

October 25, 2016

Karen Belfer
Executive Director
Ontario Colleges Quality Assurance Service
Suite 1600
20 Bay Street, Box 88
Toronto, ON M5J 2N8

RE: 18-Month Follow-up to PQAPA Report

Dear Ms. Belfer:

Sheridan is pleased to provide to the Ontario Colleges Quality Assurance Service Board the 18-month follow-up report. Sheridan College submitted the Program Quality Assurance Process (PQAPA) Audit Self-Study on April 24, 2013 to the Audit Panel chaired by Hans van der Slagt with Deborah Wilkin and Don Duclos as panel members. The subsequent site visit was conducted Mary 28 to 30, 2013. Sheridan was pleased that the Audit Panel recognized “. . . the College’s commitment to program quality assurance . . . as exemplified by the attitudes and enthusiasm of the students, faculty, program administrators and senior management at the College”.

Since the audit, Sheridan has continued to make improvements and build upon our quality assurance processes as evidenced in the accompanying documentation. If you have any additional questions after reviewing the documentation, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Regards,



Dr. Mary Preece
Provost and Vice-President, Academic

Cc Dr. Melanie Spence-Ariemma (Associate Vice-President, Academic Quality and Acting Vice Provost)
Joan Condie (Dean, Centre for Teaching and Learning)



Ontario College Quality Assurance Service

Service de l'assurance de la qualité des
collèges de l'Ontario

PROGRAM QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESS AUDIT (PQAPA)

CURRENT STATE OF QUALITY ASSURANCE ACTIVITIES REPORT for: **Follow-up (18-month)**

SHERIDAN COLLEGE

DATE SINCE LAST UPDATE TO OCQAS: November 1, 2013

DATE OF PREPARATION OF REPORT: October 26, 2015

REPORT PREPARED BY: Dr. Mary Preece and Dr. Melanie Spence-Ariemma



This report aims to provide updated high-level information regarding the quality assurance activities that the college is implementing to address the identified gaps (affirmations, recommendations and other) since the college's last submitted report to the OCQAS.

A. IMPLEMENTATION PLAN AND RESULTS TO DATE

* The college must provide (at the very least) the affirmations made by the college and the recommendations made by the Audit Panel at the time of the last Audit. These affirmations and recommendations should be listed, verbatim as they appear in the Final Report.

	This project has been completed.	Completed

* What has been identified as needing to be done? (Affirmation)		
Criterion One: Ensure the College's web-site reflects program learning outcomes for all programs		
How is the college addressing the identified gaps? (please identify the tasks involved)	What is the current status?	When is the completion deadline?
Over a two-year period, internal and external research, strategic and creative development and implementation resulted in the launch of 'Sheridan Get Creative' in the fall of 2013. As a part of the re-branding exercise the College web site was re-designed. Program pages were standardized to include Program Learning Outcomes. During the comprehensive and annual program reviews, program teams are expected to ensure the Program Learning Outcomes are current.	This project has been completed.	Completed



Ontario College Quality Assurance Service

Service de l'assurance de la qualité des collèges de l'Ontario

*** What has been identified as needing to be done? (Affirmation)**

Criterion Two: A report has been commissioned to establish institutional standards for the assignment of academic credit across Sheridan courses and programs.

How is the college addressing the identified gaps? (please identify the tasks involved)	What is the current status?	When is the completion deadline?
<p>In 2012 the Provost and Vice-President, Academic commissioned an internal paper to investigate the practice of assigning academic credit. This paper was intended to be a catalyst for a college-wide academic dialogue leading to the establishment and documentation of a consistent framework, processes, and related standards for the assignment of academic credit to Sheridan courses and their programs. The final recommendation of the report described the need for a Sheridan policy and procedure to guide the awarding of academic credit to its programs and related courses. However, it was felt that additional research was required to understand the context of the assignment of credits / hours at Sheridan before any policy discussion could begin.</p> <p>The Institutional Research and Planning department within Sheridan mined existing data related to course credit-hour allocations. Data was mined across each Faculty and each of Sheridan's programs. The purpose of the data mining was to identify courses that did not follow a practice of allocating 1 credit: 1 hour. This part of the project was completed in fall of 2013. The second part of the project was to meet with the Associate Dean and/or Program Coordinator for courses that had been identified as having different credit-hour allocations. The interviews were scheduled to understand the rationale and/or purpose for the different credit-hour allocation models. A total of 12 interviews were conducted between January and March 2014, which included 19 people, 4 Faculties, 23 programs and 39 courses. The qualitative data was analyzed for patterns with four themes emerging. The four themes were: 1) Historical purposes for allocation, 2) Differentiated model due to breadth:core ratio required by PEQAB for the degrees, 3) Work Integrated Learning, and 4) Joint programming with Universities (i.e. York-Sheridan Design degree).</p> <p>The final qualitative data summary was presented to the Provost and Vice-President, Academic, the Vice-Provost, the Associate Vice-President, Academic Quality and the Director, Academic</p>	<p>The Provost and Vice-President, Academic has referred the proposed model to the Senate. The proposed Academic Credit model at Sheridan will be presented at the November 2016 Senate meeting.</p>	<p>June 1, 2016</p>



