1. ***Industry Trends***
	1. Sectoral Standards and Industry Trends

The Preparatory Health Science program successfully prepares learners for the Trent Fleming Bachelor of Science Nursing program. To fully understand the “industry” trends, one needs to consider both Registered Nursing (RN) field and learners preparedness to enter a degree program in Nursing.

In general, the demand for RNs has increased with provincial and national health care changes and a growing aging/elderly population. We reviewed the following sources (these are available if required in our shared directory):

* the Canadian Association of Schools of Nursing (CASN) annual reports from 2004-2008;
* Registered Nurses’ Association of Ontario (RNAO) overview of the RN workforce;
* Canadian Nurses Association (CAN) Nursing Education in Canada Statistics 2006-2007;
* Consolidated Statistics for Entry to Practice Certificate, Diploma and Baccalaureate Programs 2006-2007;
* CNA’s toward 2020; Visions for Nursing;

The overall conclusion is that the demand for RNs is increasing and is expected to do so for quite some time. From this review, it was also clear that many learners (both direct and non-direct) lack necessary entrance requirements to immediately apply successfully to an RN program. We need to verify this and clearly understand why this is suggested in these reports.

With respect to the learners that are coming to this program without the required 12U entrance requirements to directly apply to the BScN program, we identified a clear gap in our knowledge about how many learners would be in this position. We have attempted to address this in a number of ways. Our data link to the pathway destination for our learners is the BScN program at Trent University. We haven’t made the most of our partnership there in terms of learning and confirming our assumptions about applicants who are denied entry there. Who are they, what specifically are they missing and we have assumed that our offering meets their needs. In addition, to not really knowing the information, we have also not used this link well to provide students who were specifically turned away by our partners with direct information from us about our program and how it meets their needs. We have not, as of yet, put the formal pieces that support a better partnership in place to have this seamlessly, consistently and efficiently happen

The second way we have tried to bridge the gap is learn more information from our high school partners. We have (via our Program Advisory Committee) been very successful in our PR process at learning about the Science, Math and English curriculum and now have a much better system for communicating changes in those areas and thinking about the impacts on our potential students. For example, we have learned that Science curriculum in the high schools is integrating both an environmental and a health focus. Are those new courses going to be able to be considered as one of the required courses for entrance into the BScN program? Whether they are or not impacts who might be eligible for entrance and therefore who we might need to service. It raises questions about our entrance requirements into our program, what sciences we consider “valid” and potentially impacts our curriculum.

The third approach to this gap in information has been to use our own information system better and with the help of the Academic Analyst we were successful in getting created for college wide use a query ability that identifies specifically which high school courses our learners have previously completed, and what the range of their GPAs was in those courses. Our first query has been included in the Appendix add

So although, we have some work to do in terms of acquiring information, what is clear is that the impact of learners not having entrance requirements has meant that the program trend has been growing. Initial intakes of 30 students in fall and 15 in winter semesters has increased over ‘06/07’, ‘07/08’ and 08’/09’academic years. Last year, there were approximately 60 students in the fall term and 30 in winter term.

Overall, students without the required entrance requirements are seeking pathways to degree programs. Increasingly, universities are looking for students that they initially overlook. Contact with Ryerson, Ottawa U ???Kari here has allowed consideration of PHS program as a pathway for students into their Nursing program

* 1. Program Advisory Committee Feedback

With Fleming’s Academic Restructuring in the Fall of 2007 and the introduction of a Dean to the (then called) School of Interdisciplinary Studies, the Program Advisory Committee for the Suite of General Arts and Sciences programs was re-vitalized. Our PAC has continued to diversify and represents an excellent mix of School Board representation and other post-secondary partners. As a result, (and as was indicated in section 1.1) we are working together to confirm assumptions about learners and what they bring to us and need from us.

Directly out of discussion about the PHS program we have become involved with the College Math Project (CMP) which will support not only PHS learners but learners in all of our programs.

We have learned that a reduction in the number of sciences required for OSSD completion will likely impact the number of sciences offered in secondary schools and we have begun to see evidence that in our represented boards, there are schools that never offer some specific 11 or 12 U science courses because they can’t support them (either resource wise or with the number of students requesting/needing them). This resulted in the development of a new GAS program – University Science Preparation that was approved and will begin in September 2010.

The committee members have encouraged us to consider accepting new **Science SNC 4M** (health science focus), **Exercise Science PSE4U**, and possibly some technology courses (**Health Care TPA3C; Child Development and Gerontology TPO4C**; **Medical Technologies TPT4C**) as part of PHS science admission requirements.

