

**Report of the DQAB Panel
Quality Assurance at the University of Victoria
December 2018**

The review panel consisted of Ross Paul (chair), Ron Bond and Brenda Brouwer. The team conducted a site visit on December 12th and 13th, 2018 (the final schedule is attached). This Report outlines the context for the commendations, affirmations and recommendations contained in the enclosed Assessors' Report Workbook. Per the panel's mandate, it focuses on processes and their impact rather than detailed analysis of specific issues associated with the sample programs reviewed. Where appropriate, the latter are used to illustrate findings and recommendations.

As outlined in its November 9, 2018 Institution Report, the University of Victoria is a research-intensive, comprehensive university in Victoria, B.C., serving more than 21,000 students. It has 51 academic departments in nine faculties (Business, Education, Engineering, Fine Arts, Human and Social Development, Humanities, Law, Science and Social Sciences).

The University's vision is encapsulated in its new Strategic Framework (2018-2023) which addresses its mandate as a research-intensive comprehensive university and its accountabilities, role and responsibility to the government and people of British Columbia. It focuses on action necessary to:

1. Cultivate an extraordinary academic environment
2. Advance research excellence and impact
3. Intensify dynamic learning
4. Foster respect and reconciliation
5. Promote sustainable futures, and
6. Engage locally and globally.

The panel met with senior leaders of the University and with those associated with the three programs that were selected by DQAB for detailed examination – Political Science (both undergraduate and graduate programs), Teacher Education and the BComm program in the Gustavson School of Business. This examination enabled the panel to test the consistency of the application of quality assurance

measures across the institution and to evaluate the extent to which policies led to concerted action in priority areas. Comments on the three program areas are encapsulated here, with associated recommendations contained in the QAPA workbook.

Political Science:

Political Science was examined for both its undergraduate and graduate programs. These are well regarded, notwithstanding recent declines in applications and enrolments, a not atypical trend among social sciences and humanities programs in Canadian universities at this time. The department has embraced recent quality assurance initiatives such as the Enhanced Planning Tool (EPT) and assessment of learning outcomes which are taken into consideration in the budget process as well as in the imminent UVic Strategic Enrolment Management Plan. This integration of performance metrics and goals into strategic decision-making necessitates processes that support timely action including minimizing the time elapsed between self-study submissions, academic program reviews and action planning.

The program has the highest per capita enrolments in the Co-op program in the Faculty of Social Sciences and burgeoning graduate programs. It is the only department in the Faculty to include both essay writing and the development of research skills in every one of its courses. It has important connections to two research institutes – the Centre for Global Studies (CFGS) and the Centre for Asia-Pacific Studies (CAPI) and to other collaborative entities including the Consortium on Democratic Constitutionalism (DEMCON), the Faculty of Law, and with the departments of Sociology, History and English, the Cultural, Social and Political Thought (CSPT) interdisciplinary program.

There is strong evidence of a vibrant research culture with productive faculty members, a speaker series and active engagement with the research centres. Indeed, the new MA in Global Studies was developed in collaboration with CFGS and CAPI. Honours students are involved in undergraduate research while the research centres mainly engage graduate students with some provision for participation of the best undergraduates.

The department has an enviable record of student engagement in experiential learning. In particular, co-op participation aligns well with the strategic framework focus of *intensifying dynamic learning*.

The latest Academic Program Review (APR) was conducted in 2016. Rather than deploying the newly developed Enhanced Planning Tools (EPT) reports or the suggested *Procedures for Academic Program Reviews*, Political Science chose to write its self-study in narrative form, which loosely adhered to the Senate Policy guidelines. However, several elements were absent, including such factors as under-represented student descriptions; proportion of EETs taught by regular, sessional and part-time faculty; completion/attrition and time to degree for Master's and PhD students for the past seven years; and policies and practices to promote inclusivity, diversity and equity. These are useful metrics and benchmarks to support continuous improvement and to enable comparisons across programs and institutions. This observation contributed to the panel's recommendation of a more prescriptive review process that takes full advantage of EPT reports and considers the eight criteria from the *Procedures* for inclusion in program self-studies.

