**Program and Curriculum Review Template**

*Instructions: Review all information that is stored on your program and curriculum review web page.*

[***https://department.flemingcollege.ca/pcr***](https://department.flemingcollege.ca/pcr)

*On this template, enter Key Findings only, in brief point form. This is intended to be a reflective, continuous exercise and it is not expected that there will be a written response to every single question. You will work with this document and update it annually. The primary focus on an annual basis will be on the curriculum areas and at the 5 year interval, the document will be a more comprehensive representation of further depth of analysis within each of the sections. Add links to additional information only if you will find it to be helpful in the future use of this document.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Program Coordinator: | | Sara Kelly | | Chair: | Rick Gray |
| Program Review Facilitator: | | | Val Bishop | Date Completed: | June 2017 |
| Program Name: | Sustainable Agriculture Co-op | | | Program Code: | SAG |
| 1.0 Industry Trends and Employment | | | | Summary of Key Findings | |
| 1.1 Industry and Sector Trends  Review and discuss the following:  Industry / sector changes or issues identified by the Program Advisory Committee  Recent labour market data or sector reports as provided by the Fleming Library Researchers.  Recent or anticipated changes in occupational standards, level of entry and credential and / or standards of accreditation  Based on the above, do these changes or issues necessitate changes to your program, either immediately, or in the next few years? | | | | Labour demand and labour supply are expected to be broadly in line for this occupation group over the 2015-2024 period at the national level. This occupation (**Managers in agriculture**) is part of a larger occupational group called **Managers in agriculture, horticulture and aquaculture** (**NOC 082**). For **Managers in agriculture, horticulture and aquaculture**, over the period 2015-2024, new job openings (arising from expansion demand and replacement demand) are expected to total **61,800**, while **53,700** new job seekers (arising from school leavers, immigration and mobility) are expected to be available to fill them.  As job openings and job seekers are projected to be at relatively similar levels over the 2015-2024 period, it is expected that the balance between labour supply and demand seen in recent years will continue over the projection period. [ Source: [Canadian Occupational Projection System (COPS)](http://www23.hrsdc.gc.ca/)  Extensive farming experience (obtained as a farmer, farm supervisor or specialized livestock worker or by working on a family farm) is usually required. A college diploma in agriculture may be required. [Ontario Job Futures – Farms & Farm Managers 8251]  The 2017 PAC meeting was held May 30, 2017. What follows is industry updates as noted in the minutes.   * + Mechanics is changing so much in software   + Financial sustainability of a farm/business is very important. Most people will use Quickbooks, but we need to help them understand how to analyze this.   + More focus on using farm equipment safely – need more time on the tractor   + Sustainable Agriculture - entrepreneurship is the goal   + Other types of agricultural businesses i.e. wholesale should be considered   + Aramark buying $2000 produce from the on-campus SAG garden   + Marketing around hard core sustainable and more conventional   The primary focus for SAg in 2017 and 2018 is to review and renew the curriculum and program design based on comments in Section 3.2 | |
| 1.2 Labour Market and Employment Trends  Review and discuss the following:  Graduate employment statistics over the last few years, including those of students employed in the field, in a related field, outside the field, or unemployed, and any emerging patterns in this data.  Emergent employment trends such as new types of positions, changing job market, regional distinctions, changing employer profile, or emerging skill shortages | | | | KPI 2 Overall Employment Rate 2014 100% 2015 80% 2016 100% 2017 100%  KPI 3 Related Employment Rate 2014 66.7% 2015 80% 2016 50% 2017 100%  https://department.flemingcollege.ca/fdr/attachment/1298/download  Combined 2014/2015/2016 graduate responses total 13 respondents with 69% indicating employment in a related field and 92% indicating that they were working.  With growing consumer demand and improved market opportunities, some farmers see multiple benefits in creating longer term, more permanent positions and providing their employees with training opportunities. This is helping create some stable careers in farming on small scale diversified farms. While these farms will likely always need to hire short term seasonal labourers, these longer term stable positions allow farmers to invest in increased training for these employees as the return on investment is tangible in increased efficiency and increased opportunities for diversification in farm operations. In the past 4 months, the SAG Program Coordinator has had two farmers contact her to inquire about Fleming’s sustainable Ag program, indicating to her that they were considering paying for part of the tuition cost for one of their employees to take the program. In addition to private farm operations providing these career opportunities, there are also similar opportunities opening up with demonstration farms and farm cooperatives (see Appendix A attached for a Farm Team Leader position with the YMCA of Greater Toronto) (Kelly, 2017). | |
