Appendix [illegible]

Affirmations

Provide clear statements that articulate areas where the institution itself has found a weakness, identified the weakness, or intends to correct it (a plan of action has already been developed) . , Q H I I H F W , W K L V L V D I I L U P L Q J *and* W K H L Q V W L *findings in its Institution Report.*

1. Deans Accountability & Intranet Posting
   Deans are accountable for reporting on progress of Tier 3 reviews via the Director of Learning & Applied Research at Deans Forum. Reports of the Tier 3 reviews are posted on the OC intranet with access to all employees. The posted programs should be extended to include programs, which have gone through external program accreditation. Finally, OC should consider posting all Tier 1 and 2 reports to the website.
2. Consistency in Program Reviews & Greater
   Buy-In. OC outlines areas

the self-study that indicates that reviewers "…are not required to use a specific format…" (Self-Study, Part 1, p. 22). In addition, the panel observed that the report structure for the Tier III reviews provided as examples in the self-study were not all presented in a consistent format. The panel recommends that OC consider implementing additional standardized tools and processes to support

Signed:

Chair of the QAPA Team:

(Signature) Jan 31, 2018
(Date)

Baldev Pooni
(Printed Name)

QAPA Assessors:

Appendix 3a September 2016

1. Overall Process

Does the process reflect

v[• }µv]o

x

strengths and weaknesses, desired improvements, and future directions. A self-study takes into account: x the continuing appropriateness of the program's structure, admissions requirements, method of delivery and curriculum for the program's educational goals and standards; x the adequacy and effective use of resources (physical, technological, financial and human); x faculty performance including the quality of teaching and supervision and demonstrable currency in the field of specialization; x that the learning outcomes achieved by students/graduates meet the program's stated goals, the credential level standard, and where appropriate, the standards of any related regulatory, accrediting or professional association; x the continuing adequacy of the methods used for evaluating student progress and achievement to ensure that the program's stated goals have been achieved; x the graduate satisfaction level, student satisfaction level, and graduation rate; and x where appropriate, the graduate employment rates, employer satisfaction level, and advisory board satisfaction level.	review. Program faculty spoke positively about the value and intent of the reviews.
¾ *An assessment conducted by a panel that includes independent experts external to the institution. The assessment should normally include a site visit, a written report that assesses program quality and may recommend quality*	x An independent external team of reviewers was selected for each of the three sample reviews. The External Review Team reviewed various documents, including student and graduate data and the report generated by the Internal Review Team. Interviews with key college personnel took place during the site visit. The External Review Team submitted a written report to the VP, Education. The report included recommendations for improvements to the program. The panel did note that OC has an established guideline to assist the External Review Team but felt that the procedure could be improved by adding more detailed instructions on the scope, process, validation of findings, report content, etc. x The QAPA panel also found some inconsistencies between the review policy and practice. For example, the Program Review Policy references an Internal Review Panel (page 6) to consist of at least seven members. The three sample programs show only two or three members. OC needs to ensure the intended breadth and diversity is included. In addition, page 17 of the review policy indicates that the review should result in "5-10 specific recommendations ordered by priority" and a "local operational/action plan to respond to recommendations made by the review teams". The panel noted inconsistencies in the number of recommendations and that formal action plans were not evident (see

improvements; and an institution response to the report; x *A summary of the conclusions of the evaluation that is made appropriately* available.	recommendation #4 above).
(ii) The institution can demonstrate that it has a policy and process for new program approval that includes peer / external review by appropriate experts.	x As part of the self-study, OC provided a copy of a draft new program development policy (Appendix M). In the self-study, there is an indication that "No decision has been made to determine if the draft policy will be presented for further discussion" (Self- study Part 1, p. 38). The policy is an excellent step towards quality assurance of new programs but needs to be completed and approved at the earliest opportunity. The panel

undertake diversified program review?	review. However, as noted in recommendation #3 above, the panel feels that the procedure could be improved by providing additional standardized tools and supports to ensure better consistency at the Tier 3 review level. These could include further details around required data and supporting evidence to be included in all Tier 3 review (i.e., surveys and focus groups).
(iii) Are the guidelines consistent with institutional Mandate, mission, vision and associated strategic goals?	x OC has ensured the guidelines are consistent with the Mandate, mission, vision and values.

Does the process promote quality improvement?

ensuring that programming is up to date.	program to support new faculty to acquire skills in teaching and learning. Faculty can also participate in the Instructor Certification Program. OC invests over $1M in faculty PD, annually and twelve course releases for scholarly activity. All continuing faculty members complete an annual Faculty Development Activity Report. The report is the faculty member's accountability for the resources used and the benefit to the individual and the program.
(iii) The institution should be able to demonstrate how learning outcomes are being achieved and how student progress is assessed and measured.	x The Learning and Applied Research Unit supports faculty in developing relevant program and course learning outcomes. Students are assessed for their

post-

	shared between the Program Chair level, Dean and the VP, Education. The results should be shared with all department faculty and staff consistently across the college. By understanding the strengths and weaknesses of all programs by all stakeholders, there will be peer learning and continuous improvement across the college.