

Quality Assessment Panel Report Guidelines

**Review of an Application from
NAME OF PRIVATE INSTITUTION proposing to offer a
Baccalaureate/Bachelor's Degree:**

PROPOSAL/PROGRAM: Bachelor of Interior Design

SAMPLE

Preface

In Ontario, organizations that wish to offer degree programs or part of a program leading to a degree (that either have limited or no legislative authority to do so) must request the consent of the Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities. The Minister refers the organization to the Postsecondary Education Quality Assessment Board (PEQAB, the Board) for its recommendation on the quality of the program and the organization's ability to deliver it. If the Minister is satisfied that the organization can deliver a quality program, s/he grants a time-limited consent that requires the program and the organization to be reviewed on a regular basis (typically every 5-7 years).

Guidelines for your Review

THIS SECTION OUTLINES THE EXPECTATIONS OF THE QUALITY ASSESSMENT PANEL

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL INSERTED HERE: i.e., Private Institution A, has applied to offer a Bachelor of Arts (Honours) in Program A.

We have enclosed the organization's proposal for your review. Your assignment, discussed in detail below, is to assess the submission against the Board's requirements for a Bachelor's Degree.

We will provide a short orientation session for you over the phone a week or so after you receive the package. Following that session, we will start the process by introducing you (by email) to your contacts at the institution. Please note that in the *Background* and the *Additional Information Related to Your Review* Section (p.33ff) of these *Guidelines* you will find information, that we will also cover in the orientation, about degree granting in Ontario, and the review and assessment of applications for Ministerial consent. In addition, this section contains tips about the review that you might find helpful.

Your primary obligation is to provide the Board with your best judgement on the quality of **Institution A's** proposed **Bachelor of X** and the institution's capacity to deliver the program. To this end, the Panel is asked to assess the organization against the standards and benchmarks set by PEQAB (enclosed) and, when it deems it appropriate, to identify and address any other quality-related issues arising from the proposal.

The QAP will prepare the report for the Board. The QAP report should provide the panel's best judgement with respect to the quality of the proposed program, the reasons for its judgements and be of sufficient detail to enable the Board to determine the extent to which its criteria are satisfied. The key issues are whether the proposed program meets the standards set by the Board, and whether you think the program is of sufficient quality to be recommended to the Board and eventually to the students of Ontario. The materials provided in these *Guidelines* are intended to assist you to conduct your assessment. They should not be seen as limiting the scope of the assessment or the QAP report to the Board.

We have provided you with the institution's complete submission, and should we receive any additional information, either from the organization or interested stakeholders, we will forward it to you. Please direct any requests for additional information directly to the organization. Should you receive additional information, please submit it with your report for our files.

Specifics of the Review

THIS SECTION OUTLINES ANY SPECIAL INSTRUCTION IDENTIFIED BY THE BOARD FOR THE REVIEW.

Assessment against Standards and Benchmarks

The Board has nine standards relevant to the review:

1. Admission Promotion and Graduation
2. Program Content
3. Program Delivery
4. Capacity to Deliver
5. Credential Recognition
6. Regulation and Accreditation
7. Nomenclature
8. Program Evaluation
9. Degree Level

Each standard has several benchmarks that demonstrate the organization's performance against the standard.

Definitions of Assessment Categories

When assessing the proposal against the Board's benchmarks, you're asked to indicate whether the organization **meets or exceeds the Board's benchmark** (this aspect of the proposal meets or exceeds the threshold set by the Board in the benchmark) or **does not meet the Board's benchmark** (this aspect of the proposal does not meet the threshold set by the Board in the benchmark).

In the case that the benchmark is not met, the Board requires your guidance about whether the revisions required to meet the threshold set by the Board in the benchmark are **major** (required revisions to meet the Board's benchmark are substantial, would take significant time and/or resources to rectify, and/or should be re-assessed before being implemented) or **minor** (required revisions to meet the benchmark are relatively minor, the institution has the capacity to implement them, and they do not require reassessment prior to implementation).

For each benchmark, please indicate whether the organization

- Meets or exceeds the benchmark (check "Y"); or
- Does not meet the benchmark (check "N").

Where an aspect of the proposal does not meet the benchmark, characterize whether a) you consider the revisions required to meet the Board's threshold to be major or minor (based on the definitions provided above), b) the nature of the revision(s) that will be required to meet the threshold, and c) the reasons for your judgements.

Note any commitments made by the organization during the review that were critical to your judgements.

Completed Report:

Please return the final report to the Postsecondary Education Quality Assessment Board in electronic format and send a signed version of the report to:

Postsecondary Education Quality Assessment Board
c/o Secretariat staff name
900 Bay Street
23rd Floor, Mowat Block
Toronto, ON M7A 1L2

Alternatively, the Chair may submit the final report electronically and copy all members of the QAP on the email. This submission will be considered affirmation from the panel that they are aware of and approve the content of the final report.

Electronic submissions should be forwarded to: **X@ontario.ca**.

SAMPLE

Quality Assessment Panel Guidelines

1. ADMISSION, PROMOTION, AND GRADUATION STANDARD

Standard:

Admission, promotion, and graduation requirements are consistent with the postsecondary character of degree-granting organizations.

Benchmarks:	Meets or exceeds the benchmark (Y/N)?¹	If no: comment on a) whether the required revisions are major or minor ² ; b) the nature of the revisions required; c) the reasons for your judgements; and d) any commitments or important clarifications the applicant made during the review that were critical to your judgements. If yes: detail any commitments or important clarifications the applicant made during the review that were critical to your judgements.
1. Admission requirements are appropriate to the learning outcome goals of the program and the degree level standard ³ .	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	
2. Admission to a bachelor degree normally requires at a minimum an Ontario Secondary School Diploma or equivalent ⁴ , six university or university/college courses at the Grade 12 level, a minimum average of 65% and any additional requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	
3. Mature students ⁵ are required to demonstrate academic abilities equivalent to those of Ontario high school graduates, verified by successful completion of courses at the postsecondary level or an	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	

¹ Indicate whether the Applicant

- Meets or exceeds the benchmark (check “Y” for “yes”); or
- Does not meet the benchmark (check “N” for “no”).

² **Major:** Required revisions to meet the threshold are substantial, would take significant time and/or resources to rectify, and/or should be re-assessed before being implemented.

