Fleming College

LEARN | BELONG | BECOME

STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL

APDC/ASA EXECUTIVE SUMMARY FOR PROGRAM REVIEW

SUBJECT:	**School of Justice and Business Studies Program Review Report**
PROGRAM	**Police Foundations**
PRESENTED BY:	**Jim Drennan**
ACTION:	**For Discussion / Information**

SOURCE

- Fleming's Quality Assurance Process (College Policy 2-207)
- ASA Committee mandate (Board Policy 1-102J) to conduct reviews of existing programs of instruction on an ongoing basis, subject to current regulation, legislation and policy directives

PROGRAM STRENGTHS

The revised Ministry Police Foundations Program Standards, released in 2011, provided an ideal opportunity for the program to review its strengths, especially in conjunction with the 2010 Program Renewal Strategies which emerged from the curriculum renewal process. A key strength in the program is its concentrated focus on behavioural instruction as a way to enhance the learning experience and better prepare students for a career in the field of law and justice. There are high behavioural expectations of students, both inside and outside of the classroom. This is seen as such a critical element of success, that this review will recommend the formalization of this approach in the creation of a Police Foundations Handbook that will be used by both faculty and students. The manual will include practical details about processes and an articulation of our teaching and learning philosophies in the program. This will encourage consistency, alleviate issues around faculty orientation, and develop a sense of identity and pride within the program.

Another strength of the program is the move toward applied, scenario and problem-based learning. To date, scenario applied learning activities have been limited by space and funding, but with the recent proposal for a dedicated Skills-for-Justice scenario room, these opportunities could be better embedded within the program of study.

Students in the Police Foundations program at Fleming also have the opportunity to engage with an entirely unique opportunity. Our Indigenous Education Experience Program (IEEP) allows students to complete their diploma while taking courses designed from an Indigenous

perspective and with an emphasis on Indigenous peoples, history, spirituality, and culture. Students who complete this initiative receive a special letter upon graduation, with a new direction being a certification or endorsement from the college. This initiative is such a defining strength of Fleming's program that this review will also suggest broadening the opportunity.

PROGRAM CHALLENGES

A constant challenge in Police Foundations is that even with a slowly declining enrolment, the program remains popular as a direct entry program, and this translates into a student population with a wide breadth and range of profile and ability. The reality is that the percentage of students who graduate from the Police Foundations program who go on to become Police Officers is low compared to other college programs (an average of 15%). This is not to say that the remaining students fail to find employment, and in fact, many of them do end up working in some form of law and justice field, just not policing. The challenge remains in building strong and relevant pathways for those students who are not destined for a career in policing, while also finding ways to honour the hard work and commitment of those students who are most likely to make that professional leap.

As with many programs across the province, Fleming's Police Foundations program is experiencing significant decreases in enrolment. This challenge can be partially addressed by working to implement some of the changes noted already. It is also important to note that as we cast our nets wider in terms of recruitment, we may find that fewer of our students are prepared for the rigours of the program, meaning, once again, that we should strengthen our pathways for students who find themselves in Police Foundations, even if policing isn't in their future. A major contributing factor to this decline is the profession's slow migration toward degree status for new recruits (this kind of credentializing has been seen in other professions, e.g. Human Resources and Accounting). Tied to this is increase in the credentials required to become an officer is a growing trend toward civilian policing. In other words, the numbers of activities that were previously the sole domain of uniformed officers are becoming civilianized.

KPI RESULTS

KPI 1: Graduation Rate:

- There has been a decline in graduation rate for the PF program from 2008's score of 66%, which was then on par with the system, to 52% in 2012, below the system score of 58%.
- The fitness requirements of the PF program have long provided a barrier to graduation for some of our students, and this report will recommend addressing this.

KPI 2 Overall Employment Rate
KPI 3 Related Employment Rate

- The scores for KPI 2 have always been relatively strong, typically more or less on par with college and system scores. However, the scores for KPI 3 have been consistently below both the college and system scores. This is due, in large part, to a significant program challenge noted earlier: very few students of Police Foundations will ever find employment as Police Officers. This report will make recommendations for supporting all of our students through well articulated curriculum streams and program pathways.

KPI 4 Graduate Satisfaction with Generic and Vocational Learning Outcomes

KPI 11 Graduate Satisfaction with Program

- These scores continue to be higher than both the college and system. In 2012, PF reached a five year high in both KPI 4 (95) and 11 (93).

KPI 8: Student Satisfaction with Learning Experience
KPI 9: Student Satisfaction with Teachers

- Again, these scores have historically been strong for the PF program, consistently scoring on par, or higher than college and system scores.

