

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

Assessment of the Nova Scotia College of Arts and Design's Quality Assurance Policies and Procedures

Final Panel Report

Prepared by

Dr. Ron Bond and Dr. Liz Halford

September 2024

ISBN 978-1-988264-26-4

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 NSCAD 3**
- C. Preface: Panel’s Description of Principal Features of NSCAD in 2022-2023..... 4**

Section II: Assessment of NSCAD’s Policies and Procedures for Assessing Academic Programs and Units.....5

- A. Progress since the 1st Cycle: 5**
 - 2009 Recommendation 1: Improve the documentation of quality assurance practices 5
 - 2009 Recommendation 2: Strengthen management and accountability of policy and process..... 6
 - 2009 Recommendation 3: Strengthen NSCAD’s program review policy 7
 - Recommendation 4: Shorten the review cycle 8
- B. Implementation of NSCAD’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 17**

Section III: Recommendations for Improvement17

Appendices:

- A. Action plan submitted by NSCAD
- B. Table outlining alignment of the NSCAD’s Policies and Procedures for Assessing Academic Programs and Units with the MPHEC’s 2016 Guidelines
- C. Site Visit Agenda
- D. A copy of the 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 NSCAD

At the request of the Maritime Provinces Higher Education Commission (MPHEC), the Review Panel was asked to carry out the QAM review of the Nova Scotia College of Arts and Design's (NSCAD) quality assurance framework. The members of the Review Panel were:

Dr. Ronald 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 B.C. and for the Postsecondary Education Quality Assessment Board in Ontario. Among the institutions for which he has worked as a consultant is the Alberta University of the Arts, formerly the Alberta College of Art and Design.

Dr. Elizabeth Halford: A higher education consultant and Director of Wells Advisory UK, she has worked in United Kingdom higher education since 1993, as a research active academic and in senior leadership roles. She was Head of Validation and Review (2008 – 2012) at the University of West London and Head of Research and Intelligence at the UK Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (2012-2016). She has a Doctorate in Education from UCL and is a Fellow of the Higher Education Academy. She has also served on the Boards of Governors of public and private higher education providers, including Hereford College of Arts, a specialist arts institution in the UK, where she was Chair of the Academic Quality and Standards Committee.

The QAM Process at NSCAD included the following steps:

1. An institutional progress report prepared by NSCAD (May 2022; updated, at the request of the Panel, November 2022);

2. An analysis of all pertinent documentation by the Review Panel (June, August, November-December 2022, and January 2023);
3. A virtual site visit (January 24-26, 2023);
4. A draft report prepared by the Review Panel to NSCAD to validate factual information and correct any errors (March 6, 2023);
5. Validation of draft report by NSCAD (April 4, 2023)
6. A final report, incorporating NSCAD's comments, to NSCAD (April 12, 2023)
7. A action plan prepared by NSCAD (February 28, 2024; updated April 30, 2024);
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 (June 26, 2024);
9. The Review Panel report, with the action plan from NSCAD appended, posted (in the language of the institution) on the MPHEC and NSCAD's website (September 16, 2024); and,
10. A follow-up report to be submitted by NSCAD to the MPHEC one year following submission to the MPHEC of the action plan. The follow-up report will outline how NSCAD has addressed the actions it had identified in its action plan.

C. Preface: Panel's Description of Principal Features of NSCAD in 2022-2023

Founded in 1887, the Nova Scotia College of Art and Design is one of only four Canadian art-and-design schools in Canada. This section of the Reviewers' Report provides some contextual information about NSCAD, since it is a special purpose university whose organization, programs, and challenges will be alluded to during the following sections of our Report. The information presented here relies on the documentation provided for the 2nd Cycle QAM monitoring initiative along with some insights gained during the virtual site visit conducted in January 2023.

It is important to recognize that NSCAD's programming, for a small niche institution, is quite diverse, ranging from film to jewelry to ceramics. The University relies for delivery of its programs on faculty attached to various divisions: Craft, Design, Fine Arts, Foundation Studies, Media Arts, Art History and Contemporary Culture, and Graduate Studies. Each of these is home to programmatic areas where teaching and learning occur; the Division of Fine Arts, for example, houses Painting and Drawing, Sculpture, and Printmaking, whereas the Division of Graduate Studies administers three programs at the master's level, namely Art Education, Fine Arts and Design. Because of the small size of the institution, a small faculty complement works in each of these areas. Just over 800 students are distributed over the degrees offered and 41.5 full-time faculty members share the responsibility of educating them. In some cases, no more than one or two instructors practice and profess in a given area.

In addition to the quality assurance provisions overseen by MPHEC, NSCAD has now been granted "substantial equivalency" by the National Association of Schools of Arts and Design in the USA. This is a designation applied to art and design schools from outside the USA who apply to be evaluated according to the standards and assessment processes originally created for such schools in the USA. Our Panel spent some time considering the differences and similarities between MPHEC's QA practices and those to which NSCAD has recently been subjected. One major difference is that the NASAD review delves into a considerable amount of institutional data (over 150 appendices are attached to the principal assessment of NSCAD) and examines the institution as a whole, whereas the MPHEC-QAM process is focused on the QA policies of the university and the degree to which they have been implemented in a few programs selected for detailed audits.

An important facet of NSCAD's current reality is that since July 2022 the institution has been led by a new President, who succeeds a series of individuals who had recently held that position. Dr. Peggy Shannon joined NSCAD from San Diego University as an experienced professor and administrator. The Panel understands that a period of labour unrest, administrative churn, and financial challenges preceded her arrival. That said, we are confident that she will provide stable and stimulating leadership to the institution she has chosen to join. Coupled with the arrival of the new President are the very recent appointments of a new Academic Dean, a new person in charge of the Office of Teaching and Learning, a new administrative secretary of Senate and others new to the positions they occupy. Among many we met, there is a sense of revitalization and renewal at NSCAD. For the Panel, it was sometimes disconcerting to realize that occasionally we were asking questions of colleagues who were too new in their jobs to be secure in their responses.

This preamble concludes with summary remarks on quality assurance at NSCAD. There appears to have been a hiatus between the First Cycle of the QAM review in 2009 and the Second Cycle review in 2022-23. It was not until 2018 that the current quality assurance framework, which we examine in some detail in the next section of this Report, was adopted by Senate and the Board. This gap in time, coupled with the financial and other challenges of the last decade and with the delays caused by Covid-19, has affected continuous quality improvement at the institution.

SECTION II: ASSESSMENT OF NSCAD'S POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR ASSESSING ACADEMIC PROGRAMS AND UNITS

A. Progress since the 1st Cycle:

The First Cycle of QAM completed its assessment of NSCAD in 2008-9. Since then, NSCAD has assiduously addressed the recommendations made in "1st cycle" Report and has made significant changes to its QA policies. We gauge that progress by referring, in italics, to each recommendation made in 2009 and the proposed ways of implementing the recommended changes. We also record some questions and shortcomings based on our understanding of the documentation provided, as glossed by the interviewees we talked with during our virtual site visit. We note that NSCAD's progress report to MPHEC contains comments on some but not all of these items.

2009 Recommendation 1: Improve the documentation of quality assurance practices

Possible ways to achieve this include:

- 1. Clarify the relationship between quality assurance and NSCAD's mission.*

In the quality assurance documents examined, we see references to NSCAD's mission, but no explicit reference to the relationship between that mission and quality assurance. The reviewers maintain that making that relationship explicit would be beneficial.

- 2. Create Generic Terms of Reference for external reviewers*

An External Review Guide has now been prepared. It enumerates comprehensively the questions external reviewers are asked to consider when using the program's Self-Study. It also sets out the "Content and Form" of the External Review Report. This is a useful component of the QA Framework at NSCAD and we can affirm that it has been used to good effect in the two programs we audited.

3. *Define the assessment criteria against which a division/program under review will be measured.*

Although they are not called “assessment criteria”, the Self-Study Report Guide sets out a list of suggested “categories” that should be addressed. There are 8 such categories, each of them amplified with considerable detail in this Guide. They are i) Introduction; ii) Program Analysis; iii) Teaching, Research and Creative Practice; iv) Students; v) Alumni; vi) Resources; vii) 5-year academic plan; viii) Major Areas of interest for External Reviewers. In our audits, we saw that all programs adhered in their self-studies to the suggestions listed, with various degrees of emphasis, depending, as one would expect, on the circumstances of the program.

4. *Define a process to review interdisciplinary and graduate programs.*

Although NSCAD describes itself as an institution devoted to interdisciplinary programming and although it has mounted three graduate programs, we believe that its quality assurance framework lacks special provisions for reviews of these two types of programs.

5. *Define how the annual review process contributes to quality assurance.*

We find it difficult to interpret this statement, unless there used to be an “annual review process” for QA that is now in abeyance.

6. *Document other initiatives related to quality assurance.*

See our account of the Framework in the following section of this Report

7. *Define, within the policy, NSCAD’s links to the local arts scene and other organizations.*

We do not ascertain, within the new QA Framework, information about these links. In conversation, however, we heard much about the laudable ways in which NSCAD is integrated into the local cultural scene.

