

Second Cycle of the MPHEC's Quality Assurance Monitoring Process:

Assessment of Cape Breton University's Quality Assurance Policies and Procedures

Final Panel Report

Prepared by

Dr. Neil Besner and Dr. Ron Bond

February 2024

ISBN 978-1-988264-24-0

MPHEC
Maritime Provinces Higher
Education Commission



CESPM
Commission de l'enseignement
supérieur des Provinces maritimes

Contents

Section I:	Introduction.....	3
A.	Overall purpose of the 2nd Cycle of Quality Assurance Monitoring Process	3
B.	Description of the Monitoring Process with Cape Breton University.....	3
C.	Preface: The Panel’s Description of the Principal Features of CBU in 2022-2023	4
Section II:	Assessment of Cape Breton University’s Policies and Procedures for Assessing Academic Programs and Units	5
A.	Progress since the 1st Cycle:	5
	2009 Recommendation 1: Assign a high priority to quality assurance.....	5
	2009 Recommendation 2: Foster the development of a culture supportive of ongoing quality improvements.....	5
	2009 Recommendation 3: Define the accountability for quality and for the policy itself.	6
	2009 Recommendation 4: Further develop the quality assurance policy.	7
B.	Implementation of Cape Breton University’s Policies and Procedures for Assessing Academic Programs and Units:	8
C.	Alignment with the MPHEC’s 2016 Guidelines for Maritime Universities’ Quality Assurance Frameworks:	19
Section III:	Recommendations for Improvement	19
Appendices:		
A.	Action plan submitted by Cape Breton University	
B.	Table outlining alignment of Cape Breton University’s Policies and Procedures for Assessing Academic Programs and Units with the MPHEC’s 2016 Guidelines	
C.	Site Visit Agenda	
D.	Assessment report from the “1st cycle”	
E.	Second Cycle of the Monitoring of Maritime Universities’ Quality Assurance Frameworks: Overview of the Process	

SECTION I: INTRODUCTION

A. Overall purpose of the 2nd Cycle of Quality Assurance Monitoring Process

Universities are responsible for ensuring the ongoing quality of the programs and services they provide to students. This is largely accomplished through cyclical internal and external reviews managed independently by each university. The MPHEC's primary role is to confirm that such reviews are taking place and to validate the extent to which institutional quality assurance (QA) frameworks meet agreed-upon regional standards, while at the same time providing advice and assistance to institutions. The 2nd cycle of the Quality Assurance Monitoring (QAM) process is intended to serve that purpose, and builds on the MPHEC's "first cycle" of the QAM process, which was carried out between 2001 and 2009.

The QAM process aims to answer the following questions:

1. What progress have institutions made since the "first cycle"?
2. To what extent are institutions following their own QA framework?
3. To what extent are institutions' QA frameworks aligned with the MPHEC's 2016 Guidelines for Maritime Universities' Quality Assurance Frameworks?

B. Description of the Monitoring Process with Cape Breton University

At the request of the Maritime Provinces Higher Education Commission (MPHEC), the Review Panel was asked to carry out the QAM review of Cape Breton University (CBU) quality assurance framework. The members of the Review Panel were:

1. **Dr. Neil Besner** – He is the former Provost and Vice-President, Academic, University of Winnipeg. He has assessed Canadian universities and colleges and their programs in British Columbia, Saskatchewan, and Alberta; he was a member of Campus Alberta Quality Council from 2014-16, and since 2018 has been a member of the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance.
2. **Dr. Ron Bond** – A Professor of English, he is Provost Emeritus at the University of Calgary. He chaired the Campus Alberta Quality Council for six years, was a founding member of the Ontario Universities Quality Council and chaired the Saskatchewan Higher Education Quality Assessment Board. He has conducted many quality assurance reviews for the Degree Quality Assessment Board in BC and for the Postsecondary Education Quality Assessment Board in Ontario.

The QAM Process at CBU included the following steps:

1. An institutional progress report prepared by CBU (November 2022).
2. An analysis of all pertinent documentation by the Review Panel (February-March 2023).
3. A virtual site visit (see Appendix A for agenda) (April 25-26, 2023).
4. A draft report prepared by the Review Panel to CBU to validate factual information and correct any errors (May 2023).
5. Validation of draft report by CBU (June 8, 2023).
6. A final report, incorporating CBU comments, to CBU (August 1, 2023).
7. An action plan (Appendix B) prepared by CBU (October 30, 2023).
8. Recommendation by the joint Association of Atlantic Universities and MPHEC Quality Assurance Committee to approve the final report and action plan and subsequent approval by the MPHEC board (November 29, 2023).

9. The Review Panel report, with the action plan from CBU appended, posted (in the language of the institution) on the MPHEC and CBU website (February 7, 2024).
10. A follow-up report to be submitted by CBU to the MPHEC one year following submission to the MPHEC of the action plan. The follow-up report will outline how CBU has addressed the actions it had identified in its action plan.

C. Preface: The Panel's Description of the Principal Features of CBU in 2022-2023

CBU's history includes the following milestones:

- 1974: the College of Cape Breton (CCB) was formed.
- 1982: University College of Cape Breton (UCCB) established, the first of its kind in Canada, offering a mix of liberal arts and science degree programs together with technological and vocational diploma programs.
- 2005: renamed CBU.

Among Maritime universities, CBU belongs to the smaller group: its customary enrolment has hovered around 3500 students, but it now educates well over 5000 students with 6500 projected for 2022-23. (A very high percentage of those students hail from countries around the world, especially India.) With over 70% of its enrolments consisting of international students, attracting and retaining students from abroad has had a significant impact on CBU's revenues and on its provision of various kinds of student support. CBU also provides educational opportunities for c. 250 indigenous students per annum, a key responsibility given the demographic of the population surrounding its location in Sydney, Nova Scotia. Commitment to indigenous populations is animated by Unama'ki College, whose Dean is vital part of the senior leadership group.

Post-secondary programming at CBU is delivered by five schools: Arts and Social Sciences (SASS), Science and Technology (SST), the Shannon School of Business (SSOB), Education and Health (SEH), and Nursing. An exciting development is that planning has begun for a Medical School, to be established in conjunction with Dalhousie University. As one of the "feeder" institutions for Dalhousie's undergraduate Engineering degree, CBU already enjoys a solid relationship with the larger research-intensive partner. It is worth noting that the University of Prince Edward Island is also planning a medical school with support and guidance from Memorial University.

The recent surge in enrolments has resulted in the approval of CBU's first *Strategic Enrolment Management Plan, 2023-2027*, a key document for sustaining controlled growth (or decline). It supplements a *Strategic Plan 2019-2024* and an *Academic Plan 2020-2025*. Burgeoning enrolments caused the institution to announce recently the need to hire no fewer than 58 new academic staff members. Another consequence of enrolment growth is the stress it imposes on CBU's physical plant. Put simply, CBU is out of space. It has been using a movie theatre, off-campus, for some classes, and plans are afoot to find affordable accommodation for students in or around Sydney. Against this backdrop is the procurement of \$84M of funding for a Centre for Discovery and Innovation, a new academic building that will be home to classrooms, labs, research space and student services and will position CBU as a leader in climate change readiness.

In 2009, at the time of the First Cycle QAM review, CBU's understanding of and commitment to internal quality assurance were questionable. It has come along way since then. Among the highlights of its firm commitment to quality assurance are the adoption of a sturdy Framework to QA at the institution, the acceptance of Graduation Attributes for its students, and the recent appointment of a quality assurance

officer, who was the liaison between CBU and our Panel and who recruited participants for various sessions of the virtual site visit. CBU has a longstanding practice of embracing the inclusion of academic support units in its regularly scheduled reviews: the Panel regards this as highly commendable and an audit of one of those units was part of the process we describe in the following Report.

This is the place to express our appreciation to all those with whom we interacted during the site visit. We applaud their deep interest in the welfare of CBU and their candid engagement with the questions we asked.

SECTION II: ASSESSMENT OF CAPE BRETON UNIVERSITY'S POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR ASSESSING ACADEMIC PROGRAMS AND UNITS

A. Progress since the 1st Cycle:

CBU's submission provides a helpful five-page synopsis of the extent to which it has progressed since the First Cycle QAM Review completed in June, 2009. The earlier review revealed that CBU was lagging behind, having done one program review since 2003 and none in 2006-2009. The initial QAM reviewers had no dossiers to audit and were unable, therefore, to comment on whether CBU was implementing appropriately its own policies and procedures. The Report in 2009 did settle on a series of four recommendations, however, and they were quoted in full as part of CBU's synopsis in its 2022 submission.

Following the quotations, CBU comments on the progress made in each instance. The Panel presents here a condensed version of CBU's account.

2009 Recommendation 1: Assign a high priority to quality assurance.

Given that CBU has not yet implemented its quality assurance policy, which the Committee believes has the hallmarks of what could be an excellent framework for this purpose, the Monitoring Committee urges CBU to commit to the quality assurance approach by:

- Actively engaging the higher echelons of the administration including the Senate, the President, and the Vice-President, Academic and Research, in the review process.
- Clearly demonstrating a commitment to quality assurance at every echelon of the University.

2022 CBU Response: CBU has implemented its policy. It has clarified the differences between policy and procedures and has included on Senate's Quality Assurance Committee, the Vice President Academic and Provost, as well as representatives from each school, the Registrar's office and students. It has assigned coordination of QA efforts to an Officer who reports to the VPA and Provost. It has also given prominence to quality assurance in the Academic Plan and in its provision for Program Development.

2009 Recommendation 2: Foster the development of a culture supportive of ongoing quality improvements.

Possible ways to achieve this include:

- Communicating information pertaining to the University's quality assurance policy and the results of, and follow-up to, reviews to the university community (students, faculty, staff, etc.), government and the general public.
- Clearly identifying, documenting and publicizing changes brought about by a review (whether conducted by the University or an accrediting body) by flowing information through the Deans.

