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

Assessment of the University of New Brunswick's Quality Assurance Policies and Procedures

Final Report

Prepared by

Dr. Neil Besner and Dr. Ron Bond

November 2022

MPHEC
Maritime Provinces Higher Education Commission

CESPM
Commission de l'enseignement supérieur des Provinces maritimes

Contents

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 the University of New Brunswick

At the request of the Maritime Provinces Higher Education Commission (MPHEC), the Review Panel was asked to carry out the QAM review of the University of New Brunswick's (UNB) quality assurance framework. The members of the Review Panel were:

1. **Dr. Neil Besner** – He is the former Provost and Vice-President, Academic, University of Winnipeg. He has assessed Canadian universities and colleges and their programs in British Columbia, Saskatchewan, and Alberta; he was a member of Campus Alberta Quality Council from 2014-16, and since 2018 has been a member of the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance.
2. **Dr. Ron 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.

The QAM Process at UNB included the following steps:

1. An institutional progress report prepared by UNB (August 2021);
2. An analysis of all pertinent documentation by the Review Panel (October-November 2021);
3. A virtual site visit (November 22-23, 2021);
4. A draft report prepared by the Review Panel to UNB to validate factual information and correct any errors (January 2022);
5. Validation of draft report by UNB (March 2022)
6. A final report, incorporating UNB's comments, to UNB (April 2022)
7. A follow-up action plan prepared by UNB (July 2022);
8. Recommendation by the joint Association of Atlantic Universities and MPHEC Quality Assurance Committee to approve the final report and follow-up action plan and subsequent approval by the MPHEC board (October 2022);

9. The Review Panel report, with the action plan from UNB appended, posted (in the language of the institution) on the MPHEC and UNB's website (November 2022); and,

10. A follow-up report to be submitted by UNB to the MPHEC one year following submission to the MPHEC of the follow-up action plan. The follow-up report will outline how UNB has addressed the actions it had identified in its follow-up action plan.

C. Preamble to the Panel's Assessment

Several key features of the University of New Brunswick (UNB) serve as context for this report on quality assurance there. UNB is proud of its status as the oldest anglophone university in Canada. It has two campuses, one in Fredericton and the other in Saint John and a site in Moncton. It currently has c. 10,000 students, who populate more than seventy-five programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels. It employs over three thousand staff, including almost 600 faculty. It is research-intensive, attracting, to use one indicator, c. 70% of publicly funded research dollars in the province; it generates almost $40M in external research funding annually and hosts many research institutes and centres. By all accounts, UNB is the premier comprehensive university in the province, and along with Memorial and Dalhousie universities, one of the principal institutions of its kind in the Atlantic region. UNB relishes its designation as Canada's most entrepreneurial university and promotes entrepreneurial learning opportunities at both campuses.

These and other features of the University were highlighted in a concise and informative presentation by the President, Dr. Paul Mazerolle, at the first session of our virtual site visit. For our purposes, several of these highlights deserve mention since they are part of the Strategic Plan.

There are five pillars to the Strategic Plan "UNB Toward 2030":

- Research Impact
- Transformative Education for the Future
- Engagement and Impact
- A People-Centric, Values-Informed University Community
- A Modern, Integrated, Sustainable UNB

Some of the action items set out in this Plan present "stretch targets": for example, "Double the annual value of our research grants and contracts" or "grow the student population to 15,000" (an increase of 50%). Deciding how the pursuit of goals such as these would be integrated with the persistence of quality at UNB will be a challenge for the institution over the next decade. The President has been hosting town hall meetings intended to engage members of the UNB community with the dimensions of the plan, with the priorities in it, and with the pros and cons of various options it invites the community to consider.

The notion of "one UNB" galvanized by the academic activities at the Saint John and the Fredericton campuses is a theme of the Strategic Plan. Currently, the presence of two Senates, two Vice-Presidents with academic responsibilities, and two Registrars, for example, goes hand in hand with a single quality assurance policy, a single library, a single Program Review Committee, and a single Dean of Graduate Studies. Facing a somewhat unorthodox arrangement, the external review team tried to learn as much as it could about the inner workings of the bi-campus model, especially as it impinges on quality assurance.

Of the 14 faculties supported on the two campuses, Fredericton is home to Arts, Science, Education, Kinesiology, Law, Management and Nursing, as well as Engineering, Forestry and Environmental Management, and Computer Science (all firsts in Canada), together with the small, interdisciplinary Renaissance College. At the Saint John campus, students can opt for programs in Arts, Business, Science, and Applied Science and Engineering.

There are two other aspects of UNB that merit brief comment in this introduction to the main body of our report. The first is the impact of COVID on the operation of the university and the experience of its students. Like all Canadian universities, UNB has been affected in many ways by the pandemic. At both campuses, COVID has disrupted program delivery and has stimulated the spread of online teaching and learning. It has also delayed or thwarted the introduction of initiatives at all levels from departments through to the Senate and its committees. In the dossiers we examined in some detail (see Section II.B of this report), action plans for recently reviewed units were often said to be impaired or not yet executed. The Acting Vice-President Academic (Fredericton) led a team that developed and updated, as needed, COVID protocols that applied to both campuses. Designed to emphasize safety, accessibility and flexibility, they were highly praised by those we met during the site visit. Some students, however, said that the need to attend classes online had compromised the quality of their education at UNB and also remarked that some of their instructors were not well versed in the pedagogies of online delivery.

UNB's commitment to indigenous peoples and to Truth and Reconciliation is encapsulated in this statement from the Strategic Plan: "Piluwitahasuwawsuwakon[1]—a Wolastoqey word gifted to UNB by Opolahsomuwehs (Elder Imelda Perley) which means 'allowing your thinking to change so that action will follow in a good way toward truth,' and considering and sharing other world views, histories and practices. This commitment lies behind all that we do as a university. In all that we do, we commit to walking this path together, as we are all treaty people." This commitment underlies an action item under "research impact" where we learn that the University, according to its Strategic Plan, wants to "increase recognition and support for indigenous research methods."   In the Strategic Plan's section on transformative education, an action item is "embrace indigenous knowledges." In his opening presentation, the President spoke to these commitments with reference to a "Reconciliation Action Plan." After declaring that UNB intends to hire an Indigenous Lead and to establish an Indigenous Advisory Council, this TRC Strategic Action Plan from 2018 enumerates 10 priorities for UNB, including the metamorphosis of the Mi'kmaq-Wolastoqey Centre into a University-wide centre. Currently that Centre offers a range of First Nations Studies courses in Fredericton and support for indigenous students there. We believe that not all of initiatives in UNB's Truth and Reconciliation Action Plan have been fully realized, in part because of the impact of COVID on the university's activities.

SECTION II: ASSESSMENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW BRUNSWICK'S_POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR ASSESSING ACADEMIC PROGRAMS AND UNITS

A. Progress since the 1st Cycle

To gauge the progress made at UNB in the fifteen years since the First Cycle of QA Monitoring, the external reviewers first of all cite the recommendations found in the 2006 report from the monitoring committee of the time. We note that the official response from UNB to the 2006 report came from the then President. Rather than responding to each of the four recommendations and then commenting on possible ways of implementing them, the President considered previous sections of the report (4.2 and 4.2.1, 4.2.3 and 4.2.4) that prompted each of the recommendations and the possible action items the committee had appended to them

RECOMMENDATION 1: Foster institutional wide commitment to quality assurance.

Possible ways to achieve this include:

- That over the next few years the University focus its efforts on communicating information pertaining to the University's quality assurance policy and the results of and, follow-up to, reviews to the University's immediate community (students, faculty, etc.), government and the general public.
- That the changes brought about by a review (whether done by the university or an accrediting body) be clearly identified.
- That the dissemination of information be proactive and go beyond making the information available online or by request.
- That educational activities be added to a communications strategy.

UNB Response in 2006: Alluding to the account of faculty resistance to and cynicism about QA, discussed in section 4.2.1 of the 2006 report, the President states that UNB was in general agreement with the recommendation and that a workshop offered once a year could fulfil the role that enhanced educational efforts might take in fostering more widespread commitment to quality assurance at the institution.

RECOMMENDATION 2: Improve the continuity of the decision-making process.

Possible ways to achieve this include:

- That the results of programme reviews inform decision making, and in particular decisions related to budgeting and the improvement of programmes/services.
- That the results of programme reviews be integrated into the University's Annual Planning and Budgeting process.
- That the University monitor closely the implementation of its process to ensure adequate follow-up to reviews.
- That decisions as a result of a review not be limited to increasing or decreasing faculty positions or resources, but also encompass changing current practices and procedures.
- That results and follow-up to a review be reported to Senate for discussion and decision, and not simply for information.

