

**Program Quality Assurance  
Process Audit**

**SENECA COLLEGE**

**FINAL AUDIT  
REPORT**

**September 2006**

This report represents the findings of the Program Quality Assurance Process Audit for Seneca College of Applied Arts and Technology, conducted on **June 15, 2006**.

This report has been prepared, reviewed, and accepted by all parties to the Audit, including the college personnel, members of the Review Panel, and the Management Board of the OCQAS. The signatures of the representative parties demonstrate their acceptance of the content of this Report.

For the College:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

For the Review Panel:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

For the Management Board:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

**Review Panel Membership**

Chair: Judith Eifert, Consultant

Members: William Gordon, Consultant  
Suzanne Drouin, Fleming College

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

**A. CONCLUSIONS**

The work that Seneca has undertaken over the years to implement, refine and re-develop its Quality Assurance Policies and Procedures is commendable. More recently, the work undertaken to ensure that there is adequate support for the implementation of its Quality Assurance Policy is having a positive impact on the programs and services offered by Seneca. Faculty and students are excited, energized and encouraged by the knowledge and experience they have acquired through this process and indicate that this is beneficial for program change and enhancement. Additionally, it is providing a form of professional development for faculty, staff and students, encouraging a dialogue regarding pedagogical issues amongst faculty, and facilitating communication and work across areas (e.g., library and faculty) in the development and offering of programs and services to students.

Seneca has met all the requirements for its initial audit review.

**B. OVERALL FINDINGS OF PANEL**

<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Met</b>	<b>Partially Met</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
Criterion 1	X		
Criterion 2	X		
Criterion 3	X		
Criterion 4	X		
Criterion 5	X		

**C. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT**

- Continue the further development and refinement of Seneca’s Quality Assurance Policy and Program Review Policy and Procedures and incorporate key existing and new findings into Policy and Procedures;
- Complete, as expeditiously as possible, the development of the annual data base and the completion of the “dashboard” indicators which will inform annual review (early identification system) and the determination of criteria for designating programs for either Tier 1, Tier 2 or Tier 3 Review. Use these criteria to refine the 10-year Program Review Plan and allow for adjustments on an annual basis if the early identification system triggers a modification to the Plan;

- Maintain the existing level of support for the Program Review Process to achieve the desired results, as there are several ancillary benefits of engaging in this exercise for faculty, students and staff;
- Develop more fully the assessment data for student performance at the course and the program level. In particular, the notion of a Program Portfolio which provides evidence of student achievement of program outcomes may enhance the Review outcomes;
- Ensure the participation of external representatives from the discipline on the Program Review Teams, if possible from outside of Seneca;
- Encourage and facilitate the involvement of students in the process, and minimally ensure graduate involvement in such reviews;
- Ensure the thorough review of the regular course/professor Student Feedback Questionnaire, as it informs the Program Review process and the students interviewed expressed limited faith in it as a reliable tool;
- Develop a clearer mechanism to monitor and ensure follow-up on the recommendations resulting from Program Reviews, assessing their success and measuring their impact, especially as the number of Program Reviews being completed in years to come will escalate. Embedding or linking the recommendations within annual work plans could be considered as one way to monitor this aspect of the Program Review Policy.