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Introduction

At its best, external quality assurance supports and enhances continuous improvement in program delivery and is proportionate to an institution’s ability to maintain and continuously improve the quality of its programs. Recognising this, the Postsecondary Education Quality Assessment Board (PEQAB) seeks to acknowledge and encourage institutional capacity for internal quality assurance.

PEQAB’s regular process for quality assurance in the context of renewal of consent for College degree programs has involved, for all such programs, a double examination of the programs and two site visits: the first conducted by the College itself through an External Program Evaluation Committee (EPEC) or an Program Evaluation Committee (PEC) according to PEQAB’s Internal Quality Assurance and Development standard--typically more than a year prior to the end of the current consent; and a second review and a site visit, conducted by PEQAB after referral of the degree program. For many College degree programs, this dual process can be reduced to a single, simplified and expedited process without risk to program quality.

An environmental scan of the Canadian quality assurance (QA) landscape has shown that QA agencies employ myriad processes for program renewal/program audit, most of which contain a recurring monitoring or auditing element that reflect internal QA processes. In addition, many Canadian and international QA agencies offer some form of expedited or partial reviews in certain circumstances. Based on these examples and best practices, PEQAB has devised an Expedited Renewal Process that focusses on colleges’ internal QA practices, principally through PEQAB staff attending the site visit of a College’s own EPEC/PEC.

This simpler process for renewals eliminates approximately half of the current consent process for renewals, while preserving all the elements necessary for mature Colleges’ assurance of quality.

This Manual is for Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology seeking to renew consent pursuant to the Post-secondary Education Choice and Excellence Act, 2000 (the Act) via the Expedited Renewal Process. It addresses:

1. Eligibility Requirements
2. The Expedited Renewal Process
3. Submission Requirements
4. PEQAB’s Audit and Recommendations
5. Additional Support from PEQAB Secretariat
6. Appendices

Colleges should note that the Board may revise any/all of its Manuals including this one usually in August of each year, and the onus is on the College to ensure that it is using one of the current Board Manual(s).

This Manual addresses only the Board’s requirements for applications under the Expedited Renewal Process for consent. For an overview of the Board, and its assessment criteria and
procedures, applicants should refer to the *Manual for Ontario Colleges*. Inquiries about the Board’s criteria or procedures should be directed to

Postsecondary Education Quality Assessment Branch
315 Front Street West
16th Floor
Toronto, ON M7A 0B8
E-mail: peqab@ontario.ca
Web: [http://www.peqab.ca](http://www.peqab.ca)

Inquiries about the application and consent process, the Act and its regulations, the activities subject to the Act, and the Minister’s requirements should be directed to the Universities Unit of the Postsecondary Education Division, Postsecondary Accountability Branch, Ministry of Colleges and Universities.

1. Eligibility Requirements

*Expedited Renewals* will be available to all Colleges with degree programs that have received initial consent. Any College program wishing to undergo the Expedited Renewal Process can do so, simply by notifying the PEQAB Secretariat prior to the appointment of an EPEC/PEC and the initiation of the site visit according to the Internal Quality Assurance and Development Standard. No College is required to do so, and every program is welcome to undergo the full PEQAB renewal process.

Should a College feel it may benefit from a comprehensive renewal against the full set of PEQAB criteria by a PEQAB appointed external panel, the requirements for full renewals are outlined in the *Submission Guidelines for Consent Renewal*. While the decision about whether to conduct expedited or full renewals lies with each College, PEQAB may, in some circumstances, suggest a full PEQAB renewal.

All applications for new programs would undergo standard PEQAB review processes and the requirements for new program submissions are addressed in the *Manual for Ontario Colleges*.