Minor: Required revisions to meet the threshold are relatively minor, the institution has the capacity to implement them, and they do not require reassessment prior to implementation.

³ See standard 11 for description of the degree level standard.

⁴ For credentials earned in Quebec, applicants should have a Secondary V diploma and at least one year (minimum 12 academic courses) in CEGEP academic diploma program, with subjects at stated levels relevant to the degree program.

⁵ Mature students are applicants who have not achieved the Ontario Secondary School Diploma (OSSD) or its equivalent and who are at least 19 years of age on or before the commencement of the program in which they intend to enrol.

entrance examination.		
<p>4. Where any type of advanced standing into the program is proposed, policies and procedures pertaining to bridging requirements, advanced standing, credit, and credential recognition:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) have as a principal criterion that the credits accepted for admission to a degree program are in proportion to the affinity with and/or applicability to the specialist content of the program and other curricular requirements; b) are fair (award credit where credit is due), reasonable (do not award credit where none is due) and consistent; c) identify the bases on which such decisions are made, including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i) the minimum acceptable grade or achievement level; ii) the requirements for comparability of program content of earlier studies with that of the proposed program; iii) the procedures for determining the credit to be awarded; iv) the procedures that students will follow when requesting credit and appealing transfer of credit decisions; v) the limit on the number of credits that will be awarded for prior degree⁶ level study toward the degree program; d) For undergraduate programs, the limit on the number of credits that will be awarded for prior diploma level study, with and without affinity⁷, toward the degree program (excluding any work experience/internship requirements) such that the advanced standing to be awarded does not exceed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 67% degree level credit for a 3-year degree program from a completed 3-year diploma program; • 53% degree level credit for a 3-year degree program from a completed 2-year diploma program; • 65% degree level credit for a 4-year degree program from a completed 3-year diploma program; 	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	

⁶ Credits recognized for advanced standing must be earned at a postsecondary institution which is (i) a Canadian public university, (ii) an organization authorized to offer the degree program on the basis of an Ontario Ministerial Consent; or (iii) an organization that has the legal authority to grant degrees, is accredited by a recognized accrediting body where relevant, applies quality assurance policies to programs consistent with the program evaluation policy requirements of the Board, and is a member of a recognized association of degree-granting institutions, or (iv) another institution acceptable to the Board.

⁷ Course affinity is based on similarity of course content and the level of learning outcomes.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> e) require in all cases a gap analysis of the program content and outcomes of the studies for which transfer credit is being awarded f) ensure that the degree level standard and all of the program learning outcome standards of the degree program are met; and g) identify any requirements for bridging studies that facilitate entry into the proposed program. 		
<p>5. For a degree completion arrangement a detailed gap analysis demonstrates the academic integrity of the degree program and that the degree level standard and degree program learning outcomes are met.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	
<p>6. Applicants proposing to award credit for learning that takes place outside formal postsecondary educational institutions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) have policies and procedures pertaining to prior learning assessment, which must include at a minimum: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) key principles informing the prior learning assessment; ii) methodology used for portfolio assessment, and examination challenge for credit; iii) policies on credit limits, appeals and confidentiality; iv) assessment documents, guidelines and brochures for potential students; and b) demonstrate that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) credit will be awarded only for learning and not for experience; ii) credit will be awarded only for degree-level learning; and iii) the determination of competence levels and credit awards will be made by academic experts in the appropriate subject matter. 	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	
<p>7. The institution:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) does not offer any credits for “life experience”, unless that experience is assessed for its appropriate learning value to the specific degree program; b) does not waive comprehensive examinations, academic reports, research projects and/or theses, if these are standard requirements of the program; c) does not award advanced standing for more than 50% of the total number of the credits of the program based on prior learning assessment; and d) requires that at least 50% of the individuals enrolled in a program at any given time are actively taking required elements of that 	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	

<p>program.</p>		
<p>8. Administrative procedures for assessing advanced standing include the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Credit awards and their transcript entries are monitored to avoid giving credit twice for the same learning. b) Policies and procedures applied to assessment, including provision for appeal, should be fully disclosed and publicly accessible. c) All personnel involved in the assessment of learning should receive adequate training for the functions they perform, and provision should be made for their continued professional development. d) Advanced standing decisions are regularly monitored, reviewed, and evaluated to ensure their ongoing validity for the degree program. 	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	
<p>9. Promotion and graduation requirements are consistent with the learning outcome goals of the program and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) policies governing academic remediation, sanctions and suspension for students who do not meet minimum achievement requirements; b) a grading system that is easily understandable, meaningful and convertible to students, other postsecondary institutions, and potential employers, whether expressed as letter grades, percentages or grade points; c) regardless of the grading scheme, grades for acceptable performance correspond to student work that demonstrates the degree level standard has been achieved; d) minimum overall average acceptable achievement for progression (across all degree requirements, including the breadth and discipline-related requirements) not lower than the level typically designated by C- or 60 - 62%; e) minimum overall average acceptable achievement in discipline-related requirements for progression in the program not lower than the level typically designated by C- or 60 - 62%; and f) a level of overall achievement expected in the core discipline(s) of study higher than the overall average. 	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	

1. The proposed program:
- Meets or exceeds the Board's standard
 - Does not meet the Board's standard

2. Identify, for this standard:
 - a. Strengths
 - b. Major weaknesses
 - c. Minor weaknesses

3. Was the information provided in the submission combined with any additional information sought from the applicant (including at the site visit) sufficient, reliable, and valid for the purposes of this review?
 - Yes
 - No (if no, please comment)

2. PROGRAM CONTENT STANDARD

Standard:

The program offers an education of sufficient rigor, breadth, and depth to achieve the knowledge and skills identified in the degree level standard.

Benchmarks:	Meets or exceeds the benchmark (Y/N)?⁸	If no: comment on a) whether the required revisions are major or minor ⁹ ; b) the nature of the revisions required; c) the reasons for your judgements; and d) any commitments or important clarifications the applicant made during the review that were critical to your judgements. If yes: detail any commitments or important clarifications the applicant made during the review that were critical to your judgements.
1. The program ensures an appropriate balance of theory and practice.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	

⁸ Indicate whether the Applicant

- Meets or exceeds the benchmark (check “Y” for “yes”); or
- Does not meet the benchmark (check “N” for “no”).