UNB Response in 2006: The President referred to section 4.2, which provides context for this recommendation and the items listed. Among the emphases in that section, the Monitoring Committee addressed the need to ensure "adequate follow-up" to link the "review process and the decision making process" and "in particular decisions related to budgeting and the improvement of programmes/services." The President's response refers to "responsibility for this follow up process and [the need to] incorporate all levels of the institution, not just administration." The President also observed that at UNB "the Senate is not responsible for decision making issues related to budgets and resources."

RECOMMENDATION 3: Define the relationship between accreditation reviews and the University's quality assurance reviews.

Possible ways to achieve this include:

- That the University's overarching policy clearly define the relationship between accreditation reviews and the University's quality assurance reviews.
- That, where appropriate, inputs from accreditation reviews and the University's reviews be combined.
- That the timing of both review processes be aligned to reduce redundancy.

UNB Response in 2006: Pointing to Section 4.2.3 of the report, the President was in general agreement with the Monitoring Committee's recommendation and observed that in practice there has been an attempt to coordinate QA and accreditation reviews. He did not explicitly endorse the development of an overarching policy on the relationship between the two kinds of reviews.

RECOMMENDATION 4: Define the review process for articulated programmes.

Possible ways to achieve this include:

- That the college component of articulated programmes be included in the review process.
- That the University and its partner(s) assume shared responsibilities and develop an integrated approach to delivering and evaluating articulated programmes.
- That an inter-institutional coordinating mechanism be established that operates with the authority and autonomy similar to that of a university department.

UNB Response in 2006: UNB approved of the inclusion of the "college component of articulated programmes" in review processes and advocated a system-wide approach. UNB questioned what is implied in the last bullet point above and asked for clarification or elaboration.

External Reviewers' Comments 2021 on Progress Made since the First Cycle Review Report 2006:

The material considered during the 2021 review of QA at UNB did not include a systematic progress report on each of the recommendations just presented, nor did it refer explicitly to the ways in which the institution has addressed the undertakings embedded in the university's response to the First Cycle Report. A general comment in its *Evaluation of the Current Institutional QA Framework* does refer in broad terms, however, to some of the matters the foregoing synopsis covers:

UNB has followed a quality assurance (QA) policy since 2003. Adjustments were made to the policy after the advice provided from the Commission's first round of Quality Assurance Monitoring in 2006. Specifically, the adoption of a seven-year review cycle has helped provide more timely feedback to units, ultimately benefiting students. The QA policy has also evolved to include more emphasis on the assessment of student learning outcomes, engaged in increasingly rigorous accreditation reviews, and improved and standardized the follow-up procedures for units that have been reviewed. The challenges experienced in implementing changes resulting from the 'first cycle' have been related to faculty member buy-in in the process. Many reviews recommend increasing resources available to the units. Unfortunately, financial constraints have not always made it possible for the University to act on these recommendations, creating frustration. The University has since implemented a new academic planning process that includes the

review cycle (November 2018), prioritizing resourcing needs for program growth. Engagement in the process by faculty members has since grown.

The external panel very much appreciates this overview, but presents here some more focussed observations on the changes it perceives in the fifteen-year period from 2006 to 2021. We base our observations both on the documents we analyzed and on the conversations we had during our site visit:

1.   Adjustments to the policy on QA at UNB resulted in the Framework (2008), presented in Appendix to the main document received by the external reviewers. This Framework encompasses

- Guidelines for the Appraisal of Faculties and Departments
- Roles and Responsibilities of the Program Review Committee
- Guidelines for External Reviewers
- Guidelines for a Faculty/Department Self-Study.

We also learned that a newly constituted Program Review Committee has just embarked on a re-evaluation of the 2008 document. We comment in depth on the opportunities inherent in the newest effort to revise the policies and procedures for QA at UNB in a subsequent section of this report.

2.   With respect to recommendation #2 (2006), there remains a need, perhaps not as pronounced as it was in 2006, for more widespread dissemination of information about QA at the University. Meetings with faculty, including those from UNB's Senate, and with students, suggested strongly that more work should be done to acquaint the university community with the reasons for QA, the procedures used, and the outcomes derived from the process. The institution has interpreted the need for linkages between its QA processes and its planning and budgeting processes largely by asserting the critical connection between academic planning and the outcomes engendered by QA processes. Our observation is that there is a strong tendency for that synergy to be acknowledged at the unit level, but a considerably weaker tendency for it to be respected at the senior administrative level. The need for visible "follow-up" was one of the most frequently voiced criticisms of UNB's QA practice. Challenges in getting QA outcomes to the Senate floor, one aspect of "follow-up", are acknowledged by the administration at UNB.

3.   The call, in recommendation #3 (2006), for QA policies that clarify the alignment between QA reviews and accreditation reviews has not yet been heeded, if UNB's policies alone are considered. In one of the dossiers we examined, we did find, however, that the external QA reviewers had had access to a recent accreditation report and the analytical data found in it.

4.   With respect to recommendation #4 (2006), we did not encounter any issues, but admittedly, we did not invite discussion with UNB's representatives of quality assurance involving articulated programmes. We cannot comment on the degree to which progress has been made in dealing with those programmes, either at UNB or within the New Brunswick system. UNB's own evaluation of the current QA Framework says that the number of articulated programs has increased of late.

Our general impression is that in the years between 2008 and 2018, UNB may have found it difficult to gain traction on some of the encouraging words found in the 2006 report.

Commentary on the Quality Assurance Framework at UNB

The external reviewers have studied closely the ways in which UNB handles the need to assure the quality of its programs and has parsed its policy Framework carefully. As noted, this Framework dates from 2008, but in implementing it since then, the institution has discovered most of its strengths, weaknesses and gaps. The very recent formation of a newly constituted Program Review Committee with an agenda that identifies as a top priority a thorough review of the policies and procedures governing QA at UNB is a timely initiative, given the advent of the new Strategic Plan (which does not mention quality by name) and given the opportunity presented by this Second Cycle review. The Acting Vice-President Academic (Fredericton) was one of several people at UNB who strongly encouraged our panel to comment on the current arrangements and to suggest ways in which revised materials would strengthen UNB's commitment to excellence in its programs. We are pleased, then, to provide here some observations on the Framework and the way in which it is administered. Some of what we say here will inform the *Recommendations for Improvement* recorded in the third section of our report.

We applaud UNB for creating in 2008 a sturdy framework for its assessment of the quality of its academic programs and related activities. Among its most conspicuous strengths is the breadth of its scope. We single out in particular the inclusion of academic support units, both those that directly support academic endeavours, such as the offices of the two Registrars, the academic Vice-Presidents, and Student Services, and those that indirectly support academic programs, such as financial services, IT, and research services. The wide purview of quality reviews at UNB has resulted in evaluations, for example, of Facilities Management, the University Secretariat, and the College of Extended Learning in the last seven years. UNB stands out as an institution that has voluntarily embraced a comprehensive roster of QA reviews that erases some of the undesirable distinctions that sometimes obscure the fact that those who work in whatever capacity in an academic institution have important roles to play in contributing to the quality of a student's academic life.

Another strength of the current QA Framework is the coupling of the guidelines per se with ancillary documents such as the detailed description of the roles and responsibilities of the Program Review Committee, helpful specifications for the preparation of self-studies at the unit level, and the advice given to external reviewers for their appraisal of a unit within UNB. Among the documents we reviewed, we commend the comprehensive account of "Documentation Required for a Program Review."

The questions and points immediately below reflect the experience of the reviewers in the QA domain in Canadian PSE institutions and their conscientious attempt to understand the operations of QA at UNB. We offer these considerations, constructively, at a time when UNB is pressing the reset button after a period of several years when, for various reasons, some of the QA processes at the University have been paused. We refer here to aspects of the Framework that should be retained, but should be clarified or re-described. We refer as well to some questionable aspects of the framework that should, in our opinion, be re-considered and perhaps discarded. In a few instances, we recommend that gaps be filled.

1.   It is important to re-affirm that the position of Vice-President Academic (Fredericton) is the Chief QA officer at UNB. This affirmation accords with the common practice in Canada and the status of the Provost as the Chief Academic Officer at UNB.

