**
>> **Chair**: Carly Hall, Health and Human Services, Lansdowne, 370-3240, hall@camosun.bc.ca
>> **Vice-Chair:** Cynthia Wrate, Business, Interurban, 370-4134, wratec@camosun.bc.ca
>> **CCC Chair:** Nicole Greengoe, Student Services, Interurban, 370-3840, greengoe@camosun.bc.ca
>> **VP Ed:** John Boraas, Office of VP, Interurban, 370-4543, boraas@camosun.bc.ca
>> **Permanent Secretary:** Shelley Butler and Cindy Kwok, Office of VP Ed & SS, Interurban, 370-4690, edapprovals@camosun.bc.ca

> **Intranet:**
>> *For the most up to date agenda and other resources visit us on our Share Point site. "UserName" is your Camosun number, password is your regular Camosun password. Students use the password that will be provided to you.*
>> http://sp1/sites/edco/homepage; **or**
>> http://sp1.camosun.bc.ca/sites/edco/homepage

> **Curriculum Documents (detailed):**
>> - **Prior to CCC recommendation:** View CCC Agenda Packages (PDF's) – prior to CCC recommendation - http://sp1/sites/edco/ccc/ or http://sp1.camosun.bc.ca/sites/edco/ccc/
>> - **Post CCC recommendation:** Latest Curriculum Docs and Updates (Word .doc). Search by school, course or program - \\nas2\cecp\

PROGRAM-MIX ANALYSIS PROJECT - FRAMEWORK DRAFT

A. Purpose / Rationale

At Camosun we embrace student learning as our core purpose, and we honour our identity as a community college, acknowledging our roots in applied learning, labour force development and the social and economic development of the communities we serve. Serving our community effectively requires us to continuously improve the quality of our programs and services. It also requires that we build a sustainable organization with structures and processes that enable excellence in all we do. It was with these values in mind that the following purpose statement was crafted:

The purpose of the Program-Mix Analysis project (Phase I) is to develop a framework the college can use to inform operational, developmental, and programming mix decisions to ensure the sustainability of our programming. Once a model for the program-mix analysis has been established, Phase II of this project will see the implementation of the framework. Once Phase I and II are complete, it is intended that a similar framework will be outlined and applied to college services. This process will be initiated through the Vice President, Academic, with collaboration within the Deans and with the Education Leadership Team. Benefits of a program-mix analysis include:

(i) Continued emphasis on excellence, currency and relevance of programs and services

(ii) An alignment with and responsiveness to student success data

(iii) Responsiveness to the learning needs of the community

(iv) Clarity around the strategic priorities of the college

(v) Development of strategic balance – an optimal allocation of available resources

(vi) Clarity of strategic communication to/with internal and external communities

B. Guiding Principles

1) Transparency - the process will be accessible to members of the college community with clarity regarding when and where consultation and input will be gathered and how it will be used. Members of the college community will be be regularly updated regarding the process and how they can participate in it.

2) Collaboration - will involve discussion and input from across the college. Input will be sought regularly and will feed into the decision making process at ELT.

3) Comprehensiveness - approaches that are determined for this process will be applicable across the entire college

4) Consistency – the framework will incorporate an approach that will be applicable across the college in a fair and equitable way

5) Effectiveness - this exercise will lead to a result that will be used to support a key college process

C. Proposed Framework Criteria

Note: Robert Dickeson's work on "Prioritizing Academic Programs and Services – Reallocating resources to Achieve Strategic Balance" (2010) was drawn upon heavily in the creation of the following criteria.

Stage 1 Criteria (Quantitative)

1) External Demand for the Program

   This criterion seeks to assess the need for and attractiveness of the program.
   a) Enrolments in the program for the past five years?

   b) How is demand being met by competing institutions that offer the same program?

   c) Are other institutions in the same enrolment catchment zone experiencing the same kinds of proportionate numbers by program?

   d) What is the likely potential for future enrolments – a demonstrated documentable potential?

   e) Is the program offered at a level that corresponds to the demand? For example, degree versus diploma versus certificate?

   f) What are the characteristics of patrons, clients, or customers of the program? Will their numbers and interest foretell a continuing need for the program?

   g) What other forces are at work in the surrounding environment that affect this program? Do external demands suggest that the institution continue with this program?

2) Internal Demand for the Program

   Many academic programs are necessary simply because they are required to support other programs. Some disciplines perform extraordinary service beyond taking care of their own majors and minors and should be given appropriate credit for doing so
   a) What are the enrolments in courses required for other programs?

   b) What proportion of enrolments are for major, minor, general studies, or service purposes?

   c) What programs would suffer, or possibly fail, without the service courses offered by another program?

   d) Are there other internal claims on the program's resources that should be revealed? Does the program produce services needed by other parts of the campus?

   e) Looking into the future, is there potential for internal demand because this program may have pioneered new approaches to collaborative learning or uses of technology

likely to be emulated by other programs?

3) Quality of Program Outcomes

   a) What is the degree of student satisfaction, alumni satisfaction, employer satisfaction?

   b) In the case of performance programs, e.g. music, drama, art – what evidence is there of client outcomes?

   c) Do alumni records and placement data give insights into program success?

   d) For two-year programs, did students articulate well into upper-division success at the receiving institutions or within the next program attempted?

   e) How successful are program graduates in seeking graduate and professional admission?

   f) In sum, what is the demonstrable effectiveness of the program in preparing students for the future?

4) Size, Scope, and Productivity of the Program

   a) How many students (clients, customers, patrons, as appropriate) are being served?

   b) How many faculty and staff are assigned?

   c) What other resources are committed?

   d) How productive is the program? What are the number of credit hours generated? Degrees or certificates awarded? Services rendered? Research developed? Creative efforts produced? Attendance at performances?

