

QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESS AUDIT

ASSESSORS' REPORT WORKBOOK

INSTITUTION NAME: College of the Rockies

SITE VISIT DATES: November 23-24, 2022

SUBMISSION DATE: November 29, 2022

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 an outcome of the QAPA review process, it was evident that College of the Rockies has made a significant commitment to quality assurance and to the quality of its educational programs. There is substantial work underway to build robust quality assurance practices, and there has been impressive progress on several initiatives to build a culture of quality at the College.

College of the Rockies staff completed a comprehensive and well written Institutional Self-Study report, providing the panel with a good understanding of the efforts made towards quality assurance at the College. These include new policies, practices, and resources for program review, the establishment of a Centre for Innovation in

Teaching and Learning, new mentoring programs for new faculty (First Year Experience), and investment in a new curriculum management system. It was evident to the panel the level of involvement and awareness of faculty engaged in quality assurance processes.

The Institutional Self-Study and the well-organized site visit demonstrated the College's sincere and effective commitment to continuous improvement. There was clear understanding that this is a work in progress and that the work ahead will take sustained collective effort. The panel commends the College for its vision, leadership, collegial and collaborative approaches, and commitment to quality and the processes necessary to support quality.

The panel's comments in this report are intended to provide insights in support of the College's journey of continuing to build a quality assurance and continuous improvement culture.

Commendations

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

The panel was impressed with the commitment and enthusiasm for quality assurance demonstrated by the full range of participants during the site visit. There is clear momentum in building a quality assurance culture at the College. The panel wishes to commend College of the Rockies in particular on the following areas.

1. Commitment to Quality Assurance

There is impressive progress on a number of quality-related initiatives at the College. These include new policies, procedures, and resources to guide program reviews, new committees to oversee aspects of quality assurance, new initiatives to provide mentoring for faculty (i.e. First Year Experience), and new approaches to gather student data (i.e. Student Experience Survey). This is evidence of the significant efforts being made to move the institution's culture forward towards greater focus on quality assurance and continuous improvement.

2. Establishing Centre for Innovation in Teaching & Learning (CITL)

The panel commends the College on establishing CITL as a central resource for the College, which demonstrates significant commitment and investment in quality by the College leadership. The importance of the role and expertise of the CITL staff was evident in discussions during the site visit, and demonstrated the value of this resource in supporting quality assurance processes such as program review. In addition, it was clear that the faculty development offerings provided by CITL were well received by faculty and contributed to the quality of teaching and learning at the College. Ensuring that the resources of the CITL match this growing need will further strengthen the faculty's commitment to continuous improvement.

3. Commitment to Indigenization and Truth and Reconciliation

It was evident that College of the Rockies has embedded Indigenization and a commitment to Truth and Reconciliation as a core value at the institution. This was evidenced by the renewed MOU with the Ktunaxa Nation Council, the hiring of an Executive Director of Indigenous Strategy & Reconciliation, broader engagement of the Indigenous Education Team on policy and program reviews, and embedding an Indigenous lens in curricular decisions. In addition, the recently established Equity, Diversity, Indigenization, Inclusion and Belonging (EDIIB) Task Force is further evidence of the College's commitment to fostering a culture of equity and belonging at College of the Rockies.

4. Focus on Faculty-driven Program Review

In redesigning its program review policy and processes, the College intentionally established a focus on these as faculty-driven initiatives. This is demonstrated in the initial faculty visioning process that establishes guiding questions for program reviews (referred to as Terms of Reference), clearly defined roles for faculty throughout the program review process, and resourcing program reviews appropriately in terms of faculty release time and CITL support. This faculty-led approach has built trust in the renewed program review process as a valuable and important way to conduct a comprehensive review of programs with a view to future-focused improvements. As the program review process matures, consideration for the role of related academic leadership (Deans, Department heads) should be discussed as a way of strengthening the program areas' ability to enact the formulated recommendations.

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.