2.   It is equally important that the forthcoming revisions define and clarify the roles and responsibilities of the part-time QA Coordinator who currently splits time between QA on both campuses and is also administrative support for the Associate VP, Teaching and Learning in Fredericton. It is time for

the position, which we understand is due for re-classification, to be re-animated. We believe that the person in this pivotal position should be accorded professional development opportunities that would enable him or her to interact with and learn from professional QA practitioners elsewhere.

3. We encourage the VPA, who is designated as the Chief Quality Assurance officer at UNB Fredericton, to be more readily visible as an active participant in the QA process and the VPAs on both campuses to play an integral role in creating reciprocity between academic planning and the results of QA reviews.

4. It would be worthwhile if the description of the Program Review Committee contained a section delineating the relationship of that committee to the UNBF's Senate Academic Planning Committee and to the UNBSJ's Senate Academic Planning and Resources Committee.

5. The University should re-visit the role of "summaries" of the external review processes at UNB. These summaries, according to the Guidelines in place at present, are to be submitted when reports about unit reviews proceed to the Senate and to the Board. Even the Program Review Committee receives abridged versions of the full reports, though it may ask for access to the full report if it has questions. We query whether the Senate and its Program Review Committee should receive just a truncated version of the reviewers' reports.

6. Further, there appears to be an internal contradiction between the advice to the external reviewers engaged by UNB to include in their reports a Summary that can be extracted and incorporated into the Final Program Review Report (pp. 14-15) and the fact that the sample Summaries we received were prepared by the QA Coordinator.

7. We find highly questionable the notion that QA reviews at UNB can be precipitated when the institution is about to search for or to re-appoint a dean. In our experience, this rationale for launching a QA review is unprecedented in post-secondary institutions in Canada. Our conjecture is that this provision has rarely if even been used. We recommend that this rationale for the inauguration of a QA review be dropped from the policy at UNB.

8. We support very much the idea that undergraduate and any graduate programs offered would normally be included in the review of a unit. We believe, however, that the stipulation that the two sets of programs should be subject to separate sections in the reviewers' report seems to be more honoured in the breech than the observance.

9. The controversial matter of whether and when self-studies and reviewers' reports should allude to resource constraints and the need for augmented resource levels should be clarified. Some of the Chairs and faculty we interviewed during the site visit asserted strongly that in the absence of such allusions, all the work undertaken in a program review process was futile. Although it is customary to differentiate the roles of the Board (and those to whom it delegates its fiduciary responsibilities) from the roles of the Senate, there is currently some confusion on this point in some circles at UNB. Some of the confusion would be dispelled if there were more transparency about how resource allocation (including academic positions, space, and labs) is or is not related to or informed by results of program reviews.

10. Under the caption, "Reporting Process and Follow-up", the main policy document states that "the Final PR Report is posted on the Program Review Committee's web site." We invite UNB to re-consider this provision. In the first instance, we suggest that the posting appear on the VPA's web site and that it

be outward facing to ensure that QA is seen to be a function of public accountability. As a panel, we came up against a firewall between us and the intranet reports we hoped to look at.

11.   As we observed earlier, UNB is proud of its research intensity. For a time, departments were appraised using a Research Ranking system that now has been discontinued. Since research activity and productivity should continue to be a component of an academic unit's work, we urge UNB, working with its VP Research and its Dean of Graduate Studies and others, to come up with another set of indicators that bear in mind differences between and among units that fall under the SSHRCC umbrella and those that obtain publicly funded grants mainly from NSERC or CIHR.

12.   The Program Review Committee (PRC) currently stipulates that a liaison be appointed to assist a department in preparing its self-study and in engaging with the external reviewers brought in to evaluate its programs. As suggested during our panel's discussions with representatives of UNB, an alternative, that has proven its worth in other jurisdictions, would be for it to invite a person from a unit scheduled for a review in the following year, to participate in the review.

13.   As mentioned in our discussion of the 2006 review, the policy at UNB should address more explicitly than it now does the procedures to be followed when an accreditation review and a scheduled QA review come up more or less simultaneously. This would alleviate the "regulatory burden" such units often experience. Other jurisdictions with which we are familiar (e.g. the Council of Ontario Universities' Quality Council) publish their protocols on this sort of convergence.

14.   UNB is suitably direct about the need to include students not only as beneficiaries of QA process but as participants in them. When the new policy Framework is introduced, it would be prudent for a section to provide advice on how a unit might go about doing that.

15.   When strengthening the "follow-up" procedures in the aftermath of program reviews, we urge the PRC to require the unit, with input from the Dean, to set forth an "Action Plan" that is hinged to timelines and unit priorities and to require regular annual reports to the PRC and the Senate on the Implementation of that Action Plan. This procedure would help to demonstrate the consequences of reviews and might assist UNB in creating more pervasive buy-in, the lack of which was noted in the First Cycle Review Report.

16.   Could the modified QA arrangements at UNB make room for the sharing of self-studies or the dissemination of "best practices" that would assist units?

17.   Could the Office of Institutional Analysis and the Faculty of Graduate Studies, when appropriate, supply common data sets for each review to enable greater comparability between and among units?

18.   As discussed in a subsequent section of this report, we invite UNB to incorporate provisions for the articulation and assessment of learning outcomes in its revised QA Framework.

As UNB progresses toward an updated QA Framework, to be considered by Senate in the spring of 2022, we trust that it will take these suggestions and observations into account.

We move next to our consideration of the four dossiers we studied[1]; two from Saint John and two from Fredericton.

B. Implementation of UNB's Quality Assessment Policies and Procedures for Academic Programs and Units

We are grateful to the Coordinator of QA at UNB for providing the dossiers and ancillary material that we examined ahead of our two-day virtual site visit (Nov. 22/23/2021), allowing us time to study them carefully and to trace their adherence to the internal policies articulated by UNB. These dossiers, along with the policies that govern the significant work of assembling them – work done at the level of these dossiers by external reviewers and by UNB Deans, Chairs, and faculty members – stand at a central juncture in the Quality Assurance process at UNB. We found the dossiers to be exemplars of some of the continuing strengths of QA at UNB on one hand, and on the other, of the several key challenges to this process that we believe must be addressed.

Before reporting on the four dossiers from academic departments that the panel examined in detail, we note that we had originally selected six dossiers for review. One, the dossier reporting on Student Services, we have addressed in an Appendix. We were unable to undertake a review of the dossier for one of the academic units we had selected – the Department of Biology, Fredericton Campus (this QAR was completed in 2015) – because one of its major components, the self-study, remained missing from the materials submitted to the panel. We regret that missed opportunity and remain perplexed that a such a document could not be located.

The panel believes that the four academic dossiers we did study, however, provide a view both sufficiently detailed and sufficiently wide-ranging to afford us an accurate overview of QA practices as they have been enacted over the years since the first cycle at UNB. In order to gain the widest appreciation of the scope of QA activities at UNB in this Second Cycle review, we selected dossiers from both the Fredericton and Saint John campuses; from different Faculties; and from dates of completion ranging from 2014 to 2019. We also sought to review dossiers that included both undergraduate and graduate programs, as well as one that included a major focus on an interdisciplinary curriculum.

Dossiers selected (in order of their date of completion):

- History (Fredericton Campus, 2014)
- Psychology (Saint John Campus, 2014)
- Computer Science (Saint John Campus, 2017)
- Renaissance College (Maggie Jean Chestnut Building, Fredericton Campus, 2019)

The dossiers also included helpful and substantial appendices (in one case, totalling 1056 pages) of relevant ancillary materials. They contained, for example, elements such as enrollment patterns in both graduate and undergraduate programs; individual citations of graduate students, their research topics,

---

[1] We also considered a fifth dossier, which was the review of Student Services; however, our comments on this dossier are described in an addendum to this report, as requested by the MPHEC, and will be shared with UNB for information but will not be part of the final published report. This was done because the second cycle is focused on the cyclical reviews of academic units and not units that indirectly or directly support academic units, such as Student Services.

and funding; students' course evaluations; faculty CVs; course outlines; departmental organization of and participation in conferences; and detailed staffing requests.

Department of History (Fredericton campus)

Like the other dossiers we studied, History's is comprised of three major and related documents: a Self-Study (in the case of History, a 58-page document prepared in 2012-13); an external reviewers' report, prepared in 2014 following a two-day site visit by two reviewers from UBC and University of Victoria respectively; and a departmental response to the external reviewers' report. Both from British Columbia, the selection of external reviewers does not conform to the UNB guideline that suggests there should be one from out of province and one from the local region, but that may well be the result of difficulty in finding suitable external reviewers, as was the case with the external reviewers for the Student Services dossier.