- Including educational activities such as workshops for faculty/staff and unit heads in the communications strategy to educate them on the policy, its objectives, assessment criteria, and follow-up processes, with particular emphasis on the benefits of the policy to faculty, staff, students, Departments, and the University in general.
- Making the process more transparent by:
 - having the Vice-President, Academic and Research, and the relevant Dean meet with faculty/staff and students to clarify expectations prior to launching the review process; and
 - Posting minutes of Program Review Committee meetings and copies of Review Reports online.
- Making it more explicit in the policy that a wider network of stakeholders, such as employers, graduates, professional associations, the local community, etc. are required to participate in the review process.

2022 CBU Response: Information about review processes, the status of ongoing reviews and the executive summaries and action plans are now available on the VPA's site and these follow-up items are available to the public. CBU's intranet is also an information hub that enhances the transparency and accessibility of reviews and Program Review Committees.

2009 Recommendation 3: Define the accountability for quality and for the policy itself.

Possible ways to achieve this include:

- Making the Vice-President, Academic and Research, responsible for quality assurance, as planned. Having the Vice-President, Academic and Research, chair the Quality Assurance Committee and including tenured faculty in the committee membership.
- Distributing responsibility for the process more broadly across the administration to carry out the activities that support quality assurance, from preparing the schedule of upcoming reviews to monitoring follow-ups. Deans, for example, should play an active role in the entire process, as they will be better able to provide leadership to, and oversight of, day-to-day operations within their Departments, as front-line administrators.
- Enforcing timelines and compliance, while at the same time providing units with appropriate support to carry out a review in a timely and effective manner.
- Maintaining responsibility for service reviews from the QAC rather than creating a separate mechanism for non-academic reviews, as the QAC is ideally placed to oversee the quality of the entire student experience from application to graduation and all points in between.
- Ensuring adequate follow-ups by:
 - Documenting the follow-up process within its quality assurance policy, including clearly defined timelines and responsibilities.
 - Making Deans responsible for monitoring follow-ups of their respective units.
 - Monitoring the progress of a unit for two years following the submission of the Review Report.

2022 CBU Response: CBU again asserts the importance of the Quality Assurance Officer appointment and the broad composition of Senate's Quality Assurance Committee, which is not chaired by the VPA, as recommended, but rather by an election by and from the members. CBU also notes that systematic reviews of academic support are now supervised by the VPA and Provost

2009 Recommendation 4: Further develop the quality assurance policy.

Possible ways to achieve this include:

- Clearly defining and documenting the criteria to be used to measure the progress of a unit or program/service under review as well as how the results of a program/service review inform decision-making (e.g. budget, planning, priority-setting, etc.) within the University.
- Simplifying the template for the self-study.
- Defining the relationship between accreditation reviews and the University's quality assurance reviews. Creating a common student evaluation form to be used for all courses.
- Ensuring the timeliness of the review process by:
 - Establishing a review schedule so the review process does not extend past 12 months and the self-study is prepared over the summer months.
 - Distributing a schedule of upcoming reviews over the next five years to Deans, Chairs, and heads of service departments to allow for ease of preparation.
 - Sending reminders periodically to units under review to ensure the self-study is progressing as planned.
 - Imposing strict timelines and having administration respond constructively but firmly to any delays or compliance issues.
 - Working with units to identify what support can be provided to facilitate completion of the self-study.
 - Inviting the Chair of a given unit, or head of a given service, to attend the meeting where the results of its review will be discussed by the QAC to be able to have questions addressed quickly and easily.
 - Ensuring adequate follow-ups as described under Recommendation 3.

2022 CBU Response: The chair of the Review Committee routinely interacts with the Quality Assurance Committee and there is a plan to invite the chair to the QAC meeting when the review is being discussed. A student evaluation form, common to all teaching units, is extant at CBU and course evaluation software enables automated evaluation of all courses.

Gap Analysis according to CBU: It is heartening to sense that the introspection required by the QAM process has led to some substantial thinking about ways in which the practice of quality assurance at CBU could be further advanced. Here is a handful of those ideas, as expressed by the Panel:

- To supplement the appointment of the QA officer, each school should name a representative for a team that would address ongoing quality assurance.
- Links between academic decision-making and quality reviews should be strengthened and major changes to a program or a unit's structure should not be introduced in the midst of a program review.
- A culture of quality assurance would be enabled, among other things, by improved communications, through the Office of the VPA in conjunction with the Strategic Communications team.
- Moving forward, the Centre for Teaching and Learning and the Office of the VPA need to pursue jointly the goal of improving faculty education on quality assurance matters.
- The annual reports required for each of 2 years after a review need to be systematically implemented.
- Clearer guidelines elucidating the relationship between accreditation and quality assurance processes should be worked out.
- "Follow-up" guidelines need to be developed by QAC and approved.

- Some revisions to elements of the templates used would be welcome, as would consistency among the Action Plans produced in the aftermath of each review.

The Panel alludes to some of these ideas in its list of recommendations in Section III of this Report.

B. Implementation of Cape Breton University’s Policies and Procedures for Assessing Academic Programs and Units:

In order to evaluate the degree to which CBU is adhering to its own policies and procedures, the Panel selected six sample programs for relatively close examination. Before addressing each of those six programs, it is necessary, of course, to outline the main aspects of the Quality Assurance Framework employed by CBU. That Framework is based on a version prepared in 2016 and updated in 2017 and in 2022.

At the heart of the Framework is the Senate policy, consisting of six sections describing the i) purpose, ii) responsibility; iii) scope; iv) objectives; v) the “policy itself; and vi) the guiding principles. This is an admirable statement, at once comprehensive and concise. The documents associated with this policy are “Procedures for the Quality Assurance Review of Academic Programs and Support Services”; “Quality Assurance Program/Service Review Process Timeline”; “Self-Study Guidelines for the Review of Academic Programs”; and a complementary item, described in 2016 as forthcoming: “Self-Study Guidelines for the Review of Academic Support Services”, but now available. It is important to note that the Framework is conceived to cover both academic and academic support units. Furthermore, CBU has included within its Framework finely calibrated templates for the reports from external review teams, its list of Graduate Attributes, and the anticipated schedule of reviews of both sorts. The full package amounts to 29 pages.

As noted already, the documentation solicited by the Panel included review materials for six programs. In chronological order, they were: 1) the Bachelor of Health Sciences degree (2010-11); 2) The School of Science and Technology (2014-16); 3) the Bachelor of Arts Degree (2016-17); 4) The MBA in Community Economic Development (2018); 5) the Bachelor of Hospitality and Tourism Management (2020-21); and the Centre for Teaching and Learning (2021-22.). This selection of programs to audit gave us a broad sampling of the academic programming offered at CBU, including some at the graduate level and one, the last, of a service unit.

1) Bachelor of Health Science (Public Health) program

The Quality Assurance review of this professional program in 2011 preceded an accreditation review later that year by the Board of Certification of the Canadian Institute of the Canadian Institute of Public Health Inspectors. The Self-Study followed the contours set out in the Policy of the day: Section One details the principal contextual information; Section 2 offers an Overview of the Self-Study Process, which began with the formation of the program committee; Section 3 provides Self-Analysis, and Section 4 lists appendices. Information about the Program includes sections on:

- Its History, Philosophy and Development
- Program Overview
- Administrative Structure
- Governance
- Communication
- Budget and Resource Management

Sections offering overviews of Research and Service lead to sections on Faculty and Students, respectively, and a final section refers to Resources, including those supporting Teaching and Learning and Space and Equipment.

The two-person external review Committee, which was commissioned by the then Vice-President Academic and Provost, involved a reviewer from the College of the North Atlantic in Newfoundland and another from what was then called Ryerson University in Toronto. This team made a series of seven recommendations, each of which elicited a written response from the Program Chair of the Health Studies Department.

The Panel that is undertaking the Second Cycle QAM review appreciates that the review of the Health Science (Public Health) degree was launched and completed prior to 2016 when MPHEC issued its revised Guidelines for internal quality assurance. It also appreciates that much time has elapsed since this review was conducted and that many changes have occurred in the intervening years. At the time of this review, for example, public health was under the purview of a Dean of Graduate and Professional Programs, a hybrid unit that no longer exists. We make a few observations about the review of this program, however.

- The Program Review Committee was composed in conformity with section 11.1.1 of CBU's QA Policy.
- This review resulted in a recommendation to create a minor in Occupational Health and Safety; in 2022, CBU announced the introduction of a new post-baccalaureate diploma in the field.
- Discussion with employers of the graduates from this program resulted in enhancements to the external advisory committee.
- Greater emphasis on environmental issues was recommended for the program's curriculum.
- The Self-Study delineates both Program Goals and Program Objectives; the accreditor itemizes both general and specific competencies.
- According to the Collective Agreement at the time, research was not required but instead was encouraged.
- Several recommendations or comments in the material studied support the University's efforts to promote teaching and learning effectiveness.

2) *School of Science and Technology*

This review took place between 2014 and 2015. The dossier contained the customary sections: Executive Summary; External Reviewers' Report; Review Committee's Response to that Report; Provost's Response to the Review Committee; the School's Self-Study. Three programs were considered within this process: the Bachelor of Science; the Bachelor of Engineering, done in conjunction with Dalhousie University and externally accredited; the Bachelor of Engineering Technology is also externally accredited.

The Summary to the Self-Study points out that its principal focus is the BSc, which is available in Biology, Chemistry, Mathematics and Psychology and which has historically attracted more students than the transfer program or the Engineering Technology program. In auditing the entire School, the Panel was considering a unit review spanning several programs rather than a program review, pure and simple.

The Self-Study covered the Context, Information about the University and the School (one subsection of which refers to the institutional partnership with the Canadian International College in Cairo), Faculty information, Academic Resources (the Library, IT services, and the Centre for Teaching and Learning.) It also included a section astutely combining "Reflection and Recommendations". Eleven Appendices brought the total page count to over 100 pages. The appendices included data from student, alumni, and

employee surveys and from NSEE; some benchmarking comparisons; and commentary on program goals, learning outcomes and curricular mapping.