Developments in local boards of specialty majors (like a health science focus) may result in an increased number of applications to PHS. We will need to focus on the impact of this as we move forward

The PAC has been essential in providing specific marketing advice. They have refocused who, how and when to provide information to in order to tap into the audience that needs the outcomes of our program. They helped us to identify that guidance counselors need certain, information, in a specific format, at specific times to best guide learners who for example may have applied to a University program, but were unsuccessful. We need to further operationalize how this happens.

We have identified that we need a specific representation from the Trent/Fleming Nursing program on our advisory committee and we are working to have this occur.

A challenge for Fleming’s Practical Nursing program graduates was flagged by the PAC and sent on the the School of Education, Health and Wellness because PN graduates were being refused entry to Nursing programs because they were missing the required high school entrance courses. In some instances they were being referred to the PHS program.

* 1. Industry Liason

We very clearly need stronger and more specific ties to the Trent/Fleming Nursing program. We do currently conduct information sessions about Trent/Fleming Nursing program and run these for both Fall and Winter intakes of PHS via PHS program coordinator. We capitalize on the “be a nursing student for a day”( <http://www.trentu.ca/nursing/studentforaday.php>) by encouraging our students to participate.

We have clearly learned in this review that we need to establish stronger links with our graduates, track our graduates and use their experience both here and in their future lives as BScN students better. Plans are being made to use graduates as guest speakers, mentors, and establishing social networking opportunities for students and faculty. We have learned that following Freedom of Information policy we need to officially ask for and get permission to contact the graduates in the future. We have also asked Trent for access to data and to keep records on student success.

1. ***Curriculum Development and Framework***

2.1 Curriculum Framework

This section of the program review process provided the School the opportunity to ask a number of serious questions about who was involved in the development, delivery and assessment of the program. The result has been seen in the PHS program staffing in the Fall09 term and in other programs in the school as well. The identification of a program teaching team was done in the Spring of 2009 and the faculty group (although not set because of the demands of staffing the entire school’s needs) was established by those who expressed interest in the program, had experience in the program and were passionate about teaching in a pathway program.

The approach to the program is to prepare students for the rigor of university studies, to set high expectations for students across the curriculum and in and out of the classroom (accountability, responsibility, self management) and to foster and support students in the development of transferable skills that will guide them as life-long learners.

The faculty team is a mix of veteran/new, full time/contract members who are focused on providing both the essential content elements and the learning skills required for success.

Regular program team meetings that follow a set of expected agenda items have allowed issues that are cross course and student based to be addressed directly and has given the coordinator a team of people to rely on. Common policies, expectations and approaches have benefited student learning.

2.2 Outcomes from Curriculum Renewal

In preparation for the program review process, the team was unable to locate any curriculum map as a baseline. There were not any Program Outcomes from the Ministry identified in any document either. We were only able to find a brief program description, an list of required courses in the historical database. As a result the following Ministry Program Outcomes were located and identified by Terri Geerinck and Pauline Smiley (CLT Consultants):

1. Apply the principles of mathematics and natural sciences to analyze and solve problems in preparation for further studies in a broad range of college and university science programs.
2. Analyze the influence of social and natural forces on historical and contemporary issues and events in preparation for further studies in a broad range of college or university science programs.
3. Communicate effectively at a level required by a broad range of college or university science programs.
4. Use critical thinking processes and creative problem solving techniques in finding effective and efficient solutions to simulated scenarios in preparation for further studies in a broad range of college or university science programs.
5. Use team collaboration skills and personal accountability and responsibility skills in preparation for further studies and careers in a broad range of college or university science programs.

Therefore, no previous curriculum map existed.

In the past each course on its own was following a constant review and revitalization approach. Science courses are shared with another program and there was balancing of needs between the programs. Communications and Math were equally reviewing on an individual basis. What was missing, was a clear, concentrated effort of examining effect of the four core program courses together and how they individually and collectively met/supported the program outcomes. There was not really specific and direct connection to the pathway destination either. Individually, courses would look at where the students were headed, but as a collective this was not done.

Having said this, in the Winter of 2008 the Dean of the School of General Arts and Sciences had implement what has become standard practice of Focus Groups for each course within our school. The material from those focus groups has been gathered since then and provided to the teams of each course for consideration – these have been integrated by the faculty. In Fall of 2008, the focus groups evolved to become program based for the courses below.

As a result, there had been varying degrees of renewal in each of the core areas.

