



Ontario College Quality Assurance Service

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

COLLEGE QUALITY ASSURANCE AUDIT PROCESS (CQAAP)

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

GEORGE BROWN COLLEGE

DATE SINCE LAST UPDATE TO OCQAS: February 22, 2016

DATE OF PREPARATION OF REPORT: April 6, 2018

REPORT PREPARED BY: George Brown College Office of Academic Excellence



This report aims to provide updated 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.

1. Provide the continuous improvement plan (action/ 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 stipulations (affirmations and recommendations) should be listed, verbatim as they appear in the audit report.*

<p>* What has been identified as needing to be done? (stipulations)</p>	<p>CQAAP Recommendation #1: It is recommended that the College ensure that its quality assurance processes include a mechanism for monitoring new methods of teaching and learning and, ultimately, assessing the effectiveness of these various approaches. It is also recommended that the College ensure that there is a method for disseminating information about the relative success/usefulness of these new approaches to all academic areas of the College.</p>
<p>What deliverables are associated with addressing the stipulations?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Research, Planning and Development In addition to existing quality assurance processes that monitor new methods of teaching and learning, George Brown College will develop and support a Teaching and Learning Exchange (TLX) that offers comprehensive delivery of tools and resources to support all groups involved in the delivery of quality learning experiences for our students. The developmental process includes a robust internal and external research component that engages key stakeholders across the college culminating in a proposal with clearly defined recommendations. 2. Implementation and Monitoring



	<p>The Teaching and Learning Exchange will coordinate and consolidate the various teaching and learning resources under one umbrella for ease of access, added visibility and better alignment to meet the needs of our employees and support the academic plan. Once established the TLX will act as a central hub for monitoring and sharing the effectiveness of new methods of teaching and learning across the college.</p> <p>Note: There are significant synergies with the College-wide commitment to the implementation of Universal Design for Learning principles described in detail in Affirmation #8</p>
<p>What tasks are associated with addressing the deliverable?</p>	<p>1a) Assemble a college-wide Teaching and Learning Exchange Steering Committee to assist with initial planning.</p> <p>1b) Undertake initial internal and external research project to determine optimal configuration.</p> <p>1c) Complete Teaching and Learning Exchange proposal/report with key recommendations for presentation across college and to Academic Management Committee.</p> <p>1d) Project is articulated in the Academic Plan and detailed implementation process is underway.</p> <p>2a) Define departments and supports that are to be a part of the Teaching and Learning Exchange.</p>



	<p>2b) Define physical space: ensure that components of the various departments that fall under this umbrella are physically located in close proximity to each other with higher visibility, the ideal campus being St James for the main site;</p> <p>2c) Build on-line space: a robust and interactive website designed to address employee needs, including ease of access and information relating to innovative approaches to teaching and learning as well as about the relative success/usefulness of these new approaches to all academic areas of the College.;</p> <p>2d) Teaching and Learning Exchange initial “soft launch”; and</p> <p>2e) Teaching and Learning Exchange is fully implemented in place.</p> <p>2f) Initial and on-going feedback and monitoring.</p>
Who is responsible for the specific deliverable/ task?	Director of Organizational and Staff Development Key supporting accountabilities: Director Academic Quality; Director e-Learning and Teaching Innovation; Director, Student Affairs; Director Academic Service and Learning Resources.
When is the completion deadline of the specific deliverable/ task?	1a) June 2015 1b) September 2015 1c) March 2016 1d) June 2016



	<p>1e) October 2016</p> <p>2a) March 2017</p> <p>2b) January 2017</p> <p>2c) September 2020</p> <p>2d) September 2017</p> <p>2e) September 2019 and on-going</p>
<p>What is the current status of each specific deliverable/ task? (include a completion percentage)</p>	<p>1a) [100% Complete] The membership of the working committee was composed of faculty and administrators from across the college including representation from Centre for Business; Academic Excellence; Organizational and Staff Development; Office of the Senior Vice President Academic; Centre for Construction and Engineering Technologies; Educational Resources, Library Learning Commons, eLearning and Teaching Innovation; Centre for Hospitality and Culinary Arts; Centre for Preparatory and Liberal Studies</p> <p>1b) [100% Complete] In addition to external research into domestic and international CTL configuration and implementation, research was conducted with internal stakeholders to determine the utility of existing resources as well as a gap analysis. 245 faculty, 62 administrators, and 117 support staff are included in this data set. The results were compiled and a series of focus groups then scheduled to provide the opportunity to share added input. The summary data forms the basis for the report and the recommendations.</p>



1c) [100% Complete] Report completed and circulated. Academic Management Committee approval of key recommendations.