5) Revenue and Other Resources Generated by the Program

   a) Enrolments. What internal subsidy would be appropriate to account for the enrolment the program attracts?

   b) Cross-subsidies. What subsidy should the program receive for services it provides other internal programs? Is the program a net payer or a net receiver?

   c) Research grants. From its research grant activity, what has the program generated for itself, and what does it receive as a result of overhead or indirect cost recovery for the institution? How reliant is the institution on this source of funds for purposes other than the direct program costs?

   d) Fundraising. Is the institution a recipient of development or advancement dollars or other gifts because of the program? How significant are program-restricted funds, and should this be a factor in judging the relative worth of this program?

   e) Equipment grants. Has the program attracted equipment or other capital items to the institution, and what is the use of these items by other programs? Do these items represent outlays the institution would have had to make without them, and at what value?

   f) Other sources. Does the program generate revenues from admission fees, special fees, laboratory fees, ticket revenues, or other user fees, or by other means that help offset some or all of the expenses associated with the program?

g) Potential revenue. Are there conditions of anticipated gifts, bequests, or endowment that require maintaining the program?

h) What is the degree to which the program has cultivated relationships that benefit the institution?

6) Costs and Other Expenses Associated with the Program

a) What are the relevant costs, direct and indirect, that are associated with delivering the program?

b) What demonstrable efficiencies in the way the program is operated (or which could be inaugurated) are beneficial to the institution? Programs that have been better than others at driving efficiencies or improving productivity should be given appropriate credit.

c) What investment in new resources will be required to bring the program up to a high level of quality?

Stage 2 Criteria (Qualitative)

1) History, Development, and Expectations of the Program

a) Why was the program established? What is its academic background? How has the program evolved over the years? What were the institution's original expectations? How have those expectations changed? What were the origins of initial support? What is the degree to which the program has adapted to meet change?

In particular, what is the degree to which the program has adapted to the changing demographic characteristics of the College's students? In the United States, research reveals the following facts about current undergraduate student:

- They are more likely to enroll on a part-time than full-time basis

- On average, many have family and work responsibilities, as compared to more traditional students

b) To the extent that these characteristics are representative of the students coming to Camosun, what has the program done to engage these students?

c) What is the maturity level of the program? Is it a fledgling program, recently authorized and still building toward its initial survival threshold? What progress is it making? Or is it a solid cornerstone of the overall curriculum, fully mature and attracting attention to the institution? What is the overall visibility of the program?

d) Finally, has the context changed within which the program is expected to operate? Would this program, for example, meet the expectations that the institution now places on new programs up for approval today?

2) Quality of Selected Program Inputs and Processes

   a) Adaptability to Technology
   What is the degree to which this program has taken advantage of advancements in technology to enhance learning, reinforce computer skills and computer literacy to prepare students for the higher-tech world in which they will live and work, attract technological support to the institution, enhance research, and enhance program-related public service? To what extent is the program part of a complete online program?

   b) Equipment, Facilities, and Other Resources
   Programs differ widely in the physical resources required to deliver them. This measure purports to evaluate the program on its capital capacities. How current are equipment and materials? What is the degree of modernization of laboratories and specialized facilities necessary to ensure that students are adequately prepared? How significant are the program holdings in the library and other learning centers? What is the degree of student and faculty access to electronic sources of program information? To what extent are the facilities conducive to quality learning experiences? What resources will it take to bring this program up to a high level of quality?

3) Impact, Justification, and Overall Essentiality of the Program

   a) What impact has this program had or does it promise to have?

   b) What are the benefits to the institution of offering this program?

   c) What is the connection relationship between this program and achievement of the institution's mission? How essential is this program to the institution?

   d) What is the relationship of this program to the success of other programs?

   Practical examples of the use of this criterion generally involve programs that are buttressed or considered essential because of their academic centrality. Examples include English and Mathematics.

   e) Does this program serve people in ways that no other program does?

   f) Does it respond to a unique societal need that the institution values?

   g) To what extent does this program help the institution differentiate itself from the crowd of other colleges and universities?

   h) In the final analysis, how is this program linked with the institution's overall strategy?

4) Opportunity Analysis of the Program

   a) What external environmental factors affect the institution in such ways that opportunities are created? Which among these might this program seize?

   b) Are there opportunities for the program to continue, but in a different format? Are their opportunities for productivity gains that, if followed, would salvage the program? Can we implement cost-containment measures due to restructuring or technological innovation? What about cooperative or collaborative relationships with other programs? With other institutions? What are the opportunities for combining courses

or sections? Where is duplication avoidable? What is the potential for reengineering the way the curriculum is delivered? What is the relationship of the program to emerging trends in distance learning? Is this program poised to transform itself in new and different ways?

D. Project Plan
SPECIFIC ACTIONS, MILESTONES AND TIMELINES

Specific Actions	Who	Completed By
Project Conduct		
1. Draft criteria for framework	Steering Comm.	March 31, 2013
2. Consult re: framework	Steering Comm.	Apr–June, 2013
3. Validate framework	Steering Comm.	July 12, 2013
4. CET updated re: framework	John	July 15, 2013
5. Develop implementation plan & timeline for Phase 2 (Framework implementation)	Steering Comm.	Sept 30, 2013
Project Closure		
1. Report Out To Sponsor & Other Authorities	Committee Chair	Sept 30, 2013
2. Communicate Conclusion	Committee Chair	Sept 30, 2013
3. Evaluate (lessons learned) and launch Phase II	All	Sept 30, 2013
4. Celebrate	All	Sept 30, 2013