⁹ **Major:** Required revisions to meet the threshold are substantial, would take significant time and/or resources to rectify, and/or should be re-assessed before being implemented.
Minor: Required revisions to meet the threshold are relatively minor, the institution has the capacity to implement them, and they do not require reassessment prior to implementation.

<p>2. The Program Advisory Committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) includes experts in the field external to the organization and, for degrees in applied and professional areas of study, employers and representatives from industry and professional associations; b) confirms the currency of the curriculum, and as appropriate, its relevance to the field(s) of practice; and c) endorses the program as represented in the application. 	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	
<p>3. Learning outcomes in the subjects/courses enable graduates to meet or exceed the requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) for graduates from similar programs in Ontario and other jurisdictions; b) of the field(s) of study and/or practice; and c) of any relevant professional or accrediting body. 	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	
<p>4. All courses provide exposure to increasingly complex theory at the degree level and, in applied or professional courses and where otherwise appropriate, the application of that theory to practice and the demands of practice in the field(s).</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	
<p>5. Time allotments assigned to the program as a whole and to its components are appropriate to the stated learning outcomes.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	
<p>6. All bachelor programs have a breadth requirement that includes coherent and substantive non-core¹⁰ offerings. This requirement informs the design of non-core courses and provides the basis of at least some of the assessment of student outcomes. The non-core curriculum contributes to the achievement of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) the development of critical thinking, quantitative reasoning, written and oral communication skills; b) more than introductory knowledge in the humanities, sciences, social sciences, global cultures and/or mathematics; c) knowledge of society and culture, and skills relevant to civic engagement; and d) more than introductory knowledge of the distinctive assumptions and modes of analysis of a discipline outside the core field(s) of study. 	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	
<p>7. The curriculum reflects current knowledge in the core field(s).</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	
<p>8. The curriculum reflects current knowledge in the fields represented in</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	

¹⁰ Non-core courses are those that contribute to knowledge in the fields unrelated to the main field(s) of study. Core courses are those that contribute to the development of knowledge in the main field(s) of study. The main field(s) of study is the field(s) identified in the degree nomenclature. Core courses can be in the main field(s) of study, or in related fields. (e.g., psychology, history and statistics are different fields of study. Because the field of psychology uses the scientific method as one of its methodological approaches, statistics would be a core course in a psychology degree program. Statistics is not related to scholarship in history, however, and would not be a core course in a history degree program.)

the non-core/breadth offerings.		
9. The balance of core and non-core/breadth studies is normally achieved as follows ¹¹ : a) No more than 80% of the program hours are in courses in the core or main field(s) of study (all required elements in theory, practice, and corollary disciplines); and b) some courses are outside the core or main field of study are free electives.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	
10. The type and frequency of student assessments demonstrate the achievement of the stated learning outcomes and provide appropriate information to students about their achievement levels.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	
11. Work experiences, internships, and field placements: a) are appropriate to the program; b) have articulated learning outcomes; and c) identify an appropriate method for both instructor and employer/supervisor assessment leading to the assignment of a grade.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	
12. Where applicable, the curriculum reflects appropriate levels of Ontario and Canadian content.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	

1. In the context of this program, are the breadth (non-core) electives and core courses appropriately categorized as non-core or core?
 Yes
 No (if no, please comment)
2. The proposed program:
 Meets or exceeds the Board's standard
 Does not meet the Board's standard
3. Identify, for this standard:
 - a. Strengths
 - b. Major weaknesses
 - c. Minor weaknesses
4. Was the information provided in the submission combined with any additional information sought from the applicant (including at the site visit) sufficient, reliable, and valid for the purposes of this review?
 Yes
 No (if no, please comment)

¹¹ An applicant may demonstrate through alternative approaches that the degree program meets the breadth/non-core requirements.

3. PROGRAM DELIVERY STANDARD

Standard: The delivery methods support achievement of the expected and actual learning outcomes.

Benchmarks:	Meets or exceeds the benchmark (Y/N)?¹²	If no: comment on a) whether the required revisions are major or minor ¹³ ; b) the nature of the revisions required; c) the reasons for your judgements; and d) any commitments or important clarifications the applicant made during the review that were critical to your judgements. If yes: detail any commitments or important clarifications the applicant made during the review that were critical to your judgements.
1. The institution conducts sustained, evidence-based and participatory inquiry to determine whether courses and programs (whether delivered using traditional, web facilitated, blended, hybrid, or online methods) ¹⁴ are achieving the intended learning outcomes.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	
2. The results of such inquiry are used to guide curriculum design and delivery, pedagogy and educational processes.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	
3. Assessment of the delivery methods includes consideration of: a) their quality and effectiveness; b) standardized and regular feedback from students; c) provisions for pre-registration and ongoing academic advising; d) policies concerning interventions for poor student progress; and e) availability and suitability of technical and other supports.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	
4. Delivery methods are appropriate to course content and design.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	
5. The institution has the expertise and resources to support the	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	

¹² Indicate whether the Applicant

- Meets or exceeds the benchmark (check “Y” for “yes”); or
- Does not meet the benchmark (check “N” for “no”).

¹³ **Major:** Required revisions to meet the threshold are substantial, would take significant time and/or resources to rectify, and/or should be re-assessed before being implemented.

Minor: Required revisions to meet the threshold are relatively minor, the institution has the capacity to implement them, and they do not require reassessment prior to implementation.

¹⁴ **Traditional Delivery:** Classroom based teaching with assignments and activities which students pursue independently of each other. **Web Facilitated Delivery:** Web resources and technologies are used to facilitate what is essentially a face to face course. May use web pages and course management systems (CMS) to post syllabi, readings and assignments.