Ontario College Quality Assurance Service

Service de l'assurance de la qualité des
collèges de l'Ontario

*** What has been identified as needing to be done? (Affirmation)**

Criterion Two: A report has been commissioned to establish institutional standards for the assignment of academic credit across Sheridan courses and programs.

How is the college addressing the identified gaps? (please identify the tasks involved)	What is the current status?	When is the completion deadline?
<p>Computing Strategies. This group recommended that a model be proposed for those courses that do not follow the 1:1 ratio (e.g. 0.5 credit: 1 hour). During the fall semester (2014) meetings were scheduled with program teams to assess the implications of applying a standard model to those courses that do not have the 1:1 ratio. During this application, an analysis was done to understand the impact from a course and program context perspective. The overall goal was to finalize and establish proposed standards for the credit:hour allocation at Sheridan.</p> <p>Presented to the Provost and Vice-President, Academic in late spring of 2015 was a proposed model based on the previous quantitative and qualitative research.</p>		



*** What has been identified as needing to be done? (Affirmation)**

Criterion Three: The College has participated in Phase 2 of the Work Integrated Learning (WIL) project commissioned by The Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario “to evaluate the impact of WIL on the social and human capital of postsecondary graduates. The College intends to use the results of this study in order to standardize the delivery of these activities, ensure appropriate documentation and provide a consistently valuable student experience.

How is the college addressing the identified gaps? (please identify the tasks involved)	What is the current status?	When is the completion deadline?
<p>As Sheridan continues to develop new programs and evolve our existing academic programs, the numbers of programs with Work Integrated Learning (WIL) components, whether internship, co-op work –terms or field and clinical placements continue to grow. Student and prospective student interest in WIL also continues to rise.</p> <p>In 2012, Sheridan commissioned a Work Integrated Learning Report. Its findings and recommendations suggested exploration of a more integrated approach to the delivery of all forms of WIL in order to maximize quality of learning, build consistency, maximize resources and minimize risk.</p> <p>In 2014, a pilot was launched whereby a partnership was created to integrate the Social Service Worker Program Field Placement activity with the Cooperative Education Department. This pilot has brought the expertise of the Co-op department to the SSW program resulting in improved practices, identification of efficiencies, implementation of common standards and reduced liability. It has also enabled the Co-op Team to gain experience with Field Placement, study the process and model and create data sets that will inform the development of a more fulsome strategy for effective integration and innovation models. An institutional WIL Steering Committee was also created with Executive and Senior Management membership to investigate and propose new models that ensure the best possible WIL experiences for students and to consider centralizing aspects of both Field Practicum and Co-op.</p>	<p>A comprehensive project plan with key deliverables has been developed and endorsed by the Provost and Vice-President, Academic and the Vice-President, Student Affairs and Enrolment Management.</p>	<p>The initial pilot will be completed by spring 2016.</p>



Ontario College Quality Assurance Service

Service de l'assurance de la qualité des
collèges de l'Ontario

*** What has been identified as needing to be done? (Affirmation)**

Criterion Four: Review the Student Feedback Policy to ensure that it addresses timeliness, regularity and expediency of feedback

