Information about Changes that occurred during the transition to the new 2018 Manual for Private Organizations

Board-approved changes
The following are Board-approved changes to its Handbooks from August 2017 until current.

Changes approved by the Board to the Standards
• Requiring applicants to perform due diligence with respect to the academic credibility of the credential granting institution for all qualifications claimed by faculty members (Capacity to Deliver Standard - November 2017)
• Strengthening of the Program Evaluation Standard most importantly by further detailing - requirements for faculty performance indicators - criteria for the assessment of the learning outcomes to be employed in a program - requirements for Program Evaluation Committees (PEC). (March 2018)
• Editing PEQAB’s breadth criteria for clarity to ensure among applicants the unambiguous notion that ‘non-core’ comprises every course/subject that falls outside the program core, including relevant parts of the Liberal Arts curriculum but also potentially much more. (July 2018)

Additions approved by the Board to the Handbooks/Website
• a Concerns and Complaints Procedure for concerns about programs or organizational quality, as well as complaints about PEQAB operations and those pertaining to PSECE Act. (January 2018)
• a Reconsideration Process for PEQAB recommendations for conditions of consent, a shorter duration of consent, and/or denial of consent. (May 2018)
• Principles in Reviewing Bridges to Degrees to address gaps and differences in the interpretation of the Board’s requirements for pathways from diplomas to degrees by both institutions and reviewers. (July 2018)

Synopsis of other changes

Formal Changes
• Combining the Handbook and the two sets of Submission Guidelines (new and renewal) into one document, where the Standards and benchmarks are followed by a section called “Documentation commonly submitted” that contains information formerly found only in the Submission Guidelines.
• Adding sub-headings to longer benchmarks sections to group them into themes and increase usability.
• Including one comprehensive appendix that comprises all reference materials and information pertinent to applications formerly found distributed among Handbooks Submission Guidelines and the website.

Content Changes
• Eliminating unnecessary or redundant criteria/benchmarks, and combining, synthesizing others.
  - Part of the Mission Statement and Academic Goals Standard was turned into a benchmark.
  - Under the Student Protection Standard multiple sub-benchmarks were abridged and moved into two footnotes (10 and 11)
  - Some benchmarks were moved to the “Documents Commonly Submitted” section (e.g. under the Financial Stability Standard requirements for the business plans were removed from the benchmarks but referenced in the “Documents Commonly Submitted” section)
- Under the *Dispute Resolution Standard* multiple sub-benchmarks were abridged and moved into a footnote (14)

- Both the *Program Evaluation* and the *Organization Evaluation Standard* were fully revamped, reducing the criteria to three short benchmarks addressing the requirements for:
  1. a policy and procedure for the periodic review of its operational and administrative policies and procedures
  2. suitable instruments, processes and information to ensure the appropriateness, effective management and continuous improvement of the organization’s operation, policies, and procedures.
  3. A requirement for involving all relevant stakeholder groups stakeholders at the institution in the ongoing quality assurance procedures.

All requirements for the internal program and organization review were removed from the Standards and are now presented in a comprehensive appendix (12.10) that outlines the requirements for the internal program and organization review including the self-study, the Program Evaluation (PEC) Committee Organization Evaluation Committee (OEC) and the reports of the PEC and OEC and the applicant response(s).

- Introducing as criteria the notion of studiability/academic feasibility to expand consideration of student workloads and well-being. – *Program Delivery Standard*

- Increasing consideration of student involvement in quality assurance, for example by
  - asking that applicants describe how they (plan to) engage students in discussions about program content and delivery,
  - underlining that the program self-study shall be undertaken with student input.

- Improving output measures and strengthening the focus on the application of Standards, for example by requiring applicants to provide a plan for tracking graduates (new programs) and information/data about the labour market and further education outcomes of graduates (renewals).

- *Credential Recognition Standard*