Blended/Hybrid Delivery: Course blends online/e-learning and face to face delivery. Substantial parts of the content are delivered online and discussions, team projects and activities are used for learning. The number of face to face sessions is decreased as the volume of online activity increases. **Online Delivery:** A course where all or almost all of the content is web-based with no or a very small number of face to face meetings. Delivery methods included in the “online” category include multimedia, video conferencing, social networking, web-based learning management system (LMS), and/or learning objects.

proposed delivery methods and to ensure their effectiveness.		
<p>6. The delivery methods contribute to and enhance the creation of academic community among students and between students and faculty. For online learning elements, this includes ensuring that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) the program/course design and the course syllabus make appropriate provisions for instructor-student and student-student interaction; and b) the technologies used to achieve interactions among faculty and students (e.g., email, telephone office hours, phone conferences, voicemail, fax, chat rooms, web-based discussions, computer conferences, threaded discussions) are adequate. 	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	
Online Delivery:		
<p>7. Where a program is offered both in the classroom and online, there is a clear and integral relationship between those responsible for electronically offered courses(s)/program and the classroom-based academic structure.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	
<p>8. The responsibility for program quality remains with the applicant institution. Accordingly, consortial and other agreements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) reflect that the applicant institution(s) shares responsibility for all aspects of program delivery, including but not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) ongoing oversight of the curriculum and program design decisions; ii) financial, human and physical resources; iii) resource upgrading; iv) setting the qualifications and training required of faculty and staff; v) ensuring data integrity; and vi) students' privacy; b) include clearly defined performance expectations concerning all aspects of program delivery, including but not limited to those matters identified in (a); c) specify the conditions for the termination of the contract between the parties; d) include provisions to ensure quality control of all aspects of program delivery; and e) ensure the financial arrangements among the parties to the consortial and other agreements provide for adequate participation and management by the applicant institution. 	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	

<p>9. Policies pertaining to blended, hybrid, and online learning modes of delivery ensure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) student and faculty preparation and orientation to existing and new technologies; b) adequate resources and processes to acquaint faculty, students and course designers with new software or systems as they are adopted; c) regular opportunities for ongoing professional and course development for faculty and others responsible for program development; d) reliable, sufficient and scalable course-management systems to meet current and projected needs, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) a robust and secure technical infrastructure, providing maximum reliability for students and faculty; and ii) emergency backup provisions; e) accessible technical assistance for students and faculty for all hardware, software and delivery systems specified by the institution as required for the program; f) 24 hours per day, 7 days per week access to secure online databanks for web-delivered courses; g) well-maintained, current and appropriate hardware, software and other technological resources and media; and h) risk assessment and planning that includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) disaster recovery plan to ensure consistency of operational capacity; ii) back-up and storage technology protocols; and iii) a requirement for historical logs and physical documentation of exceptions, breaches, capacity usage, upgrades, workarounds, bolt-ons, etc. 	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------	--

<p>10. Appropriate safeguards assure the authentication of student identity and the integrity of student work for online courses/programs. Policies and procedures assure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) the security of students' confidentiality and privacy when conducting assessments and evaluations, and in the dissemination of results; b) the secure destruction of personal data when it is no longer needed; and c) the verification of student identity for coursework and examinations, and for the control of examinations, including but not limited to security, time limits, the selection of proctors/invigilators and the requirements for, and weighting of, evaluations conducted face to face. 	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------	--

1. The proposed program:
 - Meets or exceeds the Board's standard
 - Does not meet the Board's standard
2. Identify, for this standard:
 - a. Strengths
 - b. Major weaknesses
 - c. Minor weaknesses
3. Was the information provided in the submission combined with any additional information sought from the applicant (including at the site visit) sufficient, reliable, and valid for the purposes of this review?
 - Yes
 - No (if no, please comment)

4. CAPACITY TO DELIVER STANDARD

Standard:

The applicant has the legal characteristics, governance structure and administrative capacity necessary to organize and manage a competent institution of higher learning and the capacity to deliver the quality of education necessary for students to attain the stated and necessary learning outcomes.

Benchmarks:	Meets or exceeds the	If no: comment on a) whether the required revisions are major or minor ¹⁶ ;
--------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	benchmark (Y/N)?¹⁵	<i>b) the nature of the revisions required; c) the reasons for your judgements; and d) any commitments or important clarifications the applicant made during the review that were critical to your judgements.</i> <i>If yes: detail any commitments or important clarifications the applicant made during the review that were critical to your judgements.</i>
1. The program is appropriate to the institution’s mission, goals and strength.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	
2. The applicant’s legal status is appropriate for its goals.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	
3. The applicant provides for an appropriate governing structure, such as a governing body that is the legally constituted body responsible for managing the assets of the organization and maintaining the purpose, viability, and integrity of the institution, achieving institutional policies and goals, selecting administrative leadership, and providing the appropriate physical, fiscal, and human resources.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	
4. The applicant has the administrative capacity to manage effectively an institution of higher learning, as demonstrated by coordinated business and academic plans detailing the commitment to the academic quality of program content and delivery.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	
5. Development of the curriculum, academic policies, and standards includes appropriate participation by qualified academic staff and appropriate consultation with students.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	
6. The applicant makes a commitment in its budgets and policies to provide and maintain the necessary learning, physical, technological, human, and other resources for the program, and to supplement them as necessary.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	
7. The applicant provides for reasonable student access to learning and information resources (e.g. library, databases, computing, classroom equipment and laboratory facilities) sufficient in scope, quality, currency, and kind to support students and faculty in the program.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	
8. Learning resources are available online to students in online	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	

¹⁵ Indicate whether the Applicant

- Meets or exceeds the benchmark (check “Y” for “yes”); or
- Does not meet the benchmark (check “N” for “no”).

¹⁶ **Major:** Required revisions to meet the threshold are substantial, would take significant time and/or resources to rectify, and/or should be re-assessed before being implemented.

Minor: Required revisions to meet the threshold are relatively minor, the institution has the capacity to implement them, and they do not require reassessment prior to implementation.

courses/programs. If not all appropriate resources are routinely available online, the institution has made appropriate and adequate arrangement to provide them to online students.		
9. Students have access to an appropriate range of academic support services (e.g., academic counselling, tutoring, career counselling, placement services).	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	
10. Policies pertaining to faculty: a) define the academic/professional credentials required of present and future faculty teaching all courses in the program; b) require the applicant to have on file evidence, supplied direct to the applicant from the granting agency, of the highest academic credential and any required professional credentials claimed by faculty members; c) require the regular review of faculty performance, including student evaluation of teaching and/or supervision; d) identify the means of ensuring that faculty knowledge of the field is current; e) support the professional development of faculty including the promotion of curricular and instructional innovation, as well as technological skills, where appropriate; and f) specify faculty teaching and supervision loads and availability to students.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	
11. There are sufficient numbers of academic faculty and other staff to develop and deliver the program and to meet the demands of the projected student enrolment. ¹⁷	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	

¹⁷ The required minimum number of faculty and staff members will depend upon the method of delivery, enrolments and the complexity and variety of specializations.