Through the College's institutional report and discussions during the site visit, the College identified the following issues as ones that they are intending to address:

1. Strategic Enrollment Management (SEM) Plan

The College has initiated work on a SEM plan, in part as a way of informing future plans for programming at the College to ensure a program mix responsive to the needs of the community. The SEM Plan was developed with extensive engagement contributing to the plan's adoption. The panel supports the inclusion of program quality metrics within the data that will form the SEM dashboard. Determining metrics for all of the SEM plan components, as well as determining the weighted importance of each, will ensure that program quality is not only present in the decision making, but afforded the appropriate value.

2. Availability and consistency of institutional data

A key support for program reviews is the timely availability and consistency of institutional data. The College has increased resources for the Institutional

Research office to enhance the ability to provide a consistent data package for all program reviews, including student and graduate data. In addition, the College has initiated an annual Student Experience Survey to gather student data which will provide additional insights for program and institutional decision-making. Important to the meaningful use of data in program reviews is ensuring there is support for faculty in interpreting and analyzing it to inform future focused recommendations.

3. Annual review period process

The program review process has embedded a one-year status update report, which is important to ensure accountability for the resulting recommendations and action plan. The College recognizes that not all recommendations can be completed within one year, and in response, they are implementing an annual process to monitor progress on recommendations beyond the one-year timeframe. The panel supports this approach and offers the suggestion to consider the requirements of this process with an eye to value for the program while not making the process unnecessarily burdensome for program teams. Additionally, it will be important to ensure that the responsibility for implementation of recommendations is assigned at the appropriate level of the organization to allow for tracking and monitoring of progress.

4. Sharing outcomes of program reviews

The College has established a repository for program review documents, and has implemented methods of communicating the outcomes within the College (for example, within the Program Quality Review Committee and Education Council). There is recognition that there would be benefit to establishing additional ways of providing access to program review materials and outcomes internally and externally. This would broaden the learning opportunities internally and would provide opportunities to share and celebrate outcomes and program improvements with the external community. Sharing outcomes with external partners will also aid in establishing/reinforcing community relations, and commitment to the College.

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.

To assist the College in continuing on its journey of prioritizing quality assurance, the panel offers the following recommendations which we believe will help continue this important work at the College.

1. Plans to assess progress on quality assurance initiatives

The College has initiated an impressive number of initiatives related to quality assurance and continuous improvement. Some of these have evolved organically initially, and there is value in reviewing them and potentially establishing greater structure and consistency to support and sustain them. It is important to establish evaluation plans and mechanisms to review these new quality assurance initiatives to determine whether they are meeting their identified needs and/or should be refined after an initial period. In particular, it will be important to consider the interconnectedness among initiatives to find synergies and efficiencies in order to make them sustainable. Such a process will also ensure that identified effective practices and approaches to these initiatives are captured and shared across the institution.

2. Program Advisory Committees

Program Advisory Committees (PACs) are an integral connection to the community, and the panel commends the College on recent PAC policy development. The panel recommends that the College ensure active engagement across all PACs, consistent involvement in processes such as program reviews and program development initiatives, and ongoing sharing of outcomes of these types of quality assurance processes. Incorporating quality assurance as a regular and standing item in PAC meetings will reinforce the College's commitment to quality, while highlighting the important role that PACs play in quality assurance. The College could consider seeking advisory committee perspective on their satisfaction levels with engagement.

3. Program level outcomes

The panel recognizes that the College has learning outcomes at the course level and with the support of CITL is focusing on ensuring effective assessment of learning outcomes. Programs are also mapping courses and learning outcomes. The panel encourages the College to consider the significant benefit in establishing program level outcomes for all programs – for students, for faculty, and for external partners. This provides a way of communicating graduate abilities on completion of a program, and these outcomes are important to revisit over time as the landscape changes in the relevant disciplines/industry. In this way, program level outcomes can act as an important foundation from which to start program reviews. The College has started discussions around establishing program level outcomes, and the panel recommends that this be prioritized with a clear process and road map for their development across all programs.