2009 Recommendation 2: Strengthen management and accountability of policy and process

Possible ways to achieve this include:

1. *Make the Vice-President Academic Affairs and Research a standing member of Program Review Committee.*

The Vice-President Academic and Research/Provost or her designate chairs the Academic Standards and Quality Assurance Committee (ASQAC), about which we write later in this Report. ASQAC, the pivotal QA body at the institution, appears to replace the Program Review Committee, though there is confusion about that point, as we observe later in this Report.

2. *Have the Vice-President Academic Affairs and Research been responsible for monitoring the results of reviews and communicating these to the university community.*

As we say at greater length elsewhere in this Report, the current framework was not fully implemented at the time of the site visit, but, from what we have seen, the newly devised template will improve follow-up and monitoring.

3. *Provide central support to the review process*

The Panel encountered some divergent views on the extent to which centralized support is provided to divisions and programs undergoing reviews. It would appear that there is less support in terms of personnel than there used to be, but it is unclear whether, after a period of belt-tightening, the current levels of support are adequate.

2009 Recommendation 3: Strengthen NSCAD's program review policy

Possible ways to achieve this include:

1. *Make the policy more student-centred by adding criteria related to teaching practices, intended and delivered curriculum, support provided to students, and student outcomes, etc.*

The Policy itself is not overtly student-centred, but there are student members of ASQAC and the template for program reviews calls for analysis of student-faculty ratios, grade distribution, time-to-completion etc., and there is also a call for information about admission practices, employability, and orientation, advising and mentoring systems in place. A similar focus on student enrolment, recruitment, financial support, and on students' experience is a feature of the External Reviewers' mandate.

2. *Expand the scope of the policy to include non-academic units (such as student services, the Office of the Registrar, physical plant, and IT services).*

NSCAD's submission for this QAM review notes that the Non-Academic Review Policy is currently under review. In our meeting with representatives of "academic support units" as they are now called, we learned that many of them would welcome inclusion in NSCAD's QA policy framework. We note as well that in its Guidelines for Quality Assurance Frameworks, MPHEC acknowledges that the diversity of these units can make the job of assessing them challenging. Our understanding is that MPHEC continues to gather best practices on such reviews, but in the meantime expects that institutions engage in them. See as well the section later in this Report on "Review of Academic Support Units at NSCAD."

3. *Expand the search for external reviewers to the United States.*

In practice, reviewers from the USA as well as from Canada are used at NSCAD. One of the program reviews we audited avails itself of an American reviewer.

4. *Disseminate information, more widely and consistently, about quality assurance practices to the university community (students, faculty, etc.) and the general public.*

There has been improvement on the dissemination of such information, but as we observe later in this Report, we think communication about quality assurance could be further strengthened. NSCAD's submission notes that Minutes of ASQAC meeting are now publicly available.

5. *Use the results of program review to inform decision-making and in particular decisions related to budgeting and the improvement of programs/services.*

We lack evidence on the extent to which results of program reviews inform decision-making and budgeting. We heard from members of faculty that they believe the impact of QA on other orders of decision-making at NSCAD to be opaque.

6. *Include a provision to evaluate the existing quality assurance policy within the actual policy.*

This provision is now found in the policy framework.

Recommendation 4: Shorten the review cycle

Possible ways to achieve this include:

1. *Shorten the review cycle from every 10 years to every five years ideally (seven at most).*

NSCAD's policy states that each program shall be reviewed at least once every seven (7) years, though in practice the time in between reviews has extended well beyond seven years.

2. *Implement the above-noted recommendations.*

See the text above, noting the discretion accorded institutions in the phrase "possible ways".

B. Implementation of NSCAD's Policies and Procedures for Assessing Academic Programs and Units:

NSCAD's Quality Assurance Policies and Procedures

The Quality Assurance Monitoring (QAM) progress report submitted by NSCAD states that the University's Quality Assurance Framework consists of several inter-related documents:

- Quality assurance policies and procedures (approved by the Board in 2018)
- Self-study report guide
- External review guide
- Academic review timeline checklist
- Schedule of quality assurance program reviews

The governance responsibilities for overseeing that effective policies and procedures are in place for assessing academic programs and units rest with the NSCAD Senate and the Academic Standards and Quality Assurance Committee (ASQAC), which is a committee of Senate. The Vice President Academic and Research (VPAR) is the senior management post with responsibility for quality assurance. The quality assurance policies and procedures apply to all programs, and the goal is to improve their quality. The NSCAD policy states that it will endeavour to review two programs each year, if possible; however, it is clear from the documentation submitted for review that this has not occurred.

The NSCAD academic program review process is:

- ASQAC formally serves as the Academic Program Review Committee, with the Chair of the program home normally acting as the Chair of the Self-Study Committee, supported by the Office of Academic Affairs and Research
- The program self-study committee prepares a self-study report, in consultation with the wider University community
- The VPAR organizes a visit of the external review team, following scrutiny of the self-study report by ASQAC, with agreement that it is clear, complete and comprehensive
- The VPAR receives the external report and asks for a response—whether from ASQAC or a separate Program Review Committee is unclear

- The self-study, external report and any subsequent responses are then sent to ASQAC (as the formal Academic Program Review Committee) for a formal final report
- The Senate then acts to monitor the implementation of the recommendations in the final report.

The QAM report submitted by NSCAD in advance of the MPHEC visit cites the main quality assurance activity to be the review of academic programs, to ascertain their calibre and to determine whether they are meeting their own, the University's and the community's objectives. The objectives of NSCAD's review process are to:

- Improve and update academic programs as required
- Provide information for future planning including consideration of decision-making processes.

NSCAD has completed two division reviews since the adoption of the current QA framework in 2018. These are:

- The Division of Fine Arts (BFA – Fine Arts)
- The Division of Media Arts (BFA – Media Arts)

The MPHEC reviewers conducted a thorough audit of the documents for these reviews (self-study reports, external reviewers' reports, division responses and ASQAC minutes) and it is through this audit of the program review process that the effectiveness of NSCAD's own policies and procedures for quality assurance, together with how they meet the regionally agreed standards of MPHEC, are evaluated.

NSCAD's Senate is central to the operation of quality assurance processes, as it should be. One of the bodies to which Senate has delegated some of its authority is the Academic Standards and Quality Assurance Committee, chaired by the Vice-President Academic Affairs and Research (VPAR). The title reflects a merger between previously distinct entities responsible for academic standards on the one hand, and quality assurance on the other.

The Bylaws and Constitution for Academic Governance (2015) articulate ASQAC's Terms of Reference; the first few terms pertain primarily to quality assurance: *a) Guide and oversee the academic standards for undergraduate and graduate studies at NSCAD within the limits defined in the NSCAD Constitution and By-Laws; b) Act on and oversee the quality assurance processes for NSCAD University; c) Consult, support and communicate with all Divisions and program areas during quality assurance review periods; d) Report to Senate on Quality Assurance Reviews.* These Terms of Reference are cited in full according to the minutes of ASQAC's meeting on November 5, 2021, though no motions are attached to the Terms.

The Senate itself initiates each review by announcing which programs will be reviewed each year and by naming the Chair of a Program Review Committee (PRC), which "is responsible for overseeing all reviews during the review year and circulating information gathered about quality assurance to the University community." The PRC also appoints the Chair of the Self-Study Committee. The PRC in turn sets in motion the creation of a Self-Study Committee for each program to be evaluated and nominates potential external referees to the VPAR. According to the policy, the PRC writes a Report about the recommendations, and the timelines for implementing them; that Report is to be shared with the Chair of Academic Senate, the President, and the President of the Students' Council. Subsequently, Senate is to learn about the actions taken to implement the recommendations of the Program Review Committee.

It is our understanding that the PRC has now been replaced by ASQAC, as asserted in the sentence we quote below, and that ASQAC now performs all of the tasks formerly assigned to PRC.

Our observation is that for an institution with only 41.5 Full-Time Faculty NSCAD has had a many layered, convoluted and labour-intensive procedure, the value of which, academically and administratively, is questionable. In the Framework documents we reviewed, there is considerable lack of clarity on the roles and responsibilities of Senate's ASQAC vis-à-vis the so-called Program Review Committee. The former is one of Senate's eleven standing committees; the latter lacks that cachet. We acknowledge that the NSCAD's Progress Report, filed in November 2022, renders in bold this note: **The Program Committee has been replaced by the Academic Standards and Quality Assurance Committee.** The use of ASQAC as a surrogate for the PRC is a recent development that might explain why the members of Senate and ASQAC we interviewed did not refer to the PRC as a significant link in the QA operational chain. In fact, some of our interviewees ascribed to ASQAC tasks that are clearly identified in the Framework as belonging to the PRC. Since the PRC may well be vestigial, the need for it, as described in the current Framework, is a topic we take up in the list of recommendations below.

In sum, we applaud NSCAD for creating the Self-Study Report Guide and the External Review Report Guide, both of which are fit for purpose. But we maintain that there is some urgency for the QA functions of Senate and ASQAC to be redefined in the principal policy document in the Framework, now that the PRC has apparently been dissolved.

In order to answer the overarching question about the extent to which NSCAD is following its own QA policies and procedures, MPHEC asks its panels to employ an auditing system. We regret that our Panel was unable to consider the number of academic programs and units that is normal for QAM reviews. Normally the Panel selects for detailed auditing between three and five programs that have been reviewed during the past seven years. Normally, a graduate program is included when such programs are among those that have been appraised. In this case, because of the hiatus, mentioned previously, between the First and Second Cycles of review, we were obliged to study just two programs that had undergone NSCAD reviews during that timeframe. Those two were reviews of the Division of Fine Arts and the Division of Media Arts, both initiated in 2019, and both interrupted, therefore, by COVID-19.