2. Expedited Renewal Process

Any program for which a College chooses the Expedited Renewal Process need only conduct its self-study and evaluation as per the Internal Quality Assurance and Development standard and NOT also go through the subsequent PEQAB review. The main addition is that a PEQAB Senior Policy Advisor will attend the site visit with the College’s own External Program Evaluation Committee (EPEC) or Program Evaluation Committee (PEC).
The expedited renewal process will follow these steps (for more detail see narrative sections below)

1. **College**
   - Decides to undergo the Expedited Renewal Process
   - Selects, appoints and orient EPEC/PEC members
   - Plans an EPEC/PEC site visit
   - Invites PEQAB to attend the EPEC/PEC site visit and shares with PEQAB staff all relevant information and documentation

2. **The EPEC/PEC**
   - Conducts a site visit and writes a report which is shared with the college

3. **The College**
   - Completes the internal program evaluation process
   - Submits to the Ministry an application for expedited program renewal

4. **Minister**
   - Refers the program to PEQAB for quality assurance

5. **PEQAB Secretariat**
   - Posts the application on the PEQAB website

6. **Board (PEQAB)**
   - Reviews the expedited program renewal application at its next meeting and makes a recommendation to the Minister
   - Shares the PEQAB Final Report with the College
   - Posts the recommendation date on its website

7. **Minister**
   - Considers PEQAB’s recommendation and any public policy or financial issues that may flow from the renewal of a consent
   - Communicates the decision about consent to the College

8. **PEQAB Secretariat**
   - Following the Minister’s communication of the decision to the College, posts the Board’s recommendation and the Minister’s decision on the PEQAB website.
EPEC/PEC Review

The program conducts its normal self-study and evaluation according to its own institutionally approved policy and procedure and within the benchmarks in the PEQAB Internal Quality Assurance and Development Standard. The self-study thereby reflect all relevant PEQAB standards and benchmarks. The College then:

- **Selects, appoints and orients EPEC/PEC members.** It is suggested that the EPEC/PEC be comprised of at least
  - two external subject-matter experts --one of which should be the PEC/EPEC/PEC Chair--
  - one senior academic peer either internal to the College but outside the program or a member of the College Degree Operating Group (CDOG) external to the College and
  - one student or recent graduate, either from within the College or from another institution, and who is or was enrolled in a related degree program.¹
- **Plans a EPEC/PEC site visit**² approximately 18 months prior to the expiry of a current consent and includes the PEQAB Secretariat in the planning to ensure staff are available to attend the site visit which could be either in person or virtual.
- **Invites PEQAB to attend the EPEC/PEC site visit.**
- **Shares with PEQAB staff all relevant information and documentation** as provided to the EPEC/PEC.

If an accreditation review applied to the program, the role of the EPEC/PEC may be played by a panel from a professional accreditation agency (such as the Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board or the Council for Interior Design Accreditation) if

- the accreditation review is sufficiently similar to that of PEQAB and
- it covers most areas typically addressed in an EPEC/PEC review.

In such cases a College supplements the self-study, tailored toward the professional accreditation, with a self-study against any relevant PEQAB criteria not sufficiently addressed through the relevant accreditation review.

**Criteria for EPEC/PEC Members**

EPEC/PEC members should possess qualifications and personal qualities that engender the confidence of the Board, the Minister, the public, accrediting bodies, relevant regulatory bodies and other degree granting institutions. Specifically, EPEC/PEC members should demonstrate the following:

- be free of any conflict of interest.
- hold an advanced academic credential related to the subject area under review (normally at the terminal level in the field).
- possess required or desired professional credentials and/or related work experience of substantial depth and range.
- have relevant academic experience such as administration, teaching, curriculum design, and/or quality assessment experience (e.g., as appraisers for accrediting bodies or as reviewers of degree programs).
- have a record of active scholarship.

¹ The PEQAB Secretariat may assist with any of the tasks (see 5. Additional Support from PEQAB Secretariat below)
² See Appendix 6. a) for draft EPEC/PEC site visit agendas.
In addition, it is suggested that EPEC/PEC chairs be experienced in the administration of higher education and have practice as committee members who can function objectively and effectively as chairs.

It is also suggested that the institution ensure that

- at least one EPEC/PEC member be new to the institution (i.e. someone who has not reviewed the program in the past 5 years).
- EPEC/PEC members not be from the same institution.

strive to

- include on each EPEC/PEC a member with experience with the type of institution at which the program is (proposed to be) offered.
- achieve diversity in the selection of EPEC/PEC members.

