SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROGRAM REVIEW

Regular Meeting
Wednesday, February 21, 2024
2:00 p.m. - 4:00 p.m.
Teams

AGENDA

1. Call to Order ....Donna Danielson   2:00

2. Approval of Agenda

3. Approval of Minutes, January 24, 2024

4. Chair's Report 2:05

5. New Business ....

   5.1. Foundations in Design Second Annual Follow-Up Report ....Erin Ashenhurst, Ernest

   Van Der Merwe, Andhra Goundrey 2:15

   5.2. Geography External Review Report ....Donna Danielson   2:35

6. Items for Discussion

   6.1. Program Review Timeline...Donna Danielson   2:50

7. Manager's Report for OPA ....Melike Kinik-Dicleli   3:05

8. Adjournment

SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROGRAM REVIEW

Minutes of Regular Meeting
Wednesday, January 24, 2024
2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.
MS Teams Online

Voting Member Quorum: 8		
Aimee Begalka Craig Wright David Burns Donna Danielson, Chair Fergal Callaghan, Vice-Chair Hao Ma	Jeff Dyck Jennifer Gao Judy Benevides Krista Gerlich-Fitzgerald Lindsay Norris Meredith Haaf Tomasz Gradowski	Alan Davis
		Non-voting
		Catherine Schwichtenberg Laura McDonald Melike Kinik-Dicleli Nishan Perera Zena Mitchell
Regrets	**Senate Office**	**Guests**
Logan Masilamani	Ruby Gupta Michelle Molnar	

1. **Call to Order and Territorial Acknowledgement**

   The Chair, Donna Danielson, called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

2. **Approval of Agenda**

   Fergal Callaghan moved the agenda be confirmed as circulated.

   The motion carried.

3. **Approval of Minutes, November 29, 2023**

   Meredith Haaf moved the minutes be accepted as circulated.

   The motion carried.

4. **Chair's Report**

   The Chair, Donna Danielson, provided her report and highlighted that PLOs are a part of Full Program Proposal (FPP) approval process. She also emphasized the significance of PLOs for Curricular Mapping Process and requested the members to have a clear understanding around the same. She also encouraged the reviewers for focusing on evidence based Self Study reports (SSRs).

   Given the timeline, the Chair guided the reviewers to document unmet standards.

5. **New Business**

   5.1. Business Management Third Annual Follow-Up Report

   Donna Danielson moved THAT the Senate Standing Committee on Program Review accept the Business Management Third Annual Follow-Up report as attached.

   The motion carried.

   5.2. Product Design Second Annual Follow-Up Report

   Donna Danielson, chair, appreciated that the report was very well articulated.

   Donna Danielson moved THAT the Senate Standing Committee on Program Review approve the Product Design Second Annual Follow-Up Report as attached.

   The motion carried.

   Donna Danielson moved THAT the program submits another follow up report next year.

   The motion carried.

   5.3. Fine Arts Self-Study Report

   The Chair thanked the review team for their great work. The committee discussed the reviewer's written comments and requested amendments based on them and discussion at the meeting.

   Donna Danielson, moved THAT the Senate Standing Committee on Program Review approve the Fine Arts Self-Study Report as amended to the satisfaction of the chair based on revisions from this meeting.

   The motion carried.

   ACTION: The chair to report on the amendments to the Fine Arts Self-Study Report.

6. **Items for Discussion**

   None.

7. **Manager's Report for the Office of Accountability and Planning**

   Melike Kinik-Dicleli, Manager, Quality Assurance presented her report and highlighted that there are 40 programs that are at various stages in the program review process.

8. **Adjournment**

   The meeting adjourned at 3:12 p.m.

SENATE
Agenda Number: 5.1
Meeting Date: February 21, 2024
Presenter(s): Erin Ashenhurst, Ernest Van Der Merwe, Andhra Goundrey

AGENDA TITLE: FOUNDATIONS IN DESIGN SECOND ANNUAL FOLLOW-UP REPORT

ACTION REQUESTED: Motion

RECOMMENDED RESOLUTION: THAT the Senate Standing Committee on Program Review accept the Foundations in Design Second Annual Follow-Up Report as attached.

THAT the program submits another annual follow-up report next year.

COMMITTEE REPORT

For Secretariat Use Only

Attachments

Foundations in Design Second Annual Follow-Up Report

Submitted by

Melike Kinik-Dicleli, Manager of Quality Assurance, Office of Planning & Accountability

Date submitted

February 7, 2024

Foundations in Design Second Annual Follow-Up Report

Date Self-Study Report approved by SSCPR: April 21, 2021

Date of External Review Site Visit: June 29 & 30, 2021

Date Quality Assurance Plan approved by SSCPR: Feb 16, 2022

Date First Annual Follow-Up Report approved by SSCPR: Feb 22, 2023

Date Second Annual Follow-Up Report submitted: Feb 5, 2024

Second Progress Report

MONTH/YEAR WHEN THE FIVE-YEAR ACTION PLAN BEGAN: June 2021

STRATEGY 1: Revise the program model.

GOAL(S) FROM THE QA PLAN THIS STRATEGY SUPPORTS: **GOAL 2:** Address barriers to broaden access for incoming students. **GOAL 4:** Explore additional means or partnerships of course delivery to increase student enrolment.

Step(s) Required to Achieve this Strategy	Led by	Start on (M/YY)	Complete By (M/YY)	Progress to Date/Reasons for Lack of Progress
Removal of portfolio requirement and re-assessment of other entrance requirements	Chair	Jun 2021	Sept 2021	- <u>Completed (Implemented Sept 2021)</u> - The first phase of the removal of portfolio requirements includes reduced entrance requirements for Fall 2022. The entrance requirements now ask students to answer 3 guiding questions around the statement 'why design?' in a video format rather than assessing their design skills when entering the program - Outcome: stronger applications and a substantial waitlist
Explore open intake and the full elimination of entrance requirements	Chair	Jun 2021	Sept 2024	- Consultation with the Senate Office, Registrar, Associate Vice-President, Academic - June 16th, 2022, Meeting with David Burns and Amy Jeon resulting in a request to consult with Wilson School of Design Faculty regarding the formation of non-cohort, limited intake courses. - The faculty council has held the ongoing conversation in consultation with Fashion Design (FASN) and Product Design (DEPD) as they are undergoing program review. Establishing alignment with the degree programs provides significant program
Develop course outlines to align with "Elective" requirements for KPU degree programs	Chair + Faculty	Jan 2022		
Explore transfer credits and laddering opportunities in WSD degree programs	Chair	Jan 2022		

Step(s) Required to Achieve this Strategy	Led by	Start on (M/YY)	Complete By (M/YY)	Progress to Date/Reasons for Lack of Progress
				impact for the Foundations in Design Program and support for the Wilson School of Design.
				- We explored m~~M~~oving the Foundation in Design program courses to non-cohort, limited intake to allow~~s~~ for a larger funnel of students to pool into the Wilson School of Design. The key negatives to this direction would be the danger of courses being under-enrolled, complications with scheduling and certificate completion, and losing the cohort nature of the FIND certificate program — an aspect that helps students feel supported and readies them for the cohort-based degree programs. Instead, we are pursuing the development of a Minor in Design Studies that would make use of some of the courses currently offered only in the FIND program. The Minor would be non-cohort based and accessible to all KPU students without additional entry requirements. This allows students to take courses to discover what design is and either complete the minor alongside their major or use these accessible courses to work towards developing strong entrance requirements for the degree programs at Wilson School of Design.
				- There was ~~is~~ the consideration of offering a certificate program (Design [DESN] Certificate) like the General Business (BUSI) Certificate that would be comprised of core design courses and options for students to take Introduction to Marketing (MRKT 1199) and Introduction to University Writing (ENGL 1100) which are general education courses required for many of the Wilson of Design Degree programs. This would allow students to complete the general required courses before degree entrance and create options for students to take courses in the summer semester to lighten their first-year course load. We have pivoted this discussion to focus on the Minor in Design Studies which will begin development in Fall of 2024.
				- The current intake shows a large pool of waitlisted students, at 20 + per year. The current over-enrollment option has allowed for increased seats to 25 and all seats were filled for Sept 2022. We allowed for 23 students in the cohort in Fall of 2023, and we plan to allow for 25 in the cohort for Fall 2024.
				- The Design Course (DESN) sub-committee was formed in November 2022 through the curriculum committee to address the alignment of possible foundational courses that can be supported in the Wilson School of Design. These courses are currently offered through the Foundation in Design Program (FIND) and will become

Step(s) Required to Achieve this Strategy	Led by	Start on (M/YY)	Complete By (M/YY)	Progress to Date/Reasons for Lack of Progress
				Design General Studies Courses (DESN) designation to provide more options for students to remain within the Wilson School of Design and offer an opportunity for non-design students. The Foundations in Design program is in the process of transitioning its courses to use the code DESN for Fall of 2024 to better reflect the current and future use of these courses beyond the FIND certificate. While some are currently used in other WSD degree programs, they will also be used in the Minor in Design Studies. We believe the DESN (Design) course code is clearer and better reflects the course content as we expand the audience for these courses.
Review current FIND Pathway courses to assess for suitability for possible additions/changes	Chair	Jan 2022	Sept 2024	- Completion dates dependent on the activities above - Completed (implemented Sept 2024) – Two additional courses in the FIND program have been designated as Pathway 3, so we will have four courses (DESN 1100, 1110, 1130, and 1140), as options for Pathway students starting in the Fall of 2024. The challenge is to find seats available to students outside the cohort. The development of the Minor in Design Studies may allow for additional sections of core courses, allowing for more flexibility in scheduling and delivery

STRATEGY 2: Curriculum alignment to support revised program model.