The ensuing process met the challenges inherent in dealing with this review by engaging a Vice-President Academic and a Dean of Science, Applied Science and Engineering, both from regional university. That team of external reviewers praised the documentation conveyed to it and commented positively on a site visit that included, in addition to the typical sessions, a tour of the engineering labs, the library and Unama'ki College. The external review yielded eight recommendations, several of which focused on research and scholarship.

The School's response to these recommendations appears in a memo to the VP Academic and Provost in which the School reports that it will establish two parallel processes: 1) discussion enabling all individuals and each department to comment on the material produced so far; 2) the formation of four working groups, one for each cluster of recommendations found in the Report. This twinned response came with timelines. The response from the Vice-President Academic and Provost, two days later, expressed approval for these parallel processes and the suggested timelines and asserts that "it is critical that the implementation plans be incorporated into the department's reports and school plans as part of the overall university integrated planning process."

The main conclusion our Panel draws from its consideration of this dossier is that the review of key programs housed within the School of Science and Technology was done conscientiously and in conformity with CBU's Framework.

3) *Bachelor of Arts Degree*

Moving from science to arts, the Panel considers the program review done in 2016-17 at CBU. The BA is one of three degrees then offered in the School of Arts and Social Sciences, the other two being the Bachelor of Arts in Community Studies and a Bachelor of Arts and Science in Environment, which was new at the time. The standard four-part process, with which the reader of this Report will be familiar, was employed for this review.

Several features of the Self-Study stand out:

- References to the Graduate Attributes that had then been established by Senate's Quality Assurance Committee
- The notion that the BA "had to be unique so as not to compete with other maritime universities" when the degree was introduced
- Acknowledgement that there had been no formal precursor reviews of the BA
- The breadth of programming in the BA spans Communication, English, French, and Gaelic, as well as Folklore, Drama, Anthropology and Art and Mathematics, Psychology, Political Science and Mi'kmaq Studies.
- The 58 full-time faculty teaching in these disciplines are dispersed over several departments into which SASS is organized. Some disciplines are taught by sessional instructors (i.e. ICAs)
- Students at the Canadian International College in Cairo can do dual degrees in Mass Communication
- Benchmarking helped to inform the Self-Study
- A set of five Learning Outcomes, each yoked to specific BA courses with descriptors ("Introductory", "Reinforcement" and "Mastery") engenders mapping and refinement of assessment strategies.

Thirteen appendices round out this thorough Self-Study.

The External Review team impanelled to examine the BA consisted of the Dean of Arts and Science at an Ontario university and the Dean of Arts from a regional University. The team’s site visit, which involved a tour as well as meeting with representatives from key constituencies, maintained that the BA programs examined “meet or exceed degree-level expectations” and provide students with “an excellent and high-quality education.” That team crafted eight recommendations, which were subsequently categorized by the Program Review Committee into four: Institutional Supports, Degree Structure, The Student Experience and Faculty and Staff. Under Institutional Support, the External Team called for a “full-scale academic planning exercise” to address the need for an institutional academic plan. We note the impact of this recommendation on CBU, which now has adopted, as our prefatory comments say, both a Strategic Plan and an Academic Plan.

The Program Review Committee’s Response forecasts a retreat of SASS and comments succinctly on each recommendation. The Response of the Vice President Academic and Provost take this process one step further: for each recommendation, he presents to the unit the Action, the “Owner” of the Action (e.g. Dean, VPA@P, SASS Student Chairs etc.), the Expected Result and both Start and End Dates.

ACTIONS (1-8)	OWNER	EXPECTED RESULT	START DATE	END DATE
---------------	-------	-----------------	------------	----------

This strikes our Panel as an exemplary follow-up practice for reviews of this sort.

4) *MBA in Community Economic Development*

This program is offered by the Shannon School of Business and dates back to 1997. It is a high-profile program, in part because it is virtually synonymous with CBU’s values and brand and in part because it has been exported to other jurisdictions. The program is offered not only in Sydney, but in Edmonton, Kingston, Saskatoon, Whitehorse and Toronto. In some of these cases, the program had to meet standards set in and by those other jurisdictions. The Self-Study includes an appendix that addresses Media Coverage.

The review materials considered here stem from a process that commenced in 2016, culminated in 2018, and resulted in a dossier of 584 pages—much of it in the form of appendices. The Self-Study is very thorough and provides pertinent information under the headings: Introduction, Program Description, Learning Outcomes, Program Quality, and Critical Analysis. Both benchmarking and a SWOT analysis are embedded in the Self-Study and the Critical Analysis outlines recommendations. The contents of the Self-Study are clearly modelled after those set out in CBU’s Framework.

The external review team was fit for purpose: one was from the Business and Society Program hosted by the Faculty of Liberal Arts and Professional Studies at York University and the other was from the Smith School of Business at Queen’s University, whose Executive MBA program also has national reach. The reviewers presented numerous recommendations under the overarching rubrics of Curriculum, Recruitment and Admissions, Faculty Resources, Governance, Research and the Student Experience. Among those recommendations was one urging the maintenance of the Applied Research Project, a “distinctive and integral feature” of the program, another advocating that CBU add full-time tenure-track faculty to the program, yet another noting that student advising should be strengthened. The review team also mused about the possibility that the substantial growth of the program might have presented some challenges for commensurate quality improvement (e.g. the production of formal governance documents and procedures.) Highlighting the research records of instructional staff and the funding opportunities to support graduate-student research and scholarship were among a set of strong and crisp recommendations. It is noticeable that these elements of the Report resemble strongly the elements suggested in the Guidelines found in the Framework for external reviewers’ reports.

Following the normal pattern at CBU, Responses to the external reviewers' Report ensued. Feedback from the Review Committee was enthusiastic about the prospect of a course-based option for the MBA, and about an institutional commitment that three new permanent faculty members would be added to the complement. This feedback, which addressed each of the many points raised by the external commentators, also noted that all new students would be required to attend an advising session before registering in courses and that the cohort of support staff to help in this regard would be augmented.

The Response from the Interim Vice-President Academic and Provost distinguished "direct" recommendations from those embedded in the Report and observes that "Where appropriate, direct actions have been stated as important follow-up activities for the review. Otherwise, it is left up to the program's administrative personnel to best determine how the supported recommendations will be realized. Future progress reports must comment on all recommendations made." An example of a direct action is pertinent to the challenge of maintaining or enhancing quality during a time of program growth: "ACTION: Submit a Report and recommendations to the VPA addressing the challenges of growth and options for renewal. (Lead: Dean, Shannon School of Business, together with program director and faculty." Another action listed by the VPA and Provost call for the establishing of a multi-dimensional task force to examine recruitment, admissions and support, a job given to the Director of the MBA CED. It is not entirely clear to the Panel why some actions already taken are excluded from this Response. But it is a credit to the VPA and Provost that he noticed that the Review Committee failed to comment on the Report's recommendation that there be closer collaboration between the Office of Research and Graduate Studies and the program.

5) *Bachelor of Hospitality and Tourism Management*

This review of this 3-year program in the Shannon School of Business was initiated in 2017, was interrupted by COVID and was concluded in 2021. The impact of the pandemic resulted in the need for a revised Self-Study, a virtual site visit that entailed a virtual tour of the CBU campus. Perhaps because of the extenuating circumstances, no students joined the Program Review Committee, as would be normal. Despite the delays and the unusual format of the site visit, which extended almost daily from January 12 to January 19, the external team characterized the BHTM degree as a "robust program that provides students with a strong theoretical and experiential learning experience. We have observed an engaged faculty delivering a program with the right level of quality during our visit."

Several aspects of the BHTM program emerge from its Self-Study.

- The program is anchored by four FT faculty members who are supported by fourteen other instructors from the Shannon School of Business and other parts of CBU
- The BHTM has established an internship program that incorporates two paid, but non-credit placements
- The BHTM is well aligned with provincial priorities which emphasize the important tourism sector in Nova Scotia and on the Island
- In 2019, CBU established a World Tourism Institute one of the purposes of which is to promote research and scholarship in the field
- The Shannon School has created a National Advisory Board, whose past and present members are distinguished.

Professors from Mount St. Vincent (the Chair and Professor of Management) and what was then Ryerson University (from the Department of Hospitality and Tourism Management) participated in the external review of the BHTM program. Supplementing the summary statement, quoted above, the external reviewers offered thirteen "observations and recommendations." These ranged from some that focussed on missed opportunities (such as underutilization of the Institute or the potential for program expansion),

to comments on student recruitment and haphazard tracking of alumni, to judgements about faculty (such as the need for greater diversity and the heavy workloads they shouldered.) Like the Self-Study, which makes good use of links to several documents that did not need to be fully reproduced in the text, the Report is relatively brief.

In its Response, the Program Review Committee either concurred with the recommendations or said that they had merit. Schedule A of the Response groups the recommendations into three thematic areas before providing a “to-do” list of actions that can be taken immediately and those requiring more protracted exploration of implications. This is a serviceable list but it stops short of indicating who will take charge of the actions enumerated or what the timelines will be.

In his Response, the Vice President Academic and Provost uses five groupings instead of three and consequently renumbers the recommendations. These five are Curriculum, Recruitment, Faculty, Opportunities for Expansion/Enhancements and Data Collection. The VPA and Provost also acknowledges that the recommendations “have been reworded slightly to ensure they are action oriented. The intent of the reorganization and rewording is to provide a clear action plan for program improvements.” The commentary goes on to suggest concrete ways of implementing some of the recommendations: for example, “a curriculum committee should be formed to assume ownership” of recommendations on the curriculum. “As well an annual retreat of all HATM faculty need to take place that focuses on curriculum content and mapping.” The final words in this Response encourages the School to “convene a working group to oversee work on the recommendations A progress Report is to be submitted to my Office by the end of the year (December 31, 2021.)”