<p>12. All faculty^{18, 19} teaching in the professional or main field of study and, where appropriate, acting as thesis supervisors and/or members of examining committees:</p> <p>a) have, where relevant, professional credentials and related work experience;</p> <p>b) hold an academic credential at least one degree higher than that offered by the program in the field or in a closely related field/discipline; and</p> <p>c) engage in a level of scholarship, research or creative activity sufficient to ensure their currency in the field.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	
<p>13. No fewer than 50% of all faculty teaching in the professional or main field of study and, where appropriate, acting as thesis supervisors and/or members of examining committees, hold the terminal academic credential in the field or in a closely related field/discipline²⁰.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	
<p>14. All faculty teaching non-core courses:</p> <p>a) have, where relevant, professional credentials and related work experience;</p> <p>b) hold an academic credential at least one degree higher than that offered by the program in the field or in a closely related field/discipline; and</p> <p>c) engage in a level of scholarship, research or creative activity sufficient to ensure their currency in the field.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	
<p>15. No fewer than 50% of the faculty teaching non-core courses hold the terminal academic credential in the field or in a closely related field/discipline.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	

1. The proposed program:
- Meets or exceeds the Board's standard
 - Does not meet the Board's standard

¹⁸ To satisfy the following benchmarks, and in compliance with the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*, the applicant has obtained the written consent of individual faculty members to submit their CVs to the Board.

¹⁹ Exceptions to any benchmarks pertaining to faculty must be:

- a) based on the absence of a related program credential in a university or other extraordinary circumstances; and
- b) justified in writing with specific reference to the Board's Capacity to Deliver standard and approved by the President or, on explicit delegation, the applicant's senior academic officer. The signed document must be kept for review at the time of any request for renewed consent.

²⁰ The doctorate is normally the terminal academic credential in all fields or disciplines with the exception of studio disciplines where a master degree in the field/discipline is more typical. The Board expects that the faculty will hold the terminal academic credential: (a) in the same field/discipline area as the proposed program area, (b) in a field/discipline that can be shown to be closely related in content or (c) with a graduate level specialty in the same field/discipline.

2. Identify, for this standard:
 - a. Strengths
 - b. Major weaknesses
 - c. Minor weaknesses

3. Was the information provided in the submission combined with any additional information sought from the applicant (including at the site visit) sufficient, reliable, and valid for the purposes of this review?
 - Yes
 - No (if no, please comment)

5. CREDENTIAL RECOGNITION STANDARD

Standard:

While meeting particular needs, the program is designed to maximize the graduates' potential for employment and promotion in their field and for further study.

Benchmark:	Meets or exceeds the benchmark (Y/N)?²¹	If no: comment on <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) whether the required revisions are major or minor²²; b) the nature of the revisions required; c) the reasons for your judgements; and d) any commitments or important clarifications the applicant made during the review that were critical to your judgements. <p>If yes: detail any commitments or important clarifications the applicant made during the review that were critical to your judgements.</p>
1. Documented consultations with employers, relevant occupational groups, professional associations and other postsecondary education organizations indicate the credential will be recognized for the purposes of employment and further study.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	

1. The proposed program:

²¹ Indicate whether the Applicant

- Meets or exceeds the benchmark (check “Y” for “yes”); or
- Does not meet the benchmark (check “N” for “no”).

²² **Major:** Required revisions to meet the threshold are substantial, would take significant time and/or resources to rectify, and/or should be re-assessed before being implemented. **Minor:** Required revisions to meet the threshold are relatively minor, the institution has the capacity to implement them, and they do not require reassessment prior to implementation.

- Meets or exceeds the Board’s standard
 - Does not meet the Board’s standard
2. Identify, for this standard:
- a. Strengths
 - b. Major weaknesses
 - c. Minor weaknesses
3. Was the information provided in the submission combined with any additional information sought from the applicant (including at the site visit) sufficient, reliable, and valid for the purposes of this review?
- Yes
 - No (if no, please comment)

6. REGULATION AND ACCREDITATION STANDARD

Standard:

Programs leading to occupations that are subject to government regulations are designed to prepare students to meet the requirements of the relevant regulatory and/or accrediting body.

Benchmark:	Meets or exceeds the benchmark (Y/N)?²³	If no: comment on a) whether the required revisions are major or minor ²⁴ ; b) the nature of the revisions required; c) the reasons for your judgements; and d) any commitments or important clarifications the applicant made during the review that were critical to your judgements. If yes: detail any commitments or important clarifications the applicant made during the review that were critical to your judgements.
1. Documented consultations with the relevant regulatory and accrediting body(ies) indicate the credential will be recognized for purposes of employment and further study.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	

²³ Indicate whether the Applicant

- Meets or exceeds the benchmark (check “Y” for “yes”); or
- Does not meet the benchmark (check “N” for “no”).

²⁴ **Major:** Required revisions to meet the threshold are substantial, would take significant time and/or resources to rectify, and/or should be re-assessed before being implemented.

Minor: Required revisions to meet the threshold are relatively minor, the institution has the capacity to implement them, and they do not require reassessment prior to implementation.

1. The proposed program:
 - Meets or exceeds the Board’s standard
 - Does not meet the Board’s standard

2. Identify, for this standard:
 - a. Strengths
 - b. Major weaknesses
 - c. Minor weaknesses

3. Was the information provided in the submission combined with any additional information sought from the applicant (including at the site visit) sufficient, reliable, and valid for the purposes of this review?
 - Yes
 - No (if no, please comment)

7. NOMENCLATURE STANDARD

Standard:

The program nomenclature reflects the postsecondary education achieved, facilitates public understanding of the qualification and assists students, employers, and other postsecondary institutions to recognize the level, nature and discipline of study.

Benchmark:	Meets or exceeds the benchmark (Y/N)?²⁵	<p>If no: comment on</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) whether the required revisions are major or minor²⁶; b) the nature of the revisions required; c) the reasons for your judgements; and d) any commitments or important clarifications the applicant made during the review that were critical to your judgements. <p>If yes: detail any commitments or important clarifications the applicant made during the review that were critical to your judgements.</p>
-------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

²⁵ Indicate whether the Applicant

- Meets or exceeds the benchmark (check “Y” for “yes”); or
- Does not meet the benchmark (check “N” for “no”).