GOAL(S) FROM THE QA PLAN THIS STRATEGY SUPPORTS: **GOAL 1:** Update all current courses for relevancy and currency. **GOAL 2:** Address barriers to broaden access for incoming students. **GOAL 3:** Strengthen Institutional connections to support students and Faculty.

Step(s) Required to Achieve this Strategy	Led by	Start on (M/YY)	Complete by (M/YY)	Progress to Date/Reasons for Lack of Progress
Revision of program competencies: Elements and principles of design, Portfolio skills, Digital Skills, decolonization, and relevancy with other WSD programs	Chair + Faculty	Jan 2022	June 2022	- Completed 2022 for current FIND courses - Further consultation is required to align revision with the degree programs within the Wilson School of Design to establish an opportunity for open intake.
Curriculum Mapping (Supported by Teaching and Learning)	Chair + Faculty	Feb 2022	Sept 2024	- Completed curriculum mapping exercises April 2022 - Identified Gap Analysis - Courses developed in the Foundation in Design program depend on the Design General Studies Course outcomes to identify the gaps within the Wilson School of Design. - A draft of the program learning outcomes has been established for the Design General Studies Courses (DESN). - Curriculum map has been reviewed by Craig Wright of Teaching and Learning with positive feedback. His notes will be worked into the next program review - Further review is required to ensure that there is alignment for laddering and cross-listing in the Wilson School of Design degree programs (Product Design [DEPD], Graphic Design [GDMA], Interior Design [IDSN] and Fashion Design [FASN]). - The Product Design Program (DEPD) and Fashion Design Program (FASN) are currently undergoing program revisions. These programs will provide the Foundation in Design program with laddering options. Product Design plans to implement program changes in Fall 2024 including a course in DESN shared by the DEPD degree and FIND program. The Foundations in Design course DESN 1220 can be used to meet course requirements for DEPD 1160, allowing a laddering option for FIND students interested into pursuing the Product Design degree. - There are courses within the Foundation in Design program that have been identified to be offered as foundational courses in Product Design (DEPD) and Fashion Design (FASN). The courses under consideration would serve the larger
Identify elective options	Chair + faculty	Feb 2022		
Update course outlines	Chair + Faculty	Mar 2022		

Step(s) Required to Achieve this Strategy	Led by	Start on (M/YY)	Complete by (M/YY)	Progress to Date/Reasons for Lack of Progress
				student population at Kwantlen. Further to this, the appeal to broaden the opportunity for design courses is to move from the Foundation in Design Courses to the Design General Studies (DESN) designation to support a non-cohort, limited intake model. Thus, providing students at the University an opportunity to take design courses without applying to specific cohort model programs. With FIND transitioning to the course code of DESN in Fall of 2024 and the development of a Minor in Design including some courses offered in the FIND certificate, KPU students will have access to design courses without committing to a cohort-based program.
The WSD Curriculum Committee approves all course updates and new course outlines	Chair	Sept 2023	January 2024	- Completed January 2024 (Implementation Sept 2024) WSD Curriculum Committee approved all course updates and the new course in portfolio development
SSCC approves all updates and new courses.	Chair	~~January~~March 2024	~~February~~ March 2024	
Senate approves all updates and new courses	Chair	~~February~~ March 2024	March 2024	- SSCC and Senate approval currently being sought for Fall 2024 implementation - ~~Completion dates dependent on the activities above~~

STRATEGY 3: Promotion of the updated curriculum.

GOAL(S) FROM THE QA PLAN THIS STRATEGY SUPPORTS: **GOAL 3:** Strengthen Institutional connections to support Students and Faculty. **GOAL 4:** Explore additional means or partnerships of course delivery to increase student enrolment.

Step(s) Required to Achieve this Strategy	Led by	Start on (M/YY)	Complete by (M/YY)	Progress to Date/Reasons for Lack of Progress
Collaboration with FSO on program updates	Chair/Faculty	June 2022	Sept 2022	
Collaboration with Academic Advisors on course availability	Chair	June 2022	Sept 2022	
Promote program updates with international student office- international study, 'visiting' and exchange students.	Chair	June 2022	Sept 2022	- Completed (Implemented Sept 2022) - Summer 2021 First intake revision update has been implemented with Futures Students Office (FSO) - All marketing material has been updated across the institution and the Wilson School of Design. - Ongoing consultation will take place due to the upcoming changes as stated in Strategy 2.
Promote program updates with school districts to develop Dual-Credit partnerships	Chair/ Dean	June 2022	Dec 2022	
Update the FIND KPU Website	Chair/ Prog. Assistant	June 2022	Sept 2022	
Marketing campaign to launch the new program updates: • Event (including a design activity for participants to engage in) • Video • Create a digital/printed promotional package to share with potential partnerships, academicadvisors, and FSO	Chair/ Faculty	June 20222	Sept 2022	

STRATEGY 4: Develop stronger support channels.

GOAL(S) FROM THE QA PLAN THIS STRATEGY SUPPORTS: **GOAL 3:** Strengthen Institutional connections to support Students and Faculty. **GOAL 4:** Explore additional means or partnerships of course delivery to increase student enrolment.

Step(s) Required to Achieve this Strategy	Led by	Start on (M/YY)	Complete by (M/YY)	Progress to Date/Reasons for Lack of Progress
Strengthen relationships with the Counseling services	Chair	Mar 2022	Jan 2024	- ~~Postponed due to faculty time releases, scheduling, and leaves. Will be completed by stated date. Format will be through workshop or team meeting.~~ - Completed - Presentation from Robin Huppmann at KPU Counselling in WSD Operation Meeting Jan. 15th on support for WSD students. We are planning for Robin to return to host a resilience session with faculty and staff at the Spring Faculty Retreat in May 2024. - Workshop with Teaching and Learning on the 'new learner' and assessment strategies planned as part of Spring Faculty Retreat -
Develop a student mentorship program with WSD students	Chair	Jan 2022	Sept 2022	- Completed (Implemented Sept 2022) - Collaboration with other Wilson School of Design program chairs - Peer Mentors were launched Sept 2022 for the current academic year and are working with the current student cohort - Alumni support for students is implemented and is ongoing within the program for new applicants and current students. The program implements alumni engagement within the classroom and info sessions to generate peer-to-peer dialogue about the program. - A strong contact list of alumni has been established
Work with the Accommodation Office and Early Alert to understand students' needs and channels of support	Chair	May 2022	Jan 2024	- Completed (and ongoing) - Accommodation Office training is provided at Chair and Coordinator meetings with Advisors. - Faculty have been updated about the process at monthly meetings. - The chair and faculty are encouraged to engage in specific workshops for professional development. The FIND team regularly discusses accommodations, Early Alert services, and avenues for student support. We are intentional in our efforts to build a positive and supportive cohort culture to encourage students academically and emotionally.