6) *The Centre for Teaching and Learning (CTL)*

Two factors are important to stress when considering this review: 1) it applies to a significant academic support unit and thus afford the Panel an opportunity to see how the part of the QA Framework that applies to such units has been interpreted and implemented; 2) it is another review that was affected by COVID and the restrictions occasioned at CBU by the pandemic. The unit had not been subject to a review since its formation in 2000 recent review began with the assembling of material from and for stakeholders in October 2019; the Program Review Committee had to abandon its regular meetings in the spring of 2020, since many of its members had to devote themselves to the switch to 100% online delivery of CBU’s of programs and courses that was announced then for execution in the Fall term, 2021. That said, the Committee, which was slightly larger and more diverse than usual, solicited feedback from several key stakeholder groups as called for in section 2.4 of the Guidelines for Academic Support Units: Teaching Chairs, Librarians, Writing Centre personnel, the Office of On-CBU launched a program for appointing them for a period of two years in 2017. The purposes of these appointments are “to provide opportunities for teaching faculty to lend and develop their expertise in diverse areas of the scholarship of teaching and learning. Faculty members serving as Chairs also collaborate with the CTL on programming and special projects as part of their roles.” The Committee also developed and administered surveys to ascertain the views of the CTL held by regular teaching faculty, obviously a key stakeholder. A Professor of Philosophy, previously well versed in academic quality assurance at CBU, chaired the Review Committee that decided how the review would proceed. He subsequently was appointed, pursuant to a recommendation in CBU’s *Academic Plan 2020-25* to fill the new position of Academic Director of the CTL.

The Self-Study eventually produced by the CTL had weathered some fits and starts but it does the job expected of it by the Guidelines. It sketches the history of the CTL and its current mandate; it lays out information about the personnel attached to or associated with the unit and describes the facilities it occupies, some in the Library and some in the Campus Centre. It underscores the “immense amount of

feedback on teaching and learning issues” precipitated by CBU’s Strategic and Academic Planning initiatives (2018-2020). As specifically requested in the Guidelines, it compares its “service objectives” and its realization of those outcomes. It also benefited from a benchmarking exercise—another plank in the platform constructed by the Guidelines. The Self-Study chose to delve into the responsibilities of comparable units in smaller institutions, such as Acadia, Prince Edward Island, Nipissing, Mount Allison and St. Francis Xavier, but also, because of its steady growth trajectory, of somewhat larger places such as St. Mary’s, University of New Brunswick, Royal Roads, and Lakehead. The chart summarizing this effort is helpful.

Data from encounters with faculty and staff at “boot camps”, for example, led to an abbreviated synopsis of those discussions and covered a large swath of considerations, complaints and ideas. All in all, this is a rich and nuanced discussion of the role of the CTL at CBU. The critical analysis found in the Self-Study leads to five recommendations from the unit: 1) Revise the CTL’s institutional mandate; 2) Clarify the Operational Scope and Authority of the CTL; 3) Communicate a Strategically Sharper Institutional Profile; 4) Relocate the CTL (and co-locate all of its staff); 5) Develop a 3-year Plan for Enhancing the CTL’s HR Capacity. These are in keeping with section 3.2 of the Guidelines for this sort of review, even though many of them appear to place a particular onus on the senior administration of CBU.

The Self-Study and other documents, supplemented by a virtual site visit and tour, appear to have been carefully analyzed and well digested by a two-person team of external experts, one from the Vice-Provost of Teaching and Learning Excellence at a maritime university and the other from the Coordinator of Instructional Development at a university in Ontario. To create improvements in a “strong and remarkable unit” as the reviewers called it, the team generated 24 recommendations, some “systematic” and some “situational.” The concluding remarks maintained that “there is an exceedingly strong foundation and significant momentum in the CTL” and predicted that it would flourish in the years ahead.

The CTL’s response to this Report expresses appreciation for an external review that “seems to have accepted the organizing narrative of the self-study”, but pushes back on two recommendations it deems decidedly ill-advised. The other twenty-six recommendations appear to be supported in one degree or another, though on occasion that support is lukewarm, largely because action requires institutional rather than unit decision-making and effort.

As usual, the Vice-President Academic and Provost has a last word before taking the results of a review forward to Senate. He reveals that his comments are hinged to a reorganization of the action-oriented statements of the recommendations: 1) Internal Communication and Governance; 2) Faculty Development; 3) the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning and Learning, and 4) Online Learning. Among the affirmations about and support for the CTL expressed by the VPA and P that we choose to highlight are those calling for a review of the mandate and bylaws of the Senate’s Committee on Teaching, Learning and Evaluation in relation to the role of a stronger CTL, the need for the CTL to develop stronger protocols for academic integrity among students, including those from different cultural and educational backgrounds, and the desirability of promoting an enhanced understanding of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. The Final Report was tabled at the June 2022 meeting of Senate and the CTL was asked to submit an action plan to his office by the end of August of that year.

The Panel’s perception is that this review of a support unit, while not flawless, bodes very well for the continuation of review of this kind as mandated by CBU’s comprehensive QA Framework.

Before proceeding to the next sections of this Report, it is right that we thank again those with whom we met during our virtual site visit. The information and the insights we gained during those conversations strongly influenced our findings and the recommendations we make in Section III. The full meeting schedule is available in Appendix A. To summarize, on the two days of our visit, we had the opportunity to engage in dialogue with participants in twelve sessions. In all of these sessions, we learned a great deal and in most of them, we were pressed for time, even though the use of some scripted questions, shared with CBU in advance as is conventional for QAM review, left us with the impression that collectively we had covered the ground that needed to be covered.

Senior Administration: We were pleased in an opening session to hear from the two VPs (Academic and Finance and Operations) their views of the opportunities and challenges facing CBU in the next few years. They got us off on the right foot by speaking candidly about the precipitous growth of the student population as both a challenge and an opportunity. The Strategic Enrolment Management Plan figured prominently in their commentary as a vehicle for controlling and regulating run-away enrolments much of it from students from other countries, such as India. We regret that the President’s travel schedule made it problematic to attend this introductory meeting, but we were assured by both Vice-Presidents that he was fully committed to quality assurance at CBU, despite his absence. Another theme we pursued was the transformative effect on CBU, its programs and its students, of the introduction of an medical program there. That program, to be implemented with the help of Dalhousie University, is now scheduled to “go live” in the fall of 2025; it will focus on the preparation of doctors to serve remote and rural areas, many of them important to Mi’kmaq communities and many of them suffering from a dearth of health care professionals. Both VPs emphasized that CBU had never been an ivory tower and had made stalwart efforts to serve and be responsive to local and regional needs, while functioning within a national and international context

Members of the VPA and Provost’s Office: A sequel to the opening session enabled us to talk again, with a sharper focus on QA at CBU, with the Vice-President Academic and Provost, and two crucial members of the senior staff in his office—the Quality Assurance Officer and her predecessor and mentor, the Senior Planning Officer. This was a lively session that confirmed that the appointment of a dedicated QA officer and providing her very recently with an ongoing contract, was, especially in a smaller institution, a major move forward. The salutary effect of the Strategic Plan and the Academic Plan was also discussed, as was the advent of a Strategic Enrolment Management Plan that had been advisedly created with widespread input from inside and outside CBU. Diversification, both programmatic and geographical, was called for in the SEM plan. The implications of hiring 58 new faculty more or less simultaneously were discussed, as these affected not only CBU but Sydney and surrounding communities.

Another theme aired was the challenge posed to quality assurance by disciplines with meagre enrolments and faculty. Some programs make money and other are subsidized by those that generate revenue; budget are managed centrally. The institutional and academic plans tout quality as a high-priority venture.

Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) of Senate: There is no doubt that the time spent with a very good turn-out of members of this committee was time well spent. As one might expect, some participants were very inexperienced members and were thus unable to contribute a great deal to the conversation. Still some important considerations came to the fore in this session: one participant said that it takes time for new members of the QAC to become sufficiently acculturated that they understood that QA is not necessarily MPHEC-driven, but is an internal process undertaken with CBU’s welfare in mind. The interim Chair of the Committee, conceding that production of the Self-Study could be onerous, said that it needed

to be better known that a modest stipend or a 6-credit course release could be provided to leads in that process. A related comment was that the institution still had work to do to avoid unnecessary duplication of effort between external accreditation processes and those mandated by CBU's Framework.

Members affirmed the importance of QAC in making recommendations on the make-up of self-study committees, helping with the identification of external review team members, and vetting documents such as the Graduate Attributes document that is now grafted on to the QA Framework. In response to a question from the Panel, members agreed that on the whole Senate deferred to its QAC committee, having delegated considerable authority to it.

Recruiters: We met with four people tasked with overseeing or engaging in domestic and international recruitment about their responsibilities and activities. They expressed enthusiastic support for the first-ever SEM plan, which now focusses on enrolment as an on-going process extended over the "life cycle of a student." It also established concrete targets CBU would attempt to meet. The goal, after absorbing a "double cohort" of international students that climbed to over 70% of CBU's enrolment, was to scale back to c. 60%. For domestic recruitment, CBU now has personnel not only in Sydney but also in Halifax, Kingston and Western Canada. International recruitment for high volume areas such as India or Nepal relies largely on a company located there. A digital recruitment strategy is in the works. The processes and teams led by these individuals will benefit from the transition to a relatively new Student Information System. International recruitment will benefit from a partner development manager who will be subject to quality assurance filters the network of agents on which CBU has depended.

Support for students is helped by three associate registrars and by the nimbleness with which a smaller institution can react to shifts in enrolments. The participants in this session believed that CBU might well invest more in ensuring the quality of the student experience.

Leads of Academic Support Units: a) As already noted, the Quality Assurance Framework at CBU recognizes the importance of reviewing Academic Support units, and the Panel audited one such unit, the Centre for Teaching and Learning. In this session, we met with representatives of other units, including the Library and Cultural Resources, Student Affairs, Unama'ki College and the Academic and Research Associate Vice-President. We learned about student research opportunities, professional development programs for faculty, the Counselling Centre and the ways in which CBU works with equity, diversity and human rights. The Library, which embeds librarians in specific Schools, also houses the math and writing centres and is responsible for the archives and art gallery and for FOIPOP. Student Affairs handles orientation, coaching for academic success and the implementation of an Academic Performance Policy. Unama'ki College supports indigenous students, especially those in the communities, by hosting cultural events and providing a meeting space, by serving as a custodian for archival holdings in the Mi'kmaq resource centre and by assisting chairs to find instructional staff.