Please see Appendix 1 for program excerpt from the KPI Report

STUDENT DEMAND

- The student demand for the Police Foundations Program is weak, meaning that our enrolment growth is less than the system demand and is less than 1%.
- There has been a steady, slow decline in enrolment numbers in the program, however, this report will put forward recommendations designed to encourage growth, including the creation of a dedicated simulation space for applied learning.

Please see Appendix 2 for program excerpt from the Enrolment Trend Report (please note that there is an error in the 2010 enrolment figure—it should be 183 and not 21).

COMPETITOR ANALYSIS

- The competitor analysis for the Police Foundations program is strong, meaning Fleming's conversion ratio is greater than 2 below the system.
- For the last five years, Fleming's conversion ratio has consistently been 5:1 or lower, while the system's is 7:1.

Please see Appendix 3 for program excerpt from the Conversion Report.(please note that there is an error in the 2010 conversion data—there were 786 applicants, 183 enrolled students, resulting in a conversion ratio of 4:1 and not 37:1)

FINANCIAL ANALYSIS

- The financial analysis for Police Foundations is strong
    - Contribution to overhead: 49.3%
    - Program Weight: 1
    - Funding Unit: 2

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

A summary of the recommendations contained within the full report.

NOTE: Recommendations should clearly differentiate between those strategies that build upon strengths versus those developed to address any gaps that may exist

Recommendations Building on Program Strengths:

- Develop a program manual for faculty and students: A Police Foundation specific version of Student Rights and Responsibilities that is accessible to students and faculty. This will encourage consistency, alleviate issues around faculty turnover, and develop a sense of self-regulation within the program. The manual will include practical details and an articulation of our teaching and learning philosophies in the program.
    - Formalized screening process for Field Placement students
    - Behaviour expectations for students (classroom behaviour, dress code, etc.)
    - Academic integrity
    - Guidelines for volunteering
    - Recognize student contributions to their community, and where leadership opportunities are seized
    - Emphasis on soft skills for career success
    - Treatment of facilities made available for learning opportunities (i.e. scenario room)
- Re-imagine and restructure IEEP (formerly, Aboriginal Emphasis AI) to be delivered across multiple courses to ALL students (beyond the four courses presently supporting IEEP content).
- Continue to advocate for dedicated space within the college for Skills-for-Justice specific scenario/problem-based learning
- Explore possibilities for a non-fitness stream:
    - Offer a classroom based wellness course as an equivalency for Fitness 1
    - Starting in semester 3, students could opt to pursue alternate classroom courses instead of “Fitness 2” and “Fitness 3.” For example, “Civilian Policing 1” and “Civilian Policing 2.”
    - Consider approaches for acknowledgement of student’s chosen stream (e.g. letter from the Dean, etc.)
- Reduce Fitness II to 30 hours and offer a ConEd support class (Police Fitness Support Class) to students who need additional support for the fitness requirements
- Continue to monitor civilian policing as an industry trend and continue to engage in curriculum renewal to address alternate stream and/or Grad certificate of civilian policing.
- Increase pathways for students of the PF program who will not ultimately pursue--or will not be successful in their application to-- a career policing, such as civilian policing, military service, security, etc.

<u>Recommendations Developed to Address Gaps Identified</u>:

- Redevelop program contact with students in the common first semester (the contact that was lost in the removal of Careers from semester 1)
- Add Mental Health Course (45 hours) to semester 3. This course will focus on both the mental health of community members and personal mental health and wellbeing
- Increase Community Policing/Community Agencies from 30-45 hours to address victim issues
- Add Synthesis Course (30 hours) to semester 4
- Add a preliminary Field Preparation course (15 hours) in third semester to complement the 15 hour Field Preparation course in fourth semester.
- Remove Civil Law from program (currently in semester 3)
- Remove Contemporary Social Issues from program (currently in semester 2)

- Move Interpersonal Group Dynamics to 2nd semester and rename course "Police Teams."
- Move Federal and Provincial Stats to semester 2.
- Where needed, update course curriculum and programming to align with program standards, best practices in teaching, industry trends
- Explore assessments across the curriculum to ensure that best practices in assessment are being used and that we are measuring outcomes in the most effective and relevant way for our students

PROGRAM REVIEW PANEL

Program Review Panel Meeting Date:

November 23, 2012

Program Review Panel Participants:

Dean:	Jim Drennan
Program Co-ordinator:	Joseph Hays (First Year) Brian Cowie (Second Year)
Chair:	Deb Holts
Curriculum Consultant:	Wendy Morgan
External Members:	Constable Mike Penny (Peterborough Lakefield Community Police) Cst. Chauntel Inman, (Recruitment Royal Canadian Mounted Police, Toronto North, Newmarket) Deputy Chief Garry Hull (Port Hope Police Service)