Step(s) Required to Achieve this Strategy	Led by	Start on (M/YY)	Complete by (M/YY)	Progress to Date/Reasons for Lack of Progress
				- ~~We have experienced a delay, due to faculty time releases, scheduling, and leaves.~~
Library services- further develop lib guides and recourses for Anti-Racism, Indigenization, 2sQTBIPOC	Chair	April 2022	Jan 2024	- The Wilson School of Design has introduced an Indigenous designer in a residence that will commence for the 2023/2024 academic year. - The past program chair (~~-~~ currently on leave) was ~~is~~ working with Indigenous Student Services to bring more awareness of Truth and Reconciliation to the Wilson School of Design. We are now excited to be working with the WSD Indigenous designer in residence. - The past Program Chair (currently on leave) is a member of the President's Diversity and Equity Committee. Currently, WSD Dean Andhra Goundrey is on the Anti-Racism Steering Committee - The past program c~~h~~air and faculty members sit on the Wilson School of Design Equity and Inclusive Communities Working Group. The current program chair is on the Senate Subcommittee on Library and is following initiatives such as the χʷəχʷéy̓əm Indigenous Collection with a seating area upholstered by WSD student Jennifer Lamont of Métis Nation. - We continue to seek~~require more~~ feedback from key parties outside of the institution to address needs.
Faculty team building/ cross-disciplinary professional development • collaboration with Indigenous advisory • Attend workshops or conferences • Professional Development team building event(s)	Chair	Feb 2022	Jan 2023	- Completed (Implemented 2023) - Ongoing participation with Himikalas/Pamela Baker the Indigenous designer in residence for the Wilson School for Design and FIND graduate from our Squamish First Nations cohort - Require more feedback from key parties outside of the institution to address needs. - Sub. Committees have been formed first meeting Jan 2023, FIND Faculty are part of the committee - Plan to maintain and continue activities through the year including modules in the Foundations in Teaching Excellence program (i.e. Learning Assessment), workshops in mindfulness and resilience, and research into the future of GAI in design.

REPORT: Foundations in Design Second Annual Follow-Up Report

Instructions for Reviewers
Your assessment should ensure that progress on the Goals and Planned Actions is clearly articulated. If no progress has occurred on a Goal and/or Planned Action, please ensure that a clear rationale has been provided.

OVERALL ASSESSMENT:
Please provide a brief assessment of the Annual Follow-Up Report under review and an overall recommendation.
Reviewer #1: This is a good report about an important program in Design and it reflects the faculty members' thoughtful and consistent dedication to FIND. Much of the remaining action here is tied up, however, in the idea of creating a minor in Design Studies, which is (in approval terms) a deeply uncertain endeavor even if the proposal is utterly strong. I am a little concerned of how this plan would look in several years were it to transpire that a minor isn't approved.

I think we can approve this (it's a good report) but the faculty should know this is a risky promise to make and should have a chance to modify it should they wish to.

Reviewer #2: The program has made great progress and achieved the majority of the goals. Approved!

The Report (select the box that corresponds to your recommendation):
☒ Reviewer #1: Recommend for approval by the SSCPR as is
☐ Recommend for approval by the SSCPR pending suggested actions (see below)
☐ Recommend for rejection by the SSCPR

MAJOR ISSUES AND SUGGESTED ACTIONS:
Complete this section <u>ONLY</u> if you have identified the following major issues with the Annual Follow-Up:
   a) Progress to date is unclear.
   b) No clear rationale has been provided for why no progress has occurred.

Issue (page #)	Suggested Action	Program's Response
p.2	The suggestion of pursuing a minor in Design Studies would entail substantially more time investment than may be apparent. Since we do not have a Major in Design Studies this would be treated as an entirely new bachelor's degree, in effect. The report hinges on this.	

MINOR EDITS (Spelling, syntax, word choice and other mechanical issues).
Please list corresponding page numbers. Minor edits are NOT discussed at the SSCPR meeting. Add or remove rows as needed.

Minor Edits (page #)
Page 8: cair ⬜ chair

SENATE
Agenda Number: 5.3
Meeting Date: February 21, 2024
Presenter(s): Donna Danielson

AGENDA TITLE: GEOGRAPHY EXTERNAL REVIEW REPORT

ACTION REQUESTED: Motion

RECOMMENDED RESOLUTION: THAT the Senate Standing Committee on Program Review accept the Geography External Review Report as attached.

COMMITTEE REPORT

For Secretariat Use Only

Attachments

Geography External Review Report

Submitted by

Melike Kinik-Dicleli, Manager of Quality Assurance, Office of Planning & Accountability

Date submitted

February 7, 2024

BA, Major in Applied Geography,
BA, Minor in Geography,
Associate of Arts in Geography,

External Review Report

February 7, 2024

External Review Team Members

Sarah Davidson
BGC Engineering

Bernard Momer
The University of British Columbia

Connie Klimek
Kwantlen Polytechnic University

OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE SELF-STUDY REPORT

Criteria: The Self-Study Report provides a data-supported analysis of the program's strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and challenges. **Standards for Assessing the Report:** ▪ Strengths and areas of improvement identified in the report are supported by data and external review findings; ▪ Recommendations are supported by data, a clear rationale, and external review findings.
The External Reviewers: ☒Validate the Self-Study Report's findings and recommendations ☐Do not validate the Self-Study Report's findings and recommendations

Rationale for this Determination: The external review team (ERT) conducted a comprehensive in-person assessment of the geography program on November 30th, 2023, wherein we had the privilege of delving into the heart of the geography program. During this assessment, we had the opportunity to engage with various aspects of the program, touring the facilities alongside John Martin, Department Head, fostering connections with faculty members, staff, students, and alumni, and absorbing the culture that defines Kwantlen Polytechnic University. The enthusiasm displayed by the faculty members left an indelible mark on our team, creating an atmosphere of collaboration and demonstrating their passion and dedication for their discipline. Their commitment to education and care for their students was palpable, underscoring a collective dedication to the institution's mission and vision. This was illustrated by faculty members organizing and leading after-hours field activities (a majority at the upper "applied" levels) and their support of activities organized by the Geography Club. Our sincere gratitude extends to KPU for the warm hospitality extended during our visit. The thoughtful arrangements made our exploration of your facilities and interactions with various stakeholders even more insightful. We appreciate the openness and transparency displayed by all involved, fostering candid and frank conversations that significantly enriched our understanding of the Department of Geography's strengths and opportunities. Moreover, we would like to acknowledge the meticulous effort invested in preparing the self-study report. It not only provided a comprehensive understanding of the department's goals and achievements, but also reflected a commendable command of detail, presenting a well-structured and insightful narrative. The data provided serves as a foundation for a nuanced understanding of the department's current standing and prospects even though some analysis is derived from a limited data sample. The report presented a thoughtful and honest evaluation of both the program strengths and the challenges it faces. The strengths reported in the self-study (and supported by the observations of the ERT during the site-visit) include: • Enthusiastic, caring, and qualified faculty with obvious desire to ensure the success of their students and the program overall. • High retention of faculty as many have been with the program for decades. • Appropriate facilities that provide ample student access to materials, during and outside of class times. • Curricula and PLOs supported by faculty and students. • High revenue due to international students in lower year classes. A key positive aspect highlighted in the self-study is the learning atmosphere created by faculty; the

enthusiasm and dedication of the faculty was emphasized by both current students and alumni and evident in interactions with the ERT. It is also clear that the degree has the potential to open a wide range of promising career opportunities in government, industry, and education. This diversity of career paths, illustrated in pages 14-18 of the self-study and in discussions with alumni, is reflected by professional associations such as the Canadian Association of Geographers and the American Association of Geographers. However, the alignment of the program with real-world needs is not always clear to current students and there is potential to improve enrollment and student satisfaction through minor changes to program and course learning outcomes, connections with industry, and improvements in advising.

The report also underscores the adequacy of resources and facilities for program delivery, affirming KPU's commitment to providing a conducive learning environment. However, some of these resources are underused (library) or need improvement (GIS software availability and ease of use). The self-study report provides a detailed exploration of these challenges which demonstrates transparency and a commitment to addressing issues constructively, an approach supported by the ERT.

The main weaknesses and challenges identified in the self-study (and supported by our observations) are:

- Despite demand for physical geography classes, there is low enrolment in GEOG 1102; potentially due to the 4-credit status and that it cannot count as science course.
- Declining enrollment in upper-level classes in part due to high proportion of international students not pursuing geography at the upper-level.
- Opposing preferences on class timing (split between those who need night classes and those who prefer daytime).
- Some student disillusionment because of a) poor awareness of career paths, b) class cancellations in upper years, c) lack of course choice in upper years.
- Poor understanding among potential students of what geography is and what career paths it can lead to; poor connections with industry.
- Difficulties with delivery of GIS curricula due to a) difficulty using ArcGIS on own computers (especially macs), b) lack of transparency in schedule for computer lab accessibility.
- Experiential learning delivery inadequate to satisfy student's interest (e.g., outdoor activities, field course, co-ops/practicums).
- Lack of sense of community among students in the first two years of the program.