The APR committee focused on the following areas:

1. Finding an appropriate balance between the traditional strengths of the department in political theory that are important to its identity and overcoming some resistance to change that is needed to respond to the demands of today's more diverse range of students
2. Coping with declines in undergraduate enrolments in the context of no new hires (except when permitted to replace departing faculty members) primarily through recommended curriculum changes
3. Responding to significant declines in applications to graduate programs, again through curriculum changes (to both a one-year and two-year MA) and better funding for PhD students in particular. Similar recommendations were made in the 2008 academic review, reinforcing the need to address all recommendations either with an Action Plan or a rationale for tabling.
4. Making concerted efforts to measure the impact of the department's fairly impressive record of research and scholarship.

The APR committee cited the department's commitment to teaching and the effectiveness of the tutorial system of graduate student-led discussions, as a key element in student support, important factors in the program's fairly high level of undergraduate student retention. It also saw the department's involvement in indigenous political science as a strength very much congruent with UVic's success in and aspirations for indigenous education.

The timeline between the submission of the self-study document and the development of an action plan for Political Science was a 14-month process from the self-study report in February, 2016 to the April, 2017 Action Plan.

The department's response to the March 2016 review, encapsulated in a letter from the Dean of Social Sciences in July 2017, demonstrate that it has considered each of the 12 recommendations carefully, making a number of curriculum and other changes consistent with the external input. Details are set out in an Action Plan of April, 2017, which responds to each recommendation and, where appropriate, assigns responsibility and a deadline for each one. However, while the intention was apparently to provide an update one year later, there was no formal sign-off or follow-up date and the panel was unable to assess specific actions in response.

Course-based learning outcomes were first developed in 2015 and Political Science is in the process of developing program-based ones, modelled on those already developed for the University as a whole. The development of degree specific learning outcomes/goals and associated indicators of achievement are crucial steps in supporting ongoing quality improvement.

A required independent study class in fourth year is intended to measure what the students have learned in the program and how they apply their knowledge and skills to specific problems and challenges. The Department is encouraged to make better use of the EPT reports to assess the impact of initiatives and to monitor progress. Better assessments of outcomes are critical and must relate directly to program and degree-specific learning outcomes rather than self-reported student satisfaction and employment outcomes.

The department's community engagement is a strength. Its connections with indigenous communities and commitment to training indigenous scholars are commendable. The goal of creating a focus of graduate study in indigenous politics and the proposed Indigenous Graduate Certificate align directly with the University's Indigenous Plan (2017-2022). These initiatives may also contribute to a stronger and broader applicant pool to Political Science.

In an effort to improve their follow-up to recommendations and action plans, the department has moved to continuous monitoring of the impact of the changes made as a result of the review process. However, it is also important to document and publicize the results, which is part of the rationale for some of the recommendations in this DQAB quality assurance review.

Teacher Education:

Of the three programs reviewed by the DQAB panel, Teacher Education faced the most challenges from its most recent academic program review (2016). The APR committee identified a number of contextual concerns which included issues of faculty morale, low attendance at department meetings, poor collegial governance, a perception among many that a small "in-group" did most of the research, and very low student participation in the review process. As well, some faculty members did not feel adequately consulted during the review process. Some felt that the section on indigenous education was added as an after-thought. And one of the APR committee's top five recommendations, that collaborative research structures be implemented and cultivated so that research leaders mentor and involve faculty members and graduate students on research teams, was a repeat of a recommendation made in the previous 2006 academic program review and apparently still not addressed 10 years later.

The APR committee identified at least 10 areas of strength in the Teacher Education Program, notably the TRUVic initiative (see below) and the Teacher Qualification Upgrade Institutes, some of the indigenous and international initiatives, and good relationships with schools and the community.

Representation from the Faculty during the site visit suggested that many of the concerns cited above have been resolved under the current administration. Nevertheless, there are many recommendations still to be addressed.

The APRC made no fewer than 49 recommendations, the sheer number of which might have limited their impact. After various steps of consideration, the Faculty of Education reduced this to 10, then five and finally three major priorities for action – a full revision of the Teacher Education Program (TEP), the redesign and implementation of governance structures, and implementation and cultivation of collaborative research structures. The rationale for focusing on just three was their wide-ranging scope and that they needed to be addressed before other changes could be considered. As well, because of a significant delay in receiving the final APRC report, a number of changes were made in the interim which anticipated the formal recommendations based on discussions during the review process.