Audit of the Division of Fine Arts Review:

The review of the Fine Arts Division at NSCAD consisted of the parts prescribed by NSCAD's 2018 Policy—with one significant exception, i.e., "follow-up," described below. The review involved a Self-Study prepared in 2019-20 by a Self-Study Committee drawn mainly from the unit; a Report from external reviewers, one from the University of Guelph and the other from Concordia University, filed on June 7, 2021; a Response to the External Reviewers' Report, dated October 28, 2021.

The composition of the Self-Study Committee conformed to the expectations of NSCAD's Policy Framework by including two faculty members from the Division, another from a cognate area (the Division of Media Arts) and a student representative appointed by the Students' Union. Similarly, the selection of two external reviewers from two other provinces was aligned with the provisions of the Policy and procedures adopted by NSCAD.

The structure and contents of both the Self-Study and the External Report reveal that their authors had by and large followed the QA Framework.

The Self-Study, according to the Report Guide published in the Framework, is to include these sections: 1) Introduction; 2) Program Analysis; 3) Teaching, Research and Creative Practice; 4) Students; 5) Alumni; 6) Resources; 7) 5-year Academic Plan; 8) Major Areas of Interest for External Review. These elements are found on one page of the documentation; on the next, these elements are replicated with the addition of three other items, i.e. Table of Contents; Numbered Recommendations; and Appendices. The Fine Arts Division review includes the larger list, as well as a section titled “Summary of Programs Reviewed and Recommendations.” That summary refers to the programmatic components of the Division: Painting and Drawing (combined for the purposes of the review), Printmaking and Sculpture. The Panel notes that each of these three areas is very small, by most standards, with just two or three FT faculty members attached to each of them.

The Panel found the Self-Study itself somewhat difficult to follow since it is a hybrid in which commentary from the Division is mixed with commentary from Printmaking, Sculpture and Painting and Drawing. The amount and quality of this commentary differs radically among the program areas. For example, there are 12 “numbered recommendations” from Painting and Drawing; 13 for Printmaking; and just 5 for Sculpture. There is no attempt in the Self-Study to create a composite list or to establish divisional priorities.

The External Reviewers state that they will use 9 headings in their Report: 1) Summary of Key Findings and Strategic Recommendations for the Division; 2) Objective and Identity; 3) Curriculum and Pedagogy; 4) Regulation and Governance; 5) Students; 6) Faculty, 7) Resources; 8) Inclusivity; and 9) Summary of Recommendations. Apart from the first item listed and the effort to give “inclusivity” more prominence than it has in the guidelines, these categories of assessment are in accord with the “External Review Guide” and the directions in the Framework for the “content and form” of the Report.

In contrast to the Self-Study, the External Reviewers, while not ignoring discrete areas within the unit, tend to emphasize divisional needs, such as the desirability of creating a Divisional Curriculum Committee, the development of a space plan for the Port campus that will meet “divisional objectives” and the allocation of BIPOC positions to be filled with cluster hires. Its fourteen concluding recommendations allude to the need for divisional strategic planning and to an approach to the program areas that will prioritize “the whole, rather than the parts.”

The Division’s Response to their Report does not refer by name to its authors. It notes the Reviewers’ “unenviable task of reviewing a very complex and dynamic division” and proceeds to give a Divisional reaction to various recommendations (not ordered in a discernible sequence) as well as responses from the individual programs. The latter vary in length and intensity. Various errors are singled out, and a fairly constant refrain is that the workload entailed by strategic planning, for example, should be reflected in the service workload. We did not have access to the newly renegotiated collective agreement, so are in no position to comment on that claim. We do acknowledge, however, that the “regulatory burden” can be keenly felt by faculty members, particularly at a smaller institution, where there are fewer faculty members to staff committees and to do QA, planning and other forms of service work.

An egregious shortcoming apparent in the review of the Fine Arts Division is the neglect of formal follow-up, as called for by NSCAD’s Framework. The requirement for an implementation plan, which is a regular feature of quality assurance protocols at other institutions and in other jurisdictions is clearly articulated. Item 12 of the process is “Implementation of the Program Review Committee Report.” Despite several references in the Framework to the roles and responsibilities of that Committee, we encountered no

documentation to demonstrate that it had played a role in the process affecting the Fine Arts Division. To be more specific, we saw no evidence of the following stipulation: “Each September for two (2) years following the review, directors or heads of the programs will Report to the Academic Senate on the actions taken to implement the recommendations of the Program Review Committee.” An elaboration suggest that these reports should occur every three years (not two), and should go not to Senate, but to ASQAC in order to “report to ASQAC on the actions they have taken to implement the recommendations of the ASQAC.” The minutes of ASQAC’s meeting on November 5, 2021 do record conversations about both the Fine Arts and Media Reviews, but those conversations do not constitute a list of concrete action items pursuant to the two reviews

Our Panel requested a selection of minutes of Senate, since some of those interviewed said the reports we were unable to locate had in fact been presented in that venue. Our reading of two sets of minutes revealed that reports to Senate did not consider implementation of an action plan. To be fair, we also learned from the VPAR, just as we were wrapping up our review, that she had developed a template for the Action Plans needed. Among other things, it requires the presentation of recommendations from both the self-study and the external reviewers, priority rankings of those recommendations from both the division and the dean, and a set of actions and deliverables with accountabilities described. Once this admirable template becomes a regular feature of the QA processes at NSCAD, a major gap will have been filled.

Together with the analysis of our audit of the Division of Media Arts, these comments on the audit of Fine Arts will generate recommendations for Section III of this Report.

Audit of the Division of Media Arts Review:

The review of the Media Arts Division at NSCAD confirmed that this program review conformed to the process outlined in the NSCAD 2018 Policy; however, the follow-up process could have been implemented much more rigorously to demonstrate that a self-critical and constructive quality culture is present within the institution. The review involved a Self-Study prepared in December 2019 by a Self-Study Committee headed by the Chair of Media Arts and comprising six members (including one student and one faculty member from outside the Media Arts Division) in accordance with the NSCAD policy. A report from external reviewers (one from the University of Toronto and the other from the Parsons School of Art and Design, New York), was submitted in August 2021 and a response to the External Reviewers’ Report, issued in October 2021.

The structure and contents of both the Self-Study and the External Report reveal that their authors had followed the QA Framework, producing a clear and comprehensive analysis of the programs within the Division, namely:

- Expanded Media
- Film
- Photography
- Interdisciplinary Arts

The commentary of the Self-Study includes discussion of the curriculum and the pedagogical approaches, identifying pertinent issues in relation to student demand, the external environment, faculty resources,

administrative support, and a future academic plan. The appendices to the Self-Study include data to inform statistical analysis of performance.

The main recommendations of the Self-Study were to develop the current Animation Minor to a Major, and to provide separate administration for the Interdisciplinary program, given that this has the largest number of graduates.

The External Report is detailed and constructively critical, providing some helpful comments and recommendations for the future. The external review took place during the Covid pandemic, so the reviewers comment upon a number of significant curtailments caused by the restrictions, including the inability to visit the NSCAD campus, the time limitations of online meetings and the very limited student participation.

The Report comments upon the date of the Self-Study (being two years old) as necessitating the request for further information to enable appropriate scrutiny. It is stated that there was a reluctance to provide course outlines, and the reviewers make the respectful recommendation that in future, a digital folder of documentation be provided. It was also recommended that the organisation of the Self-Study be reorganised to streamline the review of each program within the division, thereby avoiding confusion.

The Report comments that *'NSCAD University has a distinct, almost mythic, national and international reputation as an institution dedicated to providing a unique, interdisciplinary approach to education leading to undergraduate and graduate degrees in the visual arts.'* It goes on to state that the Media Arts Division is currently a three-program unit that offers an undergraduate Bachelor of Fine Arts degree with Majors in Film, Expanded Media and Photography as well as a Minor in Animation, but it is unclear which Major program administers the current Animation Minor. The Report recognised that the leading objective of the Division is to expand the Animation Minor to a Major but recommends that the leading objective of the Division be focused on diversity, because there is currently a significant lack of diversity in the faculty complement, the student complement, and the curriculum. The NSCAD Academic Plan and Strategic Plan both emphasize a commitment to diversity; however, the cohort hire in July 2022 was the only concrete initiative drawn to the attention of the panel.

The Report contributes to the debate on interdisciplinarity of the curriculum versus silos, as highlighted in the Self-Study, acknowledging that the majority of the students at NSCAD opt for an Interdisciplinary Major, and suggest that a potential solution could be to return to a BFA in Media Arts, in keeping with the traditional spirit of NSCAD. The External Report concludes by making many recommendations for consideration by NSCAD, ranging across issues related to the organisation of the curriculum, the diversity of faculty and students, the improvement of the estate, and the hiring of faculty to ensure appropriate specialisation of teaching.