**EPEC/PEC Member Internal to the College or from CDOG**

As per the requirements for the Internal Program Review (see *Manual for Ontario Colleges and Public Institutions*), it is suggested the one EPEC/PEC member either be a senior academic internal to the College or a member of the College Degree Operating Group (CDOG). This individual should be someone external to the program or College whom the College/program thinks could reasonably fill the role.

**Student EPEC/PEC Members**

As per international best practice\(^3\) it is suggested that one EPEC/PEC member be either a student or recent graduate

- from a related degree program at the same institution or
- from a related degree program at different institution.\(^4\)

The student or recent graduate EPEC/PEC member would require an orientation similar to the one provided to the other EPEC/PEC members, with additional information on quality assurance in Ontario and the role of students in QA. It is suggested their compensation be comparable to those of other EPEC/PEC members. The PEQAB Secretariat can --at the College’s request-- be involved in the orientation of the student EPEC/PEC member and the PEQAB Secretariat can make its student Orientation materials as well as its EPEC/PEC Student Guidelines available to any College wishing to adapt or use them.

**Orientation of EPEC/PEC Members**

It is expected that Colleges orient their EPEC/PEC members and each College can have its own orientation materials as suitable to the program(s). The PEQAB Secretariat can, however, be involved in the orientation of the EPEC/PEC, at the College’s request. In addition, the PEQAB Secretariat can make its Panel Orientation materials as well as its EPEC/PEC Guidelines available to any College.

---

\(^3\) The recognition that student voices are critical in shaping higher education is gaining momentum, and students on review teams (and QA Boards) have been a central feature of QA in Europe for years—their use there is now entirely non-controversial. Students bring a unique perspective which should, ideally, inform the program and any reviews on an ongoing basis (as opposed to a consultation occasionally and/or only as part of the cyclical review).

\(^4\) At this point including a student is a suggestion as we understand this may take some time to deliberate over and to pilot.
Payment for EPEC/PEC Members

PEQAB’s per diem for External Expert Reviewers is $800, and these are typically compensated for 3-4 days. It is recommended that colleges pay their EPEC/PEC members at the same, or a similar rate.

Review of Expedited Renewal Application

1. Once the internal program evaluation process is completed, the College submits to the Ministry for quality assurance review
   • The program self-study\(^5\)
   • The Program Evaluation Committee (EPEC/PEC) report\(^6\)
   • The College’s response to the program self-study and the EPEC/PEC report\(^7\)
   • Course Outlines
   • Faculty CVs
   • Plus, anything additional required by the Ministry for its policy review
   • For posting on the PEQAB website the Program Abstract and Course Schedule (see details below).

2. The Ministry then refers the program to PEQAB for quality assurance.

3. The PEQAB Board reviews these materials at its next meeting and may
   a) Recommend to the Minister re-review after 7 years and continuation/’renewal’ of consent.
   b) Recommend another duration of consent and/or conditions of consent.
   c) Request further materials or further review processes of the College program.

For more detail, see Section 3. and 4. below.

3. Submission Requirements

Submission and Mailing Instructions

As with new programs and full PEQAB renewals, a College can bundle closely related study programs in a cluster. For example, Bachelor of Commerce programs with different concentrations (such as Human Resources, Supply Chain Management or Accounting) could be submitted as one application. All programs within the cluster can be reviewed by the same EPEC/PEC members if, collectively, the EPEC/PEC has expertise in each of the programs or program areas.

\(^5\) Or the self-study, tailored toward the professional accreditation, supplemented with a self-study against any PEQAB criteria not sufficiently addressed through the relevant accreditation review.
\(^6\) Or a report of the appropriate accreditation agency
\(^7\) Or a response to the recommendation from the accreditation report
All applications for Expedited Renewals are to be addressed and submitted to the Minister of Colleges and Universities.