The 2016 review suggested that the Department of Curriculum and Instruction and the previously administrative Department of Teacher Education be merged, a major undertaking that has an impact on all facets of teacher education at UVic and which is still in progress. The process of integration is so all encompassing that some other concerns requiring addressing have been postponed until everyone is comfortable with the new structures and processes.

The Department is also addressing the second recommendation, that the functional and governance structures of the TEP be revised to encourage more broad-based involvement of faculty members within Curriculum and Instruction. Participation in faculty meetings has been rejuvenated and many of the changes under governance also address some of the other recommendations of the APR committee.

In its one year report in 2017, the Department indicated that it had done less to respond to the third recommendation about collaborative research. However, in its later EPT Report in 2018, it outlined a double mentoring initiative, whereby new faculty members and graduate students are mentored by experienced faculty members in both the appropriate subject area and in research. Initiatives

to reduce teaching loads from five to four courses and to engage graduate students with practice teaching experience as sessional instructors have also been taken to provide faculty members with more time for research.

A particularly effective recent initiative has been the TRUVic experiential program intended to integrate theory and practice for effective teaching. For one semester, teacher education students spend one day a week exposed to school/classroom life to learn from experienced teachers, gain insight into the diversity and orientations of today's students, and to consider the effectiveness of various technologies and models of team teaching. The education students then reflect on their experience through case studies and other assignments pertinent to their experience. These experiences are shared and highlighted in regular celebration events on campus, thus contributing to their perceived importance and success.

The Faculty has been assiduous in documenting follow-up actions to the review, with a Dean's summary at the end of March, 2017, and a further update in September of 2018, with clear target dates in both documents for future responses. The DQAB panel noted in particular the Faculty's finding an appropriate balance among the respective priorities of the University and the Ministry of Education. Management changes within the Faculty have promoted better communications with the Teacher Regulation Branch and Teacher Qualification Service to help align teacher graduates with changing expectations pertinent to recent BC curriculum reform and the changing and diverse nature of today's elementary and high school students.

An important next step will be for the Faculty to conduct a formal and public review of all 49 original recommendations and to make clear which have been addressed, which are in process and which are not being addressed (with an accompanying rationale in each case).

Bachelor of Commerce (BComm):

The Gustavson School of Business is a relatively small business faculty that is well integrated into the rest of the University of Victoria. This is a function of its 2+2 model which requires students to take non-Business courses in their first two

years so that they bring a well-rounded academic background to the dedicated business courses in their final two years. The School has overseen steady but managed growth. It has negotiated enrolment targets for the imminent UVic Strategic Enrolment Management plan which is expected to be approved very soon.

While the City of Victoria has few head offices, the School capitalizes on the unusual number of senior executives who retire to the region and who offer a great deal of knowledge and experience to UVic students and faculty. There are also a significant number of international placements (usually for one term) for BComm students and many also benefit from learning communities located in on-campus residences reserved for Business students.

UVic's Policy 1145 indicates that the Vice-President (Academic) and Provost has the discretion to substitute an accreditation process for the regular Academic Programs Review used for other programs. The Gustavson School of Business and its BComm program derive considerable value in quality assurance stemming from the double accreditation processes of the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) and the European Quality Improvement System (EQUIS). The standards of EQUIS and AACSB are mutually reinforcing and compatible with UVic's expectations about quality assurance and quality improvements. The Dean actively participates as a panellist for both groups. The double accreditation enhances the program's reputation and branding, is a useful tool for recruiting students and faculty and provides instruments to measure the degree to which the program is fulfilling its promises.

Given the breadth and depth of working through these two accrediting agencies, the School of Business is a valuable resource on quality assurance for other faculties and departments and it often shares its experience with them

AACSB's Assurance of Learning charter has been transformative and has galvanized the articulation of learning outcomes for various business programs, including the BComm. Relying on agreed upon rubrics, the School is satisfied that students are required to demonstrate attainment of the published outcomes.

Based on the AACSB experience, the University is intending to use its Assurance of Learning protocols, suitably modified, in its ongoing QA work in all faculties.

The AACSB required *Continuous Improvement Reports* reflect the School's belief that it is well on the way towards establishing a "quality culture", the presumed goal of quality assurance processes. While previous learning outcomes have been primarily at the course level, the School is in the process of developing robust program-level ones, consistent with the rest of the University.