Appendix

KPI RESULTS

KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATOR SUMMARY
5 YEAR HISTORICAL OVERVIEW
KPI DATA FROM REPORTING YEARS 2008 TO 2012

Law Justice & Community Services

Program: Police Foundations - PF

MCU Code: 53008

KPI		REPORTING YEAR 2012 (N)	2012 (%)	2011 (N)	2011 (%)	2010 (N)	2010 (%)	2009 (N)	2009 (%)	2008 (N)	2008 (%)	5-Year Average (%)
KPI1: Graduation Rate	*Program:*	165	52	177	55	218	58	273	55	268	66	57
	College:	3283	66	3154	67	3273	67	3424	67	3456	68	67
	System:	3660	58	3527	61	3460	62	3890	64	3588	66	62
KPI2: Working	*Program:*	55	95	48	85	37	78	28	82	36	100	88
	College:	1424	82	1265	82	1008	85	962	88	1055	90	86
	System:	1323	87	1218	88	977	89	964	93	1066	94	90
KPI3: Working Related	*Program:*	55	24	48	27	37	27	28	43	36	39	32
	College:	1424	51	1265	53	1008	57	962	57	1055	63	56
	System:	1323	33	1218	37	977	40	964	44	1066	44	39
KPI4: Graduate Satisfaction - Generic and Vocational Learning Outcomes	*Program:*	52	95	41	87	29	88	32	91	43	88	90
	College:	1167	87	1042	87	857	88	1235	86	1407	89	87
	System:	1149	85	1074	85	868	87	1281	87	1404	85	86
KPI8: Student Satisfaction - Learning Experience	*Program:*	158	82	190	85	156	89	157	88	152	82	85
	College:	3893	82	3686	81	3550	83	3118	85	3049	84	83
	System:	4437	84	4262	84	3836	84	3506	86	3170	86	85
KPI9: Student Satisfaction - Teachers	*Program:*	158	79	190	81	156	84	157	87	152	81	82
	College:	3893	76	3686	75	3550	76	3118	80	3049	78	77
	System:	4437	78	4262	78	3836	78	3506	82	3170	82	80
KPI11: Graduate Satisfaction - Program	*Program:*	70	93	61	86	49	83	32	91	43	91	89
	College:	1852	83	1627	83	1378	83	1235	84	1407	86	84
	System:	1822	83	1655	84	1337	85	1281	86	1404	87	85

Definition of N Values:

KPI1: Graduation Rate - N = The number of entrants to program

KPI2: Working - N = The number of graduates (valid respondents to Graduate Survey) available for work

KPI3: Working Related - N = The number of graduates (valid respondents to Graduate Survey) available for work

KPI4: Graduate Satisfaction with Generic and Vocational Learning Outcomes - N = The number of graduates (valid respondents to Graduate Survey) who were not attending an educational institution on a full-time basis, and who were employed during the reference week. From 2007 through 2009 the reported N shown was the number of valid respondents to Graduate Survey. However, calculated scores were based on valid respondents who were not attending an educational institution on a full-time basis, and who were employed during the reference week.

KPI8: Student Satisfaction with Learning Experience - N = The number of students (valid respondents to Student Satisfaction Survey)

KPI9: Student Satisfaction with Teachers - N = The number of students (valid respondents to Student Satisfaction Survey)

KPI11: Graduate Satisfaction with Program - N = The number of graduates (valid respondents to Graduate Survey)

College Data - the average of Fleming program scores included in the reporting year. Prior to 2007, only programs included the program review process were used to calculate college data. As of 2007, college data was calculated using all Fleming programs with data for the specified KPI.

System Results - based on all programs with the same MCU code as the program under review. System data was not available prior to 2007.

5-Year Average - the program and system scores are calculated for each KPI from the scores available from 2008 to 2012. For example, if a program has 5 years of data for KPI1 then the average score for KPI1 is based on all 5 scores. If a program has 3 years of data for KPI1 the average score for KPI1 is based on 3 scores. The college score is based on 5 years data (2008-2012).