| 2.0 Key Performance Indicators  Review and analyze the formal Key Performance Indicator (KPI) results for your program. | | | | Summary of Key Findings | |
| 2.1 Student Satisfaction  In addition to the formal Student Satisfaction KPI results, comment upon any other formal or informal discussions with students and graduates such as *student focus groups*, class councils, class representatives, individuals or delegations, or debriefing sessions following a field placement, clinical placement, or practical work integrated learning experience. | | | | KPI 9 Student Satisfaction with Teachers 2015 90%; 2016 61.9%; 2017 76.2%  KPI 8 Student Satisfaction with Learning Experience 2015 90%, 2016 66.7%, 2017 65%  https://department.flemingcollege.ca/fdr/attachment/1298/download  Data indicates that 75% of the student body is satisfied with the program learning outcomes, the teachers and their learning experiences in the SAG program. Note that data is only available over a two year period for learning experiences and teacher satisfaction and a three year period for program learning outcomes.  The student focus group was conducted with the 2017 class on April 13, 2017. It is important to note that this intake was an unexpected 58 students and decided in the ninth hour where previously class size had averaged 14 students per year. The following are some of the program strengths they noted:   1. Practical knowledge of staff 2. Field trips are fully paid 3. Gain experience from internship 4. Meet new people on farms 5. Environment friendly 6. Good relationship with instructors 7. Online learning 8. Interact with different cultures in own program 9. Coordinator very good and supportive 10. Program tech is the glue of the program and without him would have fallen apart   In addition, below are students comments about changes to consider:  More learning on field crops  Course outlines not matching classes  Appropriate student to teacher ratio, classes too large  Mechanics course, more hands on, not assume prior learning  Lack of teaching methods, poor delivery and presentation of material, lack of classroom management  Standard etiquette in classroom missing  Program schedule and daily schedule not being followed  Change schedule to accommodate part time jobs, “wants three days in a row”  Daily classes are cut short  Class cancelled without notice or reasons  Class cancelled at 10:00 as teacher could not manage class  School not prepared for the class this year  Too anecdotal need substance to back up what’s being said  No mandatory textbooks, so must rely on what you’re given and your own judgement to look for material  Reduce class sizes  No structure in marking, so we don’t know where we are, week 14 we don’t know if we’re going to pass or not  Major lack of rubrics  All contract faculty  Improved communication is required | |
| 2.2 Retention Rate  Please review the retention rates for Fleming College students within each program for Fall intakes 2008 to 2012. The report illustrates the retention of students within Fleming College (i.e. those students who transfer out of their current program, but who remain in the college and progress to the next semester level). The information in this report is based on students enrolled at the 10th day of classes for each semester.  Review patterns of retention on a semester by semester basis as well as graduation rates over the last five years.  Comment on the effectiveness of any strategies adopted to improve student retention.  Please review the IPP (Integrated Program Planning) data that focuses on Retention data. | | | | \*\*Retention rates have been steadily increasing since the 2013 calendar year intake. It is important to note that changes in the traditionally small numbers of students in the program translates to significant impact on averages when looking at retention percentages. The retention rate in 2013 was 54% and in 2016 it was 83%. The highest year was 2014 with an 86% retention (IPP Situational Analysis data). There are currently 58 students registered in the 2017 calendar year (this program runs on calendar year), and retention rates are yet to be determined.  It is anecdotally noted that from 2012 - 2016 the program typically lost 1 student/year during co op and 1 student/year during the first week of Semester 1 (Kelly, 2017)  \*\* While there is Retention data for SAG in the IPP Situational Analysis summary, there is no data in the IPP data entitled Retention. | |
| 2.3 Graduate Rate  Review patterns of graduation rates on a semester by semester basis over the last five years. | | | | KPI 1 Graduation Rate: 2015 86.7% 2016 88.9% 2017 88.9%  https://department.flemingcollege.ca/fdr/attachment/1298/download  On par with system graduation rates averaging 88% for 2014 and 2015 classes. | |