Chemistry I and II have had extensive curriculum development (notes, labs); textbook change to reflect a more general chemistry course. There was an addition of on-line “WebCT quizzes” component; and a very recent change in delivery pattern to include a practical lab component in each of the courses.

Biology I and II have had extensive curriculum development (lectures, labs); textbook change to a more student-friendly version; addition of various study tools for students; recent merge of all GAS Biology to a common stream means that Biology I and II serve PHS, and other programs effectively.

English I and II apparently had a clear role when the program was developed and that this clear purpose was to meet the grade 11 and 12 university level English outcomes. Without a clear touchstone of the program outcomes, the courses drifted to meet different purposes and were caught in the context of finding a place with other communications courses which historically have been working to have students ready to communicate in some specific program areas. Focus group material clearly showed that students in the PHS program didn’t understand why they were studying poetry and other key content areas.

Math I and II were reviewing within their mandate of meeting grades 11 and 12 university level outcomes but were faced with the challenge (as are all math courses) of decreasing preparedness and huge expectations.

As a result of this program review several general things have been accomplished and some very specific developments in terms of the curriculum have occurred.

In general, there has been the implementation of program teams that are supported by the Dean and have clear expectations about what they do. The program faculty are talking with one another about curriculum, student performance and success which is enhancing both the curriculum and the student experience. We have committed to the curriculum renewal process so that each calendar year (in summer semester) the program team meeting will be to review each course, the linkages, assessments, and to share success stories and challenges. The minutes of Summer 2009 meeting are in the appendix This process will now be fed by the program team meetings that take place twice a term. The minutes of these meetings are house on the GAS course homepage and a sample has been given from one of the meetings in the appendix.

The results of the first annual review were:

Chemistry – new assessment plan and use of more weekly lab notebooks and considering integrating ICE (ideas, connections, and extensions) assessment model.

Biology – assessment ideas were altered

Math – challenge with respect to low number of full time faculty in Math Department (this was addressed) Clear direction to meet I can’t remember which courses in 12U

There was a clear message that there was overlapping content between chemistry, biology and math and this was identified and addressed with alterations to delivery and timing.

English- established the clear goal of the courses was to meet grade 12 university level and clarified that the poetry etc. that student feedback indicated was problematic, was in fact necessary for the equivalency – and that once this was understood by students and faculty it is much easier to deliver. There is still some question about whether the high school equivalency can be met in 1 or 1.5 courses and therefore leave room for additional value added scientific reading, writing, and thinking. The goal here is to ensure advanced preparation for the graduate as they move to the BScN. Program. It will require cross assessment work and Biology and Chemistry changes in assessment are taking the first step to support this with the new assessments.

The team has used documents from Ministry on high school Math, Science and English curriculum as the criteria for establishing equivalency and this has been verified.

Focus group results will continue to provide information about success of these changes.

Another indicator of success of our curriculum is whether or not additional transfer agreements with other B.Sc.N. programs can be worked out.

* 1. Curriculum Map

Kari – please fill in Sciences \_ I will do others

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Preparatory Health Science** | **Vocational Outcomes** | **Essential Employability Skills** |
|  | **Course #** | **Course Name** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |  | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** | **13** |
| **Semester 1** | SCIE9 | Biology I |  \* |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| SCIE131 | Chemistry I |  \* |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| COMM19 | English I |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| MATH20 | Mathematics I |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   |  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   |  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|  |  |  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| **Semester 2** | SCIE10 | Biology II | \*  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| SCIE132 | Chemistry II |  \* |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| COMM20 | English II |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| MATH21 | Mathematics II |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   |  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   |  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |

\* - meets outcome

Curriculum also includes a General Education Elective Each Semester and on Program Elective

* KD – We need to map our program outcomes to core courses and generic/EE skills
	1. Curriculum Sequencing

Sequencing was considered in our review of curriculum outlined abouve. The core courses were discussed and summarized by semester (linearly by term) and the development of the program team allows the coordinator to easily review assessments and sequencing of assessments can easily be done. Course content and levels of learning can and will be aligned across courses (e.g. critical summary for English will have scientific content; writing pieces for Biology will assess for format/spelling/grammar; lab notebooks for Chem I and II will allow for some practical writing experience).

This highlighted the need for the Program Coordinator (Kari Draker-Fortis) to have curriculum design and development expertise and as such she is participating in the Eastern Region ABC program and will graduate in the Spring of 2010.