4. Program review flexibility versus consistency

The current program review process has been designed with flexibility in mind, which has been well received by faculty and will lead to important learning about what level of flexibility is needed for the range of programs offered at the College. As the College reviews the program review process, there would be benefit in determining what elements of program review should be considered essential for all programs (i.e. strategic directions of the College), and which elements can be addressed flexibly depending on program type. This would provide balance

between flexibility for program teams while ensuring a level of consistency in quality assurance processes. The panel recommends that this be clearly noted in the template used to guide program review self-study reports, as well as in any resources used to guide faculty in the process. As part of this process, it will be important to clarify either the division of responsibility between the faculty team and CITL, or at least the process for determining the division of responsibilities.

5. External review within program review

An external review process has been established within the program review requirements, and has recently started being implemented. There is great value in integrating external review perspectives as part of a program review. The panel recommends that the outcomes of external reviews be integrated consistently into the process, showing how feedback from external reviews is addressed, and how this impacts final recommendations and action plans. There is a recognition that existing external accreditation activities can help inform or be informed by the program review process. Determining a clear process that balances the need to minimize duplication, while serving the intent of the existing review process (self-study, external review) will ensure that the external review within the program review is authentic and valuable.

6. Program development and change policies/processes

To support greater clarity around the development of new programs and processes to change existing programs and courses, the panel recommends updating the policy and procedures supporting these processes. In addition, there may be opportunity to establish additional resources such as guidance from CITL staff or developing new resource guides to support faculty and staff in navigating development and change processes. This will be important to coordinate with the planned implementation of the new curriculum management software, and with involvement of Education Council governance representatives.

7. Establish mechanisms to support institutional decision-making

To support institutional decision-making, the panel recommends establishing structured mechanisms/processes to encourage institutional level learning from program reviews. This may involve, for example, identifying institutional-level recommendations from which numerous programs would benefit, or patterns and trends arising from multiple program reviews that would benefit from deeper analysis.

Signed:

Chair of the QAPA Team:

(Signature)

(Date)

Kathy Siedlaczek

(Printed Name)

QAPA Assessors:

(Signature)

(Date)

Rhys Andrews

(Printed Name)

(Signature)

(Date)

David Veres

(Printed Name)

4.1. Overall Process

<i>A. Does the process reflect the institution's mandate, mission, and values?</i>	
CRITERIA:	COMMENTS / RECOMMENDATIONS:
<p>(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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • College of the Rockies has developed new policies, procedures, practices, and supports for institution and program review effectiveness. • The College has developed a 7-year cycle for program reviews (5 years for degrees) and has indicated that all programs are scheduled for review along these timelines. They have piloted the process for several programs, including the use of an external review process. • An annual review process has been integrated to monitor progress on program review recommendations spanning multiple years. The panel recommends that the College consider requirements for the annual review to ensure it will not be overly burdensome on programs while bringing value for planning processes at the program and institutional level. • Processes have a strong connection to the College's commitment to Indigenous consultation and engagement in how they view and review programming. • The College has initiated a Student Experience Survey to gather insights from current students and to inform College decision-making and resource allocation. • The College continues to invest in additional support for students with a range of initiatives including culturally specific supports for Indigenous students.

<p>(ii) The process should contribute to the continuous improvement of the institution.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The new program review process at College of the Rockies is contributing to the development of a continuous improvement culture. The process has been purposefully designed to meet the needs of the institution’s programs and the College’s current Action Plan. • Commitment to continuous improvement is demonstrated through the inclusive nature of their consultative process, the range of committees established with responsibility for aspects of the processes, and the resource commitments they have put in place to enhance their quality assurance processes. • The panel commends the College on establishing a program review process that has inspired confidence among faculty in terms of the outcomes of the process for program quality, and that directly engages faculty throughout the process. • Opportunities for continuous improvement of the institution could be enhanced with structured debriefs of new quality assurance processes recently implemented at the College, and compiling insights from program reviews to identify patterns and trends meriting attention at an institutional level.
---	---