In addition to a cheque or money order for $5,000 CDN (or $10,000/$15,000 in the case of bundled applications)\(^8\) to the Ontario Ministry of Finance as an application fee, colleges applying for Expedited Renewals are required to submit the following materials electronically on a USB stick (or equivalent):

- A copy of a letter of application to the Minister of Colleges and Universities stating the program/programs that Expedited Renewal is sought for
- A copy of the signed Applicant Acknowledgement and Agreement form as provided in the Directives and Guidelines for Applying for Ministerial Consent under the Post-secondary Education Choice and Excellence Act, 2000
- A completed Ministry Summary of Application Form (Appendix C)
- The program self-study\(^9\)
- The Program Evaluation Committee (EPEC/PEC) report\(^10\)
- The College’s response to the program self-study and the EPEC/PEC report\(^11\)
- Any update on the institution’s action plan that resulted from the self-study or EPEC/PEC report
- Information on future plans or developments of the institution or program
- Information on special challenges or developments over the period of consent
- A brief report on how any condition(s) or commitment(s) from the last Board review and report were addressed.
- Any additional (proposed) program changes (e.g., a new pathway or nomenclature) that have not been addressed in the report on commitments, the self-study, or the program action plan and the rationale for these changes (e.g., changes prompted by modifications to the regulatory framework for a profession).
- Course Outlines
- Faculty CVs

**For posting on the PEQAB website**: The Program Abstract and a Course Schedule that shows for each academic year, and by semester
- the title of each course/other requirement
- the type of course/other requirement (core or non-core)
- hours per course
- course prerequisites, co-requisites, and restrictions
- the highest earned qualifications of proposed instructors and required credentials for faculty to be hired.\(^{12}\)

Course outlines and faculty CVs can be submitted as separate, searchable files. All other submission documents for PEQAB should be provided as a single, searchable electronic file saved in PDF format including any supporting documentation (e.g., CVs of the EPEC/PEC).

---

\(^8\) For bundled applications the fee is $10,000 for an application containing up to five degree programs and $15,000 for an application of five or more programs.

\(^9\) Or the self-study, tailored toward the professional accreditation, supplemented with a self-study against any PEQAB criteria not sufficiently addressed through the relevant accreditation review.

\(^10\) Or a report of the appropriate accreditation agency

\(^11\) Or a response to the recommendation from the accreditation report

\(^12\) Please ensure that these two electronic files are compliant with the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA).
Send all materials to
The Minister of Colleges and Universities
c/o The Universities Unit
315 Front Street West
16th Floor
Toronto, ON  M7A 0B8

The information submitted according to this Manual is collected pursuant to the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act and the Post-secondary Education Choice and Excellence Act, 2000.

4. PEQAB’s Audit and Recommendations

While all programs are still expected to meet or exceed all relevant PEQAB standards, the Expedited Renewal alters the way in which alignment with PEQAB standards is demonstrated and reviewed and the nature of PEQAB’s involvement in the program review processes. PEQAB follows the principle that the review of the EPEC/PEC should focus on the sufficiency of mechanisms that a College has chosen to secure the quality of its degree programs. Of course, individual targets set by the College in the self-evaluation report should also be taken into consideration.

After referral, the PEQAB Board will normally review at its next Board meeting
• the program self-study 13
• the Program Evaluation Committee (EPEC/PEC) report 14
• the College’s response to the program self-study and the EPEC/PEC report. 15

The Board may then
a) Recommend to the Minister re-review after 7 years and continuation/‘renewal’ of consent.
b) Recommend another duration of consent and/or conditions of consent.
c) Request further materials or further review processes of the College program, which may include commitments, conditions, report backs on modifications, and others up to and including a second site visit with an External Expert Panel selected in conjunction with the College according to the full PEQAB processes.
   - If c) the College’s additional submissions would be considered at a subsequent Board meeting, at which the full current options available to the Board, in terms of duration of consent, conditions of consent and others would be recommended to the Minister.
   - If c) were to include a second site visit with an External Expert Panel or any materials or information provided by a third party, the current PEQAB process of seeking the College’s response in advance of Board consideration would also apply.

13 Or the self-study, tailored toward the professional accreditation, supplemented with a self-study against any PEQAB criteria not sufficiently addressed through the relevant accreditation review
14 Or a report of the appropriate accreditation agency
15 Or a response to the recommendation from an accreditation report
PEQAB’s new Reconsideration process is also available to the College as regards any of the Board’s conditions or duration of consent recommendations.

In rare circumstances, PEQAB may resort to a full PEQAB renewal review instead of or in addition to considering the Expedited Renewal application, e.g., if
• requested by the Minister during the referral and/or through specific instructions and/or
• major weakness in process or content were discovered during the EPEC/PEC site visit.