* 1. Delivery Mode

The current delivery modes include a mix of mass lectures, seminars, and practical labs across the core curriculum. The split in the core courses is summarized as:

Chemistry I – 2-1 hr seminars + 1 hr lab

Biology I – 1 hr lecture + 2 hr lab

Math I – 2-1 hr seminars + 1 hr lab

English I – 1-1 hr seminar + 1-2hr seminar

Chem II – 1-hr lecture + 1-2hr lab

Biology II - 1 hr lecture + 2 hr lab

Math II - 2-1 hr seminars + 1 hr lab

There is currently a good mix of technology used in the delivery of the courses and there was a recent addition of the Chemistry lab for pedagogical reasons and at the prodding of the students (specifically faculty evaluations).

This mix was discussed and agreed that it is supporting the readiness of the student to move to the BScN classes. Constant eye needs to be paid to the availability and timing of lab space (more on this in physical resources section)

The General Education electives and program electives are available in diverse modes (web, hybrid, and traditional classroom/lab settings).

Overall, the current delivery modes align well with the program outcomes, specifically the practical components of core courses and the breadth/depth of required content

2.6 Evaluation Methods

The assessments in core courses are balanced in duration and frequency, as well as in type. Across the curriculum, assessments are done throughout the semester so students can use assessment feedback as a key tool in learning.

The development of the PHS program team in place, assessments can be spread out to accommodate student learning and workload across six required courses; in addition, assessments can be shared among courses (e.g. summary writing can be done using biology content; writing can be assessed in biology, etc.)

Assessments are summarized as:

English I and II include creative writing, summary writing, critical summaries, short essays, personal essays, oral presentations, language skills tests, a final culminating task (individual essay plus group presentation) and mirror the requirements in a grade 12 U course but are developed the college and university level.

Math I and II include assignments, quizzes, tests, Excel labs and testing.

Chemistry I and II include WebCT quizzes, homework checks, labs and lab reporting, and content tests.

Biology I and II include content tests, labs and lab reporting, i-clicker assessments and participation.

* 1. Curriculum and Diversity

Supporting student diversity in terms of preparedness is inherent in a pathway program. However, increasingly accommodations for learning needs and cultural diversity is becoming more and more obvious. In the fall of 2009, all employees participated in the required training to support new customer service standards.

The program teaching team has requested that they participate in Professional Development on Universal Instructional Design and invite Audrey Healey and Deb Harrison to do their workshop on Inclusive learning as a first step. This needs to be set up.

Kari – your note in the files says =

More to write on this in recommendations section (social night at beginning of semester, drop-in sessions for various disciplines, etc.)

2.8 Credentials Framework

This program is an Ontario College Certificate (OCC) and the discussion of this section of material prompted the Coordinator to seek and begin the ABC Eastern Region Training for curriculum design.

As previously mentioned, this program did not have any standards, or curriculum map and that has been generated.

The current minimum admission requirements for PHS are:

“OSSD with the majority of credits at the College (C) and Open (O) level, including: 2 College (C) English courses (Grade 11 or Grade 12); 2 College (C) Math courses (Grade 11 or Grade 12); 2 different Grade 11 College (C) Science courses (Biology, Chemistry or Physics)”

We do believe that the admission requirements are suitable for the rigour and preparedness needed within the PHS program (many potential students access Academic Upgrading for math and an additional science prior to PHS program). But, as previously identified there has been discussion about which Sciences should be admissible.

A more recent thought that will require more research is whether we could support one science if the learner had some other options within the program.

2.9 Learning Pathways

Recent or anticipated initiatives that promote student pathways include information sessions for guidance counsellors (completed by the Dean and the Liasion Office), high school visits to Fleming and dedicated room/times for visitors (completed in the fall semester with great success), video clips of program coordinators to be sent to potential students (completed in the Summer09 terms), and follow-up with potential students who have currently not accepted an offer of admission (still to be done for the next entry point).

Program laddering exists in the form of transfer credits in core courses (Chemistry, Biology, Communications and Math) and various general education electives and program electives that can be applied to other Fleming programs (GHS, BTF, Health and Wellness programs, etc.)

There are no current high school articulations, dual credits diplomas, or articulation agreements however, one of the newly developed courses for our new University Science Program (sibling to PHS) is Practical Science which entices people into the world of scientific thinking and could be used as a dual credit to show potential PHS students the “doability” of science.

The transfer agreement with Trent/Fleming School of Nursing was reviewed and is consistent and well-established for PHS graduates. We are seeking further documentation of our student’s success in the program and boosting the role of alumni of our program in support of our current learners as was previously mentioned.