1d) [100% Complete] Teaching and Learning Exchange is included in current Academic Plan and implementation is underway (see section 2 below).

2a) [100% Complete] Led by Organizational and Staff Development and with contributions from Academic Centres across the college, the dedicated stakeholders for the Teaching and Learning Exchange include the Office of Academic Excellence; e-Learning and Teaching Innovation; and Academic Service and Learning Resources, Student Affairs.

2b) [100% Complete] In accordance with recommendations the initial site for the Teaching and Learning Exchange is located at the St James campus at 210 King Street East.

2c) [20% Complete] Resources relating to the Teaching and Learning Exchange are available on the college's Intranet site. A Teaching and Learning Exchange website will be implemented after the "soft launch" of the TLX and take into consideration initial feedback and alignment with the permanent implementation of the Centre.

2d) [100% Complete]

2e) [50% Complete] The Teaching and Learning Exchange is clearly defined. The TLX has a central, dedicated location (210 King Street East). The TLX launched in September 2017 with a college-wide communications campaign.



	2f) [20% Complete] Monitoring and planning associated with initial feedback from the 2017 launch is underway.
* What has been identified as needing to be done? (stipulations)	CQAAP Recommendation #2: It is recommended that the College work on its affirmation to develop a Meta policy for academic policy to define the terms and frequency for the tracking and review of existing academic policies, while also developing a system to monitor academic policies in case there is a need for an expedited review outside the schedule specified in the Meta policy.
What deliverables are associated with addressing the stipulations?	1. Policy is in place that clearly outlines the process by which all Academic Policies will be routinely vetted and updated where necessary. The “Policy Review Policy” will establish clear processes and timelines for the regular vetting of each Academic Policy—these timelines are posted on the Policy website accessible to the public.
What tasks are associated with addressing the deliverable?	1a. Policy research and initial drafting completed by Academic Policy Taskforce Researcher 1b. Initial draft of Policy Review Policy approved by Academic Policy Taskforce 1c. Policy Review Policy Draft approved by Academic Policy and Issues Committee (sub-committee of the College Council) 1d. Policy Review Policy Draft approved by Academic Chairs and Directors Team



	<p>1e. Policy Review Policy Draft approved by Academic Management Committee</p> <p>1f. Policy approved by Board of Governors</p> <p>1g. College-wide Policy Review Policy implemented</p> <p>1h. College-wide communication relating to new Academic Policy</p> <p>1i. Tracking usage/effectiveness of policy</p>
Who is responsible for the specific deliverable/ task?	Director, Academic Quality
When is the completion deadline of the specific deliverable/ task?	<p>1a. September 2017</p> <p>1b. October 2017</p> <p>1c. November 2017</p> <p>1d. April 2018</p> <p>1e. April 2018</p> <p>1f. September 2018</p> <p>1g. October 2018</p> <p>1h. October 2018</p> <p>1i. October 2018 and on-going</p>



<p>What is the current status of each specific deliverable/ task? (include a completion percentage)</p>	<p>1a. [100%] Policy Researcher completed research and initial draft.</p> <p>1b. [100%] Draft reviewed 2x by Academic Policy Taskforce and requested changes implemented.</p> <p>1c. [100%] Policy draft vetted and approved by Academic Policy and Issues Committee at November 2017 meeting</p> <p>1d. [10% Complete] Policy scheduled to be reviewed at spring ACDT Meeting</p> <p>Updated May 8, 2018: The policy has been awaiting these approvals for longer than originally anticipated. There are two reasons for the delay.</p> <p>The first was the 5-week labour interruption in the fall/winter of 2017. The disruption led to the cancellation/alteration of Academic Chair and Director Meetings as well as Academic Management Committee meetings where the policy was set for discussion. These cancellations meant that, when the college returned to more regular scheduling, there was a backlog of urgent issues (many directly relating to the work stoppage and planning around an altered schedule) that dominated the agendas of these meetings.</p> <p>The second reason for some delay is that, on January 15, 2018, George Brown announced the appointment of Dr. Cory Ross as Vice-President, Academic as a part of a larger restructuring of senior management positions including new vice-presidents. Dr. Rick Huijbregts, Vice-President, Strategy & Innovation, Chris McGrath, Vice President, Student Success. These are exciting developments for the college, however, as it related to academic</p>
---	---