5. Additional Support from PEQAB Secretariat

In addition to attending the site visit and at the request of the College, the PEQAB Secretariat may provide
• support in identifying potential external expert reviewers as a part of the Program Evaluation Committee,
• support in orienting the Panel, interpreting the standards and benchmarks,
• a template for the Review in the form of ‘Review Panel Guidelines’,
• a list of all Benchmarks and Standards that can be excluded from review as PEQAB determined through and previous review that the College satisfies these,16
• any other similar supports which the program requests,
• support to the College in choosing assessment tools or reviews/evaluations of student work that demonstrate student achievement.

6. Appendices

a) Suggested EPEC/PEC Member Qualifications and COI

Suggested Criteria and Principles for EPEC/PEC Members
The Board suggests that Colleges recruit EPEC/PEC members who possess qualifications and personal qualities that engender the confidence of the PEQAB Board, the Minister, the public, accrediting bodies, relevant regulatory bodies and other degree granting institutions. Specifically, it is suggested that EPEC/PEC members demonstrate the following:
• be free of any conflict of interest, in accordance with the institution’s policy on conflict of interest guidelines.
• hold an advanced academic credential related to the subject area under review (normally at the terminal level in the field).
• possess required or desired professional credentials and/or related work experience of substantial depth and range.

16 These often include institutional policies and procedures as well as the review of Breadth/Non-core courses.
• have relevant academic experience such as administration, teaching, curriculum design, and/or quality assessment experience (e.g., as appraisers for accrediting bodies or as reviewers of degree programs).
• have a record of active scholarship.

In addition to the qualities of Panel members, it is recommended that Panel chairs normally be experienced in the administration of higher education and have practice as committee members who can function objectively and effectively as chairs.

It is also recommended that the College ensure that
• at least one Panel member be new to the institution (i.e. someone who has not reviewed the program in the past 5 years).
• Panel members not be from the same institution.
• no more than one Panel member be an applicant nominee.

strive to
• include on each Panel a member with experience with the type of institution at which the program is (proposed to be) offered.
• achieve diversity in the selection of EPEC/PEC members.

Suggested Policy on Conflict of Interest for EPEC/PEC Members
This guideline is intended as a suggestion or reference point for Colleges wanting to draft a Conflict of Interest (COI) policy for EPEC/PEC members and it is similar to the COI that PEQAB employs for the recruitment of its External Expert Review Panels.

EPEC/PEC members must not reveal or divulge confidential information received in the course of their duties and confidential information must not be used for any purpose outside the duties. EPEC/PEC members must not make public comments concerning any evaluation.

EPEC/PEC members are expected to avoid conflicts of interest or the appearance of conflict of interest between their duties as EPEC/PEC members and their personal or business interests. An actual or potential conflict of interest arises when an individual is placed in a situation in which his or her interests and experience appear to conflict with his or her responsibilities to the College, PEQAB, the Ministry and the public interest.

Definition of Conflict of Interest
Excluding the members of the EPEC/PEC that are recruited from inside the College or that are current or former students of the College, EPEC/PEC members appointed by the College should not have any connection to the College or program partner(s) under review within the previous five years, or for a period of up to six months following the completion of their duties in connection with the evaluation/review process. Some examples of an unacceptable connection include:
• Preparing or providing expert advice used in developing the program self-study or other expects of the program,
• Making public comment for or against a program or College that might result in the apprehension of bias
• Being currently or having previously been employed by the institution
• Being a student or graduate of the College (with the exception of the student EPEC/PEC member)
• Working as a consultant for the College
• Serving in an advisory capacity or on a board or committee at the College
• Having financial or other business interests with the institution;
• Supervising students or employees of the institution;
• Collaborating regularly with the College and/or,
• Teaching at the College.

Employment or previous employment by a competitive or potentially competitive institution does not, in and of itself, constitute a conflict of interest.

EPEC/PEC members who have any interest by virtue of a past or current connection, or who make public statements about the College/program under consideration must decline acceptance of EPEC/PEC membership or withdraw from the EPEC/PEC panel. Individuals who make public statements or who participate in the preparation of public statements concerning the College and/or any aspect of a program, before or during an external evaluation, are considered to be in a conflict of interest by reason of a potential apprehension of bias.

