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Plan de la Présentation

- Overview of quality assurance
- The Quality Council and its Committees
- Key elements of the Quality Assurance Framework
  - New programs and expedited approvals
  - Cyclical review of existing programs
  - Audit process
- Questions
Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance

- Created in 2010
- At arm’s length from both universities and government
- The **Quality Council has two committees** under its umbrella:
  - **Appraisal Committee**: reviews all new program, expedited approval proposals, reports on new programs and occasionally, major modifications; and
  - **Audit Committee**: reviews audit reports and institutional one year follow-up reports resulting from audits of each university on an eight year cycle
- **The two committees make recommendations to Quality Council**
Overview of the Work of the Quality Council (QA)

- Receives
  - Recommendations from the Appraisal and Audit Committees
  - Final Assessment Reports and Implementation Plans from Program Cyclical Reviews
  - Annual Reports on Major Modifications from Universities
  - Revised Institutional IQAPs for re-ratification

- Involved in
  - The Biennial Learning Outcomes Symposium
  - The Annual QA Key Contacts Meeting
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Quality Assurance Framework

- Approved by Ontario’s Executive Heads in April 2010
- Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP) developed to meet Quality Assurance Framework (QAF) standards (2010 - 2011)
- All university IQAPs were ratified by Quality Council (2011)
- IQAPs are revised periodically and re-ratified by Quality Council
- Every university IQAP includes protocols for:
  - New program approvals
  - Expedited approvals
  - Major modifications to existing programs
  - Cyclical review of existing programs
Appraisal Committee: New Program Approval Process

University level:
- Proposal developed
- External arm’s length review
- Internal response
- Institutional approval by University governance

Quality Council level:
- Appraisal Committee review
- Quality Council approval

Follow-up:
- Report to AC (where req’d)
- Institutional program monitoring
- Cyclical program review
New Program Approval Process, continued

- All new program proposals must:
  - Be based on **Degree Level Expectations** (DLEs) appropriate to the degree (undergraduate / graduate)
  - Identify **program-level Learning Outcomes** (Los)
  - Describe **appropriate assessment methods for the LOs**
  - Meet **all Evaluation Criteria** listed in the QAF
Ontario University Degree Level Expectations (DLEs)

Depth and Breadth of Knowledge
Knowledge of Methodologies
Application of Knowledge
Communication Skills
Awareness of Limits of Knowledge
Autonomy and professional capacity

→ Program Learning Outcomes and DLEs are at the heart of the process!
Quality Assurance Framework - Evaluations Criteria (some)

Objectives

• Consistency of the program with the institution’s mission and academic plans.

• Clarity and appropriateness of the program’s requirements and associated learning outcomes in addressing the institution’s own undergraduate or graduate Degree Level Expectations.

Admissions

• Appropriateness of the program’s admission requirements for the learning outcomes established for completion of the program.

Structure

• Appropriateness of the program's structure and regulations to meet specified program learning outcomes and degree level expectations.
Quality Assurance Framework - Evaluations Criteria (continued)

Program Content

• Ways in which the curriculum addresses the current state of the discipline or area of study.

Mode of Delivery

• Appropriateness of the proposed mode(s) of delivery to meet the intended program learning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations.

Assessment of Teaching and Learning

• Appropriateness of the proposed methods for the assessment of student achievement of the intended program learning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations.

• Completeness of plans for documenting and demonstrating the level of performance of students, consistent with the institution’s statement of its Degree Level Expectations.
Resources

• Adequacy of the administrative unit’s planned utilization of existing human, physical and financial resources, and any institutional commitment to supplement those resources, to support the program.

• Participation of a sufficient number and quality of faculty who are competent to teach and/or supervise in the program.

• Evidence that there are adequate resources to sustain the quality of scholarship produced by undergraduate students as well as graduate students’ scholarship and research activities, including library support, information technology support, and laboratory access.