We are seeking and working toward establishing additional specific transfer agreements with other post-secondary institutions (specifically targeted are Ryerson and Ottawa).

Out of this review and in conversation and consideration with other institutions the idea of the University Science Program (launched Fall 2010) came to fruition. It was clear that other programs beside BScN were facing the same challenges of having students ready with the required science courses and abilities to be successful in Science programs in advanced diplomas within the college system (Radiography) or university (physics).

1. **Student and Graduate Satisfaction**
	1. Formal Measures of Student and/or Graduate Satisfaction

Ann – are you okay with this KPI

– you need to add the summaries of faculty evaluations here and completion rates – I never got them from FDR – and then we can address what we did with the details

The first Formal Measure that is to be considered in the Program Review process is the Key Performance Indicator Data. The Data we used was provided by FDR to the School of General Arts and Sciences in September 2009 (it is available on their website) and is the KPI Review of Post Secondary Programs 2009 Reporting Year (a hard copy is in the Appendix) . This measure is very difficult for pathway programs and the PHS program in particular because of the nature of the program. The fundamental goal of the program is in contradiction to many of the questions that the KPI tool asks. Learners in this program are NOT being prepared for a “vocation”, but are being prepared for a destination – which is not recognized in the questions. In fact, these questions are likely very confusing for students in GAS programs. In addition to this, the programs in the GAS suite often have very low response numbers and the data is then very corrupt.

We will (as required) be focussing on sharing and considering the data from KPI4 (Graduate Satisfaction – Generic and Vocational Learning Outcomes), KPI8 (Student Satisfaction - Learning Experience), KPI9 (Student Satisfaction – Teachers), and KPI11 (Graduate Satisfaction – Program).

Preparatory Health Sciences - PHS (MCU Code: 41601) Percentage Results (College benchmarks in parenthesis)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| KPI | 2009 | 2008 | 2007 | 5 Year Average |
| KPI4 | 30 (86) | 61(89) |  92(87) | 61 (87) |
| KPI8 | 58 (85) | 67 (84) | 94 (82) | 73 (83) |
| PKI9 | 73 (80) | 72(78) | 90 (76) | 78 (77) |
| KPI11 | 78 (84) | 85 (86) | 82 (85) | 82 (85) |

* no data provided in report for 2006 or 2005

These results are concerning. As indicated earlier we have sought and found the program outcomes and have mapped them, we recognize that students may be struggling with the KPI questions and that we need to educate them about those questions. This will be done by focussing on the link between the individual courses and the overall program outcomes.

In addition, we are proposing to use graduates to come back after varying periods in the BScN program (and other places they end up) to provide us feedback about the program. In addition, we will be using these graduate groups to help our current learners see the big picture and help them see the link of what they are doing in our classes to where they want to be. Integrating examples from university level courses (either in curriculum or assessment techniques/tools is another strategy to address these gaps

We are pleased to see relatively high overall satisfaction with the program (2009 figure of 78%).

The other review that is required here is of Learning Support Services data. This data was provided via Grant Meadwell, Michael Fleming and Angie Premate (included in the Appendix)(based on 2008-2009 academic year data).

From this data we know that Science and Math courses high demand courses for tutoring. This speaks to the nature of the academic rigour required in each of the courses and the nature of the learner in our programs. Out of this information the Math department has met with the LSS staff and are working to ensure that there is a good flow of information about the courses, expectations and resources so that students are being well supported and academic rigor and integrity is ensured. Science???

Ann’s additions

* 1. Other Measures of Student and Graduate Satisfaction

We (as previously mentioned) have a very strong need to establish a data exchange with our Trent partners that allows us to understand graduate satisfaction and success and be able to document that in more than an anecdotal manner. We would also like to be able.

Our PAC member, Karen Maki is working on this with us.

Kari you had a note about KD - Trent/Fleming Steering Committee data?

The student advising model (since 2005) has been very successful in helping students adjust to college life (direct and non-direct entry) and give us an in process assessment tool of student satisfaction. Advisors give students a person to contact when personal/school-related issues arise.