The Division of Media Arts responded to the External Report on 22 October 2022. As with Fine Arts, the Division's response does not refer by name to its authors and it appears that the responses are somewhat random and selective, with no detailed comment upon the main recommendation from the external Report that the main objective of the Division should be on improving diversity rather than establishing an Animation Major. It is apparent that some of the recommendations regarding faculty hire are in train, but that the Division is competing with others at NSCAD for the allocation of finite resources. The shortcoming apparent in the review of the Fine Arts Division (outlined above) regarding the neglect of

formal follow-up, as called for by NSCAD's Framework, especially the requirement for an implementation plan, is repeated in the review of the Media Arts Division.

Evidence base to inform the review recommendations

In addition to the document review, the Panel held meetings with various groups of NSCAD staff and students during the visit. These included meetings with the President and VPAR, senior leadership posts, members of faculty, and academic support units, Chairs of recently reviewed programs, Chairs of Divisions, members of the Senate and students. Outlines of these meetings are provided below:

i) Meetings with ASQAC and the Senate

Our meetings with representatives of Senate and of ASQAC were revealing in several respects. For members of ASQAC, one theme was the lack of follow-up which is a critical part of the approved process and involves the PRC in the first instance. Another topic was the role of ASQAC in nominating external reviewers and the decision taken at ASQAC not to rule out the possibility of one such reviewer being from the USA. Again, the policy Framework gives this job primarily to the PRC, which is expected to consult with the academic community before providing the VPAR with a prioritized list of candidates for the job. The conflation of the PRC with ASQAC was a take-away from this session. A subsequent meeting with representatives of Senate attracted very small numbers, one of whom was, in fact, the newly appointed university secretary. A theme in this meeting was the overarching authority of Senate. One participant referred to the official Terms of Reference for ASQAC from which we have quoted earlier in this section. Another commentator in this session opined that the program review process at NSCAD had been reduced to the compilation of "wish lists."

ii) Meetings with members of the Senior Leadership Team

We were pleased not only to have met with the new President, but also to discuss her understanding of the importance of ensuring the quality of the programs offered at NSCAD to its students. She has high hopes for the future of NSCAD and realizes that, if NSCAD is to prosper, the maintenance and improvement of high-quality programs there are essential.

We also met with the VPAR and members of her office, since the VPAR plays a major role in the QA arrangements MPHEC asked us to evaluate. She was helpful in positioning NASAD reviews within the ambit of quality assurance and provided us with her perspective on some controversial issues such as the lack of follow-up (particularly on the creation of a major in Animation) and the effort to gain institutional approval for learning outcomes. She also shared with us, as already noted, a sturdy and intelligent template for identifying and monitoring Action Items flowing from NSCAD's review procedures.

iii) Meeting with faculty members and Chairs of Divisions of recently reviewed programs

This meeting provided an opportunity to discuss program reviews and the role that these play in quality assurance at NSCAD and how they relate to MPHEC requirements, from the different perspectives of the Chairs of Division and faculty members.

Two major issues emerged from these discussions: firstly, meeting the regulatory requirements of different bodies for differing purposes, with the inherent potential for 'regulatory overload'. This is particularly relevant at NSCAD because the institution recently participated on a voluntary basis in a review by the National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD) and was successful in gaining 'substantial equivalency'. NASAD is a US organisation, offering accreditation services in the field of arts and design. The understanding amongst the Chairs of Division is that that the reason for joining NASAD

was to ensure American students could get student funding to attend NSCAD; however, now these students are subject to an international student fee in Canada, the numbers of international students have dropped significantly. The NASAD review process created a substantial amount of work for faculty and academic support staff, in addition to incurring the expense of the NASAD fee. It was not clear from the discussions with faculty and senior management how the NASAD review requirements complemented or diverged from those of MPHEC, which poses a potential duplication of effort for staff involved. It is our view that the strategic decision for NSCAD to seek accreditation by NASAD (a US organisation) should be communicated clearly to staff.

The second emergent issue is the role that learning outcomes should play in the NSCAD curriculum. It is a requirement of MPHEC that learning outcomes are a feature of all programs, and we understand that NSCAD is preparing a Learning Outcomes Policy for implementation in the 2022/23 academic year. A Director of Teaching and Learning has been appointed to support Directors of Program with this activity, to ensure that student pathways through degrees are available to all students. It was apparent from our conversations with faculty members that there was some confusion about the definition and purpose of learning outcomes, and a view was expressed that they may encourage a restricted and instrumental approach to learning that is inappropriate to arts education. This is an area where staff development is essential to move forward constructively, and hopefully the Director of Teaching and Learning will be able to facilitate progress towards this institutional objective.

Another issue which emerged and would benefit from clear communication between senior leadership and faculty is how decisions are made regarding the hire of new or replacement faculty. Faculty members are aware that curriculum change is dependent upon appropriately experienced and qualified staff being available to teach new subjects, and that financial resources are necessary for this, with competing demands being made for available budgets. However, some faculty members expressed the view that they are unaware of the institutional priorities impacting decisions about the hiring of staff.

iv) Meeting with students

The reviewers met with six current students, including both undergraduate and graduate, to discuss their views on the following matters:

- The highlights of their NSCAD experience
- What would they wish to change about this experience?
- What has been their experience of quality and accreditation at NSCAD?
- Have they had an opportunity to be involved with quality assurance at NSCAD?

In general, the students commented positively about their experiences to date at NSCAD. Resources and facilities are regarded as excellent, with the 24-hour access to the premises much appreciated. The relationships between students and instructors are seen as a highlight of the learning experience. In addition, the pivot to online learning during the Covid pandemic was perceived as very effective, with examples of flexibility in teaching, including how to set up a jewellery workshop at home, being cited. However, in some instances, students decided to defer their studies on some courses which were dependent upon specialist resources and spaces until the return to campus, post-Covid. Students also commented positively on the extra-curricula opportunities available, including internships.

Areas which could be improved were related to the availability of course information at the commencement of studies, course structure and the distribution of credits, which did not always appear

to be related to the work involved in a course. The quality of teaching could be variable and the feedback provided on assignments was not always regarded as a constructive critique of work. It was considered that in some of the more vocationally-focused areas, more support could be available for employability and entry to work. It was commented that there appeared to be no channel for feedback to be provided regarding student evaluations, together with no feedback loop on student complaints.

Interestingly, none of the students were familiar with the NASAD review for substantial equivalency and did not appear to be aware of how students could engage with quality assurance processes at NSCAD.

Review of Academic Support Units at NSCAD

Through the Second Cycle QAM exercise, MPHEC is assembling information from participating institutions on how they assess academic support units. The goal is to share information about leading practices with Maritime institutions:

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:

6.1 The continuing appropriateness and effectiveness of the service or support provided to the academic programs, students and faculty;

6.2 The capacity of the unit or program to deliver the service or support which its mandate defines

6.3 The appropriateness and efficiency of the use made of the existing human, physical, technological and financial resources;

6.4 The contribution of the unit or program to other aspects of the institution's mission and to the student experience.

In its submission, NSCAD indicates that two such units, Extended Studies and the Library, have been reviewed during the last seven years. In both cases, NSCAD avers that it has relied in part, when conducting those reviews, on the guidelines supplied by NASAD (the National Association of Schools of Art and Design) in the USA. As we have said in Section 1.C of this Report and thereafter, one of the principal features of NSCAD is that it has applied for and received “substantial equivalency” from this accrediting agency.

NSCAD's library, which is open to the public, supports faculty and students by providing visual and other resources that contribute to teaching and learning in the arts. The library houses archives, and both print and digital resources, is headquarters for the Learning Commons, and is a key participant in the institutional response to the action items in the Report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. It is the only arts library in NovaNet, the consortium of Nova Scotia libraries, and it wishes to establish closer ties with the Art Gallery of Nova Scotia.

During our site visit, the Panel met with representatives of a handful of academic support units—not only the library but also other units such as the Anna Leonowens Gallery, the Teaching and Learning Unit, Information Technology, Institutional Analysis, the Opportunity and Belonging initiative and the Registrar's office. From these discussions, we derived a strong sense of commitment to the institution and a devotion to students' experience and to their success, with considerable respect for quality

assurance processes. When quizzed about belonging to an institution with a unique and specialized mandate, most of our interlocutors were keen to emphasize the extent to which they consult and collaborate, informally and formally, with like-minded colleagues in Halifax and beyond about questions of professional interest or concern.

NSCAD's progress Report also alludes to its evaluation of academic support units that indirectly support its programs. Again, using NASAD guidelines, four such units have been identified and assessed, namely the Office of Student Experience, the office of Academic Affairs and Research, University Relations, and Finance and Administration.

The Panel did not delve into NASAD's guidelines and criteria for the appraisal of units that directly or indirectly support its academic programs.

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

An appended Table exhibits the alignment of NSCAD's QA policies and procedures with MPHEC's 2016 *Guidelines*. This Table reveals that the comments entered on the Table by officials of NSCAD accord with 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, if implemented, pave the way for strengthening of the QA processes at NSCAD and their congruence with the published MPHEC *Guidelines*.

SECTION III: RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

The reviewers wish to commend the staff of NSCAD who participated in this review with enthusiasm, demonstrating their commitment to the student experience and the development of creative talent. As commented upon in Section 1 of this report, NSCAD has experienced some turbulence in its leadership and finances since the 1st Cycle review in 2008/09, with a number of changes in the post of President. A new President (Dr Peggy Shannon) has been in the post since July 2022, and is now embarking upon a strategic planning exercise for the University. This process will include the move to a new location at the harbor in Halifax, which will enable all NSCAD divisions to be located on one campus with accessible accommodation for all facilities.