**Disclosing a Conflict of Interest**
To assist in determining whether a conflict exists, all EPEC/PEC members shall make full disclosure to the College of any potential conflict of interest, within the terms of this policy, as soon as they become aware of the potential conflict of interest. Similarly, if a College discovers a real or perceived conflict of interest between itself and a EPEC/PEC members, the conflict shall be disclosed to the EPEC/PEC member or EPEC/PEC candidate. In accordance with these guidelines, the College should then exercise its discretion in determining whether a conflict exists and notify the parties accordingly.

**b) Draft EPEC/PEC Site Visit Agendas (on-site or virtual)**

**ON-SITE**

NAME OF COLLEGE, SCHOOL and PROGRAM
EPEC/PEC Site Visit Agenda
Site Visit: DATE & LOCATION

EPEC/PEC Members:
PEQAB Observer:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Topics/Areas of Focus/Session</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00 – 8:30am</td>
<td>Welcome and Coffee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 8:30 – 9:00  | **Overview of the Agenda, College, Centre, School and Program Review (Self-Study) Process**                      | • Senior college administration  
• Program coordinator and/or chair  
• Dean of the relevant faculty  
• Program Development and Quality Assurance |
| 9:00 – 10:30 | **Academic Program Overview/ Overview of Program Development, Content, Outcomes, and Delivery**               | • Program coordinator and/or chair, i.e. person(s) responsible for the oversight of the program  
• Dean(s)  
Maybe:  
• Research Services  
• Program Development and Quality Assurance |
| 10:00 – 10:45| **Break**                                                               |                                                                              |
| 10:45 – 11:45| **Meeting with current and past Students**                              | Opportunity to meet with  
• current students and graduates (for program renewals)  
• current students and graduates from related programs (for new programs) |
| 11:45 – 12:30| **Working Lunch (panel only)**                                          |                                                                              |
| 12:30 – 1:15 | **Tour of Campus Facilities**                                           | This tour may include a visit to the library, computing facilities, student support services and some classrooms and labs |
| 1:15 – 2:15  | **Program Content and Delivery and Capacity to Deliver**               | Meeting with Faculty |
| 2:15 – 3:15  | **Program Currency and Relevance to the Field(s) of Practice**         | Representatives of the Program Advisory Committee |
| 3:15 – 3:30  | **Break**                                                               |                                                                              |
| 3:30 – 4:15  | **Institutional Support for Program and Program Policies**             | Participants may include representatives from ‘enabling areas’/ ‘support areas’ such as  
• Student Services & College Resources/ Student Affairs  
• Co-op Education and Career Services  
• Enrolment Services  
• Financial Aid and Student Awards  
• Marketing |
| 4:15 – 4:45  | **Panel Caucus (panel only)**                                          |                                                                              |
| 4:45 – 5:00  | **Concluding Meeting/ Exit Interview**                                  | The same participants as in the first session |
EPEC/PEC Members:
PEQAB Observer:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Topics/Areas of Focus/Session</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00 – 9:00</td>
<td>Panel Welcome and Introduction</td>
<td>• Senior college administration • Program coordinator and/or chair • Dean of the relevant faculty • Program Development and Quality Assurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 – 10:00</td>
<td>Overview of the Agenda, College, Centre, School and Program Review (Self-Study) Process</td>
<td>• Program coordinator and/or chair, i.e. person(s) responsible for the oversight of the program • Dean(s) Maybe: • Research Services • Program Development and Quality Assurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 – 11:30</td>
<td>Academic Program Overview/Overview of Program Development, Content and Outcomes Including e.g., detailed discussion of curriculum, course outlines, work integrated learning experiences and bridge pathways (if applicable), college’s research capacity and academic pathways for degree graduates</td>
<td>Participants may include representatives from ‘enabling areas’/ ‘support areas’ such as • Student Services &amp; College Resources/Student Affairs • Co-op Education and Career Services • Enrolment Services • Financial Aid and Student Awards • Marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30 – 11:45</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 – 1:00</td>
<td>Institutional Support for Program and Program Policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