The Panel was impressed by the commitment and vitality of those representing academic support units and believes that their contributions to students' experiences are notable.

b) Members of Academic Support Units Recently Reviewed: The perceptions shared by a handful of people from support units confirmed that there is considerable engagement with quality assurance processes among colleagues who work in them. Among the views expressed were appreciation for the Framework's emphasis on community stakeholders, the expertise and insights of the external reviewers, and the validity of the recommendations which helped subsequent priority-setting in the unit's planning.

Deans Involved in Recent Reviews: Under this heading, we talked with a group of deans who had had some experience with recent reviews, either because they had served as the “internal external” member of the Program Committee or because they came from Schools that had undergone a review not long ago. The consensus seemed to be that the infrastructure supporting reviews was stronger than it used to be, that the QA Framework was helpful, and advice from external reviewers was on the mark.

When the conversation turned to Learning Outcomes, some maintained that they were less “fluid” in programs needing to meet accreditation standards (e.g. Engineering). They also agreed that Graduate Attributes were useful and allowed CBU to differentiate itself from other institutions, especially when linked to program-level outcomes. We asked about Academic Freedom and it quickly became apparent that views on that topic were quite diverse. Some asserted that academic freedom could be compromised if an academic organization insisted on the use of learning outcomes. Others said it knowing about expected learning outcomes enabled new faculty members to learn the culture of CBU and the expectations of the unit they had joined. One commentator believed that learning outcomes loom large when new programs are in development, then subside in importance until it’s time for a cyclical review.

We were gratified by the thoughtful engagement of these Deans with the questions we pursued with them.

Chairs/Heads and Faculty of Recent or Current Reviews: a) The Chairs came from accredited and unaccredited programs. All acknowledged that those from the former group were accustomed to doing reviews, meeting standards of them and engaging in rigorous action-oriented follow-up, whereas those from the second group could chafe under the need to do so. The Chairs also averred that there is often a lot of overlap between accreditation and QA processes and requirements and that one of the jobs of the Quality Assurance Officer should be the reduction, to the extent possible, of duplication and redundancy. The group appeared united in the sense that external reviewers had on the whole been well chosen of late, whereas there had been a time when CBU sought reviewers who would be congenial to the program. The invocation of academic freedom as a form of resistance to institutional directions, including quality assurance, was mentioned but not pursued. An idea that appealed to the group and to the Panel is that there could be more sharing of information about processes, outcomes and best practices both among Deans and Chairs;

b) A half dozen faculty members of recently reviewed programs deepened our understanding of how quality assurance at CBU is regarded. They held that good staff support is essential to the smooth functioning of the processes since faculty can sometimes feel overwhelmed with the amount of work involved, especially since the service load had become heavier with the growth of the institution. A few complaints were heard: there should be more training, since not all members of a unit under review knew what a self-study entailed or what the sequence of subsequent events were; there could be more serious follow-up because action plans were not always implemented or were hit-or-miss. A telling question, paraphrased here was “Who owns the report, is it the chair’s the dean’s, the School’s, the Senate’s or the QAC’s?” But there was also acknowledgement that considerable improvements had already taken place; no longer were reviewers from competitor institution. QA reviews, one said, stimulated more input from students and enabled input from employers as well. Both the criticisms and the kudos aired in this session helped the Panel form its evaluation of quality assurance at CBU.

Students: Since quality assurance is ultimately about the quality of the education and the adequacy of the learning environment students experience, we were pleased to have had a lively session with students near the end of our sessions at CBU. Some were from the Students’ Union whereas others were from

some of the programs we had chosen to audit. There was representation from both international and Indigenous communities. We gained a copious amount of information in this session, despite its brevity.

The consensus among these students is that they had had a good experience at CBU. They elaborated by noting their appreciation for

- the care and attention of the learning environment there
- the student-centred ethos of CBU
- smaller class and lab sizes of the sort a large campus would not offer
- the diversity of cultures on campus
- ability to interact with personable and approachable staff
- the strong community spirit on campus
- the opportunities they had been given to grow
- the services provided by the Writing Centre

When asked to propose suggestions for improvement, they noted these:

- avoid using the Cineplex for classes; students want to be on campus
- make on-campus housing more affordable
- address the unavailability of courses listed in the catalogue
- bolster mental-health resources
- demonstrate that criticisms of teaching in student evaluations are addressed
- provide more opportunities for experiential learning
- enhance communication about the variety of services offered
- offer more funding opportunities for student, including scholarships

We recognize that we might have heard other things from a different cohort of students, but what we did hear attested to the students' commitment to CBU. Even when they were somewhat critical, their criticisms were clearly intended to be constructive. In our estimation, they were a credit to CBU.

A final observation is that about half of the small sample of students interviewed knew something about quality assurance either because they were studying in programs that had been reviewed recently or because of membership on the Quality Assurance Committee of Senate.

Senate: The last session on which we offer a few comments gave us the chance to interact with several members of Senate, including the current Chair. As the counterpart of the Board on the academic side of the bicameral governance system and as the body that has a major role in quality assurance at CBU, Senators were fittingly the last group with whom we met.

Gleanings from this session reinforced, on the whole, things we had learned in previous sessions. One of the challenges Senate faces is trying to get a range of experienced people to serve on the program review committees. Another is trying to ensure, in a time of increasing emphasis on interdisciplinarity, cross-fertilization among the six committees of Senate: that goal is accomplished through monthly meetings of committee chairs. As is usually the case, Senate knows that it needs to communicate regularly with the university community and CBU's does this by sending out highlights of its meetings. We also heard that even though Senate delegates some of its work to the committees established, it is not simply a rubber-stamp: the materials it considers go through a thorough process of rumination. One member said that in a way there is a double form of peer review as QA documents moved from the QAC to the Senate as the parent body.

All agreed that the decision to appoint an ongoing Quality Assurance Officer was enlightened, would strengthen the administrative support for and the focus of the processes used before the VPA's Report to Senate on the outcomes. There was some support too for the comment that pragmatic forms of follow-up were needed so that action plans are not just aspirational.

C. Alignment with the MPHEC's 2016 Guidelines for Maritime Universities' Quality Assurance Frameworks:

As is customary in QAM reviews, an appended Table (Appendix C) exhibits the alignment of CBU's Quality Assurance Framework with the MPHEC's 2016 Guidelines. This Table reveals that on the whole the comments on the degree of alignment evident to officials from CBU resemble the perceptions formed by the Panel. Even though we are pleased to affirm the degree of alignment apparent to us, we have compiled a list of recommendations as a result of the review we have conducted. These recommendations, taken individually and collectively, hold the potential to improve the QA processes at CBU and their alignment with the published MPHEC Guidelines.

SECTION III: RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

We introduce our recommendations with the observation that in recent years CBU's commitment to quality assurance has evolved in several admirable ways. These recommendations, then, are intended to strengthen a Framework and a set of practices that are already demonstrably strong.

It is recommended that:

1. CBU proceed with its commitment to review its Framework for Quality Assurance relying both on the introspection prompted by this QAM review and the following recommendations as inputs for possible revisions.
2. Implementation of the Strategic Enrolment Plan continue to be a high priority at CBU.
3. When planning for the medical school a significant consideration be the impact of the new entity on the quality of existing programs and services.
4. Sustain the initiatives of the working group on the first-year experience, widely regarded as a high-impact activity.
5. A revised Quality Assurance Framework be more explicit about the need to harmonize accreditation processes and procedures with internal quality assurance protocols in order to reduce the "regulatory burden" to the extent possible.
6. The Self-Study Guidelines for the Review of Academic Programs be streamlined as part of the review of the Framework advocated in recommendation 1. Improvement to consider:
 - Remove the "institutional overview", which could be shared with the external reviewers when they are invited to serve.
 - Encourage the use of links to (instead of descriptions) of relevant academic policies.
 - Eliminate the request for detailed information about faculty members at 4.1 and instead rely on the provision of faculty CVs, as called for under "accompanying documentation."
 - Establish a normal word-length for self-studies.
 - Make it clear when these Guidelines allow for options, alternatives or the exercise of academic discretion.
 - Enable the Vice-President Academic and Provost to determine whether both a SWOT analysis and a Benchmarking exercise are vital to particular self-studies.
7. The Quality Assurance Committee expedite the creation of follow-up procedures and action plans, perhaps using a template to provide guidance and to enable consistency.

8. Programs or units under review suspend implementation of structural modifications while a review is in progress.
9. Make more widely known that partial teaching remission or the provision of modest stipends may be forthcoming when program reviews are occurring.
10. The plan to invite the “lead” of a program or service to attend the pertinent meeting or meetings of the Quality Assurance Committee be executed.
11. The new CIO be well oriented to the QA Framework so that CBU continues to exploit Ellucian, its relatively new data management system, as a supplier of reliable and consistent data for use in quality assurance reviews.
12. The newly appointed Officer for Quality Assurance work closely with the Centre for Teaching and Learning to refine an understanding both of learning outcomes and their assessment and of mapping as a tool for deepening that understanding.
13. The Quality Assurance Officer consider compiling a list of best practices in quality assurance that could be shared with Deans, Chairs and others in order to enhance a quality culture at CBU.
14. After each review, the Quality Assurance Officer or the Vice-President Academic and Provost solicit, with a very brief questionnaire, input from external review teams on their experience doing the evaluation expected of them.
15. With assistance from the Quality Assurance Officer, improve communication about quality assurance between the Vice-President and Provost’s Office and faculty members at large, using at a minimum the microsite maintained by the Office.
16. Communicate the influence of quality assurance processes on budgetary and resource allocation decisions.
17. Continue to entrust the President and the two Board members who are also Senators with the job of ensuring that the Board is fully briefed on the extent of CBU’s commitment to quality assurance.