It was apparent from our discussions with the President and VPAR that significant changes to the organizational culture are now in train, to develop the academic leadership within NSCAD, enhance pedagogy, introduce learning outcomes across the curriculum, and strengthen governance and management procedures. We hope that the following recommendations will assist NSCAD leadership and faculty in their progress towards new strategic goals. We have formulated our recommendations under four main headings, with more detailed aspects outlined under each heading.

Recommendations

1. Management and Governance

- The Dean's roles and responsibilities with respect to quality assurance should be clearly formulated.
- The relationships between ASQAC and the Curriculum Committee should be laid out in the description of Senate's committee structure.

- The contributions of the Teaching and Learning office to quality assurance and the improvement of the student experience should be articulated.
- 2. Action planning and impact**
- Beginning as soon as possible, the new template for action items should be used at NSCAD. This would be an improvement in the effectiveness and efficiency of the quality assurance work undertaken internally by the institution.
 - Regular reporting to Senate of the results of each review should be re-instituted, perhaps with the inclusion of a standing item on the agenda of September meetings of Senate.
 - The influence of quality assurance reviews on budgetary and funding decisions should be tracked and publicized.
- 3. Framework for quality assurance**
- The policies and procedures which constitute the NSCAD Framework for Quality Assurance (last reviewed in 2018) would benefit from a review to ensure that they are clear, definitive and reflect the new committee structure of Senate. In particular, whether the role of the Academic Program Review Committee has now been absorbed by the Academic Standards and Quality Assurance Committee, thereby making the Program Review Committee defunct.
 - The annual timetable for program review should be realistic and adhered to, to ensure that program content is current and enables graduates to meet the expectations of knowledge and skills required for employment or freelance work as creative professionals.
 - Reviews of a division should include distinct assessments of each program (including curriculum, outcomes, resources, etc.) housed within the division.
 - The requirements of the NASAD review process should be incorporated in a single coherent quality assurance framework for the University, to avoid 'regulatory overload,' and it should be supported by adequate data from NSCAD management information systems.
 - The Framework should outline policies and procedures for the periodic review of Academic Support Units, those offering either direct or indirect support for academic programs.
 - The Framework should address how graduate and interdisciplinary programs will be reviewed.
- 4. Communications**
- An institutional communication strategy should be developed to ensure that the new objectives arising from the current strategic planning exercise are communicated clearly to all staff and students at NSCAD, to promote effective decision making and achievement.
 - The relationship between the Executive, the Divisions and the Senate Committees should be defined to promote clear and effective communications at NSCAD. This will be critical during the significant period of change occurring as a result of the move to the new campus.
 - Consideration should be given to branding NSCAD as an institution that uses and benefits from both MPHEC and NASAD review processes. It is recommended that NSCAD strive to develop an explicit quality assurance culture to embed its own processes with the external requirements of MPHEC and any other accreditation bodies used.

APPENDICES:

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

Second Cycle of the MPHEC's Quality Assurance Monitoring Process
Assessment of the Nova Scotia College of Arts and Design's Quality
Assurance Policies and Procedures

NSCAD University's Action Plan

February 2024
Updated May 2024

Introduction

Following their virtual site visit on 24-26 January 2023 and review of NSCAD University's quality assurance policies and procedures in the context of the Second Cycle of the MPHEC's Quality Assurance Monitoring Process, the Review Panel of Dr. Ron Bond and Dr. Elizabeth Halford produced a thorough report including 15 recommendations.

The University wishes to express again our appreciation to the Review Panel, whose thoughtful report provided an excellent basis for our own review of our quality assurance process and will be informing any revisions to our Division/Program Quality Assurance Policy and Procedures.

We appreciate their astute inquiries and perceptive remarks. We appreciate that the Review Panel's understood the changing culture from discussions with the President and Vice-President, Academic & Research (VPAR) – "to develop the academic leadership within NSCAD, enhance pedagogy, introduce learning outcomes across the curriculum, and strengthen governance and management procedures." We value their recognition of NSCAD University's evolution in enhancing quality assurance and quality improvement since the last QA evaluation.

Below, we provide a comprehensive account of our responses to each of the individual recommendations. We are also pleased to provide our action plan. The table below outlines action items emerging from each recommendation.

We agree with the **recommendation 1a** that Dean's roles and responsibilities with respect to quality assurance should be clearly formulated. The role of Dean, Academic Affairs has been evolving since being reinstated in 2019. The Dean will be working with the VPAR to structure a response statement in the internal Committee's response to external review report and then work with the Division Chair and/or program to complete action items. As NSCAD is presently launching a new hiring search for this role, this is being integrated into the job description.

Recommendation 1b pertains to the Senate's involvement in the program review process. The Senate committee mandates, and constitution are in the midst of a review and refinement. The Academic Standards and Quality Assurance Committee encompasses a wide swath of governance that in many instances would be guiding initial policies and standards and ensuring the quality assurance process. The Curriculum Committee's work lands in the middle of this process, and the ASQAC struggles in compartmentalizing its role. The refined mandate will be written into the constitution. A proposal to split the ASQAC into two committees is under consideration. These refinements will further support **recommendation 1c** around the contributions of the Office of Teaching and Learning. The Director, Teaching and Learning (DTL) currently administers the action plan follow up recommendations that are academic in nature. To support the Division Chairs and the internal review committee, the Director will also be part of the front-end support for the self-study. This needs to be constituted into the ASQAC's understanding of the process and the DTL job description. The proposed changes to address **recommendations 2a, b and c** include adding Divisional review reports into regular meetings, utilizing action item templates, scheduling talks at an earlier stage in the Senate meeting cycle, and increasing the involvement of the Dean and VPAR in the process to guarantee that the results of external review recommendations that have budgetary repercussions are communicated to the Senate.

The **recommendations 3a to 3f** revolving the NSCAD Framework for Quality Assurance. It became apparent in the external review and noted by the review team, that NSCAD University's review process has an additional hurdle around nomenclature. Due to different Division structures, all are not created equal. This was the basis of some of the confusion observed and noted by the reviewers, as the Division of Fine Arts is a division as well as a program/major, while the Division of Media Arts encompasses three programs/majors and a minor. Internally this has resulted in some periodic reviews encompassing more than a singular program, thus adding additional confusion for external reviewers as well as the internal committees. With the DTL having completed her first year in the role (a role that had sat vacant for several years), the aspect of quality assurance has been highlighted as a primary need due to the previous lack of administrative leadership and institutional conflation of governance and administration. These recommendations suggest the need for more participation of chairs, and directors in the review process, in line with the current policies of NSCAD University. With a review of the Senate committee mandates upcoming in Winter 2024, the Framework and a Quality Assurance Policy has been emphasized by the Office of Academic Affairs and Research as being primary before launching the next cycle of reviews.

Recommendation 4a will be activated once the strategic planning exercise is due to be completed in Spring 2024. To date the goal has been to have internal townhalls that focus on the future of NSCAD University as a consolidated campus. The plan is to have ongoing key performance indicators and communications to be live on the revised university website, accessible to the NSCAD community and external stakeholders. Our goal is to enhance the link between NSCAD University's Academic Plan and Strategic Research Plan and the overarching Strategic Plan.

Recommendation 4b is equally linked to the ongoing plans with the strategic initiatives and the capital projects and will be part of the communication framework. In terms of **recommendation 4c**, there is internal questions around the benefits of the NASAD Substantial Equivalency. As NASAD is an institutional review that does not have the same programmatic review expectations as for MPHEC, the internal Quality Assurance process is being reviewed and confirmed over the next year, at which point the NASAD validity will be further explored.

Recommendation	Action Item
<p>1. a) The Dean's roles and responsibilities with respect to quality assurance should be clearly formulated.</p>	<p>Response: The role of Dean, Academic Affairs has been evolving since being reinstated in 2019. The Dean works with the Vice-President (Academic & Research) to structure a response statement in the internal Committee's response to external review report and then works with the Division Chair and/or program to complete action items.</p> <p>Action Item:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Define quality assurance leadership within the new job description.
<p>1. b) The relationships between ASQAC and the Curriculum Committee should be laid out in the description of Senate's committee structure.</p>	<p>Response: The Senate committee mandates, and constitution are in the midst of review and refinement. The Academic Standards and Quality Assurance Committee encompasses a wide swath of governance that in many instances would be guiding initial policies and standards and ensuring the quality assurance process. The Curriculum Committee's work lands in the middle of this process, and the ASQAC struggles in compartmentalizing its role.</p> <p>Action Item:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The refined mandate will be written into the constitution. A proposal to split the ASQAC into two committees is under consideration.
<p>1. c) The contributions of the Teaching and Learning office to quality assurance and the improvement of the student's experience should be articulated.</p>	<p>Response: The Director, Teaching and Learning currently administers the action plan follow up recommendations that are academic in nature. To support the Division Chairs and the internal review committee, the Director could also be part of the front-end support for the self-study. The Director maintains and administers internal curriculum renewal cycles.</p> <p>Action Items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Define QA responsibilities within the DTL job description. • Amend QA Policy and Procedures to include DTL role and fully clarify the scope and cycle of curriculum renewal.
<p>2. a) Beginning as soon as possible, the new template for action items should be used at NSCAD.</p>	<p>Response: The Director, Teaching and Learning will complete and distribute the template summarizing action items resulting from internal self-studies and external reviews upon the next round of reviewing for NSCAD programs. The template has already been used in prior reviews by faculty. The post-external review process is also currently being revised to ensure ongoing tracking of action items over 7 years which will utilize the template.</p> <p>Action Items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend periodic review process to further clarify steps in the QA process and institute the use of the new template for tracking action items.