End of first day

Virtual Site Visit: DATE
URL of Meeting and Password
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Topics/Areas of Focus/Session</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00 – 8:30</td>
<td>Panel Welcome and Recap of Previous Day</td>
<td>Opportunity to meet with current students and graduates (for program renewals) current students and graduates from related programs (for new programs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30 – 9:30</td>
<td>Meeting with current and past Students</td>
<td>Opportunity to meet with current students and graduates (for program renewals) current students and graduates from related programs (for new programs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 – 9:45</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:45 – 11:00</td>
<td>Program Content and Delivery and Capacity to Deliver</td>
<td>• Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 – 11:15</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:15 – 12:15</td>
<td>Program Currency and Relevance to the Field(s) of Practice</td>
<td>• Representatives of the Program Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:15 – 1:15</td>
<td>Panel Caucus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

URL of Meeting and Password

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Topics/Areas of Focus/Session</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2:00 – 3:00</td>
<td>Concluding Meeting/ Exit Interview</td>
<td>The same participants as in the first session</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

End of Virtual Site Visit

c) Review of Samples of Student Work

Collecting and Providing Samples of Student Work
To facilitate the EPEC/PEC’s review of samples of student work for evidence that the expected learning outcomes related to the Degree Level Standard have been achieved, the following is suggested:
That
• the College select and sort student work into what it considers exemplary, average, and minimally acceptable performance categories allowing EPEC/PEC members to select samples from among these three categories,
• samples be from the terminal stage (3rd and/or 4th year) of the program,
• samples are from a range of courses and a variety of instructors and ideally include the capstone project and that they be representative of the program being reviewed,
• all personal identifiers be removed from the samples of student work,\textsuperscript{17}
• Colleges provide the details of the assignments (i.e., a copy of what the student receives) and, where available, the rubrics against which the assignments were graded,
• if possible, samples be unmarked (i.e. void of grading and instructor comments),
• the sample size be large enough to randomly select from (i.e. that the samples size from the core courses in the program be at least 20\% (or a minimum of 15 samples, whichever is greater) of the total number of students in the program (e.g., 20 samples if 100 students are enrolled in the program under review)
• the College distribute samples to the EPEC/PEC (and the PEQAB Secretariat) prior to the site visit to allow for a desk review in advance of the visit. Where that is not possible, a minimum of 60-90 minutes will have to been found somewhere in the agenda for the EPEC/PEC to conduct this task.

\section*{Reviewing Samples of Student Work}

The EPEC/PEC is responsible for randomly selecting samples of student work from the collection that the College provides. The objectives of this requirement are to assess

• whether the Degree Level Standard has been met (i.e., whether the samples of student work reflect the anticipated outcomes of the program)
• whether the applicant has appropriately assessed the level of student performance.

EPEC/PEC members are asked to confirm in the Panel Report that a review of samples of student work was undertaken, indicate how many samples were reviewed, and provide details around their findings. EPEC/PEC members may use the following chart to document this process.

Please complete the following table regarding samples of student work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Minimally Acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of samples available (if too many to count, indicate ample)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of samples reviewed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number without personal identifiers removed (if all or majority, indicate such)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples of assessment methods used</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of students enrolled in program (if available):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{17} Anonymizing the samples of student work is a suggestion. PEQAB would have no objections to personal identifiers being included if a college has an internal policy or appropriate disclosures making students aware and ensuring their consent to share samples of student work, with their personal identifiers included, with an external QA panel.
d) Other assessments of the learning outcome achievements of students/graduates

As a supplement to the EPEC/PEC marking random samples of student work that reflect exemplary, average, and minimally acceptable performance from the terminal years of the degree program (as per PEQAB’s current *Guidelines for Samples of Student Work, Appendix c*), student achievement can also be demonstrated through

a) Recognised, comparable, or scalable evaluations of critical thinking, problem-solving, communication skills of students graduating from the program, and/or

b) Other learning outcomes assessment models/management systems, as proposed by the institution.

If assessments in addition to reviewing samples of student work are chosen to demonstrate student achievement, EPEC/PEC members should be instructed to review/comment on the learning outcome achievements of students/graduates based also on the option chosen.