After leaving the home department, each dossier makes its way through the University by means of the work of the Program Review Committee and the two Senates, as described earlier. However, we did not see an Implementation Plan emanating from the recommendations in the external reviewers' report and the History Department's response to that report; and more generally, we were unable to gain a clear sense of follow-up actions to this QA process after 2014. It might be that these gaps relate to the suspension since 2016, mentioned in Section II A above, of the activities of the PRC, and to the apparent lack of substantive discussions of QA reports and recommendations in Senate, as we heard in our online meeting with Senators during our virtual site visit. These elements related to follow-up will be further addressed in our ensuing recommendations.

Woven in among the more salient elements of all three components of the Department of History's QA exercise, there is a recurrent and robust assertion of the Department's excellence in research, teaching, and service, amply documented by the data and statistics provided concerning research ranking and productivity; curriculum development; the impressive contributions of History faculty in administrative positions at UNB; and the equally impressive contributions of this unit to the wider community beyond UNB. Concomitant with these highly positive and well-documented aspects of this Department's excellent performance and ranking, however – within UNB, in the Atlantic region, and indeed, in the country – the dossier also documents an ample measure of pronounced dissatisfaction with the University's lack of attention or response to this Department's assertions concerning its shrinking faculty complement and its repeated request for more teaching resources (in 2014 its faculty complement was down to 13.5 from 15 in 2007), and with what it perceives to be its unsustainably heavy teaching load (a 3/2 load; given the demands of its M.A. and Ph.D. programs and its reduced teaching complement, the Department believes its workload should be adjusted to 2/2).

Alongside these general attributes of this dossier, following are some of its most striking elements:

- Calling attention to the vocation of its discipline, the Department asserts that this exercise is more preoccupied with looking pastwards to its history as a Department – referring repeatedly to the substance and recommendations of its 2006 self-study and external reviewers' reports, culminating in the 2007 QA report – than it is with looking ahead to the Department's future;
- In the same vein, the self-study also warns its readers that the Department adheres to the QA principles that guided the 2006-07 exercise rather than conforming to any more recent changes in QA processes at UNB;

- The self-study alludes to an enterprising initiative, to date not followed up on, regretfully, to devise a province-wide graduate school (in History in this instance) drawing from the programs at several New Brunswick universities. That initiative was envisioned as a possible solution to strains on individual departments to sustain their graduate programs at both the M.A. and Ph.D. levels;
- The Department advises that support for the prominent journal *Acadiensis*, housed in the UNB History Department, is vulnerable and in strong need of more resources;
- Support, similarly, for the Gregg Centre, which conducts military and strategic studies, is identified as a pressing need; and
- The Department regrets its inability to mount a more extensive curriculum that would include, for example, African history or the history of Islam.

Among the most striking challenges emanating from a consideration of this dossier are the following elements:

- There is no implementation plan or ranking of recommendations, nor an account of the actions they require, a timetable for completion, or identification of the actors who will undertake or direct these actions;
- Although the Department carefully considers and responds to the external reviewers' recommendations – many of which confirm the direction of the departmental self-study – there is no evidence or record of what follow-up to these recommendations has occurred;
- Similarly, there is no record of the progress of the reports to the PRC or to Senate; nor is there a record of what their reception was in either venue.

We hasten to add that this disconnect between the substance of all of the QA reports and their follow up might well be the results of the hiatus since 2016, exacerbated by the COVID years of 2020 and 2021, in the functioning of the PRC. As well, there is some suggestion that changes and transitions in senior administration have impeded the more orderly functioning of QA processes at UNB.

Department of Psychology (Saint John Campus)

Begun in 2013 and completed in 2014, the dossier of the Department of Psychology is, remarkably, both the briefest of the four dossiers examined and the most trenchant. UNB succeeded in recruiting one external reviewer locally (from Université de Moncton) and another from out of province (Brandon University). Several features of its self-study stand out:

- The Department in 2014 offered programs in both the Faculty of Arts and Science;
- The Department resolutely pursues an interdisciplinary vocation, with a joint degree in BioPsychology and another program offered jointly with the Department of Social Science; and
- Its academic home in 2014 in both the Faculty of Arts and Science presented several challenges.

Among the most pressing issues documented are the following:

- By a wide margin, in 2014 the Department had the largest class sizes on the Saint John Campus (an average of 69 students per course; the next closest ratio was 34 students per course) and the largest number of students per full-time professor. These facts made (and, we assume, continue to make) teaching subjects like writing in Psychology courses particularly challenging;

- The lack of laboratory resources in a Department dependent on such research spaces has been decried since the last QA process in 2006, when the Department made a case for enhancing its laboratory space; as of 2014 that request had gone unfulfilled; and
- Similarly, the decrease in technical support – from a norm of 36.25 hours per week to an allocation in 2012 of 43 total hours per term – has vitiated the Department's capacity to conduct appropriate lab research or to train its students.

Given these constraints, we were not surprised to see the recommendation from the external reviewers that the Department seriously consider emigrating from one of its homes in the Faculty of Arts to a new location entirely in the Faculty of Science, where, it was felt, the Department might find an environment more suited to its needs for lab space and technical support. In 2014 the Department was seriously considering such a move; that move has now been accomplished. We heard nothing during our meetings with faculty members and with the current and past Chairs of Psychology to suggest that the move has not been successful.

Department of Computer Science (Saint John campus)

At 17 pages, this Department's succinct yet thorough self-study is exemplary of best practices in its presentation of this element of the QA process. We are given clear accounts of the important elements of the Department – its two degrees, its faculty and students, its graduate and undergraduate curricula, its recently developed certificate in Big Data, its research capacity, for example. There is a helpful table that identifies the priorities of the Department's 6 - year Strategic Plan (2017-2023), including a clear implementation schedule.

The self-study is followed by an equally thorough and succinct, if admirably detailed, external reviewers' report of 13 pages, which clearly evidences the reviewers' careful appraisal of the self-study and of their having seized the opportunity of the two-day site visit to further explore this department's history, current state, and aspirations. (Again, both of these reviewers come from other parts of the country, suggesting that there is considerable difficulty at UNB in recruiting the ideal pair of reviewers.)

The Department's 21-page response to the external reviewers' report is the most impressive document among the three that comprise this commendable dossier. Taking into careful consideration each of the 28 recommendations in the external review, the Department provides thorough responses to each of them.

Salient elements in the Department's self-study include:

- An account of its Bachelor of Science's ten-year record of accreditation by the Canadian Information Processing Society, and its new accreditation for the period 2017-23. This account provided the panel with helpful insight into how internal QA processes at UNB align with accreditation processes from external agencies;
- Its account of the top-heavy (and thus problematic) nature of its complement of 6 full time faculty -- 4 Professors and 2 Associate Professors -- and the worrisome reliance on part-time instructors to deliver its programs;
- Its renaming, from the former Department of Computer Science and Applied Statistics to its current designation;

- Its delivery of two degree programs: the B.Sc. in Computer Science, and the BISC (Bachelor of Information Science), as well as its timely addition of a Big Data component to its Certificate in Data Analysis;
- A delineation of the richly interdisciplinary nature of its degree offerings, drawing as they do on Mathematics, Science, and Business, as well as the identification of the wide range of minors available to its students; and
- A data-rich account of its productivity as a research unit, aligned with UNB's aspirations to become a "research powerhouse."

Included in the external reviewers' report, as well as in the Department's response to that document, are some of the most pressing challenges faced by the Department. Chief among these might be this perception, couched as "Recommendation 3" in the external report:

- "Since there has been a competitive spirit between the Fredericton campus and St. John campus, concerted efforts should be made by the faculty and the administrators to bridge this gap and to remove the sense of competitiveness and second rate status to the St. John campus. The reviewers recommend an integrated approach to the two campuses, rather than one campus trying to obtain all resources, benefits and students. Specializations on the two campuses should be unique so that each offers a niche programs on their campus and remove conflicts in student recruitment and vying for the resources. There needs to be interaction between the computer science departments of the two campuses so that a feeling of oneness exists rather than a spirit of competitiveness…. At the moment, it seems as if one campus of the university is in conflict with the other campus although it is the same university."

This commentary seems to the panel to represent one distillation of the contemporary discussion percolating at UNB about "one UNB" rather than two separate campuses.