As of September, 2018, the School has identified four main goals and six "parked" goals for its BComm., the latter to be acted upon if and when various practicalities and impediments are addressed. Through its accreditation officer and others, the School has developed its own QA instruments, including an accreditation data base and a curriculum matrix. Its "flat" governance arrangements and non-departmentalized structure enable the School to achieve coherence and to emphasize an unusual degree of interdisciplinarity in Business programming.

The School's scholarly performance is measured in part through citation indices. The Dean is planning the creation of research institutes related to the School's mission and mandate (e.g. a Trust Institute).

Although Gustavson attracts small numbers of indigenous students to its BComm, it has been offering non-degree programming in Northern B.C. and expects to contribute significantly to the University's new Indigenous Plan.

Conclusions:

Specific recommendations emanating from the above review are contained in the Assessors' Report Workbook. This concluding section offers some of the rationale for these.

While the panel found that the UVic processes were consistent with good quality assurance practice, perhaps our most significant concern was that the results of reviews, EPT reports and action plans were not always readily and publicly available. For example, we were impressed with the EPT reports and the "summaries" of each Academic Program Review prepared by the Provost's office

that we were able to obtain, but much of the relevant information is in departmental minutes or documents not easily accessed by those not directly involved. It is in the University's interests to share these more publicly.

These concerns have led us to recommend (#1) that the University create a "Quality Assurance" website. UVic has much to be proud of in its efforts at continuous improvement and such a site would contribute to faculty, staff and student pride in the institution, marketing and recruitment, and, most importantly, public accountability for following through on recommendations emanating from program review processes. This recognizes that a true culture of quality assurance is spurred by public acknowledgement of areas needing improvement, concerted actions to address the concerns, ongoing public reporting on actions required and actions taken, and a regular candid assessment of the impact of all such actions on the quality of teaching, research, and student and community services. Such a website would also help the University to share issues, concerns and its unique achievements with other post-secondary institutions in British Columbia, thus addressing directly a key government priority for improving quality across the post-secondary system.

The University is in the process of revising and refining its learning outcomes, both for the institution as a whole and for specific academic programs. It is making good process but would benefit from the experience of other institutions. To this end, one specific suggestion is made in the recommendations.

We were also concerned about some unevenness across program areas in processes and results. While the University has introduced its very effective Enhanced Planning Tools (EPT) reports for each area, it has been fairly permissive in whether and how these are used so that there is a lack of consistency across programs. For example, a rather laissez-faire approach about the structure of self-studies has resulted in elements identified in Appendix A of Senate policy AC1145 being omitted. Given that such elements are considered relevant to quality assurance, these omissions may compromise the comprehensiveness of the review and associated recommendations.

As well, some program areas are more systematic than others in their follow-through assessments of the impact of action plans and the panel believes that requiring (and ensuring) follow-up reports after intervals of one, three and five years would contribute substantially to consistent accountability and continuous quality improvement across all sectors.

Finally, the challenging question of how teaching is informed by research should be addressed more systematically by all program areas.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ross Paul", enclosed in a thin black rectangular border.

Ross Paul, Chair
(per Brenda Brouwer and Ronald Bond)
December 24, 2018

QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESS AUDIT
ASSESSORS' REPORT WORKBOOK

INSTITUTION NAME: University of Victoria

SITE VISIT DATES: December 11, 12, 2018

SUBMISSION DATE: December 24, 2018

OVERALL ASSESSMENT

The panel is requested to keep in mind the objectives and the guiding principles when undertaking the QAPA assessment.

Objectives

The main objectives of the quality assurance process audit (QAPA) are to ascertain that the institution:

- a) Continues to meet the program review policy requirements outlined in the DQAB's Exempt Status Criteria and Guidelines and the Degree Program Review Criteria and Guidelines, as applicable to the institution;
- b) Has and continues to meet appropriate program review processes and policies for all credential programs; and
- c) Applies its quality assurance process in relation to those requirements and responds to review findings appropriately.