<i>B. Is the scope of the process appropriate?</i>	
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"> • The recently approved Program Quality Assurance (PQA) Policy (6.1.6) and associated Procedure effectively identify the expectations, processes, and responsibilities for regular program review. This is supported by a template

<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 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; • 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. • 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>to guide faculty through the self-study process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The scope of the program review process seems well suited to the College and its strategic plan and program mix. Program review seems appropriately designed and purposeful for the needs of the institution. The process has included significant policy development with procedures that are supported by administration and CITL. • The process is informed by engagement with Indigenous partners and supported by the staff in the Indigenous Education Office as well as the Equity, Diversity, Indigenization, Inclusion and Belonging Task Force. • The program review process has been designed to engage faculty, students, alumni, and employers to ensure program currency and relevancy. The process is supported by administration (deans and department heads), CITL, and Institutional Research. • The process includes data from the new Student Experience Survey implemented at the College, use of BC Student Outcomes Survey data, student evaluation of instruction, and consultation with program advisory committees. Additional engagement with and analysis of this data within program self-study reports would benefit the program review process. • The panel recognizes the allocation of resources to quality assurance and continuous improvement. There appear to be adequate resources to support the processes as evidenced by the development of quality assurance policy and process, adding CITL staff, release time for faculty engaged in program review, IR resources, excellent facilities and access to technology that contribute
--	---

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A summary of the conclusions of the evaluation that is made appropriately available. 	<p>to quality assurance and continuous improvement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A common approach to program goals and program outcomes is not yet evident at this stage, but the College indicated this is currently under discussion. CITL is supporting faculty around assessment strategies related to course learning outcomes. The program review process would benefit from the development of program outcomes. • Policies and processes are in place to ensure faculty qualifications and currency (specifically Policy 6.3.1 Faculty Qualifications Framework). The College has implemented several initiatives to support faculty in their ongoing development, including a new mentoring program for new faculty (First Year Experience) and a series of opportunities offered by CITL. • The College has developed a new program advisory policy. The College is encouraged to continue to make progress at consistent engagement with program advisory committees, including surveying advisory committees on industry trends and employer satisfaction with graduate outcomes and program content. • An external review process has been developed and piloted with recent program reviews. The College has prioritized remote site visits where appropriate, as aligned with program needs and institutional resources in mind. The panel recommends consistent use of external reviews and ensuring that the timing of reviews occurs prior to the finalization of program review recommendations in order for this important process to be of most benefit to program quality. As well, clear expectations on how program review
--	---

	<p>teams should respond to the outcomes of external reviews would be helpful.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• There would be benefit to identifying and communicating how program review recommendations are considered with reference to the distribution of college resources.• Access to the outcomes of program reviews is currently available internally to select College employees. Consideration around sharing some aspects of the review externally (i.e. sharing recommendations and resulting changes with PACs) and providing access to documents more broadly internally would benefit the process in terms of wider learning of the process and its impact on program quality.• The College has implemented a formal follow-up 1-year report to demonstrate progress on resulting recommendations. While it does not appear that this is embedded in policy, the College described an annual review process to continue monitoring progress on recommendations. The College may consider formalizing this requirement as part of their overall quality assurance processes around continuous improvement.• The relative newness of the PQA policy and procedure make it difficult to appropriately evaluate their effectiveness at this time. The institution is encouraged to implement a feedback mechanism associated with the implementation of the policy as well as a formal review of its effectiveness in meeting intended outcomes. The level of stakeholder engagement and commitment (i.e. faculty, administration, students, employers, CITL staff etc.) are commended. It is also noted by the panel that recently completed program reviews
--	---