| 2.4 Graduate Satisfaction  Use the FDR report for Program Review – 5 year historical trends to provide your analysis. | | | | KPI 11 Graduate Satisfaction with Program: 2014 86.1% 2015 97.9% 2016 95.8% 2017 77.8%  https://department.flemingcollege.ca/fdr/attachment/1298/download  KPI scores indicate that 92% of graduates are satisfied with the program. | |
| 2.5 Enrolment Trends and Demand  Your team will review and analyze the patterns in the number of program applicants, confirmations and actual registrants over the past 5 years. You will also examine changes, if any, in the student demographic profile and the impact, if any, of this changing student profile on program curriculum.  Assess whether the program curriculum needs to change based on the above analysis.  Use the KPI excel spreadsheet that provides Day 10 enrolment numbers for Fleming for the last 10 years, to assist you with your analysis.  Please review the IPP (Integrated Program Planning) data that focuses on trends related to student demand, and the related ‘Situational Analysis’ information included for your program – select the  Demand Trending Tab and Situational Analysis Tab. | | | | Application data indicates a 45% increase in applications over the Jan 2013 to Jan 2016 period. What is interesting is the increase in applications has not translated into increased confirmations and registrations over the same time period. Confirmations remained stable averaging 9 per year and registrations also remained constant averaging 16 per year. Anecdotally, student numbers have remained stable from 2011 - 2016 at about 14 students/year. The anomaly is the January 2017 - Dec 2017 intake where 57 students were registered in the program.  From 2011 - 2016 we had consistently about 25 - 33% of the class being international students. In 2017 our class of 57 students is 89% internationals students. Of the 51 international students, 49 are from India, the Punjab specifically and have 4 year ag. degrees, with 1 vietnamese and 1 malaysian student. Our domestic students typically do not have an academic background in ag. but come to us from a wide variety of post-secondary fields including, culinary, nutrition, forestry, business, psychology, etc. (Kelly, 2017).  Beginning in January 2018 program cap is set at 2 class sections of 25 students/section for a total student enrollment in SAg of 50. | |
| 3.0 Program Curriculum | | | | Summary of Key Findings | |
| 3.1 Program Learning Outcomes and/or Sector Standards  Review program level learning outcomes in preparation for curriculum mapping (vocational, essential employability skills, general education)  Where applicable review sector standards to ensure program is keeping up with new trends, developments and requirements. | | | | Program Learning Outcomes have been reviewed and are considered to be in line with current industry demands. Thought will be given to include a Vocational Learning Outcome that addresses Technology with respect to the continued development and integration of a “Domain of One’s Own” for students (Kelly, 2017). | |
| 3.2 Program of Study, Course Outlines, Delivery and Program Map  Review the feedback and suggestions received from Course-level survey completed by faculty at the end of each semester.  Review the balance and frequency of assessment types across the curriculum and their appropriateness to learning outcomes for the course and program level outcomes.  Collect a cross section of samples of student work as evidence of achievement of learning outcomes.  Reflect and comment upon the variety of methods used to demonstrate program outcomes.  Reflect and comment upon the degree of technology-enhanced delivery of the program outcomes.  Discuss the degree and depth to which the program is providing work integrated learning experiences.  Record the course in the curriculum that covers the college-wide sustainability learning outcome: “Students will be able to explain the interconnections between the broad principles of sustainability - which include human health and well-being, ecological health, social issues, and secure livelihoods- in order to support a better world for all generations”  Review (or create) Program Curriculum Map(s) to ensure that there is alignment of current courses to the overall program outcomes, including the Vocational Learning Outcomes, the Essential Employability Skills, and adherence to the General Education Policy.  Make recommendations to address any gaps identified or improvements required.  Review the program’s current admission requirements and their suitability in relation to program rigour and student preparedness.  Include an updated program curriculum map on your program and curriculum review web page. | | | | **Program-level comments**  SAg 1 year post-graduate certificate was designed as a “modular” program. During the original program development a number of modules were designed and then packaged together to create a course. Modules are between 1 - 9 days in length and all of our faculty are part-time. This means that some of our faculty only teach for 1 day/ yr and others teach for up to 12 days/year (if they teach more than 1 module). None of our faculty are on campus weekly, have an office on campus, or keep office hours. There is some collaboration between faculty teaching modules within a course but largely our faculty are teaching at a module level rather than a course level. This creates some very significant challenges for students; at the high level it is difficult for the students to understand how all the curriculum fits together and also logistically it creates challenges as they try to figure out where dropboxes for modules are within D2L, what marks fit together to generate a course mark, etc. It also creates some very significant challenges for the Program Coordinator; because our faculty teach “modules” rather than courses, 8 of our 13 “courses” are co-taught by multiple (2 - 4) faculty. There are no faculty course leads to do things like write the course outlines or finalize course marks and enter them into Evolve at the end of each semester. As a result this workload has been taken on by the Program Coordinator.  