Guiding Principles

- 1) Transparent and credible evidence of robust quality assurance criteria and processes are vital to BC public post-secondary institutions, the Degree Quality Assessment Board and the Ministry; demonstrate accountability; and contribute to the national and international reputation of the BC public post-secondary system.
- 2) Credible quality assurance should be rigorous and have peer evaluation as an essential feature.
- 3) QAPA standards will recognize the diversity and different mandates of BC public post secondary institutions.
- 4) Primary responsibility and accountability for educational program quality assurance rests with post-secondary institutions themselves.
- 5) QAPA will be carried out so as to maximize the opportunity to:
 - a. affirm, and add value to, the internal quality assurance processes at each institution; and
 - b. share best practices from other BC institutions and elsewhere.
- 6) QAPA will promote a collaborative and supportive process that benefits BC public post- secondary system.

Summary:

As outlined in the attached report ("Quality Assurance at the University of Victoria"), the DQAB panel was impressed with the scope and substance of the University of Victoria's commitment to effective quality assurance across the institution. It reviewed both the overall approach of the University and its Senate and tested the understanding and application of institution-wide policies based on three specific programs – Teacher Education, Political Science and the Bachelor of Commerce.

Its primary conclusions were to recognize the extent to which UVic has embraced quality assurance processes throughout the institution, to celebrate some of its unique approaches which would be valuable to all B.C. post-secondary colleges and

universities, but also to note a lack of transparency in responding to internal and external reviews and considerable unevenness in the application of university-wide policies and practices in specific program areas. These conclusions are reflected in the immediately-following commendations, affirmations and recommendations.

Commendations

Provide clear statements that articulate areas where the institution has shown exemplary practice in the field of program quality assurance and improvement.

1. The university's Enhanced Planning Tools (EPT) contribute substantially to the UVic quality assurance processes by encouraging data-driven decision-making, the development of appropriate matrices, and the use of templates while providing useful data to each department. The EPT reports save faculty time and render the QA process more efficient.
2. Another custom-made UVic tool, the Viability Index, greatly facilitates consideration of program proposals by serving as an important early check on their suitability for further development. Other post-secondary institutions could benefit significantly by developing instruments similar to the EPT and Viability Index for their own quality assurance purposes.
3. The department of Political Science is to be commended for its embracing of experiential learning and its efforts to improve the scholarly recognition of faculty research.
4. The Teacher Education Program is saluted for its regular celebration events around practice teaching and community liaison. Its TRUVic initiative, which encourages teacher education students to reflect on their application of theory to practice in the schools, is particularly noteworthy and should be expanded.
5. The School of Business, through its AACSB and EQUIS accreditations, has systematically developed a quality assurance culture that is a model for the rest of the institution.

Affirmations

Provide clear statements in the areas where the institution has identified a weakness and has articulated how it intends to correct it. In effect, this is affirming the institution's judgment and findings in its Institution Report.

1. The University is in the process of revising and developing new learning outcomes for each program. There are institution-wide learning outcomes and, in many cases, program specific learning outcomes. This is a work in progress which needs to be better integrated within the institution but the direction is the right one. The process should differentiate outcomes at the undergraduate program level from those at the Master's level and, in turn, at the doctoral level.
2. At the time of the review and after broad-based consultation, the University was about to launch a Strategic Enrolment Planning initiative which has the promise of contributing significantly to the integration of all of the elements of quality assurance into institutional planning and implementation.

3. Led by the School of Business, the University is developing a culture of sharing best practices in quality assurance across the institution.
4. The University has an ambitious Indigenous Plan which needs to be widely considered and integrated into all components of the institution.
5. The Faculty of Education has introduced “double mentoring” for research and scholarship whereby new scholars are mentored by experienced faculty members both in research and in subject-matter expertise.

Recommendations

Provide clear statements in areas needing improvement. Recommendations may also be made in relation to areas of concern identified by the institution for which no plan of action has been articulated by the institution.

While some recommendations are implicit for one or more of the three disciplinary areas discussed in the enclosed report, the following are directed at the University as a whole, given the DQAB panel’s required focus on processes rather than program specifics.