Prepared by Fleming Data Research (07-2012)

STUDENT DEMAND

ENROLMENT TREND – 5 YEAR SUMMARY
REGISTRATIONS (NOV 1 AUDIT)
ALL COLLEGE PROGRAMS
FALL INTAKE: 2007 - 2011

Program: 53008 - POLICE FOUNDATIONS

	2007	2008	% Change (07-08)	2008	2009	% Change (08-09)	2009	2010	% Change (09-10)	2010	2011	% Change (10-11)	% Mean Growth Rate (07-11)	5 Year Average Reg. Students
ALGONQUIN	420	421	0	421	428	2	428	418	-2	418	424	1	0	422
CAMBRIAN	67	75	12	75	87	16	87	81	-7	81	93	15	9	81
CANADORE	68	79	16	79	94	19	94	85	-10	85	64	-25	0	78
CENTENNIAL	109	138	27	138	139	1	139	143	3	143	150	5	9	136
COLLÈGE BORÉAL	26	21	-19	21	12	-43	12	25	108	25	24	-4	11	22
CONESTOGA	1							4		4	4	0	0	3
CONFEDERATION	60	80	33	80	70	-13	70	67	-4	67	67	0	4	69
DURHAM	136	143	5	143	189	32	189	173	-8	173	187	8	9	166
FANSHAWE	349	353	1	353	338	-4	338	349	3	349	364	4	1	351
FLEMING	178	170	-4	170	166	-2	166	21	-87	21	164	681	147	140
GEORGIAN	175	188	7	188	202	7	202	215	6	215	209	-3	5	198
HUMBER	293	351	20	351	417	19	417	370	-11	370	391	6	8	364
LA CITÉ COLLÉGIAL	155	193	25	193	230	19	230	255	11	255	247	-3	13	216
LAMBTON	46	62	35	62	69	11	69	70	1	70	68	-3	11	63
LOYALIST	84				108		108	103	-5	103	103	0	-2	100
MOHAWK														
NIAGARA														
NORTHERN														
SAULT														
SENECA														
SHERIDAN														
ST. CLAIR														
ST. LAWRENCE														
Total	***2167***	***2274***	***5***	***2274***	***2549***	***12***	***2549***	***2379***	***-7***	***2379***	***2559***	***8***		

CONVERSION REPORT
APPLICATIONS TO REGISTRATIONS (NOV 1 AUDIT)
ALL COLLEGE PROGRAMS
FALL INTAKE: 2007 - 2011

Program: 53008 - POLICE FOUNDATIONS

	App. 2007	Reg. 2007	Conversion Ratio	App. 2008	Reg. 2008	Conversion Ratio	App. 2009	Reg. 2009	Conversion Ratio	App. 2010	Reg. 2010	Conversion Ratio	App. 2011	Reg. 2011	Conversion Ratio
ALGONQUIN	1481	420	4:1	1482	421	4:1	1520	428	4:1	1651	418	4:1	1582	424	4:1
CAMBRIAN	367	67	5:1	370	75	5:1	412	87	5:1	426	81	5:1	439	93	5:1
CANADORE	346	68	5:1	350	79	4:1	407	94	4:1	382	85	4:1	338	64	5:1
CENTENNIAL	994	109	9:1	956	138	7:1	1033	139	7:1	1182	143	8:1	1100	150	7:1
COLLÈGE BORÉAL	116	26	4:1	96	21	5:1	106	12	9:1	95	25	4:1	110	24	5:1
CONESTOGA	5	1	5:1	24			0			0	4	0:1	132	4	33:1
CONFEDERATION	233	60	4:1	238	80	3:1	229	70	3:1	250	67	4:1	256	67	4:1
DURHAM	840	136	6:1	845	143	6:1	885	189	5:1	922	173	5:1	960	187	5:1
FANSHAWE	1527	349	4:1	1563	353	4:1	1668	338	5:1	1750	349	5:1	1727	364	5:1
FLEMING	845	178	5:1	793	170	5:1	772	166	5:1	786	21	37:1	743	164	5:1
GEORGIAN	774	175	4:1	816	188	4:1	907	202	4:1	1041	215	5:1	971	209	5:1
HUMBER	1783	293	6:1	1814	351	5:1	2043	417	5:1	2107	370	6:1	2297	391	6:1
LA CITÉ COLLÉGIAL	365	155	2:1	405	193	2:1	480	230	2:1	483	255	2:1	526	247	2:1
LAMBTON	259	46	6:1	283	62	5:1	290	69	4:1	351	70	5:1	300	68	4:1
LOYALIST	438	84	5:1	469			453	108	4:1	466	103	5:1	469	103	5:1
MOHAWK	998			1056			1242			1294			1236		
NIAGARA	950			1038			1078			1060			1082		
NORTHERN	112			95			138			140			132		
SAULT	204			197			198			161			182		
SENECA	1446			1436			1469			1523			1535		
SHERIDAN	1145			1181			1268			1309			1333		
ST. CLAIR	151			138			178			290			308		
ST. LAWRENCE	787			821			875			951			933		
Total	***16166***	***2167***	***7:1***	***16466***	***2274***	***7:1***	***17651***	***2549***	***7:1***	***18620***	***2379***	***8:1***	***18691***	***2559***	***7:1***