Enrollment was highlighted by many – from faculty to program advisors and administrators – as key challenge for the department. Despite high overall revenue from international student enrollment in lower-level courses, low enrollment in upper-level and physical geography courses leads to cancellations and limits the delivery of physical geography curricula (despite faculty expertise in this subjects). Many initiatives and creative ideas to boost enrollment and to enhance sustainability through years 3 and 4 of the applied program are being imagined. We recognise the challenge that parsing great ideas are limited by the number of people able to execute and deliver them in an intentional, goal-oriented, strategic way. The Review Team commends the intention and commitment of all the faculty involved. A "Program Logic Model" integrated with a deliberate, intentional Evaluation Plan may be considered as frameworks to help isolate and prioritize program needs, goals, resources, activities, outputs, and outcomes.

The self-study report also points to student dissatisfaction with the time to graduation due to limited course delivery options. Students who met with the ERT expressed the same concerns. This implies a potential misalignment between program offerings and the expectations and preferences of the student body, urging a closer examination of the program delivery. This sentiment may also suggest a potential gap in the curriculum that needs addressing to sustain student engagement and satisfaction. Additionally, the ERT noted a discrepancy between the program's potential and its current market representation. This suggests that a more robust marketing strategy could better reflect the breadth of opportunities the program offers, potentially addressing enrollment concerns.

To sum up, the self-study offers a holistic view of the academic department, highlighting its strengths and acknowledging areas for enhancement. The ERT commends the intention and commitment of all the faculty members involved.

REVIEWERS' VALIDATION OF THE SELF-STUDY REPORT CHAPTERS

CHAPTER 2: Curriculum Review

Criteria: This chapter provides a clear profile of the program graduates, relevant program learning outcomes, and a curriculum mapping assessment that adequately identifies any gaps in the program's curriculum. The assessment is supported by appropriate evidence and conclusions.

Standards for Assessing this Chapter:
- Strengths and areas of improvement identified in this chapter are supported by data and external review findings;
- Recommendations in this chapter are supported by data, a clear rationale, and external review findings.

The External Reviewers:

☒Validate the Self-Study Report's findings and recommendations

☐Do not validate the Self-Study Report's findings and recommendations

---

Rationale for this Determination:

The ERT supports the findings and recommendations outlined in the self-study report, particularly in the following areas:

Enrollment Challenges in GEOG 1102: The review team validated the self-study's identification of a paradoxical situation where there is a demand from geography students and alumni for more physical geography content. Despite this demand, there is a notable enrollment challenge specifically in the GEOG 1102 course.

Career Pathways and Student Disheartenment: Both the self-study and review team observations concur on the significant issue of students not perceiving a clear pathway to careers, leading to student disheartenment midway through their degree. This shared concern highlights the importance of strategic interventions to provide clearer guidance and support for students.

Foundational Skills Enhancement: The recognition of the need for more foundational skills, particularly in writing and oral communication in the lower years, was echoed in both the self-study and on-site observations. The suggestion to offset this by shifting some technical skills to upper-year courses demonstrates a commitment to refining the curriculum for a more balanced educational experience.

Experiential Learning Emphasis: Both the self-study and review team underscore the strong desire for more experiential learning opportunities, including field courses and practicums. The shared commitment to incorporating more outside learning experiences aligns with the program's dedication to hands-on and practical education.

GIS and Cartography: The students interviewed by the ERT expressed concerns with the GIS courses beyond the availability of lab time or software issues. Some felt unprepared to study the material covered in the GIS courses. The ERT endorses the idea of addressing cartographic skills by offering an introductory cartography course early in the program and moving the second year GIS course to the upper level. Topics could include spatial data acquisition, cartographic communication, critical cartographies, even Indigenous mapping. This recommendation aligns with the ERT's recognition of the importance of refining technical skills in response to student and industry demands.

Prescriptive Major Requirements: As indicated in the self-study, the ERT recognizes that the curriculum of the three programs offered reflect the historical context surrounding the creation of KPU. Notwithstanding the

influence of this history on the curriculum, the B.A. major is, compared to several degrees offered at other post-secondary institutions, prescriptive. This is preventing students the flexibility they need to complete their degree in a timely fashion and potentially concentrate on a preferred area of geographical study. We therefore support the revision of upper-level requirements (see *Prescriptive Requirements* in recommendations section below).

International Students: The ERT supports the continuation of the AA in Geography as this program is attractive to international students. It uses existing courses, and this program does not add any strains on resources.

The ERT, however, identified three areas where our findings diverged from the self-study report:

Limited Discussion on Indigenous Content: There was limited discussion on how to include Indigenous content during the onsite interviews. This divergence suggests potential misalignments in perceptions and priorities that should be addressed in curriculum development. This is perhaps part of a broader faculty-wide conversation to support the inclusion of Indigenous content at the B.A. level requirements.

Flexibility in Program Requirements: While the self-study proposed adding requirements for quantitative and qualitative mandatory methods at the second-year level, the on-site observations generally supported having fewer requirements and greater flexibility in the programs. The recommendation to integrate relevant skills into existing courses, however, aligns with the call for a more adaptable and responsive curriculum.

Online vs. In-Person Class Challenges: The program's acute awareness of the struggle to find the right balance between online and in-person classes, particularly in light of the Covid-19 pandemic, was highlighted by the ERT. The team acknowledged the risks and benefits associated with online course delivery and emphasized the need for ongoing discussions to meet divergent needs while maintaining strong educational pedagogy.

Additional recommendations, if any, identified by the ERT— include a rationale for each recommendation:

Prescriptive requirements: The ERT recommends keeping the comprehensive introduction to the discipline of geography at the lower-level but make the B.A. major program less prescriptive at the upper level so students can choose their path according to their interests and potential career path (e.g., although GIS is a popular and useful course, making it mandatory may turn away students who are aiming for graduate schools or interested in policy or theory rather than applied skills). We therefore recommend organising the upper-level requirements into categories from which students can choose courses (i.e., 3 credits in human geography, 3 credits of methods, 3 credits of physical geography, 18 credits at the 3000/4000 level with at least 9 credits at the 4000 level). This would alleviate timetable pressures identified by the students during our interviews and ease educational planning pressure. This might require tweaking some prerequisites.

In the spirit of utilizing limited resources effectively, we recommend to discontinue the mandatory regional geography course as discussed in the self-study and perhaps, replace it by an optional integrative theme (physical/human) upper-level place-based course focussing on an area of the world (e.g., geo-political conflicts) where topic and geographical area could be rotated to facilitate teaching by several faculty members (or perhaps a sessional instructor).

GEOG 1102: Ensure that Geography 1102 is re-listed as fulfilling a B.A. degree science requirement to encourage higher enrolments and potentially attract geography majors. This course should also return to a 3-credit course to better align with the BC Transfer Guide to enhance transferability to and from other institutions. The Department should also ensure that the course can be used to gain professional designation (e.g., P.Geo. through EGBC). The ERT's discussion with programs advisors and the dean/assistant dean indicated support for this approach. The lower revenue triggered by the reduction in credit could potentially be offset by higher enrolment. To reduce the cost associated with the delivery of this course, the ERT recommends considering reducing the number of labs or using online lab exercises or digital tools instead of in-person labs. Some techniques not covered could instead be presented in a second or third-year course lab as they become needed.

PLOs: Explore the possible integration of learning outcomes between courses. That is, can two courses be combined into one? Can more experiential and/or service-learning opportunities be integrated into all classes?

Course names: Consider changing some course names so they sound more appealing to students outside of geography and give a clearer impression of course content. Consider also revamping course descriptions to point toward potential applications/relevance of the learning outcomes.

Addition of "Either-Or" Prerequisites: Consider removing some geography prerequisites or adding pre-requisites from other programs where feasible to limit barriers to students from other departments entering 2000-level or higher courses. For example, if a student has already completed a qualitative research course in Sociology, they should have enough background in methodology to take a geography course that has a methodology prerequisite. Adding 'or SOCI XXXX' to a geography courses prerequisite could potentially encourage a sociology student completing a major to add a minor in Geography. We strongly support working with the Faculty of Science and Horticulture to pursue such arrangements and create more opportunities for students.

Advisory Committee: Engage a PAC (see Chapter 3) in a review of PLOs to ensure that they provide a clear link to career paths students may pursue.

GIS Delivery Collaboration: To address the potential challenges in delivering GIS courses, the ERT suggests accessing the KPU Teaching Learning Innovation Fund. This funding could be allocated to establish a GIS Student Champion for Open-Source support, particularly in cases where IT is unable to provide the necessary

assistance. This proactive measure ensures ongoing support and expertise in GIS, aligning with the program's commitment to staying at the forefront of technological advancements.