The Department's response to this major aspect of the external report is striking:

- "The department has tried many approaches over the years to have more collaboration (e.g., agreeing to first 2 years common) but this is difficult to maintain as this requires a two-way reciprocal effort. Anecdotal and actual evidence from many sources over the years lend credence to our perception that there are UNBF CS faculty (not all) that actively demean UNBSJ CS. This has taken the form of UNBSJ students getting negative comments about the merit of their SJ courses when going to UNBF for courses; UNBF Open House CS representatives actively telling parents not to send their children to CS@UNBSJ and that transfers from UNBSJ to UNBF are not possible or are penalised. UNBF CS contacted the UNB Registrar to stop students from registering in BCS in Saint John; UNBF CS Faculty independently funds faculty specific recruiters to "steal" students in our local catchment during promotions in schools, and openly say that our program is not as good as theirs. Indeed, UNBSJ CS has not been regularly consulted when curriculum changes were made that affect the agreed upon common BCS years 1 and 2. It will be hard to have a true collegial and scholarly relationship with CS at UNBF unless this behaviour is stopped. With the appointment of a new Dean of CS at UNBF there are likely opportunities for a normalization of relations over time."

We call attention to these elements in this dossier because they provide one insight into the ways in which the UNB community at the departmental level is engaging with the debate over the relation between the

two campuses. This account from Computer Science runs counter to other, more positive assessments of this relationship.

We were also struck by the following comments from the external reviewers on Learning Outcomes – a key MPHEC focus, but one which does not appear to us to figure as prominently as it should in current QA practices at UNB. Here is "Recommendation 3.2" from the eternal report:

- **"**Learning Outcomes. The program requirements for the Department's programs are appropriately aligned with the learning objectives established for program completion. However, there is no mention to the "learning outcomes" of any of the programs offered by CS UNBSJ. One of the great advantages of learning outcomes is that they are clear statements of what the learner is expected to achieve and how he or she is expected to demonstrate that achievement. Thus, learning outcomes are more precise, easier to compose and far clearer than objectives."

The Department's response to this recommendation is generally positive:

- The reviewers talk several times about setting learning outcomes …. We could/should also archive a number of projects' detailed grading criteria (besides the end products), to help future instructors. This could also be done for other items such as progress reports and proposals. Student consent will be obtained prior to the final report/project being archived and we also anticipate that we will need to seek permission from the Registrar to archive progress reports or project proposals."

Finally, although our impression of the QA practices as they are represented in this dossier are strongly positive, we do reiterate that there is a sparse record of follow up to this dossier's specific recommendations – of their approval or disapproval, ratification or otherwise by the PRC, the Senate, or at other administrative levels.

Renaissance College (Fredericton Campus: Maggie Jean Chestnut Building)

Of the four dossiers the panel examined**,** the Renaissance College documents comprise the most fully articulated dossier we have seen. The "cover letter" introducing the Self Study notes that this component opens with a "descriptive section" and is followed by three documents: a September 2018 "background paper" to provide context and identify issues and questions; a draft strategic plan (February 2019) that outlines "a series of conclusions and recommendations" that have emerged from the review process and that has been "reviewed and supported by various parties at UNB, including senior administration" but that has "not yet been formally approved by UNB's Senate Academic Planning Committee"; and third, a "short update document" (August 2019) that cites changes already underway at Renaissance College. This opening overview leads to the most thorough and complete account we have in these dossiers of both the process and the progress of QA practices at UNB.

Renaissance College (RC), the first program of its kind in Canada when it was founded in 1998, practises the most thoroughgoing example of interdisciplinary education at UNB that we found among the dossiers we examined. Among its most salient elements are the following:

- RC is a leadership program blending a traditional liberal arts education with "leading edge contemporary pedagogical theory";
- RC lays a heavy emphasis on experiential learning, placing many of its students in internships abroad;

- A deliberate (and welcome) emphasis is placed upon learning outcomes, which are carefully articulated and also elaborated in this document's Appendices, and further commented on in the report from the external reviewers;
- RC delivers three programs: a B. Phil. in Interdisciplinary Leadership Studies (its flagship program); a Bachelor of Integrated Studies through UNB's College of Extended Learning; and a Minor or Certificate in Leadership through other Faculties at UNB;
- RC was reviewed and strongly affirmed both in 2004 and in 2012 (the latter by a President's Task Force), resulting in significant positive change and growth in the program's curriculum;
- As of 2018/2019 a reconsideration of RC's current location was underway, as well as of potential partnerships with other entities at UNB; and
- A consideration of the status of RC as UNB's smallest Faculty was being contemplated, with the possibility of reconfiguring RC under a Director rather than a Dean.

As of late 2021, some of these initiatives are already accomplished and some are underway. Regardless of the status of individual recommendations, this dossier provides an excellent model for developing more specific guidelines at UNB for the self-study component of its QA process.

Similarly, the external reviewers' report and the RC response to it are exemplary. The selection of external reviewers, one from Wilfrid Laurier University and one from U.P.E.I., conforms to the guideline concerning local and out-of-province representation. Their report addresses seven areas, dividing each into "strengths" and "concerns" followed by recommendations:

- Program objectives
- Curriculum and Learning Outcomes
- Human resources: faculty and staff
- Students: current and alumni
- Recruitment (marketing and promotion)
- Facilities
- Future Strategic Directions

RC's thorough and considered replies to this report are prefaced by RC's advising (as it does in its self-study) that this QA process (and dossier) differs somewhat from the other three examined in that RC was already in the midst of its own planning process in 2018 when UNB decided that RC should undergo a full QAR. As RC puts it in the opening of its response to the external reviewers' report:

"This particular QAR differed somewhat from the norm in that an extensive review and planning exercise was carried out by Renaissance College in the previous academic year (2018-19) ….This RC review produced a draft Academic Plan for the College that included a number of proposals for changes in curriculum and college operations that the College was preparing to move forward with, subject to approval of the plan by the UNB Senate Academic Planning Committee and Senate itself. In the course of this approval process, members of the Senate Academic Planning Committee noted that the College was due for an external Quality Assurance Review and determined that this QAR should take place before further consideration of the Academic Plan."

RC's redoubled QA effort only seems to us to have been beneficial to the College. The thoroughness and thoughtfulness of these twinned processes are commendable.

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

As is customary in QAM reviews, an appended Table exhibits the alignment of UNB's *Policies and Procedures for Assessing Academic Programs and Units* with the MPHEC's 2016 *Guidelines*. This Table reveals that on the whole the comments on the degree of alignment evident to officials from UNB resemble 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, taken individually and collectively, hold the potential to improve the QA processes at UNB and their alignment with the published MPHEC guidelines.

SECTION III: RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

In this section, we provide recommendations pulled out from the comments and analysis found in Section II .

We recommend that:

1.   UNB re-affirm that the position of Vice-President Academic (Fredericton) is the Chief QA officer at UNB.

2.   In the forthcoming revisions to its Framework, UNB define and clarify the roles and responsibilities of the part-time QA Coordinator who currently splits time between QA on both campuses and is also administrative support for the Associate VP, Teaching and Learning, in Fredericton.

3.   Professional development opportunities be afforded to the QA Coordinator that would enable him or her to interact with and learn from professional QA practitioners elsewhere.

4.   The VPA in Fredericton be more readily visible as an active participant in the QA process and the VPAs on both campuses play an integral role in creating reciprocity between academic planning and the results of QA reviews.

5.   The description of the Program Review Committee contain a section delineating the relationship of that committee to the UNBF's Senate Academic Planning Committee and to the UNBSJ's Senate Academic Planning and Resources Committee.

6.   The University re-visit the role of "summaries" of the external review processes at UNB.

7.   UNB abandon the notion that QA reviews at UNB can be precipitated when the institution is about to search for or to re-appoint a dean.

8.   UNB clarify the stipulation that undergraduate and graduate of programs should be subject to separate sections in the reviewers' reports on academic units that have both.

9.   UNB provide more transparency about how resource allocation (including academic positions, space, and labs) is or is not related to or informed by results of program reviews.

10.   The final program review report he posted publicly on the VPA's web site to ensure that QA is seen to be a function of public accountability.

11.   UNB devise another set of indicators for the evaluation of research and scholarship within an academic unit.

12.   The PRC invite a person from a unit scheduled for a review in the following year to participate in a current review.

13.   The policy at UNB address more explicitly than it now does the procedures to be followed when an accreditation review and a scheduled QA review come up more or less simultaneously.

14.   UNB's new policy Framework is introduced it include advice to units might go about engaging students in QA processes.

15.   As a form of "follow-up" in the aftermath of program reviews, PRC require the unit, with input from the Dean, to create an "Action Plan" that is hinged to timelines and unit priorities and that gives rise to regular annual reports to the PRC and the Senate on the Implementation of the Action Plan.