	<p>policy development there was a necessary pause while new leadership was briefed/updated on current policy development and process.</p> <p>The policy will be reviewed by both bodies on or before June 5th 2018. The final approval presentations to the Board of Governors is scheduled for fall, 2018.</p> <p>1e. [0% Complete—See 1d]</p> <p>1f. [0% Complete]</p> <p>1g. [0% Complete]</p> <p>1h. [25% Complete] College-wide communication strategy and related documents and templates have been established to support the roll-out of all new Academic Policy</p> <p>1i. [0% Complete]</p>
--	--

* What has been identified as needing to be done? (stipulations)	<p>CQAAP Recommendation #3: It is recommended that the College maintains a centralized record of performance evaluations for all regular full-time academic faculty as well as a monitoring system to ensure that supervisors of academic staff adhere to the College's policy.</p>
What deliverables are associated with addressing the stipulations?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Performance and development planning processes for all employee groups across the College to be reviewed and revamped. 2. Complete a comprehensive current situation analysis for Administrative and Support Staff and launch Goal Setting and



	<p>Individual Development Planning approaches for Administrative staff. Define aspirational processes, tools, and methodologies for Support Staff and Faculty, including teaching/non-teaching faculty.</p> <p>3. Launch Human Resource Management System Cornerstone PM & Employee Development modules so all employees will be able to record their performance review discussions and individual development plans electronically, eliminating current paper processes in place. The online platform will also enable monitoring of completion and quality of discussions to define further employee training needs while maintaining a centralized record of performance evaluations for all regular full-time academic faculty as well as a monitoring system to ensure that supervisors of academic staff adhere to college policy.</p>
<p>What tasks are associated with addressing the deliverable?</p>	<p>1. Performance Evaluations & Individual Development Plans (IDP) - for all Employees</p> <p>2a. Current Situation Analysis</p> <p>2b. Stakeholder Process Review Meetings (all employees)</p> <p>2c. Data collection (all employees)</p> <p>2d. Faculty - Dean/Chair 1-on-1s</p> <p>2e. Faculty - Focus Groups (TBC)</p> <p>2f. Defining To-be/Aspirational Processes</p> <p>2g. Admin Goal Setting & IDP Design</p>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none">2h. Support Staff Goal Setting & IDP Design2i. Faculty Performance Process & IDP Design3a. Cornerstone Learning Mgmt. System Roll-out3b. Cornerstone Performance Module Design3c. Cornerstone Performance Module Roll-out3d. Cornerstone Individual Development Module Design3e. Cornerstone Individual Development Module Roll-out
Who is responsible for the specific deliverable/ task?	George Brown College's Human Resources and Organizational Development department has accountability and oversight responsibility for deliverables and tasks relating to this project. Because of the rather broad scope of this project numerous academic leaders across the college have responsibilities and accountabilities for more granular tasks.
When is the completion deadline of the specific deliverable/ task?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">1. Performance Evaluations & Individual Development Plans (IDP) - for all Employees [March 2019]2. Comprehensive Situation Analysis:<ul style="list-style-type: none">2a. Current Situation Analysis [November 2017]2b. Stakeholder Process Review Meetings [November 2017]2c. Data collection (all employees) [November 2017]2d. Faculty - Dean/Chair 1-on-1s [November 2017]



	<p>2e. Faculty - Focus Groups [Delayed—Labour disruption—2018]</p> <p>2f. Defining To-be/Aspirational Processes [Delayed for Faculty—Labour disruption—2018]</p> <p>2g. Admin Goal Setting & IDP Design [December 2017]</p> <p>2h. Support Staff Goal Setting & IDP Design [November 2018]</p> <p>2i. Faculty Performance Process & IDP Design [March 2019]</p> <p>HRMS Launch</p> <p>3a. Cornerstone Learning Management System Roll-out [June 2017]</p> <p>3b. Cornerstone Performance Module Design [August 2018]</p> <p>3c. Cornerstone Performance Module Roll-out [March 2019]</p> <p>3d. Cornerstone Individual Development Module Design [August 2018]</p> <p>3d. Cornerstone Individual Development Module Roll-out [March 2019]</p>
<p>What is the current status of each specific deliverable/ task? (include a completion percentage)</p>	<p>1. [33% complete] Performance Evaluations & Individual Development Plans (IDP) - for all Employees</p> <p>2a. [100% complete] Current Situation Analysis</p> <p>2b. [100% complete] Stakeholder Process Review Meetings (all employees)</p> <p>2c. [100% complete] Data collection (all employees): Admin and Faculty completed – Support staff collection on-going</p> <p>Updated May 8, 2018:</p>



Interviews with some support-staff were still ongoing when George Brown College's 18 Month Follow-up Report was drafted—information and timelines in the report were based on evidence collected up to and including March 2018. This recommendation was also delayed by the 5-week labour interruption in the fall/winter of 2017. Data collection relating to task 2C is now complete.