²⁶ **Major:** Required revisions to meet the threshold are substantial, would take significant time and/or resources to rectify, and/or should be re-assessed before being implemented. **Minor:** Required revisions to meet the threshold are relatively minor, the institution has the capacity to implement them, and they do not require reassessment prior to implementation.

1. The degree title conveys accurate information about the: a) degree level ²⁷ ; b) nature of the degree ²⁸ ; and c) discipline and/or subject of study.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------	--

1. The proposed program:
 - Meets or exceeds the Board’s standard
 - Does not meet the Board’s standard

2. Identify, for this standard:
 - a. Strengths
 - b. Major weaknesses
 - c. Minor weaknesses

3. Was the information provided in the submission combined with any additional information sought from the applicant (including at the site visit) sufficient, reliable, and valid for the purposes of this review?
 - Yes
 - No (if no, please comment)

²⁷ The title “Doctor” may refer to the credential that results from successful completion of a program of study that meets the standards of either a doctoral degree or a health-related professional degree (for example, Doctor of Medicine or Doctor of Dental Surgery). The latter professional degrees may or may not be at the doctoral level in terms of academic degree-level requirements.

In the context of the delivery of health services, use of the title “Doctor” is regulated in Ontario under the *Regulated Health Professions Act, 1991*. In this context, only members of the specified professions are entitled under the *Regulated Health Professions Act, 1991* to use the title “Doctor”:

- a) College of Chiropractors of Ontario;
- b) College of Optometrists of Ontario;
- c) College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario;
- d) College of Psychologists of Ontario; and
- e) Royal College of Dental Surgeons of Ontario.

The Board will not normally support proposed degree nomenclature with “Doctor” in the title unless the proposed program meets the Board’s criteria and standards for (a) the doctoral degree or (b) a degree at another level designed to satisfy the educational requirements specified for membership by the regulatory colleges entitled to use “Doctor” under the *Regulated Health Professions Act, 1991*.

²⁸ There are a variety of ways to connote with nomenclature whether a degree is applied/professional-or research-oriented. With the exception of Bachelor/Master of Applied Science, which connotes research-oriented degrees, research-oriented degrees at the bachelor and master level are normally of the form: *Bachelor/Master of [Faculty (Subject)]*, for example, Master of Arts (Psychology) or Bachelor of Science (Chemistry). The level of study at the bachelor level can be further differentiated as “Honours” for research-oriented degrees. Nomenclature for research-oriented doctoral degrees is normally *Doctor of Philosophy*.

The typical approaches to nomenclature for bachelor and master degrees in applied/professional areas are: *Bachelor/Master in [Faculty (Subject)]*, for example, Bachelor of Technology (Information Technology); *Bachelor/Master in [Applied Faculty (Subject)]*, for example, Bachelor of Applied Arts (Music Production); or *Bachelor/Master of [Subject]*, for example, Bachelor of Interior Design, Master of Social Work.

Applied/Professional Doctoral degrees are normally of the form: *Doctor of [Subject/Profession]*, for example, Doctor of Business.

8. PROGRAM EVALUATION STANDARD

Standard:

The quality of the proposed program is assured by procedures for periodic evaluation that meet the requirements outlined below.

Benchmark:	Meets or exceeds the benchmarks (Y/N)?²⁹	<p>If no: comment on</p> <p>a) whether the required revisions are major or minor³⁰;</p> <p>b) the nature of the revisions required;</p> <p>c) the reasons for your judgements; and</p> <p>d) any commitments or important clarifications the applicant made during the review that were critical to your judgements.</p> <p>If yes: detail any commitments or important clarifications the applicant made during the review that were critical to your judgements.</p>
<p>1. The applicant has a formal, institutionally approved policy and procedure for the periodic review of programs³¹ embodying the following characteristics:</p> <p>a) program reviews at regular intervals, normally not exceeding five to seven years. The first such evaluation should occur before a request for renewal of ministerial consent;</p> <p>b) criteria for program reviews that include:</p> <p>i) assessment of the continuing consistency of the program with the organization’s mission, educational goals, and long-range plan;</p> <p>ii) assessment of the learning outcome achievements of students/graduates by comparison with:</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N</p>	

²⁹ Indicate whether the Applicant

- Meets or exceeds the benchmark (check “Y” for “yes”); or
- Does not meet the benchmark (check “N” for “no”).

³⁰ **Major:** Required revisions to meet the threshold are substantial, would take significant time and/or resources to rectify, and/or should be re-assessed before being implemented.

Minor: Required revisions to meet the threshold are relatively minor, the institution has the capacity to implement them, and they do not require reassessment prior to implementation.

³¹ With amendments to reflect the learning outcomes orientation of the Board’s statements, the following benchmarks are based on the criteria employed by Ontario public universities and Redeemer University College. See UPRAC Audit Guidelines, “Methodology for the audit of undergraduate program reviews”, 1998-02-05, and OCGS By-laws, and Procedures Governing Appraisals, 2001-08.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. the program's stated learning outcome goals and standards; ii. the degree-level standard; iii. the opinions of employers, students/ graduates; and iv. the standards of any related regulatory, accrediting or professional association; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> c) where appropriate, assessment of (i) graduate employment rates, (ii) graduate satisfaction level, (iii) employer satisfaction level, (iv) student satisfaction level, (v) graduation rate, (vi) the default rate on the Ontario Student Assistance Program or other student loan plan, (vii) student retention rates and, in the case of graduate programs, (viii) time to completion. d) assessment of the continuing relevance of the program to the field of practice it serves, including evidence of revisions made to adapt to changes in the field of practice; e) assessment of the continuing appropriateness of the method of delivery and curriculum for the program's educational goals and standards; f) assessment of the continuing appropriateness of admission requirements (i.e., achievement level, subject preparation) for the program's educational goals and standards; g) assessment of the continuing appropriateness of the program's structure, method of delivery, and curriculum for its educational goals and standards; h) assessment of the continuing adequacy of the methods used for evaluating student progress and achievement; i) assessment of the efficient and effective utilization and adequacy of existing human, physical, technological, and financial resources; j) indicators of faculty performance, including the quality of teaching and supervision and demonstrable currency in the field of specialization; and k) assessment of individual student work in the terminal stage of the program, that reflects exemplary, average, and minimally acceptable performance, demonstrates that the degree level standard has been achieved. 		
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--