APPENDICES:

- A. Action plan submitted by Cape Breton University
- B. Table outlining alignment of Cape Breton University’s Policies and Procedures for Assessing Academic Programs and Units with the MPHEC's 2016 Guidelines
- C. Site Visit Agenda
- D. [Assessment report from the “1st cycle”](#)
- E. [Second Cycle of the Monitoring of Maritime Universities’ Quality Assurance Frameworks: Overview of the Process](#)



Cape Breton University Quality Assurance Monitoring Process Follow-Up Action Plan

QAM Reviewer Recommendations		Action to be Taken	Individual/Unit Responsible	Status (As of November 2023)
1.	CBU proceed with its commitment to review its Framework for Quality Assurance relying both on the introspection prompted by this QAM review and the following recommendations as inputs for possible revisions.	Conduct a review of the Quality Assurance (QA) framework to incorporate the recommendations brought forth by the external reviewers.	Quality Assurance Committee of Senate (QAC)	In progress; to be completed by April 2024
2.	A revised Quality Assurance Framework be more explicit about the need to harmonize accreditation processes and procedures with internal quality assurance protocols in order to reduce the “regulatory burden” to the extent possible.	Develop procedures to align CBU’s accredited programs with internal QA processes.	Quality Assurance Committee of Senate (QAC)	In progress; to be completed by April 2024
3.	The Self-Study Guidelines for the Review of Academic Programs be streamlined as part of the review of the Framework advocated in recommendation 1. Improvement to consider:			
3.1	Remove the “institutional overview”, which could be shared with the external reviewers when they are invited to serve.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove the institutional overview from the QA framework requirements. Develop a standardized institutional overview to be shared with external reviewers by the Quality Assurance Officer. 	Quality Assurance Committee of Senate (QAC)	Completed
3.2	Encourage the use of links to (instead of descriptions) of relevant academic policies.	Revise the QA framework to embed links to academic policies, via the CBU website.	Quality Assurance Committee of Senate (QAC)	Completed

3.3	Eliminate the request for detailed information about faculty members at 4.1 and instead rely on the provision of faculty CVs, as called for under “accompanying documentation.”	Consult with staff of Deans’ Offices to understand what faculty information can be collected annually for ongoing quality assurance purposes.	Quality Assurance Committee of Senate (QAC)	In progress; to be completed by April 2024
3.4	Establish a normal word-length for self-studies.	Include a suggested word/page length for text-heavy sections of the QA framework.	Quality Assurance Committee of Senate (QAC)	In progress, to be completed by April 2024
3.5	Make it clear when these Guidelines allow for options, alternatives or the exercise of academic discretion.	Develop guidelines to outline the procedure a Review Committee (RC) can take when looking to modify a section of their study.	Quality Assurance Committee of Senate (QAC)	In progress; to be completed by April 2024
3.6	Enable the Vice-President Academic and Provost to determine whether both a SWOT analysis and a Benchmarking exercise are vital to particular self-studies.	Determine if SWOT analysis and benchmarking exercises are required for self-study reviews.	Office of the Vice-President Academic and Provost (VPA)	Completed
4.	The Quality Assurance Committee expedite the creation of follow-up procedures and action plans, perhaps using a template to provide guidance and to enable consistency.	Create an action plan template and follow-up procedures consisting of follow up every 6 months for the first 2 years preceding the VPA response approval at Senate.	Quality Assurance Officer	Action Completed in May 2023. Additional template is now included on the VPA microsite.
5.	Programs or units under review suspend implementation of structural modifications while a review is in progress.	Revise QA launch letters to include “while a review is in progress, programs/academic support units will suspend the implementation of structural modifications”.	Quality Assurance Committee of Senate (QAC)	Completed
6.	Make more widely known that partial teaching remission or the provision of modest stipends may be forthcoming	Revise QA launch letters to highlight the teaching remission/stipend for the RC Chair.	Quality Assurance Committee of Senate (QAC)	Completed

	when program reviews are occurring.			
7.	The plan to invite the “lead” of a program or service to attend the pertinent meeting or meetings of the Quality Assurance Committee be executed.	Invite all RC Chairs to attend the QAC meeting in which their self-study will be discussed.	Quality Assurance Officer	Completed
8.	The new CIO be well oriented to the QA Framework so that CBU continues to exploit Ellucian, its relatively new data management system, as a supplier of reliable and consistent data for use in quality assurance reviews.	Establish a working group with IT Services and the Office of the VPA to determine data needs and level of access on QA related matters.	Office of the Vice-President Academic and Provost (VPA)	In progress; to be completed by April 2024
9.	The newly appointed Officer for Quality Assurance work closely with the Centre for Teaching and Learning to refine an understanding both of learning outcomes and their assessment and of mapping as a tool for deepening that understanding.	Coordinate with the CTL Projects Coordinator and CTL Teaching Chairs on the development of outcomes mapping workshops and educational materials.	Quality Assurance Officer	In progress; to be completed by April 2024
10.	The Quality Assurance Officer consider compiling a list of best practices in quality assurance that could be shared with Deans, Chairs and others in order to enhance a quality culture at CBU.	Compile QA best practices to present to the Quality Assurance Committee of Senate and the Provost Group.	Quality Assurance Officer	In progress, to be completed by
11.	After each review, the Quality Assurance Officer or the Vice-President Academic and Provost solicit, with a very brief	Develop and distribute questionnaires to QA external reviewers and members of QA Review Committee to solicit ongoing feedback on the QA framework and practices.	Quality Assurance Officer	Completed

	questionnaire, input from external review teams on their experience doing the evaluation expected of them.			
12.	With assistance from the Quality Assurance Officer, improve communication about quality assurance between the Vice-President and Provost's Office and faculty members at large, using at a minimum the microsite maintained by the Office.	Develop a QA microsite and communication plan.	Quality Assurance Officer	Microsite has been completed. In progress - The Quality Assurance Officer will develop a communication plan in partnership with the CTL during the Fall of 2023.
13.	Communicate the influence of quality assurance processes on budgetary and resource allocation decisions.	Present completed self-study reviews and recommendations to the CBU Executive for information purposes and discussion prior to the VPA&P final report submission to Senate.	Office of the Vice-President Academic and Provost (VPA)	Completed

Items for Comment

In addition to the above action-oriented recommendations, the QAM reviewers made several recommendations outside the scope of CBU Quality Assurance. These recommendations do not have specific actions attached to them, but we felt it was important to comment on how they will guide our processes throughout the next cycle.

1. QAM Review Recommendation: Implementation of the Strategic Enrolment Plan continue to be a high priority at CBU.

Comment: The Strategic Enrolment Management (SEM) plan will continue to provide guidance and support across the institution as CBU strives to continuously improve the student experience. The Vice-President Academic and Provost will inform the Quality Assurance Committee of Senate of the ongoing SEM efforts.

- 2. QAM Review Recommendation:** When planning for the medical school a significant consideration be the impact of the new entity on the quality of existing programs and services.

Comment: In consultation with Dalhousie, it has been determined that the CBU Medical Campus will have it's own services and supports.

- 3. QAM Review Recommendation:** Sustain the initiatives of the working group on the first-year experience, widely regarded as a high-impact activity.

Comment: The Quality Assurance Officer will remain a member of the Student Success Committee and continue to liaise with units across campus on issues related to first-year experience.

- 4. QAM Review Recommendation:** Continue to entrust the President and the two Board members who are also Senators with the job of ensuring that the Board is fully briefed on the extent of CBU's commitment to quality assurance.

Comment: With the recent addition of presenting completed self-study reviews and recommendations to the CBU Executive for information purposes and discussion, the Vice-President Academic and Provost ensures that the President is well informed on all quality assurance related matters.

MPHEC 2016 Guidelines	Guideline met by CBU In Policy	Guideline met by CBU In Practice	Comments From Institution	Comments From panel
2. Guiding Principles				
A success university quality assurance framework is guided by:				
2.1 The pursuit of continuous improvement;	Yes	Yes		Agreed
2.2 A focus on learning;	Yes	Yes		Agreed
2.3 The necessity of encompassing all functions and units of an institution;	Yes	Yes		Agreed. We commend CBU for the inclusion of academic support units within its Quality Assurance Framework and for its use of guidelines governing reviews of those units in its practices.
2.4 Accountability and transparency; and	Yes	Yes		Agreed
2.5 The documentation and implementation of policies, guidelines, and procedures.	Yes	Somewhat	In practice; the implementation and follow up action plan items are a work in progress.	Yes. As we say in our recommendations, follow-up actions, while evident in the audits we conducted, could be streamlined and strengthened
3. Score of a university's Quality Assurance Framework				
A university's quality assurance framework:				
3.1 Reflects its mission and values;	Yes	Yes		Yes
3.2 Accounts for the full range of its offerings and activities;	Yes	Somewhat	In practice, the current restructuring of support units has led to some units becoming a part of a self-study midway through the process or taking part in the self-study of its' old and new reporting department.	The problem has been identified and we believe CBU will try to ensure that it does not recur.
3.3 Links to the institution's strategic and other plans'	Yes	Yes		Yes. The Framework, the Academic Plan and the institutional Strategic Plan are mutually reinforcing.
3.4 Includes provisions to cover all of the functions and units of the institution (research, administration, community service, etc.) and applies to the full spectrum of a student's university experience; and	Yes	Somewhat	In practice, the current restructuring of support units has led to some units becoming a part of a self-study midway through the process or taking part in the self-study of its' old and new reporting department.	See our comment beside item 3.2 in this chart.
3.5 is forwarded to the MPHEC.	Yes	Yes		Agreed