2d. [100% complete] Faculty - Dean/Chair 1-on-1s: Faculty performance evaluation process was reviewed further through 1-on-1s with Deans and Chairs and focus groups with Faculty

2e. [0 % Delayed—Labour disruption] Faculty - Focus Groups

2f. [33% complete] Defining To-be/Aspirational Processes: Admin defined

2g. [100% complete] Admin Goal Setting & IDP Design: Completed and rolled out across the College in May 2017

2h. [70% complete] Support Staff Goal Setting & IDP Design: Initial design completed; next steps to secure Union alignment, get management approval, and run pilot studies.

2i. [20% complete] Faculty Performance Process & IDP Design: Following discussions with Deans, Chairs, and Faculty, a meeting with Cory will be scheduled. Need to secure union alignment and get management approval.

3a. [100% complete] Cornerstone Learning Management System Roll-out:



	<p>LMS platform (see Affirmation #7) will provide our employees with easy, online access to learning opportunities across the college.</p> <p>3b. [0% complete] Cornerstone Performance Module Design:</p> <p>Fall 2018: this has been delayed due to labour disruption and on-going discussions with Cornerstone.</p> <p>3c. [0% complete] Cornerstone Performance Module Roll-out:</p> <p>Roll-out is planned for 2019 PM cycle.</p> <p>3d. [10% complete] Cornerstone Individual Development Module Design:</p> <p>Design to begin in fall 2018. This has been delayed due to labour disruption and on-going discussions for some refinements with Cornerstone.</p> <p>3e. [0% complete] Cornerstone Individual Development Module Roll-out</p> <p>Roll-out is planned for 2019 PM cycle.</p>
<p>* What has been identified as needing to be done? (stipulations)</p>	<p>REQUIREMENT: CQAAP Recommendation #4 It is recommended that the College develop professional development plans for all staff members providing services to students that support their areas of professional expertise. It is further recommended that the College ensure that these staff members are aware of the professional development resources that exist to support these activities including the provision of an appropriate budget allowance.</p>



<p>What deliverables are associated with addressing the stipulations?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The launch of the Human Resource Management System “Cornerstone” (HRMS) PM & Employee Development modules [see Recommendation #3] ensured that all employees, including members providing services to students that support their areas of professional expertise, will record performance review discussions, and individual development plans will be developed and stored electronically. The online platform will also enable monitoring of completion and quality of discussions. George Brown College employees’ individual professional development plans that are to be developed in concert with the college’s new HRMS will be linked to available resources.2. As the Audit Panel observed, professional development resources that exist in individual academic units and programs for customized developmental opportunities will fluctuate on an annual basis and be defined each year during business planning. A process will be put in place to ensure that staff members are aware of these professional development resources.
<p>What tasks are associated with addressing the deliverable?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. All tasks associated with ensuring that all staff members have individual professional development plans and are aware of the resources that exist to support these activities are contained in the description of the development of the Cornerstone Human Resource Management System outlined in Recommendation #3.2. A process will be put in place to ensure that staff members are aware of these professional development resources.



	<p>2a. Conduct internal scan of current communications practices relating to professional development budgets and consult with key stakeholders to develop standard practices.</p> <p>2b. Following full launch of HRMS, enact standard communication processes to ensure all staff are informed of the professional development resources that exist in each academic unit's annual budget allowance.</p>
Who is responsible for the specific deliverable/ task?	<p>George Brown College's Human Resources and Organizational Development department has accountability and oversight responsibility for deliverables and tasks relating to deliverable #1. Academic leaders [in most cases Deans, Chairs, Directors and Managers] across the college have responsibilities and accountability related to the design of individual developmental plans as well as communicating professional development resources.</p>
When is the completion deadline of the specific deliverable/ task?	<p>1. See Recommendation #3 for a detailed description of completion deadlines for tasks.</p> <p>2a. September 2018</p> <p>2b. January 2019</p>
What is the current status of each specific deliverable/ task? (include a completion percentage)	<p>1. [65% complete] See Recommendation #3 for a detailed description of the current state of individual tasks relating to the implementation and launch of the Cornerstone Human Resource Management System.</p> <p>2a. [10% complete] Initial conversations underway.</p> <p>2b. [0% complete] Process to be determined by internal research and in conjunction with launch of new Human Resource management system.</p>