In addition, because of this modular design there are a high number of faculty teaching in the program….in Semester 1 there are 11 part-time faculty teaching and in Semester 3 there are 9 part-time faculty teaching. This adds to the challenge of ensuring cohesion across the classroom experience for the students and across the curriculum.  Given that the program has been running for 7 years and has been modified a bit here and a bit there over these years, the SAg program curriculum would benefit greatly from undergoing a concerted program redesign led by LDS program designers to overcome the issues identified above as well as other issues not related to curriculum (eg. generating faculty contracts, scheduling classes, etc.) (Kelly, 2017).  **Course-level comments**  We do not really have course level comments because our faculty teach modules.  **SEMESTER 1: Module-level comments**  **AGRI 1 Module 1** (3 hr module for program orientation; lead by Program Coordinator and Program Tech). There are no learning outcomes on the course outline associated with Module 1. This module needs to officially have a faculty assigned, and possibly be expanded to 1 full day especially if our international student enrollment continues to be high.  **AGRI 1 Module 2** (15 hrs). This module has consistently been taught by same faculty member and works well as an initial visioning exercise to get students thinking about their desired farm future.  **AGRI 1 Module 3** (6 hrs). We have had a couple changes in faculty in this module and it has been a struggle to get this module delivered and to have students see its value. NEEDS to be re-evaluated for relevancy and staffing.  **AGRI 2 Module 4** (3 hrs). Could be re-evaluated and likely should be incorporated into AGRI 1 Module 2.  **AGRI 2 Module 5** **and Module 9** (36 hrs total). Faculty indicates “I believe these modules should be combined into a single "Soil Science" module. This will make it easier for the students, and more flexible in terms of taking about Soil Fertility and Soil Sciences.  **AGRI 2 Module 6** (18 hrs total). Faculty has not yet answered survey.  **AGRI 2 Module 7 and 8** (21 hrs total). Faculty has not yet answered survey.  **AGRI 3 Module 10** (27 hrs). Faculty has not yet answered survey.  **AGRI 3 Modules 11 and 12** (60 hrs total). Faculty has been teaching for 4 years and has stated that curriculum is working well with a variety of teaching approaches and assessments.  **AGRI 4 Modules 14,15,16** (54 hrs total). Faculty has been teaching for 3 years and has stated that “This module consistently matches learning outcomes and has been revised every year so it is current.”  **AGRI 4 Module 26 (Part 1) and AGRI 9 (Part 2)**(36 hours total). We have had a change in faculty in the past 2 years. New faculty states “Material being taught is not reflected in the Course Outline. % marks do not reflect actual allocation. Clarity is needed between faculty of who is teaching which parts of the module. Learning outcomes are not captured for material taught.” This faculty has recently indicated that she can no longer teach for the College so we will be looking for new faculty to teach this curriculum. Faculty turnover in this modular design presents some significant challenges.  **APST90**  The learning outcomes have not been aligned with this evolving course. Jan 2017 is the first time that this course has officially been assigned a faculty member. Up until now the Program Coordinator and Program Technician have been running this "course" because the College had never hired a faculty to do so. Learning outcomes and associated curriculum and assessments for this course need to be designed. Existing Coop Planning and Prep course already taught to a number of other Frost programs with coop should be assessed for “goodness of fit” with SAg program.  **AGRI 12 (SDL)**  The situation with this course is very similar to the APST 90 course in that the college has never hired a faculty to teach this course until Jan 2017 when I was hired in week 3 to teach this course. Up until Jan 2017 I had developed projects with community partners and students had worked on these through the term and handed in their project work to me and their host organization. I had assessed their work and assigned a grade. The existing learning outcomes accurately reflect the work being completed and assessed by the students BUT I would like the time to properly develop this course during May/June and as a result to review and if needed revise the learning outcomes.  **AGRI 5** no longer part of program as was never resourced by the College (ie. no curriculum developed, no faculty assigned)  **SEMESTER 2: Module-level comments**  **AGRI 6 Module 18** (6 hrs) No longer part of program as was too repetitive of students’ experiences on Sem 2 5 month coop.  **AGRI 6 Module 19** (18 hrs) Faculty has not completed curriculum survey. I am guessing that this curriculum is fairly refined and solid given that faculty has been teaching it for 5 years now.  **AGRI 6 Module 20** (12 hrs). Change in faculty with new faculty starting in 2016. New faculty focused on some good hands-on activities having students learn how to extract and dry and store seeds from a variety of vegetables.  **AGRI 6 Module 21** (6 hrs). I think this module is ready for an overhaul including looking at expanding it to at least 2 days.  **AGRI 7 Module 13** (18 hrs). Just taken over by new faculty in 2016. I am not very familiar with this curriculum.  **AGRI 7 Module 22** (6 hrs). Did not run in 2016 as students were uninterested/unwilling to spend 2 1/2 hours on bus each way and pay for a meal. Definite need to contract a faculty for this work AND revisit the learning outcomes for this module. It should perhaps not be a “module” at all but the learning outcomes should be incorporated into Module 23.  **AGRI 7 Module 23** (18 hrs). Solid curriculum with long-time faculty member. Faculty states “No revisions needed to learning outcomes, assessments, or sequencing” and “Minor revisions needed to student materials and learning technologies”.  **AGRI 8 Module 24** (30 hrs). Solid curriculum with long-time faculty member. Faculty states “Minor revisions needed to learning outcomes, and use of learning technologies, and no revisions to assessments, or sequencing, or student materials”.  **AGRI 9 Module 25** (30 hrs). Faculty has been teaching for 2 years and states “Major revisions are needed to learning outcomes, assessments, minor revisions for sequencing, and no revisions for student materials or use of learning technologies” HOWEVER changes made to learning outcomes and assessments will likely require major revisions to student materials.  **AGRI 9 Modul 26** (18 hrs). See AGRI 4 comments  **AGRI 10 Module 27** (18 hrs). Change over in faculty took place in  2016 and will again in 2017. There is some solid curriculum in this  module but staffing it has been problematic.  **AGRI 10 Module 28** (18 hrs). Faculty has been teaching for 2 years  and states “Major revisions are needed to learning outcomes,  assessments, minor revisions for sequencing, and no revisions for  student materials or use of learning technologies” HOWEVER  changes made to learning outcomes and assessments will likely  require major revisions to student materials.  **AGRI 11** not part of the curriculum at present. was removed simply  because College had never developed curriculum or assigned  faculty.  **Review of Assessment Types Balance and Frequency**  SAg program has typically relied on 3 assessment types: Presentations, Assignments, and Quizzes.Opportunities to expand assessment types to include demonstrations of hands-on proficiency in tasks like driving a tractor, cutting greens, planting seeds, maintaining seedlings, etc. would be useful. Also expanding testing to include some identification tests for pests, weeds, and parts of mechanical systems (eg. tractor components, tools used on farm, etc).  In terms of frequency I think we have our assessments fairly well spread out throughout the semesters. HOWEVER the faculty teaching the core Sem 3 modules related to Business and Operational Planning has indicated a strong desire to look at re-sequencing the Business Plan and Proposal and the Financials to earlier in Semester 3 to allow more time for students to develop their plans and more time to formative evaluation and feedback from the faculty (Kelly, 2017).  **Degree of technology-enhanced delivery of the program outcomes**  2017 was first year we started to use the “simulator” down in HEO building to provide our students with experience operating machinery like skid steers. Challenge in this was the number of students in the program and the 1 simulator.  I would not say our program relies heavily on technology. Our faculty use the typical MSWord, PPT, Excel programs in their teaching. We do have one faculty that does part of her teaching via Contact North for the past 2 years. This has been working well.  We do rely very heavily on field trips and guest speakers and guest panels. This adds very valuable richness to our curriculum and insures that our curriculum is very current and pertinent as the trips and guests are all actively farming and using the methods and strategies they present on (Kelly, 2017).  **Degree and depth to which the program is providing work integrated learning experiences**  Program includes a 5 month Co op for the whole of Semester 2. Coop provides a substantial opportunity for students to apply learnings from Semester 1.  In addition, during Semester 1 students are involved in conducting Community projects with external partners. This too provides opportunities to integrate some of their learnings in real-world situations.  **College-wide sustainability learning outcome**  AGRI 1 and AGRI 2 cover this learning outcome. In addition the curriculum in all the courses touch on sustainability in many ways.  **Recommendations to address any gaps identified or improvements**  See action plan below.  **Current admission requirements and their suitability in relation to program rigour and student preparedness**  In general our Admissions requirements bring us students who are ready to succeed in this program. However, in 2017 with the substantial increase in international students enrolled it has become very apparent that many of the students from India specifically are not fully prepared to excel in this program. The primary issues encountered are related to a lack of preparedness for post-secondary academic integrity in Canadian context with plagiarism and cheating being significant issues. In addition the international students often vary greatly in their faculty with oral and written english; while some students are quite weak in their language skills others are quite proficient. It becomes very difficult for faculty trying to evaluate the students with weaker language skills as it can be difficult to ascertain meaning in responses given both orally and written (Kelly, 2017). | |
| 4.0 Strategic Positioning and New Opportunities | | | | Summary of Key Findings | |
| 4.1 College and School Alignment  Review program alignment with college priorities such as vision, mission, values, strategic plan, academic plan and the educational mandate, and / or academic priorities of the School. | | | | Program Alignment with College Vision and Values:    The SAG program is aligned with the current College **Vision: “***More than Skills. Fleming will be known for our continuous pursuit of excellence in teaching and every endeavor”;* and College **Values:** *“Learning, Collaboration, Creativity, Continuous Improvement, Sustainability, and Inclusiveness” (Fleming College Strategic Plan, 2015-2018, p. 2).*    Discuss how your program demonstrates the college Vision and/or Values with two or three examples.        Program Alignment with Academic Priorities:    Specifically the SAG program reflects the following Academic priorities:    *“Learning Design: Reimagine and design learning opportunities to fully engage our students using accessible outcomes-based approaches, applied learning and authentic assessment.*  Connection to the Strategic Plan: Priority #1 Deliver outstanding student learning and experiences, and Priority #2 Collaborate and prosper with our communities” (Fleming College Academic Plan, 2015 – 2018, pp. 10 – 11).    The SAG program demonstrates this by … (discuss two or three examples of how your program demonstrates outcomes-based learning, applied learning and/or authentic assessment)        *“Teaching Excellence: Promote and recognize innovation and excellence in teaching by supporting and engaging faculty in industry practices, discipline research, and educational technology.* Connection to the Strategic Plan: Priority #1 Deliver outstanding student learning and experiences, Priority #2 Collaborate and prosper with our communities, and Priority #3 Excel as an organization” (Fleming College Academic Plan, 2015 – 2018, p. 12).    Fleming faculty members are committed, energetic, and creative people who want to contribute to the future of education. Discuss how the college has supported faculty in your program, in their growth as dual professionals, i.e. teachers and subject-matter experts, to achieve teaching excellence. (Discuss how faculty members in your program are lifelong learners, and how they model their expectation of lifelong learning for students and graduates). | |
| 4.2 Competitor Programs  Analyze key parallels and differences between this program and those of its closest competitors, where applicable.  Comment on the ’Value-added’ program distinctions and their attractiveness to prospective students. | | | | My comments on competitor programs are based solely on my own individual experiences in talking with prospective students, students, and graduates, and in discussions with the PAC for the program. I do not feel that we have any really strong competitors at present in the Canadian College system. Our program is quite different in its status as a 1 yr. post-grad certificate and in its entrepreneurial focus, applied curriculum, and with the 5 month co op semester. When talking with prospective students they often say “I could not find any other program like yours”(Kelly, 2017).Educational Competitors:  Fanshawe College – Agri-Business Management Certificate Two 15 week semesters  January and September starts   Ridgetown College (Guelph University) – Associate Diploma in Agriculture Two years/4 semesters  September start Ridgetown College (Guelph University) – Associate Diploma in Horticulture 2 year Diploma   Niagara College – Commercial Beekeeping Certificate 3 consecutive terms   Niagara College – Greenhouse Tech (Co-op) Diploma   **Niagara College – Horticultural Technician Diploma**  2 years   Niagara College – Horticultural Technician Co-Op option 2 year diploma    **Algonquin College – Horticultural Industries Diploma**  Includes Urban Agriculture courses   Durham College – Horticulture Food and Farming Diploma 4 semesters Durham College – Horticulture Technician Diploma 4 semesters   Seneca College – Large Animal Health and Production Certificate - post