1. That the University of Victoria should consider creating a “Quality Assurance” (QA) website. This would address the panel’s concerns about a lack of transparency around quality assurance in a number of ways:
 - a. Public accountability for how every recommendation in external reviews is handled by the relevant unit (i.e., Faculty/School, including Graduate Studies, or Department)
 - b. Providing an opportunity to showcase what UVic does well in QA
 - c. Encouraging an open and proactive approach to challenges and shortfalls, the acknowledgement of which is central to an effective QA process.
 - d. Ensuring that programs are following through on external review recommendations by publicizing the status of each one (i.e., “implemented”, “in process”, “on hold”, “rejected”), including the rationale for whatever action is taken.
2. That there should be a systematic and public follow-through on each recommendation from an external review after appropriate intervals (normally 12 months, 3 years and 5 years, assuming 7-8 year review cycles). This will ensure ongoing monitoring of action plans and their impact and greatly facilitate subsequent academic program reviews and continuous improvement.
3. That Action Plans should specify enrolment targets in each case.
4. That there be a concerted effort to involve more students and other stakeholders in program review processes. The practice is uneven across disciplines and students can not only contribute significantly to the review but may also learn a lot in the process (see the Ontario Guide to the Quality Assurance Framework for useful advice in this area).

<http://oucqa.ca/guide/engaging-stakeholders-in-the-creation-of-self-studies-and-new-program-development>

5. That the program review process should be more prescriptive than it has been, notably in requiring all units to use the Enhanced Planning Tools reports at the centre of their processes so that there is less unevenness across the institution.
6. That all programs would benefit from a more concerted effort at meeting the challenge of determining the extent to which university teaching is informed by research, scholarship and creative activity.
7. That all programs complete the specification of measureable learning outcomes within the broader rubric of those defined more generally for the University. The panel recommends as a useful guide for consideration in the UVic process, the Queen's University comprehensive approach to both undergraduate and graduate learning outcomes. Another useful resource tool is the Canadian Degree Qualifications Framework.

<https://www.queensu.ca/provost/teaching-and-learning/learning-outcomes-queens>.

https://www.cicic.ca/1286/pan_canadian_qualifications_frameworks.canada

Signed:

Chair of the QAPA Team:



December 24, 2018

(Signature)

(Date)

Ross Paul

(Printed Name)

QAPA Assessors:

ON FILE

December 24, 2018

(Signature)

(Date)

Ronald Bond

(Printed Name)

ON FILE

December 24, 2018

(Signature)

(Date)

Brenda Brouwer

(Printed Name)

4.1. Overall Process

A. Does the process reflect the institution's mandate, mission, and values?	
CRITERIA:	COMMENTS / RECOMMENDATIONS:
(i) The institution should be able to demonstrate that it has an established institutional and program review planning cycle and process to assess the effectiveness of its educational programs and services, their responsiveness to student, labour market, and social needs.	The University has a well-established and well-documented planning cycle that is consistent with its mission and mandate. Labour market responsiveness is stronger at the initial phases of program development than in the review process.
(ii) The process should contribute to the continuous improvement of the institution.	It appears to but would benefit from more transparency (see recommendation #1) and, consequently, a higher profile both within the institution and beyond.

B. Is the scope of the process appropriate?	
CRITERIA:	COMMENTS / RECOMMENDATIONS:
<p>(i) There should be evidence of a formal, institutionally approved policy and procedure for the periodic review of programs against published standards that includes the following characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A self-study undertaken by faculty members and administrators of the program based on evidence relating to program performance, including strengths and weaknesses, desired improvements, and future directions. A self-study takes into account: • the continuing appropriateness of the program's structure, admissions requirements, method of delivery and curriculum for the program's educational goals and standards; • the adequacy and effective use of resources (physical, technological, financial and human); • faculty performance including the quality of teaching and supervision and demonstrable currency in the field of specialization; • that the learning outcomes achieved by 	<p>Academic program review is under the purview of the Senate under policies last revised in 2015. It generally meets the criteria set out on the left-hand side, except as otherwise noted below.</p> <p>The more recently introduced Enhanced Planning Tools (EPT) reports have contributed significantly to the effectiveness of program reviews and are more likely to ensure that all of these criteria and characteristics are well addressed than was the case in previous self-study approaches. However, departments have been given a lot of leeway in determining how they proceed, resulting in quite varied use of EPT across the institution. A more systematic approach is recommended in the interest of consistency across the institution (recommendation #5)</p> <p>The University originally defined institution-wide learning outcomes in 2006 and revised them in 2014. In 2016, it launched a new learning outcomes project to further explicate UVic learning outcomes to program-level learning outcomes for all undergraduate and graduate programs. The current pilot phase will lead to intended, measureable outcomes for all</p>