* What has been identified as needing to be done? (stipulations)	CQAAP Recommendation #5: It is recommended that the College develop a performance review process that includes non-teaching faculty similar in scope and timing to the process for teaching faculty.
What deliverables are associated with addressing the stipulations?	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. New performance review process for all classes of non-teaching faculty has been designed and piloted.2. Performance review for non-teaching faculty is an on-going process with the same timelines and completion requirements as other faculty.
What tasks are associated with addressing the deliverable?	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1a. Consult with academic leadership of each academic unit that includes a contingent of non-teaching faculty to determine specific, unique aspects of performance to be included in performance review processes.1b. Adapt current faculty performance review and probationary development cycle processes for unique non-teaching roles (including but not limited to: Counsellors, Librarians, Curriculum Specialists and Program Reviewers).2a. Develop and publish performance review and probationary development cycle manual for faculty in non-teaching roles.2b. Roll-out new processes and ensure all non-teaching faculty take part in performance review processes with the same timelines and requirements as teaching faculty.



Who is responsible for the specific deliverable/ task?	George Brown College's Human Resources and Organizational Development department has accountability and oversight responsibility for deliverables and tasks. The Director of George Brown College's Organizational and Staff Development department has accountability and oversight for the design and drafting of faculty performance review processes. This project impacts numerous academic leaders across the college who have responsibilities and accountabilities for overseeing performance review processes.
When is the completion deadline of the specific deliverable/ task?	<p>1a. September to December 2015 Consultations with academic leaders with oversight of non-teaching faculty completed.</p> <p>1b. May 2016 Faculty performance review process adapted for non-teaching faculty groups.</p> <p>2a. September 2016 Performance review and Probationary Development Cycle process manuals for Chairs published for faculty in non-teaching roles.</p> <p>2b. January 2017 Performance reviews for non-teaching faculty on-going with same timelines and requirements as teaching faculty.</p>
What is the current status of each specific deliverable/ task? (include a completion percentage)	<p>1a. [100% complete]</p> <p>1b. [100% complete]</p> <p>2a. [100% complete]</p>



Ontario College Quality Assurance Service

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

2b. [100% complete]



* What has been identified as needing to be done? (stipulations)	Affirmation #1: Enhance the formalized Annual Program Quality Assurance Reporting Template and Process; program Chairs agree to formalize, document and report on their annual program review activities using a new draft template.
What deliverables are associated with addressing the stipulations?	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Review external and internal processes to determine the key data points relating to program quality that should be reported on in updated Annual Program Quality Assurance Reporting.2. Establish a simplified and enhanced Annual Program Quality Assurance Reporting process that is linked to the Academic Quality “Dashboard.” Process to be formalized and endorsed by ACDT.3. Annual Program Quality Assurance Reporting on-going. Office of Academic Excellence rolls up college-wide themes into annual QA report to Vice President Academic.
What tasks are associated with addressing the deliverable?	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1a. Complete external review of Annual Review processes at other institutions.1b. Review comprehensive list of current academic reports generated by various college stakeholders (e.g. the Office of the Registrar and Institutional Research) with Chairs and Directors. Survey Chair and Director Group to determine key reports and utility.



	<p>2a. Consultation with the college's Information Technology and Institutional Research departments to produce initial plan of necessary infrastructure and content for an Academic Quality Data presentation that would be linked to program-specific QA reports (linked to Affirmation #2).</p> <p>2b. Content of data presentation confirmed and piloted.</p> <p>2c. Revised Annual Program Quality Assurance process vetted and accepted by Chairs and Directors as well as senior management.</p> <p>3a. Annual Program Quality Assurance Reporting process adopted.</p> <p>3b. Collection and tracking on-going including OAE reporting on key themes (becomes another source of info for the annual QA report to SVPA).</p>
Who is responsible for the specific deliverable/ task?	Director, Academic Quality; Director, Enterprise Applications, Institutional Research; Academic Chairs.
When is the completion deadline of the specific deliverable/ task?	1a. Fall 2016 1b. February 2017 2a. November 2018 2b. April 2019 2c. June 2019 3a. September 2019



	3b. September 2020
What is the current status of each specific deliverable/ task? (include a completion percentage)	<p>1a. [100% complete] External review completed.</p> <p>1b. [100% complete] Chair and Director Group survey on key reports/utility completed.</p> <p>2a. [75% complete] Initial consultation with the college's Information Technology (September 2017) and Institutional Research (January 2018) and initial planning underway.</p> <p>2b. [25% complete] Chair feedback along with current upgrades in Institutional Research reporting through 'Tableau' and enhanced annual data compiled for portfolio review has produced a defined list of data points to build annual reporting and related accountability—through, for example, annual responses in business plans.</p> <p>2c. [20% complete] Chair feedback and requests integrated into project design. Project on hold through fall of 2018 when budget process and business planning to determine the development of a new digitized reporting system portal or enhanced data presentation through Tableau.</p> <p>3a. [0% complete]</p> <p>3b. [0% complete]</p>