How is the college addressing the identified gaps? (please identify the tasks involved)	What is the current status?	When is the completion deadline?
<p>An Assessment and Evaluation Policy and Procedure as well as a Course Evaluation Procedure have replaced the Student Feedback Policy. The intent of the Assessment and Evaluation Policy and Procedure is to support consistent assessment and evaluation practices across Sheridan. The Student Course Evaluation Procedure is a part of the Formative Faculty Assessment Policy. The purpose of the procedure is to outline the principles and parameters that guide student evaluation of courses at Sheridan as a fundamental part of Sheridan's commitment to an outstanding learning experience and continuous improvement. The Student Course Evaluation Procedure applies to all Sheridan course sections and is administered near the end of the course. In course sections taught by more than one professor, evaluations will be done to assess each portion of the course taught by different professors.</p>	<p>The Assessment and Evaluation Policy and Procedure were approved in Fall of 2014 with an effective date of May 11, 2015. The Formative Faculty Assessment Policy was approved April 2014 with an effective date of May 1, 2015. The Student Course Evaluation Procedure was approved December 2014 with an effective date of May 1, 2015.</p>	<p>Completed</p>



*** What has been identified as needing to be done? (Affirmation)**

Criterion Five: A research study has been commissioned to review the College's current end of term survey with the intent of developing and testing a revised evaluation tool.

How is the college addressing the identified gaps? (please identify the tasks involved)	What is the current status?	When is the completion deadline?
<p>In early 2013, the Provost and Vice-President, Academic convened a group comprised of representation from the union and administration to discuss formative faculty evaluations and course evaluations. At the request of this group, additional research was conducted to review current practices in course evaluations. All ten of the Canadian universities that were profiled for Sheridan's research were engaged in the process of reconfiguring their existing course evaluation surveys and protocols, and were doing so with the goal of promoting effective teaching. Generally speaking each institution recognized that existing practices were out-dated and that faculty (and their unions) were concerned that current measures did not meet their present needs. While survey titles varied by institution ('faculty evaluation' and 'course evaluation' are being used interchangeably), the objective was fundamentally the same; to improve the student learning experience, to provide a source of data regarding the quality of teaching, to assist faculty in the development of their teaching, and to use the data as one indicator (of many) for the assessment of faculty for tenure and promotion purposes.¹ Of specific interest to the committee was the Course Evaluation Framework (CEF) being implemented at the University of Toronto. The cascaded model was reflective of how teaching between Faculties and programs can be different based on the subject matter and the course design. The cascaded course evaluation model was built to be responsive to the local contexts of teaching, while simultaneously reflective of the overall priorities for teaching and learning at the University.</p> <p>The flexibility to use a cascaded course evaluation framework that captures the differences in teaching priorities between Faculties while establishing the overall priorities for teaching and learning at Sheridan provided a measure for more meaningful, purposeful and helpful information for faculty and administrators. The goal of the cascaded framework at Sheridan was</p>	<p>New software and a vendor system were selected and a comprehensive project plan with key deliverables was developed and endorsed by the Provost and Vice-President, Academic. A full time Research Analyst (Course Evaluations) was also hired to support the development and implementation of the cascaded course evaluation framework at Sheridan. The Faculty of Applied Science and Technology ran small pilots in winter, spring and summer 2015 to test the software.</p>	<p>The implementation of this project will span at minimum a five-year period. Cascaded course evaluations will need to be designed by each Faculty and migrated onto the new system.</p>

¹ Gleaned from the information provided by individual institutions.



Ontario College Quality Assurance Service

Service de l'assurance de la qualité des
collèges de l'Ontario

*** What has been identified as needing to be done? (Affirmation)**

Criterion Five: A research study has been commissioned to review the College's current end of term survey with the intent of developing and testing a revised evaluation tool.

How is the college addressing the identified gaps? (please identify the tasks involved)	What is the current status?	When is the completion deadline?
to ensure the questions accurately reflect institutional, Faculty, and individual professors teaching and learning contexts. Subsequently, on June 17, 2014, Sheridan's Course Evaluation Steering Committee recommended Sheridan move forward with implementing the University of Toronto cascaded Course Evaluation Framework.		