Student focus groups (all documented on the GAS homepage housed in WebCT) provide both individual course feedback from student’s and program feedback as the students are in progress. Focus groups (in all the forms: electronically, face to face and paper based) have allowed for constructive feedback in courses and a starting point to make positive change to curriculum and delivery when appropriate. (attached in the appendix are samples of the focus group questions and the minutes of the last PHS program focus group in Nov. 2009)

4.0 Employment Trends

4.1 Employment

4.2 Other Graduate Destinations

5.0 Strategic Positioning

5.1 College Alignment

5.2 Competitor Programs

1. Enrolment Trends

6.1 Demand for the Program

* KD (PAC) – Trent, like Fleming, acknowledges an ongoing challenge with tracking student data; Trent and Fleming need to do a better job of tracking PHS students
* KD - Need student permission to track their progression through post-secondary system

KD (PAC) – Other means to track students could include a Facebook group, etc.

* 1. Student Progression
* KD – FDR info for course completion rates and students success
* KD – heavy commitment for sciences and maths within PHS program
* KD – students encouraged to access LSS tutoring very early upon start-up (for chem and math in particular)
* KD – focus groups for PHS by program and course have givin us very useful feedback to address student concerns and make courses.PHS program better

KD – drop-in sessions by discipline will be very helpful to PHS student retention and success

1. External Relations

7.1 Alumnae

* KD – FDR info for course completion rates and students success
* KD – heavy commitment for sciences and maths within PHS program
* KD – students encouraged to access LSS tutoring very early upon start-up (for chem and math in particular)
* KD – focus groups for PHS by program and course have givin us very useful feedback to address student concerns and make courses.PHS program better

KD – drop-in sessions by discipline will be very helpful to PHS student retention and success

7.2 Community Relations

PHS-specific:

* KD - PHS info session held in the fall and winter semesters; Carol Weafer-Lloyd (Trent) discusses the Trent/Fleming Nursing program with applicants over lunch
* KD - Nursing Student for a Day – PHS students are encouraged to participate during their PHS year (refer to <http://www.trentu.ca/nursing/studentforaday.php> for details)

KD – Margaret Pearson & Margaret D. Davis Memorial Student Bursary is offered each year to eligible PHS students who apply

7.3 Program Advisory Committee

* KD (PAC) – committee identified the need to have representation from Trent/Fleming Nursing program and possibly employers from the sector (Chamber of Commerce, Workforce Development Board?)
* KD - regular PAC meetings (at least three per academic year) with a good level of participation and engagement
* KD – some turnover of members but overall a consistent turn-out from core PAC members

KD – PAC currently operates under manual and policy guidelines

1. Program Resources
	1. Human Resources
* KD – Ken McMinn (technician) has 15% of his time dedicated to IDS science courses with a lab component
* KD – Ken is vital in maintaining equipment and prepping biology and chemistry labs

Follow-up on credentials and accomplishments of current PHS teaching team?

* 1. Physical Resources

KD – currently only one lab space is available (BR635) with a maximum student capacity of 30

KD – with BTF courses, Materials Science I, II, and III (Including the class/lecture scheduled in the lab), and IDS course, the chem lab is currently and consistently maxed out!

KD – recent addition of a class set of compound light microscopes, Pressure cuffs, and portable spirometers have added value and relevance to our lab sessions

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Program Review Action Plan** | **Responsibility** | **Timeframe** |
| **Recommendations:*** KD – consistent math person involved in PHS program team
* KD - from section 1.2 – PAC positive about suggestion to consider accepting new **Science SNC 4M** (health science focus), **Exercise Science PSE4U**, and possibly some technology courses (**Health Care TPA3C; Child Development and Gerontology TPO4C**; **Medical Technologies TPT4C**) as part of PHS science admission requirements
* KD – from section 1.2 - individual info sheets for each of the GAS programs, if given to guidance counselors, may heighten their awareness of individual programs (as opposed to just getting the whole program book)
* KD – from section 1.2 – committee identified the need to have representation from Trent/Fleming Nursing program
* KD – this could be done indirectly via Trent/Fleming Steering Committee (Wendy Fucile, Carol Weafer-Lloyd)
* KD – from section 2.2 - additional transfer agreements with other B.Sc.N. programs may also be an indicator of the success of our curriculum in meeting/exceeding 12U requirements

KD from section 6.1 - Trent, like Fleming, acknowledges an ongoing challenge with tracking student data; Trent and Fleming to track PHS students after graduationKD from section 6.1 - need student permission to track their progression through post-secondary system; ACTION? – generate a form that current PHS students can sign if they agree to be tracked; include as an appendix in PHS review final document? * KD from section 6.2 - drop-in sessions by discipline will be very helpful to PHS student retention and success
* KD from section 8.2 – space and timetabling limitations from only one lab space (BR635) with 30 student capacity
 |  |  |