diploma - 3 semesters La Cite – 4 agriculture related programs   **Boreal – Techniques Agricole**  5 semesters    **Niagara College – Winery & Viticulture Technician**  Diploma  5 non-stop semesters – 2 years total   Trent University – Sustainable Agriculture and Food Systems Degree/4 years  *“Trent is the only school in Canada that offers an arts degree in Sustainable Agriculture”* Kwantlen Polytechnic University, Farm Schools (Richmond Farm School and Tsawwassen Farm School (9 month practical training program in sustainable, small scale farming and direct marketing)[*http://www.kpu.ca/farmschool*](http://www.kpu.ca/farmschool)in BC  Assiniboine Community College - Sustainable Food Systems 1 year Advanced Certificate. [*http://assiniboine.net/program/162/sustainable-food-systems/program-details*](http://assiniboine.net/program/162/sustainable-food-systems/program-details) *in Manitoba* | |
| 4.3 Learning Pathways  Comment on recent or anticipated initiatives that promote student pathways including secondary school partnerships, dual credits, program laddering, dual diplomas, and university transfer, articulations, and partnerships.  Identify any new pathways that could be developed. | | | | Two meetings with Trent University Sustainable Agriculture and food Systems program Chair and Durham College’s School of Science and Engineering Technology Dean (Food and Farming program is within this School) have taken place. In addition to the formal agreement between Trent and Fleming’s Sustainable Ag programs, there is an informal agreement between the three institutions to promote each other’s programs in recognition of the fact that the programs are complementary rather than competitive.  INACAP:  INACAP is a university in Chile. INACAP has contacted Fleming’s Continuing Education office to express interest in having Fleming develop and host a 2 week intensive experience in Sustainable Agriculture for its students. SAF is currently working with Fleming’s Con-Ed in developing this experience and looking at a possible pathway for an INACAP student to enter into the SAG program. | |
| 4.4 New Program or Redesign Ideas  Are there opportunities for new program initiatives based on Program, School, or community strengths and alliances? | | | | At present I feel strongly that the focus needs to be on overhauling our existing program design and curriculum as identified in Section 3.2 Program-level comments (Kelly, 2017). | |
| 5.0 External Relations | | | | Summary of Key Findings | |
| 5.1 Community Partnerships  Does your program have significant partnerships, relationships, connections, or offers of support from the community that help to enrich the program and the student experience?  Are faculty, staff, and student involved in volunteer projects and events? | | | | Yes the SAg program has significant partnerships as follows:   * Farm Field Trip hosts. * Guest speakers and panelists. * Coop hosts \*\*very significant partners without whom we could not have our students meet all program-level learning outcomes. * Community Project partners, the most significant of which is our long-standing partnership and connection to the Lindsay Community Gardeners. * Creation Minerals is a current industry partner that we are conducting a pilot research project with a small grant from Fleming’s Office of Applied Research. If this pilot project goes well in 2017 we are interested in looking for a larger grant to continue the research on a larger scale. * Trent University agreement that allows Trent SAFS students to complete their degree here in the SAg program. * Durham College - this is a weak but still important connection in that we offer complimentary (not competing) programs and sometimes refer prospective students to each other’s programs when appropriate. | |
| 5.2 Program Advisory Committee  Comment on the distribution of Committee membership by constituency, sector, and / or region.  Comment on the vitality of the Committee (frequency of meetings, members’ level of participation, engagement, and turnover.) | | | | SAg PAC currently consists of 11 external members. However, of this 11 only 6 -7 are active. In addition, of this 11, 4 of the members have been on the advisory since the program’s inception (ie. at least 8 years).  **Current members profiles**:   * 6 members are farmers within CKL, Ptbr County, or Northumberland County. * 3 members farm, or are otherwise involved in agriculture, outside of the region. * Of the 9 members who actively farm, 4 are primarily vegetable farmers, 2 are primarily livestock farmers, and 3 raise both crops and livestock. * 4 of the 11 members are involved in organic production. * 1 member is an organic certifier. * 1 member works with Rare Breeds Canada. * 1 member works for a regional not-for-profit agriculture organization. * 1 member work as the Agricultural Development Officer for the CKL. * 1 member runs a hobby farm and is actively engaged in community gardening projects within CKL.   **Vitality:**  The 6 - 7 actively engaged members make significant contributions and observations during the annual PAC meeting. A couple of them also present as guest lecturers in the SAg program. A number of the members have indicated that they would like to be more actively engaged beyond the annual meeting. | |