Emphasis on Experiential Learning and Fieldwork: Fieldwork emerged as a key area of interest identified by faculty members and students alike. The ERT proposes an exploration of how experiential learning, integrating field study, Indigenous experiences, and existing programs/courses in Science and Horticulture, could be expanded, integrated, or offered as optional-equivalent courses. Additionally, the suggestion to survey students and alumni on their areas of interest, and career aspirations, can potentially draw common themes for a more focused program delivery.

Citizenship and Global Perspectives: Citizenship and global perspectives can be strengthened by enhancing curricular coverage of Indigenous content and integrating field study in northern B.C. communities with the assistance of KPU's International and Rural Development departments.

Reassessment of Prerequisites: The ERT identified the necessity for a review of the prerequisites of upper-level courses, encouraging a comparison of learning outcomes to prerequisites and co-requisites. Anything not supported with evidence as necessary to meet learning outcomes should not become a barrier for entry.

CHAPTER 3: Program Relevance and Student Demand

Criteria: This chapter adequately assesses program's relevance, faculty qualifications and currency, connections to the discipline/sector, and student demand. The assessment is supported by appropriate evidence and conclusions.

Standards for Assessing this Chapter:
- Strengths and areas of improvement identified in this chapter are supported by data and external review findings;
- Recommendations in this chapter are supported by data, a clear rationale, and external review findings.

The External Reviewers:
☒Validate the Self-Study Report's findings and recommendations
☐Do not validate the Self-Study Report's findings and recommendations

Rationale for this Determination:

Surveys of faculty, current students, and alumni indicated high levels of satisfaction with the geography curriculum, with satisfaction consistently higher for the BA Major and Minor program than with the AA program. The self-study report highlights that student satisfaction is bolstered by the perceived relevance of the program, with the greatest endorsement for the BA Major program; 100% of faculty consider the BA Major program to be relevant to the needs of the discipline/sector and feel the program prepares students for a career in a related field.

It is noteworthy that the data used for these surveys was obtained during the Covid Pandemic using an extremely small sample size, which renders the evaluative data unreliable. Although the ERT has approached the survey data with this in mind, we generally encountered high levels of satisfaction in our discussions with faculty, students, and alumni. Overall, we agree that, although there is room for improvement, the foundation of the program is strong and there is a clear desire to improve the program.

The self-study report identified multiple areas for improvement that are backed by the ERT based on our on-site interviews and discussed in the following paragraphs.

Relevance of PLOs: Despite the high satisfaction from within the program, alumni and discipline/sector survey respondents consistently rated PLOs as less relevant than members of the department. Discipline/sector respondents considered general PLOs related to interpersonal skills to be the most important (e.g., time management, teamwork) while only 32% to 52% of respondents considered more specialized PLOs to be relevant. The ERT agrees that more generalized skills are likely to be most relevant to employment and supports the conclusion that as a broad discipline, Geography is well positioned to deliver these skills. Several of our recommendations address ways to enhance the development of these skills in lower-level courses to improve satisfaction and employability for students completing the AA or BA Minor program.

Career Pathways: Geography is a highly relevant discipline and students and alumni both emphasized that they enjoy the breadth of the geography program, which is inherently interdisciplinary and can lead to a broad range of careers. In Chapter 2, the self-study report lists over 25 potential occupations for graduates, ranging from park ranger to teacher to emergency manager. However, students and the program advisor also communicated that they often feel discouraged by the lack of clear career pathways and experiential learning (e.g., field courses, practicums). The ERT identified, and wishes to highlight, the need to provide students with a smaller number of clear career pathways (e.g., by grouping the many potential occupations into 'career streams.' We also encourage the department to consider the curriculum recommendations presented in

Chapter 2 (i.e., providing more options in upper-year courses and cross-pollination between departments) to enable students to select courses that support their selected career stream.

Connections to Discipline/Sector: The self-study report points out that connections to external discipline and sector organizations are nearly nonexistent and that the program does not currently have a Program Advisory Committee. It is clear from both the self-study report and the ERT's interview that outreach to industry is primarily through alumni. This limits the range of career options that students are exposed to, especially since only 40% of alumni work in related fields. The ERT commends the departments ongoing outreach activities (e.g., Kwantlen Science Challenge, Geo Forum, Alumni Outreach Coordinator) and supports the conclusion in the self-study report that more systematic connections are needed with external groups. Given that only 10% of discipline/sector contacts are satisfied with their connections to the department, there is clearly untapped potential for student mentorship. We provide several and additional recommendations in the following section to foster increased industry connections.

Underuse of Physical Geography Expertise: The self-study report highlights a mismatch between faculty expertise in physical geography and course offerings. This is closely related to the paradoxical issues with enrollment also discussed in Chapter 2 (and below); despite strong demand from students and alumni for physical geography content (also emphasized in ERT interviews) and teaching strength, there is poor enrollment in physical geography courses. This has led to underuse of physical geography expertise, impacting morale within the department, and threatens the position of the lab assistant.

Enrollment Challenges: The self-study report also presents an overall enrollment issue, with enrollment declining steeply in upper years. This is in part due to the relatively high enrollment in lower-level courses (especially GEOG 1101), which is bolstered by high numbers of international students attending KPU for 2 years. The ERT observed the effects of these enrollment challenges in our interviews, with faculty and students alike expressing frustration about class cancellations, the lack of physical geography offerings, and the inability to offer some courses for several years. Given the relatively high revenues (due to international student fees) faculty expressed a strong interest in offering courses despite lower enrollment. The ERT support the recommendations offered in the self-study report and offers additional longer-term suggestions for outreach aimed at increasing interest and enrollment in geography. Chapter 2 also presents recommendations to make course offerings more self-explanatory and appealing, by updating course titles and descriptions, as well as strategies to reduce delays in graduation.

Additional recommendations, if any, identified by the ERT— include a rationale for each recommendation:

Relevance of Program PLOs: The ERT agrees that general interpersonal skills are likely to be the most relevant for future employment and note that many of these skills are taught in upper-year courses with lower-year courses focussed on methods and more specialized topics. We recommend incorporating small presentations and writing assignments into lower-year courses to improve oral and written communication skills. Specialized skills can be moved to upper-year courses, or in some cases removed; employers in geography-related fields tend to value individuals who show a strong ability to learn rather than those with specific hard skills. Program relevance can also be increased (and laboratory time reduced) by updating the approach to teaching some skills (e.g., using satellite imagery instead of maps).

Student Advising/Marketing: Identify several (e.g., 5-6) clear and tangible potential career streams in geography, each containing one or more of the 25+ potential occupations identified in the self-study report. Develop graphics (with pictures!) showing the path to that career in geography (e.g., integrate QR that lead to more information about specific career paths or video clips with alumni and/or industry testimonials about careers). Students should have a clear understanding of the potential combinations of courses to take to prepare for that career stream (e.g., teaching, urban planning) or to prepare for the additional education needed to reach it (e.g., graduate school, engineering, law).

Identify Course Requirements for Professional Designations: For physical geographers working in industry, professional designations are an asset, if not essential. Given the emphasis on human geography within the KPU geography department, physical geography students will inevitably need additional education to pursue a professional designation (e.g., to be a professional geoscientist (P.Geo.) registered with EGBC or a professions agrologist (P.Ag.)). Regardless, the ERT recommends that faculty and advisors familiarize themselves with the requirements for these professional designations and identify pathways for students to satisfy requirements (e.g., determine how many of the requirements can be completed at KPU and which/how many will need to be completed elsewhere, either subsequently or concurrently).

Program Advisory Committee (PAC): Create a PAC that includes stakeholders from Government, Non-Government Organizations, Industry, and Education. This is critical to achieve alignment between the departmental perceptions and industry perceptions of the relevant of the PLOs and CLOs and is strongly supported by the dean and assistant dean. Bi-annual meetings to explore strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT) to the Program is important for remaining current and orienting the Program toward trends/priorities in B.C. Given that only 10% of the industry contacts surveyed were "satisfied" with the connections they have with the Program, there is clearly appetite from industry to improve connection with the department, to provide program-level guidance and to participate in student mentorship.

Connections to Industry: The ERT identified several simple ways to enhance connections between students and community members working in geography-related fields. Ideas include:

   a) **Panels:** invite several contacts working in various careers to an evening panel open to all students. Panel members answer student questions. For example, on ERT member recently participated in a BCIT industry night where students rotated through in groups speaking to each panel member individually at tables and then asked questions of all panel members in the larger group at the end.

   b) **Guest Lectures:** invite practitioners in various industries to provide guest lectures on relevant course topics. For example, guest lecturers can teach students about a lecture topic by presenting a real-world project example or can guide a site tour or field trip.

   c) **Mentoring:** Match students with people in geography-related careers (including alumni) in a formalized mentoring program. This can involve a small time commitment; by meeting with mentors as few as 2-3 times students will have better insight into the actual nature of the career path that

interests them and will have a useful contact in that field. This could also be done more efficiently by matching 2-3 students with similar interests to a single mentor and encouraging them to meet as a group to reduce the time commitment for the mentor.