MPHEC 2016 Guidelines	Guideline met by CBU In Policy	Guideline met by CBU In Practice	Comments From Institution	Comments From panel
4. Objectives of the university's Quality Assurance Framework				
The objectives of a university quality assurance framework are, at a minimum, to assure the quality of programs and to ensure that stated student outcomes can be realized.	Yes	Yes		Agreed
The purpose of each institution-led assessment is to answer the following two questions:				
First. "How well is the unit or the program achieving what it set out to accomplish?" and	Yes	Somewhat	Newer programs have been developed with these outcomes in mind, but our older programs may not have been as well laid out when developed. Older programs may require additional work to align with outcomes.	Yes. Our audit of a range of programs suggest that older outcomes might require more work than newer ones, but that is not invariably the case.
Second, "Is it doing what it should be doing?"	Yes	Yes		Agreed
In answer the above questions, the university examines:				
4.1 Inputs; and	Yes	Somewhat	With the move to a new student information system, the access to data has become a bit more complicated recently. We need stronger internal processes to ensure that data is available in a timely fashion for self-study processes.	A new data management system (Ellucian) was adopted in 2020. Its full potential appears not to have been realized yet. We concur that the provision of data to units engaged in self-study should be consistent and reliable.
4.2 Outputs.	Yes	Somewhat	Outcomes can be measured in some programs through the achievement of program-specific certifications related to the field of employment, through the NSSE survey, and through understanding the opportunities students have to grow the graduate attributes.	Agreed. The grating of revised Graduate Attribute into the Framework has already occurred. NSSE scores, which need to be treated with caution, seem to be used in some but not all reviews for which they might be presented.
5. Standard for the assessment of academic programs/units				
5.1 Central Components				
To assess academic programs/units, an institutional quality assurance framework would, at a minimum:				
5.1.1 A. Identify the coordinating or administrative unit responsible for the overall management of the quality assurance process. This unit is located at a higher echelon (e.g. vice-president) of the institution's administrative structure, and	Yes	Yes		Agreed. It is clear that CBU's Vice-President Academic and Provost is in charge.
5.1.1 B. is accountable to the institution's decision-making bodies.	Yes	Yes		Yes. The VPA & P is accountable both to Senate and its Quality Assurance Committee

MPHEC 2016 Guidelines	Guideline met by CBU In Policy	Guideline met by CBU In Practice	Comments From Institution	Comments From panel
5.1.2 Assign and distribute responsibility for the various components of the quality assurance framework (deans, department heads, program managers, committee, etc.).	Yes	Somewhat	In practice; only a recent secondment has given a dedicated resource (a Quality Assurance Officer). Prior to February 2022 quality assurance support fell under the responsibility of the Senior Planning Officer. More ownership at the school level is being examined to improve inconsistencies in the evaluation of curriculum management.	We applaud CBU's resolve to create a position focused on quality assurance throughout the institution. Commentators from the institution were extremely positive about this development. We are uncertain about what is being considered in the examination of School-level management of the curriculum.
5.1.3 Define the assessment criteria.	Yes	Yes		Agreed
5.1.4 A. Require a self-study,	Yes	Yes		Agreed
5.1.4 B. involving faculty and students participating in the program or unit,	Yes	Yes		Agreed
5.1.4 C. The self-study is student-centred as it would aim, in most cases, to assess the student experience and, in the case of academic programs to assess the quality of learning and teaching.	Yes	Yes		Agreed
5.1.4 D. The self-study is structured according to the defined assessment criteria, and is both descriptive and analytical.	Yes	Somewhat	Support unit analysis is more descriptive than analytical.	Agreed to some extent. Both analysis and description were present in evaluation of the support unit whose services were part of our auditing process.
5.1.4 E. When and where appropriate, the results of accreditation processes may be included, and/or substituted for this component, or a portion thereof.	Somewhat	Somewhat	A recognized gap is our current practice and policy surrounding the quality assurance process for our accredited programs.	Agreed. We recommend that the gap identified here be filled.
5.1.5 A. Require an external review component	Yes	Yes		Agreed
5.1.5 B. with a sufficiently comprehensive site visit and written report,	Yes	Yes		Agreed
5.1.5 C. carried out by at least two experts external to the institution, with at least one coming from outside Atlantic Canada.	Yes	Yes		This may be normal, but the practice is not always followed.
5.1.5 D. The external reviewers' team should also include a senior faculty member from the institution to assist the external reviewers in the process and provide clarifications on the institution's context.	Yes	Yes		Agreed
5.1.5 E. As appropriate, the results of accreditation may be included and/or substituted for this component, or a portion thereof.	Somewhat	Somewhat	A recognized gap is our current practice and policy surrounding the quality assurance process for our accredited programs.	Agreed. See our comment above beside item 5.1.4 E.
5.1.6 A. Ensure the participation of students through:	Yes	Yes		Agreed
5.1.6 B. membership on committees dealing with quality assurance;	Yes	Yes		Agreed

MPHEC 2016 Guidelines	Guideline met by CBU In Policy	Guideline met by CBU In Practice	Comments From Institution	Comments From panel
5.1.6 C. participation in surveys designed to collect data on a number of student and graduate outcomes;	Somewhat	Somewhat	Student participation in survey design varies from study to study.	While it might be a good idea to engage students in survey design, they do have opportunities to fill out surveys, particularly on the quality of instructions received.
5.1.6 D. and mandatory student course evaluations.	Somewhat	Somewhat	Students are strongly encouraged to complete standardized course evaluations, but it is not mandated.	This is a candid admission.
5.1.7 Incorporate the participation of faculty not directly involved in the reviewed program (or discipline or unit).	Yes	Yes		Yes. An “internal external” is routinely part of program review committees at CBU and there are opportunities for those in cognate disciplines to comment
5.1.8 Enable the participation of the wider network of stakeholders, such as employers, graduates, professional associations, the local community, etc.	Yes	Somewhat	Where applicable, external stakeholders (outside of program alumni) are consulted.	Agreed
5.1.9 A. Define the follow-up mechanisms which include	Somewhat	Somewhat	Follow up on the action items generated in the Vice President Academic (Provost)’s response is an area that is currently in progress. The Quality Assurance Committee of Senate is working on the creation of follow up procedures (set to take place every 6 months for the first 2 years after the study is completed) and documentation.	Agreed that the procedures defining follow-up actions need to be re-considered.
5.1.9 B. the procedures	Somewhat	Somewhat	As above.	Agreed
5.1.9 C. areas of responsibility	Somewhat	Somewhat	As above.	Agreed
5.1.9 D. expected timelines,	Somewhat	Somewhat	As above.	Agreed
5.1.9 E. along with provisions for follow-up monitoring progress (usually involving the Senate).	Somewhat	Somewhat	As above.	Agreed
5.1.10 Establish the assessment cycle and related schedule which normally does not exceed seven years (with no program exceeding, in practice, 10 years between reviewed).	Yes	Somewhat	Timeline adjustment due to COVID-19 response and restrictions. This is a one-time adjustment.	Yes. Delays caused by COVID have affected CBU, along with all other PSE institutions.
5.1.11 Assess newly established programs or units after the first cohort has graduated.	Yes	Yes		Agreed

MPHEC 2016 Guidelines	Guideline met by CBU In Policy	Guideline met by CBU In Practice	Comments From Institution	Comments From panel
5.1.12 Document the standard timeline for individual reviews, from the preparation of the self-study through to Senate approval of the recommendations, normally 12 to 18 months.	Yes	Somewhat	In practice; now having a dedicated resource (QA Officer) to work with the Review Committees on adhering to timelines has had a positive impact. Previously the shared duties and the delay during COVID-19 restrictions resulted in extended timelines.	Agreed
5.1.13 A. Include a communication strategy to inform the university community (students, faculty, staff, etc.) and the general public about a university's quality assurance framework as well as significant changes brought about by quality assurance activities.	No	No	Recent updates to the website will streamline the process for notifying the public of QA results.	Agreed. See also our list of recommendations
5.1.13 B. The communication strategy should include activities to inform faculty, staff and heads of units about the framework, its objectives, assessment criteria, and follow-up processes.	No	No	As above.	Agreed
5.1.14 A. Define the provisions to assess the framework periodically, normally at the end of each assessment cycle	Somewhat	Somewhat	The provisions are not defined, but the division between the policy and the procedures in the approved 2016 framework has allowed the QAC more freedom to adapt and change the procedures on an ongoing basis.	Agreed: this division was often commended by the people we met during our virtual site visit.
5.1.14 B. and table the resulting report with decision-making bodies within the institution (e.g., Senate, Board of Governors).	Somewhat	Somewhat	Knowing the MPHEC progress report was coming up, we made the decision to delay the policy review until after the progress report was completed.	We can hardly argue with this rationale!
5.2 Assessment Criteria				
Each university establishes assessment criteria for reviewing the quality of its programs/units. The assessment criteria are:				
5.2 A. comprehensive in their range and in their use across programs and units;	Yes	Yes		Agreed
5.2 B. they have strong focus on students and	Yes	Yes		Agreed
5.2 C. reflect the institutions mission and values.	Yes	Yes		Agreed
5.2 D. They are published and include at a minimum the following:	Yes	Yes		Agreed
5.2.1 The continuing appropriateness of the program's structure, method of deliver and curriculum for the program's learning outcomes and the degree level expectations;	Yes	Yes		Yes. This is built into the templates found in the Framework