<p>* What has been identified as needing to be done? (stipulations)</p>	<p>Affirmation #2: Develop a Consolidated Quality Data Presentation or Dashboard for Academic leaders; this will provide a single, consolidated reporting repository or “dashboard” for quality-related reports.</p>
<p>What deliverables are associated with addressing the stipulations?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Develop a single consolidated reporting repository or “dashboard” for currently collected reports relating to Academic Quality that are already widely distributed to Academic leaders.2. On-going assessment of usage and updating of data sources. A key function of the consolidated reporting repository will be the production of an Annual Program Quality Assurance Report. Note: Affirmation #2 is closely linked with Affirmation #1 (updated Annual Program Quality Assurance Reporting)—internally these two affirmations are, essentially, parts of the same project. As such key tasks and accountabilities are repeated here.
<p>What tasks are associated with addressing the deliverable?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1a. Review comprehensive list of current academic reports generated by various college stakeholders (e.g. the Office of the Registrar and Institutional Research) with Chairs and Directors. Survey Chair and Director Group to determine key reports and utility.2a. Consultation with the college’s Information Technology and Institutional Research departments to produce initial plan of necessary infrastructure



	<p>and content for an Academic Quality Data presentation that would be linked to program-specific QA reports (linked to Affirmation #1).</p> <p>2b. Content of data presentation confirmed and piloted.</p> <p>2c. Consolidated data presentation including new Annual Program Quality Review process vetted and accepted by Chairs and Directors as well as senior management.</p>
Who is responsible for the specific deliverable/ task?	Director, Academic Quality; Director, Enterprise Applications, Institutional Research; Academic Chairs.
When is the completion deadline of the specific deliverable/ task?	1a. Fall 2016 1b. February 2017 2a. November 2018 2b. April 2019 2c. September 2019
What is the current status of each specific deliverable/ task? (include a completion percentage)	1a. [100% complete] External review completed. 1b. [100% complete] Chair and Director Group survey on key reports/utility completed.



	<p>2a. [75% complete] Initial consultation with the college’s Information Technology (September 2017) and Institutional Research (January 2018) and initial planning underway.</p> <p>2b. [25% complete] Chair feedback along with current upgrades in Institutional Research reporting through ‘Tableau’ and enhanced annual data compiled for portfolio review has produced a defined list of data points to build annual reporting and related accountability—through, for example, annual responses in business plans.</p> <p>2c. [20% complete] Chair feedback and requests integrated into project design. Project on hold through fall of 2018 when budget process and business planning to determine the development of a new digitized reporting system portal or enhanced data presentation through Tableau.</p>
--	--

* What has been identified as needing to be done? (stipulations)	Affirmation #3: Implementation of COMMS; replace the existing Course Outline Management System (COMET) with the COMMS system (originally developed by Algonquin College).
What deliverables are associated with addressing the stipulations?	1. Implementation of COMMS to replace the existing Course Outline Management System (COMET). Complete adoption across the college with all course outlines available and accessible on the system.
What tasks are associated with addressing the deliverable?	1a. Course outline migration



	<ul style="list-style-type: none">1b. Transition to focus on Academic Divisions: publish course outlines with basic course outline functionality1c. Program review & course outline mapping implementation1d. Banner integration1e. Course outline retrieval web integration1f. Course outline LMS integration1g. Identity management integration1h. Training and support1i. Retire COMET
Who is responsible for the specific deliverable/ task?	Accountability rests with the Director, eLearning Teaching Innovation with the exception of Task “1c” which rests with the Director, Academic Quality
When is the completion deadline of the specific deliverable/ task?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">1a. May 20171b. December 20191c. September 20191d. March 20181e. March 20181f. September 20191g. March 2019



	<p>1h. On-going for life of project</p> <p>1i. December 2019</p>
<p>What is the current status of each specific deliverable/ task? (include a completion percentage)</p>	<p>1a. [100% complete] All course outlines provided to eLTI have been migrated to the COMMS database.</p> <p>1b. [32% complete] Transition to focus on Academic Divisions: Wave 1 Early Adopter Transition to Production and Training complete. Wave 2 – January adopters deferred to May 2018.</p> <p>1c. [25% complete] eLTI working with Office of Academic Excellence to develop implementation plan, training, schedule.</p> <p>1d. [98% complete] Banner integration coding completed and testing underway; package moved to production with final testing underway.</p> <p>1e. [85% complete] Currently reviewing AODA and adaptive functionality.</p> <p>1f. [10% complete] Project initiated.</p> <p>1g. [10% complete] Project initiated.</p> <p>1h. [32% complete] Developed and delivered course writer and faculty training to all early adopters. Develop online training modules to supplement face-to-face workshops.</p> <p>1i. [35% complete] Need to finalize requirements and resources. Dependent on other deliverables being achieved on time.</p>