16.   The University consider ways to share self-studies or the dissemination of "best practices" to assist units in preparing their own documentation.

17.   The Office of Institutional Analysis and the Faculty of Graduate Studies, when appropriate, supply common data sets for each review.

18.   UNB incorporate provisions for the articulation and assessment of learning outcomes in its revised QA Framework.

19.   UNB continue to involve academic and non-academic support units in its quality assurance efforts.

20.   UNB consider the suggestions made in various parts of our report, even though they are not listed as recommendations.

Appendices:

A.   Follow-up action plan submitted by the University of New Brunswick
B.   Table outlining alignment of the University of New Brunswick'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

University of New Brunswick
Quality Assurance Monitoring
Follow-Up Action Plan

Prepared for

**The Maritime Provinces Higher Education Commission
Quality Assurance Monitoring Committee**

July 12, 2022

The University of New Brunswick was pleased to participate in the Maritime Provinces Higher Education Commission (MPHEC) second cycle of the Monitoring of Maritime Universities' Quality Assurance Frameworks.

We extend our sincere thanks to the members of the Review Panel, Dr. Ron Bond and Dr. Neil Besner, for their thoughtful engagement in the process. Their insight and recommendations are timely and will provide expert guidance as UNB's Academic Program Review Committee (PRC) continues to update and strengthen the University's QAR framework.

As was acknowledged by the Review Panel, UNB has a strategic vision that is marked by ambitious goals. These goals include growing our student population, developing interdisciplinary and innovative programming, and increasing our research productivity along with the annual value of our research grants and contracts. These have been correctly identified by the Review Panel as "stretch targets" – they are meant to challenge and encourage the University to be bold. We are expanding our vision of how we produce knowledge and approach knowledge transfer in our University and in our community. It is essential that a robust quality assurance framework is integrated into the pursuit of these goals to guide the development of outstanding academic programs that meet the needs of our students and stakeholders.

The Review Panel also acknowledged the uniqueness of UNB's bi-campus model and the goal to operate as "one UNB" with two campuses. Part of the move toward enhanced collaboration between the campuses is the adoption of a Provost model. UNB will begin transitioning to a Provost model over the course of the upcoming academic year. During this transition period, the Vice-President Academic (Fredericton) will remain the Chief QA officer at UNB. It is intended that the Provost will assume the role of Chief QA officer and Chief Academic Officer.

The Provost will oversee programs, Departments and Faculties on both campuses in a structured departure from a two-campus model and the difficulties that has created in the past. This transition presents many opportunities that will support quality programming and represents our effort to move in a positive direction of working better together.

As is acknowledged in the reviewers' report, UNB, like every other university in Canada, is emerging from the COVID-19 pandemic. While this has created a disruption in our QA activities, it has also provided us with an opportunity, coupled with the recommendations of the recent QAM review, to engage in a detailed assessment of current practices and process improvements.

The pandemic, coupled with significant changes in senior academic leadership and administrative support, resulted in the Program Review Committee being dormant for several years. In summer 2021, the Program Review Committee was re-established and has met regularly over the past year. It has been fully involved in the QAM process, in reviewing the University's QAR processes and guidelines and in responding to the QAM reviewers' report and related recommendations. There has been considerable focus on clearly linking the QAR process with the University's academic planning processes. The engagement of the PRC committee will augment transparency and accountability by ensuring faculty ownership and stewardship of QAR and accountability to recommendations that flow from the reviews through our academic planning committees to the Senates.

We are grateful to have the recommendations of the review panel to help guide us as we begin reaffirming this commitment. In the following table, we will address each of review panel's recommendations individually.

Sincerely,

Kathy Wilson, RN, PhD
Vice-President Academic

The Review Panel recommends that:	UNB Response
1. UNB re-affirm that the position of Vice-President Academic (Fredericton) is the Chief QA officer at UNB.	The current two-Senate structure at UNB necessitates that the Vice-President Academic (Fredericton), as the Chief QA officer at UNB, and the Vice-President Saint John be integrally involved in QAR. The VPA (Fredericton) as the Chief QA officer is chair of the PRC and the academic planning committee which is accountable to the Fredericton Senate. The Vice-President Saint John and the Dean of the Graduate Studies are standing members of this committee. The Vice-President Saint John leads the QAR processes on that campus and is chair of the academic planning and resource committees on the SJ campus that is accountable to the SJ Senate. The Vice-President Academic (Fredericton) will remain the Chief QA officer as outlined in UNB's Quality Assurance Review Manual with direct involvement of the Vice-President Saint John until the transition to the Provost at which time it is expected that the Provost will assume the role of Chief QA officer and Chief Academic Officer.
2. In the forthcoming revisions to its Framework, UNB define and clarify the roles and responsibilities of the part-time QA Coordinator who currently splits time between QA on both campuses and is also administrative support for the Associate VP Academic, Teaching and Learning, in Fredericton.	A definition of the QA Coordinator role will be added to UNB's QA framework, clarifying roles and responsibilities. This role will necessarily expand with the arrival of the Provost, who will have responsibility for all undergraduate academic programming at UNB. The QA Coordinator will maintain a relationship with QA point people in each faculty and department to facilitate the sharing of information and the adherence to timelines.
3. Professional development opportunities be afforded to the QA Coordinator that	The position description of the QA co-ordinator, including the requirements for the role to be bi-campus, and the resources required

would enable him or her to interact with and learn from professional QA practitioners elsewhere.	to support QAR at UNB will be thoroughly reviewed during the transition to the Provost. The QA Coordinator will be supported to participate in professional development activities and gain further knowledge from other QA professionals. This will be beneficial for the role and will ensure that UNB is up to date with best practices. UNB would appreciate guidance from MPHEC and the reviewers on future/potential professional development activities and opportunities that would facilitate connection with other professional QA practitioners.
4. The VPA in Fredericton be more readily visible as an active participant in the QA process and the VPAs on both campuses play and integral role in creating reciprocity between academic planning and the result of QA reviews.	The Vice-President Academic (Fredericton) will take on a more visible and meaningful role within UNB's QAR framework as well as the Program Review Committee. This will be evident through increased and enhanced material regarding QA being made available on the VPA website (or where appropriate), regular reporting to Senates, engagement with the PRC, and communication with Faculties and Departments throughout the QA process. As noted by the reviewers, UNB's QA process was negatively affected by the COVID-19 pandemic. As UNB emerges from crisis management, the QA Coordinator will need support to be able to work closely with the VPA and the incoming Provost to realize this commitment.
5. The description of the Program Review Committee contain a section delineating the relationship of that committee to the UNBF's Senate Academic Planning Committee and to the UNBSJ's Senate Academic Planning and Resources Committee.	UNB's QAR Policies and Procedures clearly define and outline the relationships of these committees. Each of these committees performs important roles ensuring that the QA process is followed in accordance with UNB's policies and procedures before reviews and recommendations appear before Senates. Clearly defining these roles and responsibilities, and how they relate to each other, will enhance understanding of the QA process,

	increase awareness of QA in general, and increase transparency.
6. The University re-visit the role of "summaries" of the external review processes at UNB.	The Program Review Committee agrees with the panel and is looking at more explicit ways to characterize and define summaries to ensure a more meaningful synopsis of the external site visit.
	These include the addition of:
	- a 1-2 page Executive Summary;
	- the listing of previous actionable items, and progress on them to date;
	- a clear and transparent process outlining how to respond to reviewers, including timelines;
	- a response to each recommendation, with timelines attached as appropriate.
7. UNB abandon the notion that QA reviews at UNB can be precipitated when the institution is about to search for or to re-appoint a dean.	It is agreed that commencing a QAR prior to a decanal search or reappointment is not a favourable time and may create challenges.
	The QA review process is not used in practice as a mechanism for decision-making in the appointment or re-appointment of a dean. Our policies and procedures will be updated to remove references to sharing review results with search committees along with references to any connection between the QA review process and/or review panel and the decanal search process.
8. UNB clarify the stipulations that undergraduate and graduate programs should be subject to separate sections in the reviewers' reports on academic units that have both.	The QAR policies and procedures as well as the guidelines for external reviewers stipulate that the review differentiate undergraduate and graduate sections in their report. This language does exist in our guidelines, however, it should be strengthened so that it is clear that two sections are expected where applicable. This will enable the review to demonstrate successes and weaknesses more clearly.
9. UNB provide more transparency about	Resource allocation depends on multiple factors/metrics that align with