Quality and Other Indicators

• Definition and use of indicators that provide evidence of quality of the faculty (e.g., qualifications, research, innovation and scholarly record; appropriateness of collective faculty expertise to contribute substantively to the proposed program).
New Program Approval Process, continued

- New program proposals:
  - Overall completeness / quality of submission
  - Adequacy of external review
    - Including qualifications of external reviewers
  - Adequacy / completeness of internal response
  - Appraisal Committee makes recommendation to Quality Council
    - Approved to Commence
    - Approved to Commence, with Report
    - Deferred
    - Not Approved
Cyclical Review Of Existing Programs

1. Program faculty/students prepare self-study
2. Arm’s length, external evaluation
3. Institutional evaluation
4. FAR and IP*
5. Follow-up reporting

*All Final Assessment Reports and Implementation Plans are sent to the Quality Council and Executive Summaries must be posted on the institution’s website
Cyclical Review

Evaluation Criteria - similar to new programs criteria

SELF STUDY

• Consistency of the program’s learning outcomes with the institution’s mission and Degree Level Expectations, and how its graduates achieve those outcomes;
• Program-related data and measures of performance
• Integrity of the data;
• Review criteria and quality indicators;
• Concerns and recommendations raised in previous reviews;
• Areas identified through the conduct of the self-study as requiring improvement;
• Areas that hold promise for enhancement;
• Academic services that directly contribute to the academic quality of each program under review;
• Participation of program faculty, staff, and students in the self-study and how their views will be obtained and taken into account
FAR and IM

Final Assessment Report:
1. Identifies any **significant strengths of the program**;
2. Identifies **opportunities for program improvement and enhancement**;
3. Sets out and prioritizes the recommendations that are selected for implementation;
4. May include a confidential section (where personnel issues require to be addressed); and
5. Includes an institutional **Executive Summary**, exclusive of any such confidential information, and suitable for **publication on the web**.

Implementation Plan:
1. Who will **be responsible for approving the recommendations** set out in the Final Assessment Report;
2. Who will be **responsible for providing any resources** made necessary by those recommendations;
3. Who will be **responsible for acting on those recommendations**; and
4. **Timelines** for acting on and monitoring the implementation of those recommendations.
The Audit Process

QAF
- Template for IQAP

IQAP
- Institution-specific version of QAF

QA practice
- Implementation of IQAP

Program Documentation
- Record of QA practice

Desk Audit Report
- Measures practice against policy

Audit Site Visit
- Answers questions and identifies issues for Audit Report

Audit Report
- Describes institution’s compliance with IQAP

One-year Follow-up
- Steps taken to address recommendations
The Audit Process, continued

- Compliance with IQAP
  - Audit of 9 programs representing different QA practices (New Programs, Cyclical Program Reviews etc.)
  - Documentation to provide evidence that IQAP requirements were followed

- Audit Visit
  - Normally 3 days
  - Purpose: to gain a full understanding of how an institution applies its IQAP in practice
  - Questions raised during desk audit form basis of site visit
  - Does not attempt to examine program quality
The Audit Report

- **Suggestions**
  - Non-mandatory
  - Used to identify areas for possible improvement and best practice (based on auditors’ experience)

- **Recommendations**
  - Mandatory
  - Identified lack of compliance with IQAP or misalignment between IQAP and QAF
The Audit Report, continued

• Causes for Concern
  ➢ Identification of structural weaknesses in QA practices
  ➢ For example:
    o inadequate follow-up monitoring
    o failing to write/provide final assessment reports and implementation plans
  ➢ When identified, follow-up required with institution, through Audit Committee and Quality Council
  ➢ Quality Council determines actions to remedy cause for concern
Publication of Findings and One-Year Follow-Up

Publication of Findings

- Summary of Findings and Recommendations on Quality Council website
- Copies of both full and summary reports → institution for publication on their website
- Report and summary → institution, OCAV, Executive Heads, and MTCU, for information

One-Year Follow-Up

- Steps taken to address recommendations
- Audit committee on suitability of response. If not satisfied, will recommend course of action
- QC approved audit recommendation - published on QC website and sent to institution and to OCAV, COU, and MTCU for information
Summary of Ontario’s Quality Assurance

- End to end, **involves broad institutional and external scrutiny** to protect the value of Ontario’s university programs
- Designed to encourage high standards, quality, innovation and continuous improvement
- Learning outcomes for students are **front and centre** at all degree levels, programs and courses
- System is more transparent and accountable to key stakeholders: students, their parents, university community, government, etc.
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