	have clear recommendations with actions and improvements in the first year.
(ii) The institution can demonstrate that it has a policy and process for new program approval that includes peer / external review by appropriate experts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The College has a policy and procedure for Program and Course Development and Approval (6.1.2) in place. Within these documents, it is currently unclear how the use of external review for new programs is incorporated in these processes. There is evidence that trend analysis and internal assessment of the academic environment is incorporated in templates, but there needs to be greater clarity on the role of the industry partners and experts in the process. • The College indicated that they incorporate the use of formal program advisory and ad hoc advisory committees of employers to support program development. Embedding these types of practices in policy/procedure would benefit the College's quality assurance processes. • Recognizing that the College prioritized work related to policy and resources for program review, future work on strengthening policy and resources to clarify expectations and processes for program development and program change would benefit College quality assurance processes. The College's investment in a new curriculum management system (Kuali) will directly support this initiative.

<i>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?</i>	
CRITERIA:	COMMENTS / RECOMMENDATIONS:
(i) Are the guidelines adaptable to the range of programs and offerings within the institution?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The program review process and self-study template seem adaptable to the range of offerings at the institution. The panel reviewed program review samples

	<p>that included self-study reports for an individual program, a review of multiple related programs, and a review of a regulated program. The panel commends the College's flexibility to ensure the program review process can work for this range of reviews.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The flexibility in the template has led to a significant disparity in the number and types of recommendations, as well as a differentiated way in which the results were presented. Such flexibility although commendable, can lead to challenges in establishing an institutional view and value of the program reviews. • Accredited/regulated programs conduct both external reviews by relevant accrediting or similar bodies, as well as the College's internal program review process. The College has established a flexible program review model in these cases to reduce unnecessary duplication while ensuring issues important to the College's program review process are considered. • The panel cautions against having unlimited flexibility in program review self-study reports, as this could lead to important considerations being missed in the review of individual programs. The panel recommends that the College identify key requirements for all program reviews within a common template, as well as which areas can be addressed flexibly given unique program types.
<p>(ii) Do the guidelines provide measurable, consistent means and direction to undertake diversified program review?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The policy and procedures developed by the College provide flexibility, are measurable and the reports reviewed during the site visit seemed consistent and meet policy for quality assurance. • Work has occurred to identify and provide a consistent set of data to program review teams from Institutional Research. This

	is an important foundation for program reviews, providing a consistent and measurable set of data across all programs.
(iii) Are the guidelines consistent with institutional Mandate, mission, vision and associated strategic goals?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The program review policy (6.1.6) aligns with the College's mandate, mission, vision, and goals, and this is embedded directly in the self-study template as well. The College currently has a two-year Action Plan, serving as a bridge between two strategic plans. As they proceed with development of their next strategic plan, it may be helpful to reference their commitment to quality assurance within the priorities for the coming years. The existing program review and quality assurance processes create a foundation that can inform the next strategic plan.

<i>D. Does the process promote quality improvement?</i>	
CRITERIA:	COMMENTS / RECOMMENDATIONS:
(i) The institution should be able to demonstrate that it has appropriate accountability mechanisms functioning for vocational, professional and academic programs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The College has demonstrated a commitment to program review across all program types. They have indicated that all programs at the institution will undergo program review, ranging across vocational, professional, and academic programs, with flexibility that best suits the needs of these types of programs. The College has integrated a 1-year follow-up monitoring process for program review teams. The College has also implemented an annual process to monitor review recommendations and their implementation beyond the first year.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to cyclical program review (7 years for most programs), the College also has a 5-year cycle for the review of all course outlines. There may be benefit to coordinating these reviews into one timeframe to establish a comprehensive picture of the program and its courses, and potentially reduce the review burden on faculty.
<p>(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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty have time available in the annual workload for professional development and scholarly activity. • Establishing and resourcing CITL has made a significant positive contribution to scholarship and professional development. There are growing numbers of faculty interactions with CITL, demonstrating the value faculty see in engaging with CITL staff and their offerings. As awareness of CITL services grows among faculty, there may be need for additional resources or prioritization of services in support of quality assurance. • CITL develops training and workshops based on faculty needs and provides a range of opportunities (symposia, workshops, individual and small group support, elearning support, etc). CITL provides a wide range of program review support and provides advice on how to approach the program review process for individual programs. As noted earlier, it will be helpful to have consistent requirements within the self-study template and flexibility on other sections for consistent advice to programs.