how resource allocation (including academic positions, space, and labs) is or is not related to or informed by results of program reviews.	academic planning, university-wide prioritization, intersection with the Strategic Vision, and the budgeting cycle. While feedback from reviewers may highlight areas for consideration related to resource allocations for programs that may assist the university in its long-range planning, we strongly assert that it is beyond the scope of the QAR to make recommendations that would be expected to direct resource allocation. This should be made clear during the program review process.
10. The final program review report be posted publicly on the VPA's website to ensure that QA is seen to be a function of public accountability.	The website of the Office of the Vice-President Academic (Fredericton) is in the process of being redesigned and will be moved to a SharePoint site in keeping with best practices surrounding information architecture. The Quality Assurance Review Processes and documentation will all be housed on this new SharePoint site. The review reports along with the responses will then be able to be accessed from there. Protocol/processes for accessing and using this information will be developed. This will be transitioned to the Office of the Provost. We agree that, in addition to this internally facing information, abbreviated information related to UNB's QA process and program reviews needs to be publicly accessible to demonstrate our commitment to quality assurance, our responsiveness to recommendations, our commitment to transparency, and our immediate plans for future growth in alignment with our Strategic Vision. We will engage in a review of practices at other universities to determine the best approach/format for such QA-related information to be disseminated to the public.
11. UNB devise another set of indicators for the evaluation of research and scholarship within an academic unit.	The VPA, supported by the PRC, will work with the Office of Research Services and the Vice-President (Research) to establish a new set of indicators. The Office of Research Services has acquired UNIWEB software and is currently piloting a new process which will allow faculty

	to enter and manage information related to their research and academic activities. The University of Ottawa provides an example of how this software can be and is used. This will be incorporated into the QA process when appropriate, if applicable.
12. The PRC invite a person from a unit scheduled for a review in the following year to participate in a current review.	As chair of the PRC, the VPA agrees with this recommendation and can see all the benefits of appointing an outside participant. Terms of Reference will be adapted to include having each faculty and department identify a QA representative/champion who will liaise with the PRC and participate in a current year review. This may be incorporated in the QA Coordinator role, who would then help facilitate that connection.
13. The policy at UNB address more explicitly than it now does the procedures to be followed when an accreditation review and a scheduled QA review come up more or less simultaneously.	The VPA with the PRC is currently working on a procedure/process that will ensure there is a comparison of criteria for various program accreditations that are aligned with the QAR process that clearly specifies the requirements for self-study and the timing of the review. This process should specify any documentation that can be used in place of the self-study documentation or any further documentation needed beyond accreditation documentation.
14. When UNB's new policy Framework is introduced, it include advice as to how units might go about engaging students in QA processes.	UNB's QAR process will be reviewed to consider how to more proactively include students in the process. However, we also acknowledge the difficulty in maintaining and managing student participation. It is expected that students will be engaged in informing specific items related to student experience in the self-study and should be consulted in elements of the self-study that relate to student experience. This expectation will be added to our guidelines. A process will be outlined that clearly indicates that units will be required to consult with students

	in the development of the self-study as it pertains to student experience, that students should participate in the review process, and that students should be given the opportunity to provide comments on the reviewers' recommendations. It will also clarify that students should meet external reviewers without faculty present.
15. As a form of "follow-up" in the aftermath of program reviews, PRC require the unit, with input from the Dean, to create an "Action Plan" that is hinged to timelines and unit priorities and that gives rise to regular annual reports to the PRC and Senate on the Implementation of the Action Plan.	Follow-up of Faculty Action Plans, submitted to the VPA by the Dean must be monitored thoroughly to ensure accountability for timelines and that reports are acted upon and program improvement is realized. The VPA will have responsibility for oversight of the process. This will be stipulated in the QAR policies.
16. The University consider ways to share self-studies or the dissemination of "best practices" to assist units in preparing their own documentation.	This recommendation will need to be reviewed as the self-studies in the current guidelines are considered confidential. More importantly, we need to ensure that the guidelines for writing self-studies are comprehensive and reflect best practices.
17. The Office of Institutional Analysis and the Faculty of Graduate Studies, when appropriate, supply common data sets for each review.	There are opportunities for more proactive participation and communication between the PRC, the School of Graduate Studies, and the Office of Institutional Analysis. When a QA review is initiated by the VPA to a unit, the VPA will ensure that the Office of Institutional Analysis and the School of Graduate Studies as appropriate are included in that communication so that information gathering can be aligned within and across the institution and inform the QAR process.
18. UNB incorporate provisions for the articulation and assessment of learning outcomes in its revised QA Framework.	The university supports the use of learning outcomes across its programs. Learning outcomes are incorporated into program curricula at various levels across the university. Some of our programs have fully developed frameworks that embed learning outcomes that guide how concepts are addressed and assessed across programs. Others

	integrate learning outcomes within the curriculum but to a lesser degree. We are well positioned to expand the use of learning outcomes and build on our success in this area with the support of our Centre of Enhanced Teaching and Learning in Fredericton and the Teaching and Learning Centre in Saint John.
19. UNB continue to involve academic and non-academic support units in its quality assurance efforts.	Both academic and non-academic support units must be involved in the QAR process as these units all work closely together to ensure the success of the student. These practices are currently employed by UNB and are being refined to ensure our units follow our internal QAR process and understand its importance. While we support QAR for non-academic units, we believe that this process should be under the University QAR processes and not incorporated into MPHEC reviews.
20. UNB consider the suggestions made in various parts of our report, even though they are not listed as recommendations.	All recommendations and suggestions will be considered to ensure best practices are followed.

MPHEC 2016 Guidelines	Guideline met by institution? Policy Practice (Yes/No/Somewhat)		Comments (From Institution)	Comments (From Panel)
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 framework[1] is guided by:				
2.1 The pursuit of continuous improvement;	Yes	Yes	The University of New Brunswick is committed to providing a high quality, student-focused, best practice-based education and is continually seeking improvement.	UNB's longstanding commitment to these commendable goals is evident, although there remains substantial work to be done to continuously improve its QA policies and practices, as UNB acknowledges and as we have outlined in the Report.
2.2 A focus on learning;	Yes	Yes		Agreed
2.3 The necessity of encompassing all functions and units of an institution;	Yes	Yes		Agreed
2.4 Accountability and transparency; and	Yes	Somewhat	UNB is committed to a transparent quality assurance process. While the processes outlined mechanisms for the Review reports flow through Senates and the discussion around these reports to be available on the UNB website through Senate Minutes, this practice has not been regularly enacted since 2017.	The panel has noted the gap since 2017, but we believe that the work currently underway at UNB to revise the Terms of Reference of the PRC (Program Review Committee), along with other elements of the QA process, is addressing this issue positively.
2.5 The documentation and implementation of policies, guidelines and procedures.	Yes	Yes	UNB's policies and guidelines are available on the UNB website. The Vice-President Academic (Fredericton) is responsible for Quality Assurance and organizes the process.	The panel believes that it is vital that the Vice President Academic become more prominently responsible for and involved in Quality Assurance at UNB. The process of clearly investing the position of the VPA with this responsibility is underway.
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	The University of New Brunswick is focused on providing a transformative educational experience for its students. The Quality Assurance Review process provides an opportunity to continually evolve programming to best serve students, preparing them for employment or further study.	Agreed
3.2 Accounts for the full range of its offerings and activities;	Yes	Yes		Agreed

MPHEC 2016 Guidelines	Guideline met by institution? Policy Practice (Yes/No/Somewhat)		Comments (From Institution)	Comments (From Panel)
3.3 Links to the institution's strategic and other plans;	Somewhat	Somewhat	UNB is currently navigating an all-Faculty Strategic Visioning exercise and is implementing a new, University-wide Strategic Plan. Once each Faculty has completed and approved their vision, the University will then update policies and practice to best create a pathway to achieving those stated objectives. The University is also working on updating its academic planning process, part of which will include incorporating recommendations from QA reviews into programming. The Quality Assurance Review Policies and Procedures Manual is scheduled to be updated to reflect the updated Strategic Plan for the University of New Brunswick and the revised academic planning process in the 2021-22 academic year.	It is clear to the panel that this work is underway. We have commented in our report on the specific QA elements most strongly in need of addressing, such as promulgating the draft Academic Plan and linking it to the new Strategic Plan; requiring clear action and implementation plans for Departmental recommendations; and instituting a more robust schedule of follow-up reports and tracking procedures. Our understanding is that the revised Framework will be considered by UNB's Senates in the spring of 2022.
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		Agreed
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		Agree in part. We call in our report for a strengthened system of articulating learning outcomes and the ways in which students are expected to demonstrate that they have achieved those outcomes.