<p>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;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the continuing adequacy of the methods used for evaluating student progress and achievement to ensure that the program's stated goals have been achieved; • the graduate satisfaction level, student satisfaction level, and graduation rate; and • where appropriate, the graduate employment rates, employer satisfaction level, and advisory board satisfaction level. <p>➤ 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 improvements; and an institution response to the report;</p> <p>➤ A summary of the conclusions of the evaluation that is made appropriately available.</p>	<p>programs by 2019-20. As noted above, this is a work-in-progress but one headed in the right direction</p> <p>Suitable provision is made for variance in programs to ensure that, when necessary, reviews meet the standards of external regulatory, accrediting or professional associations.</p> <p>Evaluation in the Teacher Education Program was inconsistent with Senate policies on grading but this has subsequently been addressed so that the policies are now congruent.</p> <p>Conclusions from the evaluation are available but should be more widely disseminated (recommendation #1)</p>
<p>(ii) The institution can demonstrate that it has a policy and process for new program approval that includes peer / external review by appropriate experts.</p>	<p>Yes. The UVic-developed "Viability Index" is a particularly useful tool to filter new program ideas early in the process. The University has also made efforts to ensure that external reviewers are appropriate to the particular program area.</p>

<p>C. Are the guidelines differentiated and adaptable to respond to the needs and contexts of different units, e.g. faculties or departments or credential level?</p>	
<p>CRITERIA:</p>	<p>COMMENTS / RECOMMENDATIONS:</p>
<p>(i) Are the guidelines adaptable to the range of programs and offerings within the institution?</p>	<p>Yes. However, the panel believes that there may be too much flexibility and that stricter adherence to institution-wide practices is</p>

	advisable (recommendation #5)
(ii) Do the guidelines provide measurable, consistent means and direction to undertake diversified program review?	The panel observed some unevenness across program areas and recommends a more systematic or prescriptive approach (recommendation #5)
(iii) Are the guidelines consistent with institutional Mandate, mission, vision and associated strategic goals?	Yes

D. Does the process promote quality improvement?

CRITERIA:	COMMENTS / RECOMMENDATIONS:
(i) The institution should be able to demonstrate that it has appropriate accountability mechanisms functioning for vocational, professional and academic programs.	The ETP process works well and provides updated information annually. The key issue is follow-through -- accountability mechanisms in particular need work (recommendations 1,2,3,5). The panel had some concern about a lack of follow-up after 1 year, and, in at least one case (TEP), a long period between reviews. Hence, it proposes regular monitoring of progress (recommendation #4) and concerted efforts to ensure that deadlines are met (recommendation #2)
(ii) The institution should be able to demonstrate how faculty scholarship and professional development inform teaching (including graduate teaching) and continue to be a foundation for ensuring that programming is up to date.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is some evidence of how teaching is informed by research (undergrads doing research, political science honours programs, independent study course in 4th year of Education) but the institution would benefit from a more systematic approach across all programs (recommendation #6)
(iii) The institution should be able to demonstrate how learning outcomes are being achieved and how student progress is assessed and measured.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The institution is putting the appropriate foundations in place but has considerable work to do in this area. See above comments and recommendation #7.

4.2. Review findings

A. Were the responses to the sample program review findings adequate?

CRITERIA:	COMMENTS / RECOMMENDATIONS:
The institution has a follow up process for internal program reviews and acts in accordance with it.	The institution has such a process but it needs to be more transparent and to more broadly disseminate its outcomes and actions (recommendations #1,2,3,5)

B. Does the process inform future decision making?

CRITERIA:	COMMENTS / RECOMMENDATIONS:
The program review ensures that the program remains consistent with the institution's current mission, goals and long-range plan.	The imminent Strategic Enrolment Management process and the recently adopted Strategic Framework should contribute to a better integration of all components of quality assurance throughout the institution. It is worth pointing out that research institutes and centres are subject to regular QA reviews that resemble those we have studied.

C. Are the review findings appropriately disseminated?

CRITERIA:	COMMENTS / RECOMMENDATIONS:
The institution has a well-defined system to disseminate the review findings to the appropriate entities.	See recommendation #1