<p>(iii) The institution should be able to demonstrate how learning outcomes are being achieved and how student progress is assessed and measured.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The institution demonstrated the achievement of learning outcomes and measurements of student progress through attention to curriculum mapping, with a focus on how assessments are connected to learning outcomes across the courses in a program. This provides excellent insight of achievement of learning outcomes at the course level. Establishing program level outcomes and conducting a mapping exercise to demonstrate how these outcomes are achieved across the various courses would provide additional and important insight for the College and its stakeholders.
--	---

4.2. Review findings

<p><i>A. Were the responses to the sample program review findings adequate?</i></p>	
<p>CRITERIA:</p>	<p>COMMENTS / RECOMMENDATIONS:</p>

<p>The institution has a follow up process for internal program reviews and acts in accordance with it.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The College has a well laid out process for program review that leads to a comprehensive self-study report. This is reviewed internally and then sent for external review involving academic peers, industry representatives, and internal College staff (who are not affiliated with the program). There would be benefit to clarifying how outcomes of external reviews are considered prior to program review recommendations being finalized. • The panel recommends that all programs use a standard approach to capture final recommendations (i.e. the recommendations table in the template), and indicate who is responsible for each part of the action plan. This will provide clear accountability for follow up. • The documentation in the review adheres to the college's policy. The review has a 1-year follow-up and opportunities for debriefing with program review teams, and sharing with Education Council and other committees. There is evidence that recommendations in the program reviews lead to action plans and progress and that the College is supporting action plans and prioritized recommendations. • There is an opportunity to extend the planning and implementation beyond the 1-year follow-up with some consistent annual planning and in supporting multi-year action plans and recommendations. • The College is encouraged to continue their conversation on communicating out program reviews internally within the College and to support other program review teams.
---	---

<p><i>B. Does the process inform future decision making?</i></p>	
<p>CRITERIA:</p>	<p>COMMENTS / RECOMMENDATIONS:</p>

<p>The program review ensures that the program remains consistent with the institution's current mission, goals and long-range plan.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While the programs reviewed during the site visit appeared to align with College strategic goals, this may be a result of standard text included in the College's template. The program review process would benefit from further alignment of program recommendations with College mission, vision, values and strategic direction. • There is evidence that the College is working to consistently tie their program review process with the institution's strategic goals in their current Action Plan. Ensuring that program review recommendations are also tied to strategic goals will strengthen this connection. • Strategic plan renewal is underway and there would be benefit in incorporating quality assurance goals and priorities into this process. This could be informed by assessing learning from completed program reviews as a way of contributing to institutional learning from these and other quality assurance processes. • The panel notes that there could be greater clarity regarding how the process outcomes drive institutional decision making and allocation of resources.
--	--

<p><i>C. Are the review findings appropriately disseminated?</i></p>	
<p>CRITERIA:</p>	<p>COMMENTS / RECOMMENDATIONS:</p>

<p>The institution has a well-defined system to disseminate the review findings to the appropriate entities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The College has established an internal repository for program review documents, and has made these available to some faculty and staff. The panel recommends giving additional thought to broader ways to provide access to these materials internally.• Consideration should be given to communicating the processes and related outcomes internally as an important way to ensure broad awareness and consistent implementation.• Broadening the awareness of the review findings will also provide the opportunity to celebrate the successes of the College and the related program/faculty teams during the implementation of these new approaches to quality assurance.• The panel suggests that sharing outcomes of program reviews with external stakeholders would provide an opportunity to celebrate successes and establish more transparency and accountability in these processes.
--	--