<p>2. The program review procedure includes:</p> <p>a) A Self-Study A study undertaken, with student input, by faculty members and administrators of the program based on evidence relating to program performance against the criteria stated above, including strengths and weaknesses, desired improvements, and future directions.</p> <p>b) A Program Evaluation Committee A committee struck by the senior administration to evaluate the program based on:</p> <p>i) the self-study; and</p> <p>ii) a site visit during which members of the committee normally meet with faculty members, students, graduates, employers, and administrators to gather information. A majority of the members must be senior academic peers (both scholars and administrators) with relevant expertise from both outside the institution and internal to the institution but outside the program, and free of any conflict of interest.³²</p> <p>c) The Report of the Committee The overarching purpose of the Program Evaluation Committee report is to assess program quality and recommend any changes needed to strengthen that quality. The report must be addressed to the senior administration and shared with the academic council, governing board, faculty members and students in the program, together with a plan of action responding to the recommendations in the report.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	
<p>3. The implementation of the policy and procedures for the periodic review of programs is</p> <p>a) aligned with the Board’s requirements for such evaluations; and</p> <p>b) achieves its intended aim of continuous improvement of the program(s).</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	

³² A conflict of interest policy similar to that of the board should be implemented in selecting members of a Program Evaluation Committee.

9. BACCALAUREATE/BACHELOR'S DEGREE STANDARD

Baccalaureate/Bachelor Degree:

Standard:

Depth and Breadth of Knowledge

- a. A general knowledge and understanding of many key concepts, methodologies, theoretical approaches and assumptions in a discipline;
- b. A broad understanding of some of the major fields in a discipline, including, where appropriate, from an interdisciplinary perspective, and how the fields may intersect with fields in related disciplines;
- c. An ability to gather, review, evaluate and interpret information relevant to one or more of the major fields in a discipline;
- d. Some detailed knowledge in an area of the discipline;
- e. Critical thinking and analytical skills inside and outside the discipline;
- f. The ability to apply learning from one or more areas.

Conceptual & Methodological Awareness/Research and Scholarship

An understanding of methods of enquiry or creative activity, or both, in their primary area of study that enables the student to:

- a. Evaluate the appropriateness of different approaches to solving problems using well established ideas and techniques;
- b. Devise and sustain arguments or solve problems using these methods;

Communication Skills

The ability to communicate the results of their study/work accurately and reliably, orally and in writing, to non-specialist audiences using structured and coherent arguments.

Application of Knowledge

- a. The ability to review, present, and interpret quantitative and qualitative information to:
 - i. develop lines of argument;
 - ii. make sound judgments in accordance with the major theories, concepts and methods of the subject(s) of study;
- b. The ability to use a range of established techniques to:
 - i. analyze information;
 - ii. evaluate the appropriateness of different approaches to solving problems related to their area(s) of study;
 - iii. propose solutions;
- c. The ability make critical use of scholarly reviews and primary sources.

Professional Capacity/Autonomy

a. The qualities and transferable skills necessary for further study, employment, community involvement and other activities requiring:

- i. the exercise of personal responsibility and decision-making;
- ii. working effectively with others;

b. The ability to identify and address their own learning needs in changing circumstances and to select an appropriate program of further study;

c. Behaviour consistent with academic integrity and social responsibility.

Awareness of Limits of Knowledge

An understanding of the limits to their own knowledge and how this might influence their analysis and interpretations.

<p>Benchmark:</p>	<p>Meets or exceeds the benchmarks (Y/N)?³³</p>	<p>If no: comment on a) whether the required revisions are major or minor³⁴; b) the nature of the revisions required; c) the reasons for your judgements; and d) any commitments or important clarifications the applicant made during the review that were critical to your judgements. If yes: detail any commitments or important clarifications the applicant made during the review that were critical to your judgements.</p>
<p>1. The program meets or exceeds the degree level standard and the applicant demonstrates how the program meets the standard.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N</p>	
<p>2. Assessment of individual student work in the terminal stage of the program, that reflects exemplary, average, and minimally acceptable performance, demonstrates that the degree level standard has been achieved.</p>	<p>N/A³⁵</p>	

1. The proposed program:
 Meets or exceeds the Board’s standard

³³ Indicate whether the Applicant
 • Meets or exceeds the benchmark (check “Y” for “yes”); or
 • Does not meet the benchmark (check “N” for “no”).

³⁴ Major: Required revisions to meet the threshold are substantial, would take significant time and/or resources to rectify, and/or should be re-assessed before being implemented.
Minor: Required revisions to meet the threshold are relatively minor, the institution has the capacity to implement them, and they do not require reassessment prior to implementation.

³⁵ Samples of student work are reviewed by a quality assessment panel when there has been a graduating cohort.

- Does not meet the Board's standard
- 2. Identify, for this standard:
 - a. Strengths
 - b. Major weaknesses
 - c. Minor weaknesses
- 3. Was the information provided in the submission combined with any additional information sought from the applicant (including at the site visit) sufficient, reliable, and valid for the purposes of this review?
 - Yes
 - No (if no, please comment)

SAMPLE

Background

Degree Granting in Ontario

Applications for Ministerial Consent

In Ontario, most universities have an act of the Ontario Legislature, which permits them to offer any degrees. Under the terms of the *Post-secondary Education Choice and Excellence Act, 2000* (the Act), the consent of the Ontario Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities is required for anyone without legislative authority seeking in Ontario, either "directly or indirectly," to

- grant a degree;
- provide a program or part of a program of postsecondary study leading to a degree to be conferred by a person inside or outside of Ontario;
- advertise a program or part of a program of postsecondary study offered in Ontario leading to a degree conferred by a person in or outside Ontario;
- sell, offer for sale or provide by agreement for a fee, reward or other remuneration, a diploma, certificate, document or other material that indicates or implies the granting or conferring of a degree;
- operate or maintain a university;
- use or be known by a name of a university or any derivation or abbreviation of a name of a university;
- hold oneself out to be a university;
- make use of the term university or any derivation or abbreviation of the word in advertising relating to an educational institution in Ontario; and
- make substantial changes to programs offered pursuant to a consent.

Anyone wishing to engage in these activities must apply to the Minister, who refers the application to the Board. Organizations in this category include colleges of applied arts and technology; most private institutions; Ontario public institutions with limited degree granting authority; and public institutions from outside Ontario.