| 5.3 Alumni Relations  Describe the type and range of alumnae involvement in the program.  Current and future strategies to engage alumnae in the program. | | | | 2 Alumni currently sit on the SAg program PAC. Typically about 2 - 4 graduates will come into the class as guest speakers each year. We know as well that especially for the international students from India that there are often strong connections between students from different years. For example, in 2016 2 our the students from India in SAg each told us that 4 - 5 of their “junior students” from their Ag. university in India would be coming to join the program in 2017. Also, we know that some of our current Indian students have had friends in the program in previous years. It seems that word of mouth advertising for SAg in India in particular is very strong. | |
| 6.0 Program Resources | | | | Summary of Key Findings | |
| 6.1 Program Revenue and Expenses  Please review Integrated Planning and Performance (IPP) information for your program.  Are program resources adequate, in the context of program currency and student numbers? (e.g. laboratory equipment, software, library holdings, or tools essential to program delivery and student learning.  Are there opportunities for further program specific external revenue such as sponsorship, grants, donations or gifts-in-kind?  Review the existing revenue and expenses associated with your program using the IPP tool and provide comments below. | | | | CTO has been increasing and is noted at 8% for 2016 fiscal year, a marked increase from -11% in 2015.  It is noted that with the 2017 enrolment increase of 107%, the CTO will follow suit, likely into the 40% + range. Historically with the small scale of the program, changes in enrolment contributed significantly to low CTO. With that said, the program expenditure budget has also been historically low sitting around $9500. The program budget is mainly made up of contract teaching costs, and as such when enrolment increases the CTO/profitability will increase significantly as there are not many variable costs. | |
| 6.2 Faculty and Staff Resources  Please comment on:  The number and distribution of all faculty, technicians, and technologists associated with the program including full-time, part-time, sessional, and cross-appointments.  Profile of the faculty, and staff associated with the program including cumulative credentials, scholarship, work-related and teaching experience, and expertise in education.  Significant faculty or staff accomplishments such as professional recognition and awards, achievement of credentials, and appointments.  Hiring priorities over the next few years based on the above. | | | | SAg program does not have any full-time staff or faculty. If the program enrollment stabilizes to 2 class sections, I believe the program quality and student experience would benefit greatly from making the program technician position a permanent full-time position and from hiring 1 full time faculty. | |

Program Improvement Plan

Based on the analysis of your key findings, identify areas that require attention and action in the next 1-3 year timeframe. Ensure that you only recommend actions that reflect the program’s priorities and its capacity to achieve them, and record the success of any changes implemented and the means by which they are being evaluated.

**Write recommendations to:**

1. **bridge identified gaps**
2. **build on strengths**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| In Order of Priority | Recommended Improvements: | Timeframe | Person(s) Responsible | Action:  Immediate  Midterm  Long Term |
| 1. | Program overhaul required to overcome issues related to original modular design and to develop much clearer curriculum structure to benefit students and faculty.  **SOLUTION:** In order to accomplish this work, need immediate contract hrs of up to 200hrs May - September 2017 for Program Coordinator. | May - August 2017 | LDS, Program Coordinator, program team as needed | Immediate |
| 2. | Beginning in January 2018 program cap is set at 2 class sections of 25 students/section for a total program student enrollment of 50. | June 2017 | Registrar Brenda Pander-Scott | Immediate  In progress |
| 3. | Establish 1 full-time core faculty position to teach and coordinate the program. | In place for Sept 2017 | Rick Gray | Mid term |
| 4. | Establish permanent full-time technician position for SAg program. | In place for Sept 2017 | Rick Gray | Mid term |
| 5. | Refresh SAg program advisory committee membership and meeting schedule | June 2017 | Sara and Kyla | In progress  Midterm |
| 6. | Insure complete alignment between curriculum taught and SAg program page on Fleming website. | AFTER priority 1 above is completed | Program Coordinator and webmaster | Immediate for Sem 3  Mid term for Sem 1 |
| 7. | Move to Domaine of One’s Own (DoOO) approach to student learning and portfolio development beginning in Semester 1 and carrying on throughout program. | Work has begun. Fully realized shift to DoOO by 2018 | LDS, Program Coordinator, Program Technician, Program faculty as needed | In progress. Part of Priority #1 as well. |
| 8. | Consider new VLO related to DoOO |  | Coordinator, LDS, Program Technician, Program faculty as needed | Midterm |