* What has been identified as needing to be done? (stipulations)	Affirmation #4: Establish a College-wide Field Education Policy.
What deliverables are associated with addressing the stipulations?	1. College-wide Work Integrated Learning Policy developed and published.
What tasks are associated with addressing the deliverable?	1a. Field Education Committee creates sub-committee dedicated to policy development 1b. The Strategy 2020 Field Education Committee, in collaboration with the Academic Policy Taskforce, researches and completes initial draft of Work-Integrated Learning Policy 1c. Initial draft of Work-Integrated Learning Policy approved by Strategy 2020 Field Education Committee 1d. Initial draft of Work-Integrated Learning Policy approved by Academic Policy Taskforce 1e. Work-Integrated Learning Policy Draft approved by Academic Policy and Issues Committee (sub-committee of the College Council) 1f. Work-Integrated Learning Policy Draft approved by Academic Chairs and Directors Team 1g. Work-Integrated Learning Policy Draft approved by Academic Management Committee 1h. Work-Integrated Learning Policy Draft approved by Board of Governors 1i. College-wide Work-Integrated Learning Policy implemented



	1j. College-wide communication relating to new academic policy 1k. Tracking usage/effectiveness of policy
Who is responsible for the specific deliverable/ task?	Director, Academic Quality; Director, Work Integrated Learning
When is the completion deadline of the specific deliverable/ task?	1a. January 2017 1b. March 2017 1c. April 2017 1d. September 2017 1e. October 2017 1f. January 2019 1g. March 2019 1h. April 2019 1i. May 2019 1j. September 2019 1k. September 2019 and on-going
What is the current status of each specific deliverable/ task? (include a completion percentage)	1a. [100% complete] Policy subcommittee established. 1b. [100% complete] Subcommittee and Policy Researcher completed research and initial draft.



1c. [100% complete] Draft reviewed 2x by Academic Policy Taskforce and requested changes implemented.

1d. [100% complete] Policy draft vetted and approved by Academic Policy and Issues Committee at November 2017 meeting.

1e. [10% complete] Policy scheduled to be reviewed at spring ACDT Meeting.

1f. [0% Complete]

In keeping with Work Integrated Learning's place as a fundamental component of GBC's academic programs and college strategies, such as those outlined in the Strategic Mandate Agreement, George Brown College has added and staffed a new role at the college: Director, Work Integrated Learning as of February 1, 2018. As the college integrates this new resource there will be a natural pause in the progress of the policy to ensure it reflects all aspects of the college's on-going commitment to WIL.

1g. [0% complete]

1h. [25% complete] College-wide communication strategy and related documents and templates have been established to support the roll-out of all new academic policy.

1i. [0% complete]

1j. [0% complete]

1k. [0% complete]



* What has been identified as needing to be done? (stipulations)	Affirmation #5 Develop a new policy governing Academic Policy Review; policy will define terms and frequency for the tracking and review of existing academic policies.
What deliverables are associated with addressing the stipulations?	This requirement and associated tasks are found in Recommendation #2.
What tasks are associated with addressing the deliverable?	
Who is responsible for the specific deliverable/ task?	
When is the completion deadline of the specific deliverable/ task?	
What is the current status of each specific deliverable/ task? (include a completion percentage)	
* What has been identified as needing to be done? (stipulations)	Affirmation #6: Include analysis and reporting on articulation agreements in George Brown College Comprehensive Program Reviews.
What deliverables are associated with addressing the stipulations?	1. All Program Review Reports include a quality assurance assessment of current articulation agreements. College-wide trends and issues are tracked and reported to senior academic management.
What tasks are associated with addressing the deliverable?	1a. Program Review template includes section for vetting and analysis of current articulation agreements.