* What has been identified as needing to be done? (Affirmation)		
Criterion Six:		
(1) Establish a process to evaluate whether programs are addressing recommendations arising from previous reviews. (2) Examine ways to identify college trends and issues through a “collective review” of its program offerings.		
How is the college addressing the identified gaps? (please identify the tasks involved)	What is the current status?	When is the completion deadline?
(1) The Senate Program Quality Assurance Standing Committee recommended a process to review implementation and action plans as identified in the comprehensive program review self-study. Aligned with PQAPA expectations, a status report is required as part of the annual report process two years following the completion of the comprehensive program review. The Dean of the program is required to report on progress in meeting the planned commitments as outlined in the Comprehensive Program Review Faculty/Program Implementation Plan chart. This information is submitted to the Program Quality Assurance Committee (PQAC) of the Senate in September. PQAC will review the information and recommend one of the following: 1) no additional follow-up is required, 2) request additional clarification/information from the Dean, or 3) additional recommendations/comments to be discussed with the Associate Vice-President, Academic Quality.	(1) The Provost and Vice-President, Academic approved the recommended revisions to the Program Review Procedure effective April 2015.	(1) The Program Quality Assurance Standing Committee received all of the 2012-2013 action / implementation plans. On the agenda for the October/November 2015 meetings is the review of each report.
(2) With the process now established to evaluate whether programs are addressing recommendations from previous reviews, the Centre for Teaching and Learning Program Review Team will be considering ways to identify college trends and issues as described in the comprehensive program reviews self-study report.	(2) Lead by the Dean, Centre for Teaching and Learning, discussions will begin fall 2015.	(2) A recommendation will be presented to the Associate Vice-President, Academic Quality June 2016.



*** What has been identified as needing to be done? (Recommendation)**

Recommendation #1 (Criterion 4.3.2)

The Audit Panel recommends that the College institute an organized system to ensure that experimentation with new teaching methods, where successful, is promoted to other parts of the College.

How is the college addressing the identified gaps? (please identify the tasks involved)	What is the current status?	When is the completion deadline?
The College has established a number of opportunities for sharing innovations in teaching methods.	The Showcase for Teaching and Learning is an annual event held in October as well as the Spring-Summer series held throughout May and June. An open call for proposals seeks professors who want to conduct sessions during these two events to share best practices in teaching. A newly launched Scholars and Creators Day conference will have its inaugural event in October 2015 to provide further opportunities for faculty, staff and students to share scholarship, research and creative activity initiatives. Currently, the Centre for Teaching and Learning, the Library and Learning Commons and the TC3 (a teaching technology community of practice group) are investigating the potential of hosting a Digital Education Symposium Winter 2016.	On going as opportunities arise.



*** What has been identified as needing to be done? (Recommendation)**

Recommendation #2 (Criterion 5.1.4)

It is strongly recommended that the College develop a formal, multifaceted faculty evaluation policy as quickly as possible.

Recommendation #3 (Criterion 5.2.4)

It is recommended that the College require faculty to engage in reflective practice, as a matter of policy. This could be incorporated into a faculty member's evaluation.

How is the college addressing the identified gaps? (please identify the tasks involved)	What is the current status?	When is the completion deadline?
<p>Sheridan is committed to effective teaching and learning to (a) support outstanding student learning and to (b) build on the opportunity for Professors to reflect on their teaching with the intent of progressing from "good to great." Toward that end, Sheridan has established a consistent process for the formative assessment of our Professors who, we recognize, are on an expertise continuum extending from novice to expert. This Formative Faculty Assessment policy applies to all full-time Sheridan Professors including Librarians and Counselors if they are teaching as part of their responsibilities. The intent of the policy and the procedure was to support reflective practice and professional development. The policy was approved April 8, 2014 and the procedure was approved March 1, 2015 with an effective date of May 1, 2015 for both.</p>	<p>All professors will complete the formative faculty assessment process on a four-year cycle. A minimum of 25% of the full time professors at Sheridan must complete the formative faculty assessment process each year. The first 25% began the process May 2015.</p>	<p>All full time professors will have participated in the formative assessment process by 2018/2019.</p>



*** What has been identified as needing to be done? (Recommendation)**

Recommendation #4 (Criterion 5.2.5)

It is recommended that the College develop and implement a mechanism to track and report on the professional development activities for each faculty member.

How is the college addressing the identified gaps? (please identify the tasks involved)	What is the current status?	When is the completion deadline?
The Centre for Teaching and Learning (CTL) acquired software called "PD Place". PD Place is used for event registration for activities that are facilitated and/or organized by CTL. The software can also provide a professional development report for professors that have used PD Place to register for events.	The Centre for Organizational and People Development is currently working with Sheridan's Academic Systems Director, Sheridan's Information Systems Interim CIO and the Centre for Teaching and Learning's Associate Dean (Teaching and Learning) to determine how this software can be used as an institutional strategy for all staff to track their own professional development activities.	December 1, 2015

*** What has been identified as needing to be done? (Recommendation)**

Recommendation #5 (Criteria 5.3, 5.4)

Although all service providers demonstrated various ways that they solicit feedback from their "clients" (students, faculty, others), it is recommended that the College establish a policy ensuring that all student service areas collect and analyze student feedback on a regular basis and use the feedback to inform how services to students can be improved.