The ERT recommends tracking the effectiveness of these efforts through both student satisfaction polls and statistics such as program enrollment.

Community Outreach: The ERT and members of the department both identified issues with a lack of understanding of geography as compared to other subjects; many students did not understand what geography was when they entered their first class and ended up majoring in geography largely by chance. The ERT recommends that the department consider increasing outreach to high school students to increase awareness about what geography is and what careers are available to geography graduates. This is undoubtedly a long-term strategy but could be made more effective in the short-term by a) identifying and targeting the local schools that are most likely to provide KPU students, b) leveraging existing connections to schools (as many KPU geography alumni enter teaching), and c) building such efforts into course curricula (e.g., assigning students to present a concept to a high school class as part of their course work, thereby improving presentation skills while also potentially recruiting future geographers).

CHAPTER 4: Effectiveness of Instructional Delivery

Criteria: This chapter adequately examines the effectiveness of the instructional design and delivery of the program and student success. The assessment is supported by appropriate evidence and conclusions.

Standards for Assessing this Chapter:
- Strengths and areas of improvement identified in this chapter are supported by data and external review findings;
- Recommendations in this chapter are supported by data, a clear rationale, and external review findings.

The External Reviewers:
☒Validate the Self-Study Report's findings and recommendations
☐Do not validate the Self-Study Report's findings and recommendations

Rationale for this Determination:

A common theme of strong relationships between students and faculty resonated in discussions with many stakeholders. Students believe Geography faculty to be "*Good people. Good profs. Seen repeatedly and become familiar with each throughout the program. They are very accessible. Kind. Caring. Available all hours. Keen. They go out of their way. They motivate us. We connect on a personal level. They are authentic. They are not power-over us. They help 'beyond Geography'*".

These relational-emotional qualities between faculty and students are recognized as the binding "mortar" among the content "bricks;" key for success in any program (or organization) and fundamental building block for effective learning. The Program should be proud of its reputation.

It is evident that students feel cared for by the faculty – many mentions of the relationships that they built with the faculty. It was consistently emphasized that any shortcomings in the department were not due to the faculty. Alumni and students emphasized that they appreciate a) building rapport with faculty over the years through multiple courses and developing personal connections with faculty who demonstrate the vulnerability to share their own struggles, b) the mix of instructional styles, c) the small program size which promotes connections between students in upper years, d) hands-on learning and labs, including access to lab material (e.g., rock samples and maps) outside of class time.

Geography classroom and equipment are very good. Access to a dedicated classroom where students can access equipment and minerals outside of class time is something that students do not necessarily get at other larger institutions (e.g., UBC). Teaching is clearly a strength of the department. The main issue is getting the students into the classes in the first place and continuing to be able to deliver courses despite low enrollment. Students do not have the time nor money to be delayed in their academic pursuit. Canceling classes impacts reputation and trustworthiness and integrity of KPU's offerings which, inevitably, impacts students choosing Geography at KPU if completion cannot be guaranteed within student's timelines/goals.

Additional recommendations, if any, identified by the ERT—include a rationale for each recommendation:

Program Recommendations to enhance student success are valid and accurate, especially in helping reduce undue delays (waiting a year is unfair) in accessing required courses. Consideration should be given to:

Pedagogy:

a) Consider adopting alternate ways to deliver the curriculum. Some courses could be "flipped" by assigning pre-labs, pre-homework, and pre-hands-on learning activities so that when students arrive in class, faculty can be better used as a facilitator, guide, resource, and content expert to help students make sense of their pre-assignments to meet instructional objectives.

b) Incorporate greater focus on key 'soft skills' in (larger) early year courses; KPU's first year courses are very small (e.g., compared to UBC) so it should be easy to incorporate things like "Geography in the News" where students present on a geography topic each week.

c) Build AI (Artificial Intelligence) skills into teaching moving forward as much as possible *"people worry that their job will be taken by AI but it will actually be taken by someone with your degree who uses AI"*; e.g., accept that students will use ChatGPT for many written assignments and create assignments that actually build on that (e.g., figuring out how to word your prompts to get the best possible answer from ChatGPT and check (and cite) actual journal articles to see if ChatGPT got the answer right.

d) More experiential learning needed. Students expressed interest in more field trips, a field course (which would also enhance student bonding), and advisors suggested a practicum early in the degree program similar to what is offered in Criminology.

GIS Courses:

a) Q-GIS and ArcGIS. Use the one that is a) used most often in industry (consult with PAC) b) compatible with MACs and PCs and c) available in Library and PC Lab.

b) Ensure computer lab has an online schedule, or a classroom schedule clearly posted outside to lab, so students know when the lab room is available to complete GIS-related assignments.

Course Delivery:

a) Poll students on preferred class timing. Students and alumni interviewed indicated that they are not keen on evening classes (7-10 PM).

b) To ensure flexibility and student access to certain courses, consider the balance between online and in-person classes.

Program Completion: To shorten time to program completion and limit student dissatisfaction from course cancellations, the Department should:

a) Define conditions that constitute "hardship" (e.g., delaying graduation by a year, graduate school admission delays) and allow students to substitute requirements with other KPU classes when conditions are met.

b) Inform students that they can attend other institutions to complete cancelled classes if needed.

c) Consider offering summer courses.

d) Consider reaching out to other geography program in the Vancouver region to coordinate course offerings or at least direct students in need of a course to consider taking it at another institution.

CHAPTER 5: Resources, Services and Facilities

Criteria: This chapter adequately assesses the program's resources, services, and facilities from both the student and faculty perspective. The assessment is supported by appropriate evidence and conclusions.

Standards for Assessing this Chapter:
- Strengths and areas of improvement identified in this chapter are supported by data and external review findings;
- Recommendations in this chapter are supported by data, a clear rationale, and external review findings.

The External Reviewers:
☒Validate the Self-Study Report's findings and recommendations
☐Do not validate the Self-Study Report's findings and recommendations

Rationale for this Determination:
The ERT's site visit corroborate and support the resource, services and facilities analysis presented in the departmental self-study, with the caveat that the survey analysis, as mentioned earlier in this report, is based on a limited number of survey participants.

The review team acknowledges the commendable performance of student services, particularly the library and academic advising. These services were recognized for providing valuable support to students. However, insights from conversations with a library representative indicated that some library resources are underutilized by students and faculty members. Few students in the geography programme make 1:1 appointments with the library staff (fewer than students from other departments). While this observation suggests an opportunity for greater integration of library resources into the academic experience, the review team recognized the need for a more comprehensive understanding of the situation to offer informed recommendations. Similarly, Academic Advising provides valuable support to students and is recognized as such, however, better communication between this group and the Department could help inform students of potential course cancellations and potential alternatives to fulfill certain program requirements. Regarding administrative support, the ERT noted a lack of sufficient information to offer a conclusive opinion on its effectiveness. However, they emphasized the critical role administrative support plays in the success of any academic program, urging the need for further exploration and enhancement in this area.

The ERT recognizes the pivotal role played by the laboratory instructor in the delivery, cohesion, and marketing of the program. This highlights the importance of investing in and supporting the laboratory components, albeit in revised form, to ensure the overall success and appeal of the program.

One standout recommendation from the self-study is the establishment of a GIS working group as a priority. This group would address concerns related to GIS software and hardware, ensuring the efficient delivery of GIS courses. Furthermore, the ERT supports revisiting the use of ESRI ArcGIS as the foundation of GIS education. With the increasing prevalence of open-source GIS approaches in industry and research, the team believes that incorporating these alternatives could provide students with more accessible and versatile tools both inside and outside the class/lab spaces. This strategic shift aligns with industry trends and will enhance the program's adaptability to evolving technologies.

Additional recommendations, if any, identified by the ERT—include a rationale for each recommendation:

Library:

a) **Budget:** The library is not using the full budget it is allocated for the purchase of geography materials. The ERT recommends considering the re-direction of funds for GIS improvements such availability of hardware or software through the library.

b) **Pedagogy:** The ERT also suggests considering the inclusion of assignments integrating information literacy components as these have the potential to improve library resources use. Incorporating research projects encourages the use of online library resources (like web of science) to find journal articles; this will be very useful in later careers (and life). As noted in previous section this can be integrated with AI (: e.g., figuring out how to word your prompts to get the best possible answer from ChatGPT and check (and cite) actual journal articles to see if ChatGPT got the answer right).