<p>2. b) Regular reporting to Senate of the results of each review should be re-instituted, perhaps with the inclusion of a standing item on the agenda of September meetings of Senate.</p>	<p>Response: NSCAD is planning to revise the periodic review process to be completed over a two-year period rather than one, due to the workload requirements not aligning with its small faculty complement. Tentatively:</p> <p>Year one: September-April - self-study. The programs up for review to be announced in September meeting of ASQAC. May - self-study will be received and reviewed for the May meeting of ASQAC.</p> <p>Year two: September - external site visit. March - external report and response completed. April - faculty in the program prepare and submit monitoring reports to Senate via the ASQAC for approval by April, the second and fourth year after the periodic program review process is completed. May - final package including the self-study, external report, and response presented though the ASQAC to Senate in its May meeting.</p> <p>Action Items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With the revised mandate of ASQAC (or its split version), the committee will report review action items to Senate by April • The Director, Teaching and Learning will regularly communicate with relevant Senate Committees on progress made in the curriculum renewal cycle in conjunction with program faculty, and division Chairs.
<p>2. c) The influence of quality assurance reviews on budgetary and funding decisions should be tracked and publicized.</p>	<p>Response: We agree completely and will work with Finance to clarify what reporting should be done and to action this part of MPHEC's recommendations.</p> <p>Action Item:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Workforce planning and resource allocation will be brought forward to the annual budgetary forecasting process through the Office of Academic Affairs and Research, by the VPAR, and then presented to the NSCAD Budgetary Advisory Committee. The CFO will present annually to Senate.
<p>3. a) Review NSCAD Framework for Quality Assurance to reflect committee structure of Senate.</p>	<p>Response: The committee structure of Senate is currently under review. The NSCAD Quality Assurance Policy and Procedures, along with its associated guides will be amended to reflect these committee changes.</p> <p>Action item:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review the QA Policy and Procedures pending the committee restructuring of Senate.
<p>3. b) The annual timetable for program review should be realistic and adhered to.</p>	<p>Response: A new proposed schedule has been created and feedback will be sought from faculty. The proposed curriculum renewal cycle has been designed to support faculty in the culminating MPHEC review and to take into consideration regular program maintenance more robustly.</p> <p>Action Item:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submit proposed curriculum renewal process to relevant Senate Committees and include it as an appendix to the QA Policy and Procedures once feedback has been received.

<p>3. c) Reviews of divisions should include distinct assessments of each program housed within the division.</p>	<p>Response: NSCAD will amend its QA Policies and Procedures to reflect a by-major program review process.</p> <p>Action Item:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarify within the QA Policies and Procedures the revision of a program by major and include a terms of reference section to support language in the policy and its associated guides.
<p>3. d) The requirements of the NASAD review process should be incorporated in a single, coherent quality assurance framework for the University.</p>	<p>Response: The role of NASAD in NSCAD’s academic success is currently under review. Should it be maintained, the review process will be incorporated where deemed viable by the internal stakeholders.</p> <p>Action item:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determine the role of NASAD within the NSCAD context through consultation with stakeholders.
<p>3. e) The Framework should outline policies and procedures for the periodic review of Academic Support Units, those offering direct or indirect support for programs.</p>	<p>Response: Presently, the Academic Support units sit under the purview of the Office of Academic Affairs and Research and go through annual administrative review for workforce planning and resource allocation. As some of the units are functionally individuals, rather than teams, the reviews are managed in ongoing weekly 1:1 interaction.</p> <p>As periodic reviews are for reviewing degree programs, academic support units factor within those reviews in terms of the resources and support they provide to the program/challenges identified in supporting the program.</p> <p>Action item:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To ensure ongoing, robust review of academic support units, NSCAD will draft a self-study template that incorporates review sections for each area that supports the given program areas under review (for example, area technicians, Computer Services, Learning Commons, Library, Office of Student Experience). • We will act on further guidance from the MPHEC in academic support unit reviews as it becomes available.
<p>3. f) The Framework should address how graduate and interdisciplinary program will be reviewed.</p>	<p>Response: The ongoing revision of the QA Policies and Procedures will clarify the ways in which each program will be reviewed inclusive of graduate programs and interdisciplinary programs. If necessary, further guides or other process documentation will be designed to support any curriculum renewal process with unique characteristics to help support both faculty and administration.</p> <p>Action Item:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submit proposed curriculum renewal process to relevant Senate Committees and include it as an appendix to the QA Policy and Procedures once feedback has been received.
<p>4. a) An institutional communication strategy should be developed.</p>	<p>Response: Once the strategic planning exercise is complete and the plan finalized and approved, the communication strategy will be activated. The strategic plan will be a living document online with ongoing performance indicators being measured.</p> <p>Action item:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NSCAD Director of Communication to present plan/online presence after strategic planning exercises completed.

<p>4. b) The relationship between the Executive, the Divisions and the Senate Committees should be defined to promote clear and effective communications at NSCAD.</p>	<p>Response: The committee structure of Senate is currently under review to clarify the role and responsibilities of all governance and administrative stakeholders.</p> <p>Action item:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Present final structural change proposal to Senate and Faculty Forum for discussion and approval. All resulting changes and information will be available online.
<p>4. c) Brand NSCAD as an institution that uses and benefits from both MPHEC and NASAD review processes.</p>	<p>Response: The role of NASAD in NSCAD's academic success is currently under review.</p> <p>Action item:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determine the role of NASAD within the NSCAD context through consultation with stakeholders.

MPHEC 2016 Guidelines	Guideline met by institution? Policy Practice (Yes/No/Somewhat)		NSCAD Comments	Reviewers' Comments
1. PURPOSE OF THE GUIDELINES				
These guidelines aim to assist institutions in establishing or improving their quality assurance frameworks (and related policies and processes) and to support the Commission when assessing the frameworks in place.			N/A	
2. GUIDING PRINCIPLES				
A successful university quality assurance framework¹ is guided by:				
2.1 The pursuit of continuous improvement;	Yes	Yes	NSCAD Quality Assurance Policy & Procedures	Agree
2.2 A focus on learning;	Yes	Yes	NSCAD Quality Assurance Policy & Procedures	Agree
2.3 The necessity of encompassing all functions and units of an institution;	Yes	Yes	NSCAD Quality Assurance Policy & Procedures	The policies and procedures are silent on the extent to which QA principles apply to Academic Support Units.
2.4 Accountability and transparency; and	Yes	Yes	NSCAD Quality Assurance Policy & Procedures	NSCAD somewhat meets this guideline. Some faculty alleged a lack of transparency in the ways in which the policy and procedures have been implemented.
2.5 The documentation and implementation of policies, guidelines and procedures.	Yes	Yes	NSCAD Quality Assurance Policy & Procedures	Documentation of some aspect of policy has been spotty (e.g. follow-up reporting and action plans.) NSCAD has advised that it has new reporting and action plan templates that will soon be implemented and should promote effective monitoring.
1. This document refers to an institutional quality assurance framework, which may encompass multiple policies and procedures covering an institution's work in this area (e.g., faculty specific policies that reflect various realities, or separate policies for academic units and other types of units).				
3. SCOPE OF A UNIVERSITY'S QUALITY ASSURANCE FRAMEWORK				
A university's quality assurance framework:				
3.1 Reflects its mission and values;	Yes	Yes	Self-Study Report Guide	Agree
3.2 Accounts for the full range of its offerings and activities;	Yes	Yes	Self-Study Report Guide	See comments on 2.3
3.3 Links to the institution's strategic and other plans;	Yes	Yes	Academic Plan	Agree. But we encourage a tighter coupling between the two.
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	Yes	Self-Study Report Guide	Agree
3.5 Is forwarded to the MPHEC.			N/A	
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	Self-Study Report Guide / External Review Guide	This guideline is partially met. The two Guides are exemplary in most respects, but they do not yet address adequately the need to take learning outcomes and their assessment into their purview.