MPHEC 2016 Guidelines	Guideline met by CBU In Policy	Guideline met by CBU In Practice	Comments From Institution	Comments From panel
5.2.2 The achievement by students and graduates of the learning outcomes in light of				
5.2.2 A. the program's stated goals,	Yes	Somewhat	More work is needed on the assessment of student outcomes.	Agreed. In some cases we examined, the articulation of learning outcomes is fine. How modes of assessment work to enable demonstration that outcomes have been achieved seems to vary across CBU
5.2.2 B. the degree level expectations, and,	Yes	Yes		Agreed
5.2.2 C. where relevant, the standards of any relevant regulatory, accrediting or professional body;	Yes	Yes		Agreed with the proviso that harmonizing QA and accrediting process is still a work-in-progress
5.2.3 The continuing appropriateness and effectiveness of the methods used for the evaluation of student progress and achievement in light of the degree level expectations;	Yes	Yes		Agreed
5.2.4 The capacity of the faculty and staff to deliver the program and the quality of education necessary for the students to achieve:				
5.2.4 A. the states learning outcomes, and	Yes	Somewhat	More work is needed on the assessment of student outcomes.	Agreed
5.2.4 B. to meet the needs of the existing and anticipated student enrolments;	Yes	Somewhat	The Strategic Enrolment Management plan is making improvements to our enrolment strategy.	This is an understatement. The critical importance of the SEM plan was emphasized in many of our interactions
5.2.5 The continuing performance of faculty, including				
5.2.5 A. the quality of teaching and supervision, and	Yes	Yes		Agreed
5.2.5 B. their continuing progress and achievement in research, scholarship or creative activity, and	Yes	Yes		Agreed
5.2.5 C. professional activity in light of the program under review;	Yes	Yes		Agreed
5.2.6 The appropriateness of the support provided to the learning environment, including but not limited to library and learning resources (e.g., human, physical and financial resources; academic advising; student services, graduate studies office; registrar services; technological services; centre for teaching and learning, etc.), unless such supports are assessed through other means;	Yes	Yes		Agreed
5.2.7 The effectiveness and appropriateness of the use made of				
5.2.7 A. the existing human resources	Yes	Yes		Agreed
5.2.7 B. the existing physical resources	Yes	Yes		Agreed
5.2.7 C. the existing technological resources	Yes	Yes		Agreed

MPHEC 2016 Guidelines	Guideline met by CBU In Policy	Guideline met by CBU In Practice	Comments From Institution	Comments From panel
5.2.7 D. the existing financial resources; and The continuing appropriateness of	Yes	Yes		Agreed
5.2.8 A. the academic policies (including admission, promotion and graduation requirements; requests for transfer credit and advanced standing, and appeals) and	Yes	Yes		Agreed
5.2.8 B. of the governing and decision-making structures of the academic unit; and	Yes	Yes		Agreed
5.2.9 The definition of indicators that provide evidence of quality				
5.2.9 A. including enrolments, graduation rates, time-to completion rates, student satisfaction level	Yes	Yes		Agreed
5.2.9 B. and, as appropriate, relevant measures of graduate outcomes (e.g., graduate employment rates, employment in field of study, employer satisfaction level, further study etc.).	Yes	Yes		Agreed
6. Standard for assessment of other units				
<p>A university's quality assurance framework ought to assess all functions and units of the institution. This includes the university's units whose missions are not driven by teaching, and in particular academic support units. The diversity of these units makes the development of general guidelines universally applicable across units and across universities challenging. It is up to the institution to determine whether each unit is assessed more effectively on its own or in conjunction with academic units (see 5.2.6 above).</p> <p><i>The Commission will gather information from, and generate discussion with, universities on best practices in the assessment of other units. In the interim, universities are still expected to review these units and, at this stage, the Commission proposes the following four assessment criteria:</i></p> <p>Note: Given the change of approach to addressing the assessment of other units, now named Academic Support Units, institutions are asked to complete Sections 6.1 to 6.4 (below) based on its policies/practices for assessing Academic support Units directly related to academic programs/student learning (as applicable).</p>				
6.1 The continuing appropriateness and effectiveness of the service or support provided to the academic programs, students and faculty;	Yes	Yes		Agreed. We note again that we audited a review of an Academic Support unit, the Centre for Teaching and Learning. The Self-Study was thorough and expanded on the items enumerated here.
6.2 The capacity of the unit or program to deliver the service or support which its mandate defines;	Yes	Yes		Agreed
6.3 The appropriateness and efficiency of the use made of				
6.3 A. the existing human resources	Yes	Yes		Agreed
6.3 B. the existing physical resources	Yes	Yes		Agreed
6.3 C. the existing technological resources	Yes	Yes		Agreed

MPHEC 2016 Guidelines	Guideline met by CBU In Policy	Guideline met by CBU In Practice	Comments From Institution	Comments From panel
6.3 D. the existing financial resources; and	Yes	Yes		Agreed
6.4 The contribution of the unit or program to other aspects of the institution's mission and to the student experience.	Yes	Yes		Agreed
7. Key documents associated with a university's Quality Assurance Framework				
Standardization and documentation of processes and procedures support two goals: a common and transparent process and shorter timelines. To this end, institutions should establish the following policy(ies), templates and standards:				
7 A. Formal, approved quality assurance related policy(ies).	Yes	Yes		Agreed
7 B. Guidelines for the preparation of the self-study.	Yes	Yes		Agreed
7 C. to include templates/data/source(s) for indicators/measures of quality (e.g., enrolments, graduate rates, time-to-completion rates, student/employer satisfaction level, graduate employment rates, employment in field of study, further study, etc.).	Yes	Somewhat	In practice; guidelines for timelines are being worked on. During the spring of 2020 CBU moved to a new data management system which led to some data merging issues and impacted timelines.	Agreed. See our comment above.
7 D. Generic terms of reference for external reviewers.	Yes	Yes		Agreed
7 E. Common student course evaluation form.	Yes	Yes		Agreed
7 F. Terms of reference for relevant committee(s).	Yes	Yes		Agreed
7 G. Guidelines for the review of programs that are also subject to accreditation.	No	No	Alignment of accreditation practices and QA requirements are a work in progress of the current Quality Assurance Committee of Senate.	Agreed. See our previous comment.

2nd Cycle of the Quality Assurance Monitoring Process	
Site visit to Cape Breton University	
DAY 1 – April 25, 2023	
Time slot	Participants
11:00-11:15	External Reviewer Panel set up <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dr. Neil Besner – Former Provost and VPA, University of Winnipeg; QA practitioner • Dr. Ron Bond –Provost Emeritus, University of Calgary; PSE Consultant; QA practitioner • Dr. Vicky Simpson – Policy and Research Analyst, MPHEC • Ms. Catherine Stewart – Chief Executive Officer, MPHEC
11:15-11:45	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dr. David Dingwall, President of CBU • Dr. Richard MacKinnon, Vice-President Academic and Provost • Gordon MacInnis, Vice-President Finance and Operations
12:00-12:50	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dr. Richard MacKinnon, Vice-President Academic and Provost • Alyssa MacDonald, Quality Assurance Officer • Marcy MacKinnon, Senior Planning Officer
1:00-1:50	Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) of Senate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dr. Richard MacKinnon, Vice-President Academic and Provost (Interim Chair in the absence of Katherine Jones, who is on leave) Committee members: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marcy Mackinnon, Ex Officio – Senior Planning Officer • Alyssa MacDonald, Ex Officio – Quality Assurance Officer • Barbara Kennedy, Registrar’s Office Representative • Marcia Ostashewski, School of Arts & Social Science Representative • Sahand Ashtab, Shannon School of Business Representative and Co-Chair of QAC of Senate • Lyndsay Best, School of Education & Health Representative • Tanya MacDonald, School of Science & Technology Representative • Samantha Hodder, School of Nursing Representative • Himali Kadam, Student Representative –SU VPFO
1:50-2:30	Panel Lunch Break
2:30-3:20	Staff involved with student recruitment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rebecca Chisholm, Associate Vice-President, University Relations • Bilynda Whiting, Director of Office of the Registrar and Admissions • Cynthia Vokey, Manager of Domestic Recruitment • Victor Tomiczek, Director of International Recruitment
3:30-4:20	Academic Support Units that contribute to the quality of academic programs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dr. Tanya Brann-Barrett, Associate Vice-President, Academic & Research • John Mayich, Director of Student Affairs • Catherine Arseneau, Dean of Library & Cultural Resources • Nina Kent, Director of Business Operations, Unama’ki College • Russ Warren, Colleague system lead

4:30- 5:20	<p>Deans connected to recent reviews:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Andy Parnaby, Dean of School of Arts & Social Sciences • Rick Pierrynowski, Dean of School of Science & Technology • John Nadeau, Dean of Shannon School of Business • Patrick Howard, Dean (interim) of School of Education & Health • Erna MacLeod, Associate Dean, Office of Research & Graduate Studies • Kimberly Lamarche, Dean of School of Nursing
DAY 2 – April 26, 2023	
11:00-11:10	Panel – set up (same as Day 1)
11:10-12:00	<p>Chairs/Heads of recently reviewed programs & current:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BHTM Representative: Mary Jane Morrison • SST Representative David McCorquodale • BHSc Representative: Melissa McDonald • MBA in CED Representatives: George Karaphillis (former SSOB Dean) and Barrie Riome (current MBA lead) • CTL Representative: Rod Nicholls
12:10 - 1:00	<p>Faculty of recently reviewed programs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty member from MBA in CED: Doug Lionais • Member from School of Science & Technology: Vielka Salazar • Member from BA: Mary Keating • Member from BHSs: Helen Mersereau • Member from BHTM: Jennifer Currie • Member from CTL: Nicole MacDougall
1:10-2:00	<p>Members from Academic Support Units recently reviewed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student Affairs Representative: Tammy Byrne • Office of the Registrar and Admissions Representative: Barbara Kennedy • Cultural Resources Representative: Anna MacNeil • Library Representative: Carla White • Athletics Representative: Teena Campbell • Colleague lead: Russ Warren
2:00-2:30	Panel Lunch Break
2:30 -3:20	<p>Students:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SU President: Damanpreet Singh • SU EVP: Peter Ade-Oyedijo • BHSc student: Jennah Syms • BHTM: Mandy Nguyen & Matthew Patles • BSc: Mike Denny & Courtney Trask • BA: Olivia Karigey • MBA: Lugano Kasyupa and Pasquale Tari • International: Mehak Kaushal

<p>3:30 to 4:20</p>	<p>Senate Representatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Erin Robertson, Chair of Senate <p>Members of Senate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tom Urbaniak, former Chair • Sahand Ashtab, Co-Chair of the QAC of Senate • Jasmine Hoover • Felix Odartey-Wellington
<p>4:20-5:00</p>	<p>Panel only – Debrief Panel Break</p>
<p>5:00-5:30</p>	<p>Closing Session</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dr. David Dingwall (optional) • Dr. Richard MacKinnon • Alyssa MacDonald, Quality Assurance Officer • Marcy MacKinnon, Senior Planning Officer