	<p>1b. Program Reviewers research existing agreements to ensure established Quality Assurance standards for articulation agreements.</p> <p>1c. Analysis of multi-year collection of data on Articulation Agreements included in PR reporting to Sr. VPs Academic/Corporate.</p>
Who is responsible for the specific deliverable/ task?	Director, Office of Academic Quality
When is the completion deadline of the specific deliverable/ task?	<p>1a. September 2016</p> <p>2a. September 2016</p> <p>3a. October 2017</p>
What is the current status of each specific deliverable/ task? (include a completion percentage)	<p>1a. September 2016 [100% complete]</p> <p>2a. September 2016 [100% complete and on-going]</p> <p>3a. October 2017 [100% complete and on-going]</p>
* What has been identified as needing to be done? (stipulations)	Affirmation #7: Establish the Teaching and Learning Exchange; the Centre will consolidate and build on the wide array of existing teaching and learning resources that are currently provided by several College departments.
What deliverables are associated with addressing the stipulations?	This requirement and associated tasks are found in Recommendation #1.
What tasks are associated with addressing the deliverable?	



Who is responsible for the specific deliverable/ task?	
When is the completion deadline of the specific deliverable/ task?	
What is the current status of each specific deliverable/ task? (include a completion percentage)	

* What has been identified as needing to be done? (stipulations)	Affirmation #8: Incorporate Universal Design for Learning (UDL); the College has committed to developing a plan/framework to incorporate Universal Design for Learning into all applicable courses and programs.
What deliverables are associated with addressing the stipulations?	<p>1. Universal Design: Determine best practices in UDL faculty development, curriculum design, course delivery, and resource support through a college-wide pilot study.</p> <p>2. Develop a framework to incorporate Universal Design principles in applicable programs and courses based on pilot data and launch a communications plan.</p>
What tasks are associated with addressing the deliverable?	<p>1a. Development of project portal</p> <p>1b. Conduct an evaluation of faculty demographics survey</p> <p>1c. Pilot “kick-off” and evaluation</p>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none">1d. Develop course redesign templates (checklist and modification tracker) for delivery of UDL Course Redesign Workshop1e. UDL Curriculum Coaching Meetings1f. Develop and deliver Library Learning Commons training from a UDL lens1g. Develop and deliver “Teaching with Technology through a UDL lens” training1h. Deliver Blackboard LMS training from a UDL lens1i. Evaluation—Faculty members to provide researcher with feedback data1j. Academic service areas integration meeting1k. Complete UDL Course Redesign Modification Trackers (15 versions - 1/course)1l. Delivery of redesigned courses1m. Initial feedback analysis of redesigned courses 2a. Build college UDL Framework based on findings2b. Deliver on communication plan
Who is responsible for the specific deliverable/ task?	Director, Student Affairs



<p>When is the completion deadline of the specific deliverable/ task?</p>	<p>1a. June 2017</p> <p>1b. June 2017</p> <p>1c. July 2017</p> <p>1d. June 11/2017</p> <p>1e. June to September 2017</p> <p>1f. September-December 2017 [and on-going]</p> <p>1g. September-December 2017 [and on-going]</p> <p>1h. September-December 2017 [and on-going]</p> <p>1i. Initial evaluation feedback September 2017—on-going throughout pilot project</p> <p>1j. June 2017</p> <p>1k. June 2017</p> <p>1l. December 2017 [initial courses] and April 2018 [second wave]</p> <p>1m. May 2018</p> <p>2a. May-July 2018</p> <p>2b. September 2018 and on-going</p>
<p>What is the current status of each specific deliverable/ task? (include a completion percentage)</p>	<p>1a. [100% complete] Project Portal established and open. Information sharing across college on-going.</p>



1b. [75% complete] Participation for Faculty Demographics Survey closed; evaluation of results underway.

1c. [100% complete]

1d. [100% complete] Materials designed and in use. UDL course redesign workshop developed and delivered. Faculty are using the templates to guide course redesign work.

1e. [100% complete] All faculty attended multiple coaching sessions.

1f. [100% complete] Training tools developed and workshop delivered.

1g. [100% complete] Training tools developed and workshop delivered.

1h. [100% complete] Training tools developed and workshop delivered.

1i. [75% complete] Initial feedback with researcher complete. On-going as new courses brought online to project.

1j. [100% complete] Roles & responsibilities outlined as well as resource collaboration and integration.

1k. [100% complete] All faculty in the pilot have submitted course redesign documentation. Faculty participants now have the tools to assess their own courses and implement changes.

1l. [75% complete] Fall courses delivered. Winter semester underway.

1m. [25% complete] Analysis of complete courses underway.



	<p>2a. [25% complete] Framework planning underway. Feedback and data from initial pilot to be collected in spring 2018: essential inputs to design.</p> <p>2b. [25% complete] Communication plan: Will leverage the existing project materials for UDL Course Redesign, the UDL Curriculum Coach and Staff Development to stimulate growth in UDL and drive adoption of UDL practices.</p>
--	--

Add (copy and paste from above) additional tables as required to complete the exercise.

2. Provide additional comments (if applicable).

Click here to enter text.