Role of the Postsecondary Education Quality Assessment Board Secretariat

PEQAB Secretariat staff:

- support the Board in fulfilling its mandate;
- communicate on the role of the Board and its operations to prospective applicants, stakeholders and others; and
- manage all applications for consent.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION RELATED TO YOUR REVIEW

Role of the Subject-Matter Experts (SMEs)

The primary obligation of the SMEs is to provide their best judgement on the quality of the proposed program. To this end, SMEs are asked to:

- assess the proposal against the standards and benchmarks set by PEQAB;
- to consider any special instructions indicated by PEQAB; and
- when members of the panel deem it appropriate, to identify and address any other quality-related issues arising from the proposal.

Role of the Panel Chair

In addition to the responsibilities noted above, the Chair is responsible for the following:

- planning and assigning the activities to the panel;
- liaising with the organization regarding timing and setting the agenda for the site visit;
- organizing the panel's work; and

- coordinating and preparing the final report using these *Guidelines*.

Writing the Report

Under the coordination of the panel chair, the panel develops a report which should provide the best collective judgement of the panel with respect to the quality of the proposed program, the reasons for its judgements, and be of sufficient detail to enable the Board to determine the extent to which its criteria are satisfied. The key issues are whether the proposed program meets the standards set by the Board, and whether panel members think the program is of sufficient quality to be recommended to the Board and eventually to the students of Ontario. More specifically, the report must include at least the following:

- an assessment of the application against each of the Board's standards and benchmarks;
- an assessment of the application in terms of any additional matters raised by the Board;
- an assessment of the sufficiency, reliability and validity of the evidence provided by the organization;
- an assessment of evidence found during any site visit, resulting from the panel's research, or submitted to the panel by other parties; and
- a recommendation, with reasons, on whether the proposed program meets the Board's criteria and is of sufficient academic quality to be offered to the people of Ontario.

Quality Assessor Procedures

- peruse the submission and guidelines included in this document;
- panels often work through the *Guidelines* as they do a desk audit, making preliminary judgements on the strengths and weaknesses of the program and noting items that require follow-up at the site visit. Reviewing the submission and conducting a desk audit prior to the site visit typically aids in the drafting of the report;
- set questions for discussion/clarification to be raised when meeting with other member of the panel;
- set tentative questions for the site visit;
- identify who needs to respond to the panel's questions at the visit; and
- determine what is needed in the way of additional information.

Additional Information provided by the Institution

The Board provides QAPs with the organization's complete submission for review as well as any supplementary information the Board has received from the organization. The Board asks the panel to direct any requests for additional information from the organization through the panel chair. Additional information pertaining to the application received by the panel should be forwarded to the Secretariat together with the panel's report.

The Site Visit

In most cases, panels are expected to undertake a one-day site visit where they can test the validity of claims made in the application. Where several locations are proposed, the chair decides which one(s) to include in the visit. Ultimately, the chair will determine, in consultation with the PEQAB secretariat, if a site visit is needed. The chair will establish the site visit strategy and develop an appropriate schedule in consultation with the organization.

Duties of the Institution's Liaison

The institutional contact person ensures that the visit is arranged so that the agenda can be realized, including scheduling meetings and rooms for the panel. Panel members will make their own travel arrangements (transportation, hotel room), but may consult the institution for recommendations.

During the visit, the panel will wish to interview senior administrators, faculty, students and alumni (in the case of renewal applications) to gain a cross-sectional view and a variety of perspectives on key issues. Depending on the type of review, they may also wish to meet with support or collaborating staff and examine facilities and other resources. The panel's expectations need to be made clear prior to the site

visit. The chair might begin each interview session by identifying the objectives of the interview and by posing open-ended questions and questions that evoke analysis and dialogue. Panel members are encouraged to take careful notes of each interview session as they will be invaluable when writing the report. The panel is encouraged to keep interviews to a manageable number. Too many interviews may limit the panel's ability to explore an issue comprehensively. The panel might decide to include a session at the end of the site visit to conclude and reach consensus about the content of the report.

Writing the Report

Under the coordination of the panel chair, the panel will prepare a report for the Board. The report should provide the best collective judgement of the panel with respect to the quality of the proposed program, the reasons for its judgements, and include sufficient detail in narrative form to enable the Board to determine the extent to which its criteria are satisfied and provide the Board with the information it needs to make an informed decision. Deficiencies should be documented particularly carefully. The key issues are whether the proposed program meets the standards set by the Board, and whether the panel members think the program is of sufficient quality to be recommended to the Board and eventually to the students of Ontario.

The materials provided in these *Guidelines* are intended to be an aid to the panel and the Board. They should not be seen as limiting the scope of the assessment or the panel's full report to the Board.

Diverging Opinions

The members of a QAP may not always agree on all matters. The Board is interested in knowing about areas of substantive disagreement, the nature of the disagreement, and the reasons for the disagreement. The Board does not want to receive minority reports. It requires a single report, which should include divergent opinions fully and fairly.

Institution's Commitments

During the review, the institution may make commitments that alter what the panel's judgement would be for the submission alone. It is important to document such commitments in the report and their role in your judgements. The panel's final assessment should be based on all information provided by the institution, including additional materials and commitments made during the review. The institution will have to confirm that they made the commitment and their intention to honour it. The Board will then be in the position of determining whether the commitments are reasonable and whether the institution is capable of honouring (hence the importance of your advice in this regard).

Ownership of Reports

The QAP's report and all related attachments are the property of the Minister. The panel will hold its deliberations and preliminary report in confidence. Following the Minister's decision on the application and in accordance with the Board's terms of reference, the Board may post on its website all official report(s) of the quality assessment panel and the organization's responses to them, or make these reports otherwise available to the public subject to the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*.

Following the Submission of the Report

Institution's Responses to Reports

To ensure a transparent and fair assessment process, the Board will provide the institution with the opportunity to respond to the panel's report. In some cases, the Board may ask the panel to respond to the institution's remarks.

Next Steps

In formulating its recommendation, the Board will consider:

- the institution's submission;

- the findings of the QAP;
- the institution's response to the panel report;
- any additional materials provided by the institution to the Board; and
- any commitments made by the institution during the review process.

The Board communicates its recommendation to the Minister. The Minister considers the Board's recommendation and any public policy matters, and makes a decision about consent. If consent is granted, it is normally for a five-year period, after which the program(s) must be reviewed again.

SAMPLE