Academic Advising:

a) Ensuring students seek academic advice as early in their program as possible, preferably by the end of their first year of study. Considering upper-level courses; earlier intervention would be useful, as students seem to be disillusioned in upper years as they do not have a clear vision of potential career paths.

b) Ensuring the academic advisors are informed of possible course cancellation so they can advise students to consider fulfilling requirements at other institutions to avoid delays in their academic progression or consider the articulation of geography courses taken during an exchange semester, so they satisfy program requirements (currently discouraged).

c) As recommended in Chapter 3, Academic Advising should be aware of the courses needed to achieve professional designations in physical geography-related careers (e.g., P.Geo., P.Ag.) and able to advise students on which KPU courses meet the requirements/additional education needed in other departments or institutions.

Computer lab access: Computer labs need to be more accessible for students outside of scheduled classes. An online booking system has been created in the Faculty of Health. This could be explored for knowledge transfer purposes.

Mentoring: Students could benefit from a "peer mentor" who is paid by the department. This role is often filled informally by an upper-year student. However, this leaves the availability of this much-needed peer mentorship up to chance and leaves a hole when the student graduates.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

The geography program undeniably stands as a hidden gem within Kwantlen Polytechnic University's academic offerings. The self-study has brought its strengths and potential into sharp focus by clearly and distinctly outlining the needs of the program. Its comprehensive scope and attention to detail have provided a solid foundation for understanding the current state of the geography program and identifying areas for improvement.

Throughout this review process, the commendable efforts of the faculty have not gone unnoticed. The dedication and openness to transformative ideas exhibited by the faculty are key elements contributing to the success of the department. It is evident that the faculty members go above and beyond, forming meaningful relationships with students and creating an environment where students feel cared for and supported.

The department is currently in good shape, with enthusiastic faculty members, adequate geography facilities, and a strong advising team that actively supports students. The external review team, having thoroughly assessed the program, expressed overall satisfaction and admiration for the achievements and potential of the geography department. With a few recommended modifications, the program has a bright future and is well-positioned to continue serving its students effectively.

As the department moves forward, however, it is crucial that it maintains the positive momentum generated by this review. Continued collaboration, creativity, and openness to transformative ideas will be essential to further enhance the geography program by resolving issues tied to long degree completion time and curricular design and delivery. The relationships built between faculty and students should remain a focal point, ensuring that students not only receive a quality education, but also feel valued and supported throughout their academic journey. With the collective efforts of the faculty, staff, and administration, the geography program is poised to thrive and make even greater contributions to the institution and the broader academic community.

APPENDIX 1: EXTERNAL REVIEW SITE VISIT AGENDA

Kwantlen Polytechnic University

BA, Major in Applied Geography
BA, Minor in Geography
AA in Geography
External Review Site Visit Agenda

November 30, 2023
Hybrid (KPU (Kwantlen Polytechnic University) Surrey Campus Cedar 2110/Teams)

Thanks to External Reviewers:
Sarah Davidson, BGC Engineering
Bernard Momer, The University of British Columbia
Connie Klimek, Kwantlen Polytechnic University

9:00– 9:30:	Breakfast and Introductions
9:30 – 10:10:	Meet with Program Chair
10:10 – 10:20:	Break
10:20 – 10:50:	Tour of Program Facilities
10:50 - 11:30:	Meet with University Services Panel (Library Services/Advising)
11:30 – 11:40:	Break
11:40 – 12:30:	Meet with Alumni
12:30 – 1:30:	Working lunch with Faculty Members
1:30 – 1:40:	Break
1:40 – 2:30:	Meet with Students
2:30 – 2:40:	Break
2:40 – 3:20:	Meet with Dean/Associate Dean
3:20 – 4:00:	Final Meeting with Program Chair
4:00 – 4:30:	External Review Team meets to discuss findings and coordinate report writing

REPORT: Geography External Review Report

OVERALL ASSESSMENT:
Please provide a brief assessment of the External Review Report under review and an overall recommendation.
Reviewer #1: The external reviewers' comments are thoughtful and thorough. They have focused on program strengths and weaknesses as highlighted in the self-study report. There are several great additional commendations provided by the external reviewers. The program should be cautious as they review these recommendations as some of these ideas may be outside the scope of the department's ability to implement.

Reviewer #2: The report thoroughly evaluates strengths and weaknesses and praises faculty effort.
The study demonstrates that the external review team interviewed teachers, staff, students, and alumni to examine the geography program. The report highlights the program's strengths—qualified staff, proper facilities, and supporting curricula—but also notes enrollment concerns and curriculum conformity with real-world demands. ERT praises the program's potential and faculty's dedication to improvement, suggesting a "Program Logic Model" and Evaluation Plan to prioritize needs and goals.

The Report (select the box that corresponds to your recommendation):
- ☒ Reviewer #1 & #2: Recommend for approval by the SSCPR as is
- ☐ Recommend for approval by the SSCPR pending suggested actions (see below)
- ☐ Recommend for rejection by the SSCPR

MAJOR ISSUES AND SUGGESTED ACTIONS:
While External Review Reports are not returned to the External Review Team for revisions, Reports may contain major issues which the SSCPR should address. These issues could include (but are not limited to): a) recommendations that go beyond the scope of program review; b) names or other identity information.

Complete the table below ONLY if you have identified major issues in the Report. Identify actions the SSCPR should take to address these issues. Suggested actions could include (but are not limited to): a) redacting names or other identity information; b) providing an SSCPR Response that provides the External Review Team's recommendations in context. Add or remove rows in the table below as needed.

Issue	Suggested Action for the SSCPR
	Please note the following are a few considerations for the program to take into account rather than any action items for SSCPR
Page 07 – T Prescriptive requirements: The recommendations to keep the program less prescriptive for upper level courses sounds reasonable.	However, to implement the suggested course of action, the program may need review its curriculum map and determine how these recommendations will align with the PLOs of the program.
Page 07 – The section on PLOs- Although this is labelled as PLOs, I believe the reviewers are referring to CLOs.	Request the program to make a note of this when developing the QA plan.
Page 11 – Additional recommendations related to the Relevance of Program PLOs. These recommendations are reasonable.	I recommend that the program carry out a review of their graduate competencies if the program decides to go ahead with changes to its competencies and related PLOs during the program change stage.
Page 14 – Additional recommendations on Chat GPT	The recommendations provided on Chat GPT is interesting. See KPU guidelines when executing these recommendations

MINOR EDITS (Spelling, syntax, word choice and other mechanical issues).
Please list corresponding page numbers. Minor edits are NOT discussed at the SSCPR meeting. Add or remove rows as needed.

Minor Edits (page #)

SENATE
Agenda Number: 7.1
Meeting Date: February 21, 2024
Presenter(s): Melike Kinik-Dicleli

AGENDA TITLE: MANAGER'S REPORT ON STATUS OF PROGRAM REVIEWS

ACTION REQUESTED: Information

RECOMMENDED RESOLUTION: N/A

COMMITTEE REPORT

For Secretariat Use Only

Context and Background

There are 39 programs (or cluster of related programs) that are at various stages in the program review process.