MPHEC 2016 Guidelines	Guideline met by institution?		NSCAD Comments	Reviewers' Comments
	Policy (Yes/No/Somewhat)	Practice (Yes/No/Somewhat)		
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	Yes	Infers through other questions in the Self-Study Report Guide / External Review Guide	Agree
second, "Is it doing what it should be doing?"	Yes	Yes	Infers through other questions in the Self Study Report Guide and External Review Guide	Agree
In answering the above questions, the university examines:				
4.1 Inputs; and	Yes	Yes	Self-Study Report Guide / External Review Guide	Agree
4.2 Outputs.	Yes	Yes	Self-Study Report Guide / External Review Guide	Agree
5. STANDARD FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF ACADEMIC PROGRAMS/UNITS				
5.1 Central Components				
To assess academic programs/units³, an institutional quality assurance framework would, at a minimum:				
5.1.1 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	NSCAD Assurance Policy & Procedures	Agree
is accountable to the institution's decision-making bodies.	Yes	Yes	NSCAD Assurance Policy & Procedures	Agree
5.1.2 Assign and distribute responsibility for the various components of the quality assurance framework (deans, department heads, program managers, committees, etc.).	Yes	Yes	NSCAD Assurance Policy & Procedures	Agree
5.1.3 Define the assessment criteria	Yes	Yes	N/A (see section 5.2 below).	Agree
5.1.4 Require a self-study,	Yes	Yes	NSCAD Assurance Policy & Procedures / Self Study Report Guide / External Review Guide	Agree – the guidance provided in the Self-Study Report Guide and the External Review Guide is comprehensive and relevant.
involving faculty and students participating in the program or unit.	Yes	Yes	Self-Study Report Guide / External Review Guide	Agree
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	Self-Study Report Guide / External Review Guide	Agree
The self-study is structured according to the defined assessment criteria, and is both descriptive and analytical.	Yes	Yes	Self-Study Report Guide / External Review Guide	The Self-Studies submitted are structured appropriately to be both descriptive and analytical.
When and where appropriate, the results of accreditation processes may be included, and/or substituted for this component, or a portion thereof. ⁴	n/a	n/a	No external accredited processes at this time	Not specifically an accreditation process; however, the NASAD review process has resulted in 'substantial equivalency.'
5.1.5 Require an external review component	Yes	Yes	NSCAD Quality Assurance & Procedures / External Review Guide	Agree
with a sufficiently comprehensive site visit and written report,	Yes	Yes	NSCAD Quality Assurance & Procedures / External Review Guide	Yes, very comprehensive reports were submitted.
carried out by at least two experts external to the institution, with at least one coming from outside Atlantic Canada.	Yes	Yes	NSCAD Quality Assurance & Procedures	Yes

MPHEC 2016 Guidelines	Guideline met by institution?		NSCAD Comments	Reviewers' Comments
	Policy (Yes/No/Somewhat)	Practice (Yes/No/Somewhat)		
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	NSCAD Quality Assurance & Procedures	Yes, although one Report comments upon some difficulties in receiving the information requested from the Division of Media Arts in a timely fashion
As appropriate, the results of accreditation may be included, and/or substituted for this component, or a portion thereof. ⁴	n/a	n/a	No external accredited processes at this time	See comment at 5.1.4 on the NASAD review.
5.1.6 Ensure the participation of students through:	Yes	Yes	Self-Study Report Guide / External Review Guide	Agree
membership on committees dealing with program review and quality assurance;	Yes	Yes	NSCAD Quality Assurance & Procedures	Yes
participation in surveys designed to collect data on a number of student and graduate outcomes;	No	Yes	Self-Study Report Guide / External Review Guide. Done in practice, not specifically addressed in the policy.	Yes; however, student participation in the Self-Study was limited because of COVID restrictions during a time of campus closure.
and mandatory student course evaluations.	No	Yes	Collective agreement specifies the use of <i>voluntary</i> student course evaluations	Agree
5.1.7 Incorporate the participation of faculty not directly involved in the reviewed program (or discipline or unit).	Yes	Yes	Self-Study Report Guide / External Review Guide	Yes
5.1.8 Enable the participation of the wider network of stakeholders, such as employers, graduates, professional associations, the local community, etc.	Yes	Yes	Self-Study Report Guide / External Review Guide	It is not evident that the wider network of stakeholders participated in the Self-Study.
5.1.9 Define the follow-up mechanisms, which include	Yes	Yes	NSCAD Quality Assurance & Procedures	Yes
the procedures	Yes	Yes	NSCAD Quality Assurance & Procedures	Yes
areas of responsibility	Yes	Yes	NSCAD Quality Assurance & Procedures	Yes
expected timelines,	Yes	Yes	NSCAD Quality Assurance & Procedures	Yes
along with provisions for follow-up monitoring of progress (usually involving the Senate).	Yes	Yes	NSCAD Quality Assurance & Procedures	Yes, although follow-up procedures and actions could be improved to ensure that actions are implemented and evaluated. See 2.5 and our recommendations.
5.1.10 Establish the assessment cycle and related schedule which normally does not exceed seven years (with no programs exceeding, in practice, 10 years between reviews). ⁵	Yes	Yes	NSCAD Quality Assurance & Procedures	Yes, but this cycle should be adhered to not only in policy but in practice.
5.1.11 Assess newly established programs or units after the first cohort has graduated.	Yes	Yes	NSCAD Quality Assurance Policy & Procedures	Not evident that this has taken place.
5.1.12 Document the standard timeline for individual reviews, from the preparation of the self-study through to Senate approval of recommendations, normally 12 to 18 months.	Yes	Yes	NSCAD Quality Assurance Policy & Procedures	Agree
5.1.13 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	Yes	Academic Senate. Done in practice, not specifically addressed in the policy. The TOR of ASQA are specific about the quality assurance framework and the activities necessary to ensure compliance to our institution standard and to the MPHEC guidelines.	Not evident that a communications strategy exists in policy or in practice. See recommendations under heading 4.
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	Yes	Academic Senate. Done in practice, not specifically addressed in policy. The TOR of ASQA are specific about the quality assurance framework and the activities necessary to ensure compliance to our institution standard and to the MPHEC guidelines.	Not evident that a communications strategy exists in policy or in practice. See recommendations under heading 4.

MPHEC 2016 Guidelines	Guideline met by institution?		NSCAD Comments	Reviewers' Comments
	Policy (Yes/No/Somewhat)	Practice (Yes/No/Somewhat)		
5.1.14 Define the provisions to assess the framework periodically, normally at the end of each assessment cycle	Yes	Yes	NSCAD Quality Assurance Policy & Procedures	Agree
and table the resulting report with decision-making bodies within the institution (e.g., Senate, Board of Governors).	Yes	Yes	NSCAD Quality Assurance Policy & Procedures	Agree
<p>2. The Commission uses the term Standard as 'A document established by consensus and approved by a recognized body that provides for common and repeated use, rules, guidelines or characteristics for activities or their results, aimed at the achievement of the optimum degree of order in a given context'. ISO/IEC Guide 2:1996, definition 3.2</p> <p>3. For the purpose of this section of the Guidelines, an academic unit is understood as a department or a unit whose mission is preponderantly teaching and whose nature reflects the existence of a demonstrably coherent field of knowledge, normally defined by close cognate disciplines. An academic unit may offer more than one program, but in the context of quality assurance, each program is to be assessed, including curriculum, outcomes, resources, etc. However, the quality assurance framework addresses gaps in accreditation processes (if any) to ensure the same standards are applied across all programs (e.g., reporting back to higher echelons of the institution). In exceptional circumstances, review cycles may be interrupted to accommodate other institutional priorities; in these cases, the MPHEC should be contacted and informed of the length/extent of the anticipated interruption (no program should exceed 10 years between reviews).</p>				
5.2 Assessment Criteria				
Each university establishes assessment criteria for reviewing the quality of its programs/units. The assessment criteria are	Yes	Yes	Self-Study Report Guide / External Review Guide	Agree
comprehensive in their range and in their use across programs and units;	Yes	Yes	Self-Study Report Guide / External Review Guide	Agree
they have a strong focus on students and	Yes	Yes	Self-Study Report Guide / External Review Guide	Agree
reflect the institutional mission and values.	Yes	Yes	Self-Study Report Guide / External Review Guide	Agree
They are published and include at a minimum the following:	Yes	Yes	Self-Study Report Guide / External Review Guide	Agree
5.2.1 The continuing appropriateness of the program's structure, method of delivery and curriculum for the program's learning outcomes and the degree level expectations;	Yes	Yes	Self-Study Report Guide / External Review Guide	Agree
5.2.2 The achievement by students and graduates of the learning outcomes in light of				
the program's stated goals,	Yes	Yes	Self-Study Report Guide / External Review Guide	Not evident – see the comments regarding the introduction of learning outcomes in the MPHEC Reviewers' Report.
the degree level expectations, and,	Yes	Yes	Self-Study Report Guide / External Review Guide	Not evident – see the comments regarding the introduction of learning outcomes in the MPHEC Reviewers' Report.
where relevant, the standards of any relevant regulatory, accrediting or professional body;	Yes	Yes	Self-Study Report Guide / External Review Guide	Not evident – see the comments regarding the introduction of learning outcomes in the MPHEC Reviewers' Report.
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	Self-Study Report Guide / External Review Guide. Inferred through other questions in the Self-Study Review Guide.	Agree
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:				
the stated learning outcomes, and	Yes	Yes	Collective agreement and performance monitoring Reflected in Self-Study Report Guide: Teaching, Research and Creative Practice	The revised Collective Agreement was not available to be seen by our Panel at the time of the site visit - see comments in the MPHEC Reviewers' Report.
to meet the needs of the existing and anticipated student enrolments;	Yes	Yes	Collective agreement and performance monitoring Reflected in Self-Study Report Guide: Teaching, Research and Creative Practice	The revised Collective Agreement was not available to be seen by our Panel at the time of the site visit - see comments in the MPHEC Reviewers' Report.
5.2.5 The continuing performance of the faculty, including				
the quality of teaching and supervision, and	Yes	Yes	Collective agreement and performance monitoring Reflected in Self-Study Report Guide: Teaching, Research and Creative Practice	The revised Collective Agreement has not been seen by our Panel - see comments in the MPHEC Reviewers' Report
their continuing progress and achievement in research, scholarship or creative activity, and	Yes	Yes	Collective agreement and performance monitoring Reflected in Self-Study Report Guide: Teaching, Research and Creative Practice	The revised Collective Agreement was not available to be seen by our Panel at the time of the site visit - see comments in the MPHEC Reviewers' Report.
professional activity in light of the program under review;	Yes	Yes	Collective agreement and performance monitoring Reflected in Self-Study Report Guide: Teaching, Research and Creative Practice	The revised Collective Agreement was not available to be seen by our Panel at the time of the site visit - see comments in the MPHEC Reviewers' Report.

