KPU's Response to Quality Assurance Process Audit Assessors' Report of January 11, 2020

Kwantlen Polytechnic University Quality Assurance Action Plan: March 2020

> The Action Plan was prepared by the Associate Vice President Planning & Accountability and approved by the President, the Provost, and the Senate Standing Committee on Program Review.

The QAPA site visit for Kwantlen Polytechnic University (KPU) was held on December 17 and 18, 2019 at KPU's Richmond campus. The QAPA Assessors' report, received on January 13, 2020, focused on three areas: 1- Commendations: Areas where KPU has shown exemplary practice in program quality assurance and practice. 2- Affirmations: Areas where KPU has identified a weakness and is in the process of improving it. 3- Recommendations in areas needing improvement.

To provide context for the recommendations, and our response, the key commendations are summarized here:

KPU was commended for the degree to which the governance process – specifically the Senate and its Standing Committees – are working to support the development and implementation of Quality Assurance (QA) processes as well as the development of a self-governing culture at KPU. *"In addition to this, KPU cites the importance of quality assurance in their program reviews and other documentation. Program reviews are also cited in difficult conversations and senators regularly ask (regarding proposals) 'what part of your Program Review told you this was important?' The panel applauds KPU for its work and its focus on the development of a culture of Quality Assurance."*

KPU was also commended for its focus on "the student experience as a measure of academic quality. During the initiation of the site visit, Dr. Alan Davis defined educational quality as student success and the act of '…meeting students' needs, regardless of what type they are.'"

The assessors saluted KPU "for their culture of continuous improvement with regard to their QA process as evidenced in the self-study as well as the responses from interview participants during the site visit. It is important to note that all participants in the interview process were passionate about their QA work and the self-study submissions also demonstrated a cross-institutional commitment to that process."

Each of the QAPA recommendations are provided below, together with KPU's response, and our plan for addressing the recommendation.

1. QAPA Recommendation: *KPU should implement a standardized program mapping process and template in order to clearly demonstrate the link between program outcomes/goals and course learning outcomes. Once implemented, this standardized program mapping tool should be reviewed and updated as required during the program review process and any other time changes are made at the course or course learning outcome level. KPU may also consider including the program map as a standard appendix in the program self-study document.*

Response: KPU will revise The Guide to Curriculum Review, which is part of the Self-Study process. This process includes articulation of the program outcomes and will be expanded to ensure a fuller assessment of mapping these to the course learning outcomes. A curriculum map template will also be designed, which will be completed during the Self-Study and included in the appendix as a requirement of the Self-Study.

Lead: Manager, Quality Assurance

Timing: Will present the revised guide to Senate Standing Committee on Program Review (SSCPR) for their approval in September 2020. Programs starting the review Fall 2020 will be able to use the new guide.

Details: Consultation on the guide has already begun with the Office of Teaching and Learning, who help support faculty in this area. Input from the Provost, and members of the SSCPR will also be sought.

2. QAPA Recommendation: *The panel suggests that KPU develop Career Pathways Maps that are truly maps: explicit, visual images of how the learning outcomes of specific courses and programs lead to a multiplicity of careers. Creating a template that requires programs to make these links might be a useful way of proceeding. We agree with the institution's belief that an automated system would be extremely helpful here; currently they do the program mapping manually wherever it is done.*

Response: Career Pathway Maps are already included in the Guide to Curriculum Review, referred to in the first recommendation. The review of the Guide to Curriculum Review will include reviewing the Career Pathways map as part of this process. This will be included in the template and will be a required part of the Self-Study submission.

Lead: Manager, Quality Assurance

Timing: Will present the revised guide to Senate Standing Committee on Program Review (SSCPR) for their approval in September 2020. Programs starting the review Fall 2020 will be able to use the new guide.

Details: Consultation on the guide has already begun with the Office of Teaching and Learning, who help support faculty in this area. Input from the Provost, and members of the SSCPR will also be sought.

3. QAPA Recommendation: *Inconsistencies in the use of tools like templates for assessing progress. We suggest that having timeline goals are helpful reminders of expectations to move recommendations forward with alacrity.*

Response: The Quality Assurance Plan that each program must develop includes places for start and end dates. Specific dates will be required for all actions in the plan.

Lead: Manager, Quality Assurance

Timing: Completed by March 2020.

Details: Instructions for completing the Quality Assurance Plan will be revised with the information on date requirements.

---

4. QAPA Recommendation: *While the panel was impressed with the inclusion of thorough student satisfaction survey results, it is our position that a more significant student voice could be achieved by each program review team ensuring that the student voice is identified and explicitly acknowledged where it has impacted on the results of the review. It would be particularly helpful to external parties if the institutional QA documents were more explicit about student involvement in the QA processes. We also feel that it would be a good idea to involve students in designing the best way to address this issue.*

Response: The inclusion of students in the program review process is not limited to surveys. In addition to surveying students and alumni, both are invited to participate in the onsite External Review site visit. The guidelines for the External Review make it clear that student participation is important, and the agenda for the day includes specific time set aside for the External Review team to talk to students and alumni. The Self-Study report clearly identifies the sources of data, including the student and alumni surveys. The External Review report includes the agenda, although this was not the practice in the past when the CADD and EPT reviews were conducted.

Lead: Manager, Quality Assurance

Timing: Completed by March 2020.

Details: KPU will ensure the agenda is included in future reports to ensure the role of students is clear.

---

5. QAPA Recommendation: *The Panel stresses the importance of ensuring that the following … are consistently addressed as part of every program review going forward…Program Advisory Committee (PAC) effectiveness including membership, support provided to the PAC (i.e., education), and compilation and follow-up on PAC recommendations and input that was provided between reviews. It is the recommendation of this panel that KPU:*

- *Incorporate PAC meetings into all future program reviews ensuring the PAC has a voice with regard to QA processes.*
- *Devise a handbook for PAC members in order to provide clarity and consistency with regard to their role in the QA process in future program reviews.*
- *Create a systematic framework to evaluate the PACs in terms of their role and overall effectiveness in the QA program review processes.*

Response: The current program review process includes a discipline-sector survey. PAC members are often invited to participate in that survey, but that is their only role in the Program Review process. PACs are more often consulted about program improvements after the review is completed.

There are two parts to this recommendation: one on giving PACs a greater voice in program review, and two, on evaluating the effectiveness of PACs. There is considerable scope to involve PACs more effectively in program review. KPU will assess how to implement this recommendation

Lead: Provost and AVP, OPA

Timing: Completed by June 2021.

Details: Consultation with Deans and faculty will be carried out, first to understand the current state regarding how PACs are supported and the role they play, and then to determine what is needed to improve PAC support and involvement. We will also consider how to evaluate PACs to ensure their effectiveness is optimized. This work is underway, starting with consultation with Deans and with a survey of PAC members that will be completed by June 2020.