How is the college addressing the identified gaps? (please identify the tasks involved)	What is the current status?	When is the completion deadline?
Sheridan made the decision to incorporate this recommendation into a College-wide survey policy. This policy will identify standard survey's (e.g. KPI, NSSE) that are used to collect feedback from students at Sheridan. The development of this policy is being lead by the Director, Institutional Research and Planning.	A consultative process began September 2015 to gather information that will frame the policy.	It is anticipated that a policy will be approved by September 2016.



*** What has been identified as needing to be done? (Recommendation)**

Recommendation #6 (Criterion 6, General)

It is strongly recommended that the College continue to ensure that the review of its academic policies be completed as quickly as possible.

How is the college addressing the identified gaps? (please identify the tasks involved)	What is the current status?	When is the completion deadline?																						
<p>The Senate Academic Policy Standing Committee prepared a schedule to review academic policies. The Senate status report below is as of October 2015.</p> <p>Approved through Senate and Board of Governors</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="121 711 1104 1273"> <thead> <tr> <th>2013/2014 Academic Year</th> <th>Approval Date</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Academic Appeals and Consideration Policy</td> <td>September, 2014</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Posthumous Award Credential Policy</td> <td>June, 2014</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Online Teaching and Learning Policy</td> <td>June, 2014</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Advanced Standing Policy</td> <td>October, 2014</td> </tr> <tr> <td>General Education Policy</td> <td>October, 2014</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Student Assessment and Evaluation Policy</td> <td>February, 2015</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Program Review Policy</td> <td>June, 2014</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Academic Standing Policy</td> <td>June 2015</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Admission Policy</td> <td>June 2015</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Liberal Arts & Science (Breadth) Policy</td> <td>June 2015 alignment to PEQAB</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	2013/2014 Academic Year	Approval Date	Academic Appeals and Consideration Policy	September, 2014	Posthumous Award Credential Policy	June, 2014	Online Teaching and Learning Policy	June, 2014	Advanced Standing Policy	October, 2014	General Education Policy	October, 2014	Student Assessment and Evaluation Policy	February, 2015	Program Review Policy	June, 2014	Academic Standing Policy	June 2015	Admission Policy	June 2015	Liberal Arts & Science (Breadth) Policy	June 2015 alignment to PEQAB	<p>The College continues to actively engage the institutional community in updating the academic policies. Since the time of the PQAPA review, all outstanding academic policies have been reviewed and the cycle will be current at the end of the 2016-2017 academic year.</p>	<p>As scheduled; academic policy review is ongoing.</p>
2013/2014 Academic Year	Approval Date																							
Academic Appeals and Consideration Policy	September, 2014																							
Posthumous Award Credential Policy	June, 2014																							
Online Teaching and Learning Policy	June, 2014																							
Advanced Standing Policy	October, 2014																							
General Education Policy	October, 2014																							
Student Assessment and Evaluation Policy	February, 2015																							
Program Review Policy	June, 2014																							
Academic Standing Policy	June 2015																							
Admission Policy	June 2015																							
Liberal Arts & Science (Breadth) Policy	June 2015 alignment to PEQAB																							



*** What has been identified as needing to be done? (Recommendation)**

Recommendation #6 (Criterion 6, General)

It is strongly recommended that the College continue to ensure that the review of its academic policies be completed as quickly as possible.