Phases	Number of programs
Self-Study	14
External Review	5
Quality Assurance Plan	2
Annual Follow-Up Reporting	18
Total	39

Attachments

Manager's Report_Status of Program Reviews_Details for February 2024 SSCPR Meeting

Submitted by

Melike Kinik-Dicleli, Manager of Quality Assurance, Office of Planning & Accountability

Date submitted

February 19, 2024

Faculty	Program	Self-Study			External Review		QA Plan	Annual Follow-up		Progress Update
										The table includes only the reviews in progress.
		Planning Began	Data Collection Concluded	Report Approved	Date of Site Visit	Report Received	QA Plan Approved	1st Report Approved	2nd Report Approved	
ACP	English Upgrading	Dec-18 re-start: Sep-21	Admin Data: Feb-19 Admin Data: April-22 Survey Data: Nov-22							Program received the survey reports on November 25, 2022. The self-study report was due in **May 2023**.
Arts	Anthropology	Sep-18	Admin Data: Feb-19 Survey Data: Feb-19	Apr-21	Oct 18/19, 2021	Nov-21	Jun-22	Jun-23		Second annual follow-up is due in **June 2024**.
Arts	Asian Studies	Oct-22	Admin Data: April-23 Survey Data: April-23	Sep-23	Feb 28/29, 2024					External review site visit is on **February 28 & 29, 2024**.
Arts	Criminology	Jan-2019 re-start: Oct-22	Admin Data: Feb-19 Revised Admin Data: Feb-20 Survey Data: May-20 Survey&Admin Data: Jun-23	Nov-23						External review site visit planning is underway.
Arts	Creative Writing	May-21	Admin Data: Nov-21 Survey Data: Nov-21	Sep-22	Jan 18/20, 2023	Feb-22				Approved pending submission of revisions.
Arts	Education Assistant	Sep-19	Admin Data: Oct-19 Survey Data: June-20	May-21	Nov 25/26, 2021	Jan-22	Oct-22	Oct-23		SSCPR asked program to report on their progress a second time in **October 2024**.
Arts	English	May-20	Admin Data: Jan-21 Survey Data: April-21	Nov-21	Feb 10/11, 2022	Mar-22	Oct-22	Oct-23		SSCPR asked program to report on their progress a second time in **October 2024**.
Arts	Fine Arts	Dec-23	Survey Data: May-23 Admin Data: May-23	Jan-24						
Arts	History	Dec-18	Admin Data: Feb-19 Survey Data: March-20	Feb-21	June 17/18, 2021	Jul-21	Jan-22	Jan-23		SSCPR asked program to report on their progress a second time in **January 2024**.
Arst	Geography	Feb-22	Admin Data: Dec-22 Survey Data: Dec-22	Jun-23	Nov 30, 2023					External review report is in.
Arts	Journalism	Dec-22	Survey Data: May-23 Admin Data: Jun-23	Sep-23	Feb 1&2, 2024					External review report is due on March 1, 2024.
Arts	Language & Culture	Dec-21	Admin Data: May-22 Survey Data: May-22	Nov-22	Mar 8 & 9, 2023	Apr-23	Sep-23			First annual follow-up report is due in **September 2024**.
Arts	NGOs and Nonprofit Studies	Jan-23	Survey Data: Jun-23 Admin Data: Sep-23							Self-Study Report will be discussed at the March meeting.
Arts	Philosophy	Sep-17	Admin Data: Sep-18 Survey Data: Dec-17 (Discipline Survey: Mar-18)	Apr-19	Jul-19	Jul-19	Apr-21	May-22	May-23	Third annual follow-up is due in **May 2024.**
Arts	Political Science	Dec-19	Admin Data: Dec-19 Survey Data: June-20	Apr-22	Nov 7/9, 2022	Dec-22	Jun-23			First annual follow-up is due in **May 2024**.
Business	Computer Science and Information Technology	Apr-19	Admin Data: May-19 Survey Data: Jan-20	Nov-20	Mar 1/2, 2021	Mar-21	Oct-21	Mar-23		SSCPR asked program to report on their progress a second time in **April 2024**.
Business	Economics	Oct-22	Survey Data: Jun-23 Admin Data: Jun-23							Self-study report will be on the agenda for the March 2024 meeting.
Business	Entpreneurial Leadership	Nov-23								Kick-off meeting took place on November 22, 2023,
Business	Global Business Management	May-23								The work on Chapters 1 &2 will start in March 2024.
Business	Green Business Management and Sustainability	May-23								The work on Chapters 1 &2 will start in March 2024.
Business	Marketing	Sep-23	Admin Data: Jan-23 Survey Data: Feb-24							Survey reports are being prepared.
Business	Operations and Supply Chain Management	Jun-23								Program is working on Chapters 1 and 2 of the self-study report.

Faculty	Program	Self-Study			External Review		QA Plan	Annual Follow-up		Progress Update The table includes only the reviews in progress.
		Planning Began	Data Collection Concluded	Report Approved	Date of Site Visit	Report Received	QA Plan Approved	1st Report Approved	2nd Report Approved	
Business	Technical Management and Services	Sep-22	Admin Data: April-23 Survey Data: April-23							Self-Study Report will be on the agenda for the February 2024 meeting.
Design	Fashion Design & Technology	Sep-20	Admin Data: Feb-21 Survey Data: Mar-21	Jun-21	Sep 28/29, 2021	Oct-21	May-22	May-23		SSCPR asked program to report on their progress a second time in **May 2024**.
Design	Foundation in Design Certificate	Oct-17 re-start: Oct-19	Admin Data: Aug-17 Survey Data: Nov-17 (Student Data: Feb-18) Revised Admin Data: Oct-19 Survey Data: Aug-20	Apr-21	June 29/30, 2021	Jul-21	Jan-22	Feb-23		Second annual follow-up report is in.
Design	Interior Design	Sep-18	Admin Data: Nov-18 Admin Data: Sep-19 Survey Data: Nov-18	Jan-20	Jun-20	Aug-20	Feb-21	Mar-22	Mar-23	SSCPR asked program to report on their progress a third time in **April 2024**.
Design	Product Design	Feb-19	Admin Data: Feb-19 Survey Data: Oct-19	Jun-20	Feb 24/25, 2021	Apr-21	Nov-21	Nov-22	Jan-24	SSCPR asked program to report on their progress a third time in **January 2025**.
Design	Technical Apparel Design	Jun-18	Admin Data: Dec-18 Admin Data: Oct-19 Survey Data: Dec-18	Jan-20	Sep-20	Oct-20	Jan-21	Jan-22	Mar-23	SSCPR asked program to report to report on their progress a third time in **March 2024**.
Health	Bachelor of Psychiatric Nursing	Sep-18	Admin Data: Feb-19 Survey Data: Feb-19	Oct-20	Feb-20	Mar-20	Nov-20	Jan-22	Feb-22	SSCPR asked program to report to report on their progress a third time in **February 2024**.
Health	Health Unit Coordinator Certificate	Jan-18	Admin Data: Jun-18 Survey Data: Discipline + Alumni: Mar-18 Student + Faculty: Aug-18	Dec-18	Jun-19	Jul-19				All intakes are suspended. The review is on hold until the future of the program is determined.
Health	Nursing	Dec-23								Kick-off meeting took place on December 13, 2023.
Health	Nursing-AE	Dec-23								Kick-off meeting took place on December 13, 2023.
Health	Traditional Chinese Medicine - Acupuncture	Dec-23								Kick-off meeting took place on December 13, 2023.
Science	Biology	Oct-19	Admin Data: Nov-19 Revised Admin Data: Mar-21 Survey Data: Mar-21	Oct-21	Feb 24/25, 2022	Apr-22	Oct-22	Nov-24		Second annual follow-up is due in **November 2024**.
Science	Brewing and Brewery Operations	Nov-21	Admin Data: May-22 Survey Data: May-22	Sep-22	Mar 14 & 16, 2023	Apr-23	Oct-23			First annual follow-up is due in **October 2024.**
Science	Computer Aided Design and Drafting	Jan-24								Kick-off meeting took place on January 15, 2024.
Science	Bachelor of Horticulture Science	Jan-18	Admin Data: Jun-18 Survey Data: Apr/Jun-18	Mar-19	Apr-19	May-19	Apr-21	Apr-22		BHS is not required to provide annual updates anymore. BHS Plant Health credential is part of the Horticulture Technology program review.
Science	Horticulture Technology Diploma/BHS Plant Health	Nov-21	Survey Data Hort Tech: Mar-23 Survey Data Plant Health: Dec-23 Admin Data: Sep-23							This review is expanded to include the BHS Plant Health credential.
Science	Mathematics	May-19	Admin Data: Jul-19 Survey Data: Faculty: Jul-19 Alumni: Sep-19 Discipline/Sector: Sep-19	Oct-20	Mar 10/11, 2021	Apr-21	Feb-22	Mar-23		SSCPR asked program to report on their progress a second time in **March 2024**.

Faculty	Program	Self-Study			External Review		QA Plan	Annual Follow-up		Progress Update The table includes only the reviews in progress.
		Planning Began	Data Collection Concluded	Report Approved	Date of Site Visit	Report Received	QA Plan Approved	1st Report Approved	2nd Report Approved	
Science	Physics for Modern Technology	May-21	Admin Data: Nov-21 Survey data: Feb-22	Jun-22	Nov 30/Dec 1, 22	Jan-23	Sep-23			First annual follow-up report is due in **September 2024**.
Science	Sustainable Agriculture	Oct-19	Admin Data: Nov-19 Revised Admin Data: Feb-21 Survey Data: Student: Aug-20 Faculty & Alumni: Jan-21 Discipline/sector: Feb-21	Sep-21	Mar 7/9, 2022	Apr-22	Nov-22			First annual follow-up report was due in **November 2023.**