MPHEC 2016 Guidelines	Guideline met by institution?		NSCAD Comments	Reviewers' Comments
	Policy (Yes/No/Somewhat)	Practice (Yes/No/Somewhat)		
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; centres for teaching and learning, etc.), unless such supports are assessed through other means;	Yes	Yes	Self-Study Report Guide / External Review Guide	Agree
5.2.7 The effectiveness and appropriateness of the use made of				
the existing human resources	Yes	Yes	Self-Study Report Guide / External Review Guide	Agree
the existing physical resource	Yes	Yes	Self-Study Report Guide / External Review Guide	Agree
the existing technological resources	Yes	Yes	Self-Study Report Guide / External Review Guide	Agree
the existing financial resources; and	Yes	Yes	Self-Study Report Guide / External Review Guide	Agree
5.2.8 The continuing appropriateness of				
the academic policies (including admission, promotion and graduation requirements; requests for transfer credit and advanced standing; and appeals) and	Yes	Yes	Annual Review	Agree
of the governing and decision making structures of the academic unit; and	Yes	Yes	Annual Review	Agree
5.2.9 The definition of indicators that provide evidence of quality,				
including enrolments, graduation rates, time-to completion rates, student satisfaction level	Yes	Yes	Self-Study Report Guide / External Review Guide	Agree
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	Self-Study Report Guide / External Review Guide	Agree

6. STANDARD FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF OTHER UNITS

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).

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:

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)

6.1 The continuing appropriateness and effectiveness of the service or support provided to the academic programs, students and faculty;	Yes	Yes	NSCAD Quality Assurance and Procedures	It was not apparent that NSCAD's Framework includes arrangements for the review of Academic Support Units.
6.2 The capacity of the unit or program to deliver the service or support which its mandate defines;	Yes	Yes	NSCAD Quality Assurance and Procedures	It was not apparent that NSCAD's Framework includes arrangements for the review of Academic Support Units.

MPHEC 2016 Guidelines	Guideline met by institution?		NSCAD Comments	Reviewers' Comments
	Policy (Yes/No/Somewhat)	Practice (Yes/No/Somewhat)		
6.3 The appropriateness and efficiency of the use made of				
the existing human resources	Yes	Yes	NSCAD Quality Assurance and Procedures	It was not apparent that NSCAD's Framework includes arrangements for the review of Academic Support Units.
the existing physical resource	Yes	Yes	NSCAD Quality Assurance and Procedures	It was not apparent that NSCAD's Framework includes arrangements for the review of Academic Support Units.
the existing technological resources	Yes	Yes	NSCAD Quality Assurance and Procedures	It was not apparent that NSCAD's Framework includes arrangements for the review of Academic Support Units.
the existing financial resources; and	Yes	Yes	NSCAD Quality Assurance and Procedures	It was not apparent that NSCAD's Framework includes arrangements for the review of Academic Support Units.
6.4 The contribution of the unit or program to other aspects of the institution's mission and to the student experience.	Yes	Yes	NSCAD Quality Assurance and Procedures	It was not apparent that NSCAD's Framework includes arrangements for the review of Academic Support Units. See also the recommendation under heading 3 in our Report.

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:

FORMAL, APPROVED QUALITY ASSURANCE RELATED POLICY(IES)	Yes	Yes	NSCAD Quality Assurance and Procedures Policy	Agree
GUIDELINES FOR THE PREPARATION OF THE SELF-STUDY	Yes	Yes	Self-Study Report Guide	Agree
to include templates/data /source(s) for indicators/measures of quality (e.g., enrolments, graduation rates, time-to-completion rates, student/employer satisfaction level, graduate employment rates, employment in field of study, further study, etc.).	Yes	Yes	Self-Study Report Guide	Agree
GENERIC TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR EXTERNAL REVIEWERS	Yes	Yes	External Review Guide	Agree
COMMON STUDENT COURSE EVALUATION FORM	Yes	Yes	Collective agreement specifies the format of the common student course evaluation form	Yes.
TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR RELEVANT COMMITTEE(S)	Yes	Yes	NSCAD Constitution and By-Laws	The Panel had access to the Bylaws governing activities of the Board (2019) and to the Bylaws and Constitution for Academic Governance (2015).
GUIDELINES FOR THE REVIEW OF PROGRAMS THAT ARE ALSO SUBJECT TO ACCREDITATION	Yes	Yes	NSCAD Quality Assurance and Procedures Policy	This needs work. The status of NASAD evaluations leading to "substantial equivalency" is especially pertinent in this case. See the recommendation under heading 3 in our Report.

2nd Cycle of the Quality Assurance Monitoring Process	
Site visit to Nova Scotia College of Art and Design	
DAY 1 – January 24, 2023	
Time slot	Participants
11:00 to 11:15	External Reviewer Panel set up <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dr. Ron Bond – Former Provost, University of Calgary; PSE Consultant; QA practitioner • Dr. Elizabeth Halford – Higher Education consultant, as Director Wells Advisory UK; previously (2012 - 2016) Head of Research and Intelligence QAA • Ms. Catherine Stewart – Chief Executive Officer, MPHEC • Dr. Vicky Simpson, Policy and Research Analyst, MPHEC
11:15 to 11:45	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dr. Peggy Shannon, President of NSCAD • Dr. Ann-Barbara Graff, Vice-President (Academic and Research) and Provost
11:45 to 12:30	Panel Break
12:30 to 1:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Melanie Colosimo, Acting Dean • Craig Leonard, Graduate Director MFA
1:00 to 1:30	Panel Break
1:30 to 2:30	Senate’s Academic Standards and Quality Assurance Committee (ASQA): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rory MacDonald • Rebecca Young • Mark Bovey • Nicole Lee • Alexandra Butu

2:40 to 3:40	<p>Academic Support Units that contribute to the quality of academic programs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ratish Mohan, Acting Registrar • Rebecca Young, Director of Library Services • Haoming (Jim) Nao, Coordinator, Opportunity and Belonging • Melanie Colosimo, Director, Anna Leonowens Gallery • Noelle Peach, Director, Teaching & Learning • Kate Walchuk, Exhibitions Coordinator • Jennifer Abrahamson, Interim Director, Opportunity & Belonging
Day 2 – January 25, 2023	
11:00 to 11:15	Panel – set up same as Day 1
11:15 to 11:45	<p>Academic Support Units that contribute to the quality of academic programs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alec Carmichael (institutional analyses) • Owen Gottschalk (IT) • Erinn Langille (residency program in terms of facilitation online)
11:55 to 12:25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anne Masterson, Academic Affairs Officer/FOIPOP Coordinator • Eric MacDonald, Academic Affairs Officer
12:30 to 1:30	<p>Chairs of recently reviewed programs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Matthew Reichertz, Chair & Associate Professor, Division of Fine Arts • Sam Fisher, Chair & Associate Professor, Division of Media Arts • Adrian Fish, Chair of Self-Study for Media Arts (unable to attend the meeting) • David B. Smith, Chair of Self-Study for Fine Arts
1:30 to 2:00	Panel Break
2:00 to 3:00	<p>Chairs of Divisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marilyn McKay, Chair and Professor, Division of Art History & Contemporary Culture • Rory MacDonald, Chair and Associate Professor, Division of Craft • Glen Hougan, Acting Chair & Associate Professor, Division of Design
3:00 to 3:45	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dr. Ann-Barbara Graff, Vice-President (Academic and Research) and Provost

Day 3 – January 26, 2023

11:00 to 11:15	Panel – set up same as Day 1
11:15 to 12:15	Faculty of recently reviewed programs: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Alex Livingston, Division of Fine Arts• Erica Mendritzki, Division of Fine Arts• Leah Decter, Division of Media Arts• Solomon Nagler, Division of Media Arts
12:25 to 1:25	Students: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Olivia Fay (Student Union President)• Tanvai Patankar (MDes)• Laura Bucci (MAAE)• Fiona McInerney (Art History)• Alex Johnston (Media Arts)• Cynthia Frascetti (Craft)• Kaitlyn Todd (Design)
1:30 to 2:30	Senate Representatives: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Lauren Tulloch, NSCAD Senate Secretary• Senate Chair, Adrian Fish• Faculty Member, Joshua Schwab-Cartas• Faculty Member, Rudi Meyer
2:30 to 3:00	Reviewers' Debrief
3:00 to 3:30	Closing Session <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Dr. Peggy Shannon, President of NSCAD• Dr. Ann-Barbara Graff, Vice-President (Academic and Research) and Provost