How is the college addressing the identified gaps? (please identify the tasks involved)	What is the current status?	When is the completion deadline?																														
<p>Policy Review in Progress</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="107 537 621 589">2014/2015 Academic Year</th> <th data-bbox="621 537 1094 589">Review Date</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="107 589 621 641">Second Credential Policy</td> <td data-bbox="621 589 1094 641">May 2010</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="107 641 621 693">Grading Policy</td> <td data-bbox="621 641 1094 693">Review Date not specified</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="107 693 621 745">Academic Integrity Policy</td> <td data-bbox="621 693 1094 745">September 2015</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="107 745 621 797">Human Participants Policy</td> <td data-bbox="621 745 1094 797">Not specified – approved June 2005</td> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="107 797 621 849">2015/2016 Academic Year</th> <th data-bbox="621 797 1094 849">Review Date</th> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="107 849 621 901">Academic Freedom Policy</td> <td data-bbox="621 849 1094 901">October 2009</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="107 901 621 953">Graduation Policy</td> <td data-bbox="621 901 1094 953">April, 2016</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="107 953 621 1005">Program Review Policy</td> <td data-bbox="621 953 1094 1005">April, 2016</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="107 1005 621 1057">Liberal Arts & Science (Breadth Policy)</td> <td data-bbox="621 1005 1094 1057">June 2016</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="107 1057 621 1109">Research Integrity Policy</td> <td data-bbox="621 1057 1094 1109">Review date not specified</td> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="107 1109 621 1161">2016/2017 Academic Year</th> <th data-bbox="621 1109 1094 1161">Review Date</th> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="107 1161 621 1213">Animal Use for Teaching Policy</td> <td data-bbox="621 1161 1094 1213">Not specified – approved January, 2009</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="107 1213 621 1265">Care and Use of Animals in Teaching Policy</td> <td data-bbox="621 1213 1094 1265">Not specified – approved</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="107 1265 621 1317">Letters of Permission Policy</td> <td data-bbox="621 1265 1094 1317">NEW</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	2014/2015 Academic Year	Review Date	Second Credential Policy	May 2010	Grading Policy	Review Date not specified	Academic Integrity Policy	September 2015	Human Participants Policy	Not specified – approved June 2005	2015/2016 Academic Year	Review Date	Academic Freedom Policy	October 2009	Graduation Policy	April, 2016	Program Review Policy	April, 2016	Liberal Arts & Science (Breadth Policy)	June 2016	Research Integrity Policy	Review date not specified	2016/2017 Academic Year	Review Date	Animal Use for Teaching Policy	Not specified – approved January, 2009	Care and Use of Animals in Teaching Policy	Not specified – approved	Letters of Permission Policy	NEW		
2014/2015 Academic Year	Review Date																															
Second Credential Policy	May 2010																															
Grading Policy	Review Date not specified																															
Academic Integrity Policy	September 2015																															
Human Participants Policy	Not specified – approved June 2005																															
2015/2016 Academic Year	Review Date																															
Academic Freedom Policy	October 2009																															
Graduation Policy	April, 2016																															
Program Review Policy	April, 2016																															
Liberal Arts & Science (Breadth Policy)	June 2016																															
Research Integrity Policy	Review date not specified																															
2016/2017 Academic Year	Review Date																															
Animal Use for Teaching Policy	Not specified – approved January, 2009																															
Care and Use of Animals in Teaching Policy	Not specified – approved																															
Letters of Permission Policy	NEW																															



*** What has been identified as needing to be done? (Recommendation)**

Recommendation #7

It is recommended that all programs, regardless of the delivery mode (e.g. part-time studies, possibly on-line delivery in the future) be subject to the College's overall program quality assurance measures.

How is the college addressing the identified gaps? (please identify the tasks involved)	What is the current status?	When is the completion deadline?
All full-time programs at the College, regardless of delivery mode are required to participate in the comprehensive program review process in addition to completing an annual report. During the past academic year, the Centre for Teaching and Learning has collaborated with the Faculty of Continuing and Professional Studies to develop a program review process for Sheridan Board Certificates.	One Board Certificate program was identified to participate in the drafted process. This program completed the self-study in June. The Centre for Teaching and Learning and the Faculty of Continuing and Professional Studies held a meeting with the Provost and Vice-President, Academic as well as the Associate Vice-President, Academic Quality. A procedure has been agreed upon and will be drafted for review and approval in the winter of 2016. The review of Board Certificates will ensure all credentials at Sheridan are subject to a quality assurance process. All full-time programs have completed their comprehensive reviews over the past 5 years and a new cycle has been initiated.	April 30, 2016



*** What has been identified as needing to be done? (Recommendation)**

Recommendation #8

It is recommended that the College's Standards and Practices for Program Advisory Committees be reviewed and updated and to address the following:

- Term of office to ensure that there is a regular turnover of advisory committee members resulting in the committee staying current and engaged in the welfare of the program they advise.
- Ensure that Advisory Committee members are well informed about the College's program quality assurance processes, that reports arising out of these processes be provided to all members and that they be thoroughly discussed at Advisory Committee meetings

How is the college addressing the identified gaps? (please identify the tasks involved)	What is the current status?	When is the completion deadline?
New Guidelines were published in 2013 and all programs are compliant with the revised guidelines. Program Advisory Committees were renamed Professional Advisory Councils. The Board of Governors has been presented with a report demonstrating all programs are in full compliance with the new guidelines	Revised guidelines have been completed and fully implemented	Completed.

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Please provide additional comments (if applicable).

No additional comments.