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		At the level of Departments that have undergone QA reviews, these questions are being addressed. More will have to be done to ensure that Departmental results and recommendations are carried forward consistently to senior levels and acted upon as appropriate.
second, "Is it doing what it should be doing?"	Yes	Yes		Yes.

In answering the above questions, the university examines:

4.1 Inputs; and	Yes	Yes		Agreed
4.2 Outputs.	Yes	Yes		Agreed. A sharper focus on outcomes, outputs and follow-up procedures would be beneficial.

5. STANDARD[2] FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF ACADEMIC PROGRAMS/UNITS

5.1 Central Components

To assess academic programs/units[3], an institutional quality assurance framework would, at a minimum:

MPHEC 2016 Guidelines	Guideline met by institution? Policy Practice (Yes/No/Somewhat)		Comments (From Institution)	Comments (From Panel)
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	The Vice-President Academic (Fredericton) oversees the Quality Assurance Process.	The Vice President Academic's oversight for the QA process is critical; the current work being done on QA policy enshrines this principle.
is accountable to the institution's decision-making bodies.	Yes	No	The Vice-President Academic (Fredericton), Chair of the Program Review Committee, meets and provides regular reports to UNB's Senate through the Academic Planning (F) and Academic Planning & Resources (SJ) Committees of the Senates. While the reporting structures are set out in the policy and guidelines, this practice has not been operationalized over the last few years due to administrative and staff turnover.	The Panel has noted this gap and addressed it in its report. UNB has recognized this lacuna and is at present working towards more fully operationalizing its QA policies.
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	VPA is chair of the Program Review Committee, and Dean's Council, both of which are key components of UNB's QAR Process. Program reviews are initiated through the VPA's office and organized within the units.	Because the PRC is such a key committee in the QA process, the VP Academic, as Chair, will have to ensure that the current revisions to the terms of reference of the PRC successfully reinvigorate the work of this group.
5.1.3 Define the assessment criteria	N/A (see section 5.2 below).			
5.1.4 Require a self-study,	Yes	Yes		Agreed
involving faculty and students participating in the program or unit.	Yes	Yes		Agreed
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		There is substantial input from students in the self-studies the Panel examined.
The self-study is structured according to the defined assessment criteria, and is both descriptive and analytical.	Yes	Yes		Agreed
When and where appropriate, the results of accreditation processes may be included, and/or substituted for this component, or a portion thereof.[4]	Yes	Yes	QAR reviews are occasionally deferred to accommodate accreditation processes; depending upon the breadth and depth, the accreditation process can be substituted for a QAR, provided that it is of sufficient rigour. The University makes every effort to align accreditation and QA cycles to alleviate repetition of document production at the unit level. Units that participate in accreditation processes can use components of those reports to complete sections of the self-study.	The Panel did see evidence of alignment between external accreditation and internal QA practices (see, eg, the Computer Science dossier) but there might be further work done to more clearly and efficiently define the relationship between these processes.
5.1.5 Require an external review component	Yes	Yes		
with a sufficiently comprehensive site visit and written report,	Yes	Yes	A Guideline document is given to the External reviewers in advance of the site visit which sets out what the University requires for its the report.	Agreed

MPHEC 2016 Guidelines	Guideline met by institution?		Comments (From Institution)	Comments (From Panel)
	Policy (Yes/No/Somewhat)	Practice		
carried out by at least two experts external to the institution, with at least one coming from outside Atlantic Canada.	Somewhat	Yes	UNB requires 2 – 3 external reviewers, one of which must be from outside the Atlantic Region (this is the University's longstanding practice and will be included in the planning modifications to the QA Policy).	This requirement (re: distribution of external reviewers) was not met in several of the dossiers the panel examined. Best efforts of UNB notwithstanding, there is evidence that this requirement can be difficult to meet.
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	If the external review is a QAR of a Faculty, the Dean assists the reviewer. If the QAR is for a department, then the assigned member would be the Chair or Director of that unit.	Yes. (See, eg, the Renaissance College QAR, and the Dean's role therein.)
As appropriate, the results of accreditation may be included, and/or substituted for this component, or a portion thereof.[4]	Yes	Yes		(See comment 5 boxes above)
5.1.6 Ensure the participation of students through:				
membership on committees dealing with program review and quality assurance;	Yes	Somewhat	Ideally, we would have one undergraduate and alternate undergraduate representative, along with one graduate and alternate graduate student as members. A sustained effort is made to reach out to students to encourage their participation in this process and there is a fairly high success rate. However, there have been some review committees that were not able to attract student volunteers to fill all four positions.	Agreed; this difficulty might well have been exacerbated recently by COVID.
participation in surveys designed to collect data on a number of student and graduate outcomes;	Yes	Yes		Agreed – see the Appendices included with dossiers
and mandatory student course evaluations.	Yes	Yes		Also included in Appendices
5.1.7 Incorporate the participation of faculty not directly involved in the reviewed program (or discipline or unit).	Yes	Yes	During an external review the entire university community is invited to a meeting/luncheon where they are able to engage with the external reviewers. The university community is also provided with an email address wherein they are able to submit (confidentially) any feedback they think would be helpful to the reviewers.	We believe there is opportunity for the University community to consult, although this policy needs further clarification.
5.1.8 Enable the participation of the wider network of stakeholders, such as employers, graduates, professional associations, the local community, etc.	Yes	Yes	Where applicable, external stakeholders are included and encouraged to provide feedback during review processes.	Agreed
5.1.9 Define the follow-up mechanisms, which include				
the procedures	Yes	Yes		Agreed
areas of responsibility	Yes	Yes		Agreed
expected timelines,	Yes	Yes		Agreed

MPHEC 2016 Guidelines	Guideline met by institution? Policy (Yes/No/Somewhat)	Practice	Comments (From Institution)	Comments (From Panel)
along with provisions for follow-up monitoring of progress (usually involving the Senate).	Yes	Yes	Follow ups from reviews are included in the academic planning exercises that Faculties participate in cyclically and come through Senates for approval. The University is aware that this is an opportunity for improvement, and consideration is being given to setting up a tracking method to facilitate acting on recommendations. UNB current has an Academic Development Fund that unit heads can apply for annually to support activities that benefit the academy, such as funding to act on recommendations from an external review.	The panel strongly endorses this recommendation that follow-up procedures need to be more consistently practiced. This clearly constitutes an opportunity for improvement.
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	Somewhat	The average cycle length at UNB is 7 years. UNB needs to establish a way to better track deferred QARs, which will be addressed in the updates to the Quality Assurance Policy planned for 2021-22.	The panel strongly endorses the need for better tracking.
5.1.11 Assess newly established programs or units after the first cohort has graduated.	Yes	Somewhat	As noted above, some units have a deferred QAR process due to accreditation cycles, which can affect reviews of new programs. Occasionally, a new program will complete its first cohort a year before the unit is due to have a full QA Review and the review of that new program will be included in the unit review.	Agreed. We saw a dossier in which this occurrence was reported.
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		Agreed
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.	Yes	Yes	The University regularly creates press releases about its academic programming innovations. Senate Minutes, where quality assurance frameworks and decisions are discussed in detail, are available to the general public through the University Secretariat's website.	The panel believes that these communication policies need to be more consistently practiced.
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.	Yes	Yes	Information about UNB's quality assurance review program is available on the University's website. Review schedules are posted internally but are accessible to all units. Detailed communications are sent to units about to undergo a review and throughout the review and follow up process. Units may choose to share this information with external stakeholders.	Agreed; however, UNB might wish to ensure that these practices are consistently followed.
5.1.14 Define the provisions to assess the framework periodically, normally at the end of each assessment cycle	No	Somewhat	Although not included in the current iteration of UNB's QA policy, the PRC periodically reviews the policy and makes updates. The planned updates to the QA policy will include a review timeline, bringing this policy in line with UNB's proposed Policy on Policies. This will be included as a part of the planned updates for the Policy in 2021-22.	This is vital work for the PRC to undertake, to be completed in 2021-22.
and table the resulting report with decision-making bodies within the institution (e.g., Senate, Board of Governors).	Yes	Yes	All academic policy changes are approved by the campus Academic Planning Committees, then the Senates and the Board.	This practice should be followed consistently.

MPHEC 2016 Guidelines	Guideline met by institution? Policy Practice (Yes/No/Somewhat)		Comments (From Institution)	Comments (From Panel)
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 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. 4. 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).				
5.2 Assessment Criteria				
Each university establishes assessment criteria for reviewing the quality of its programs/units. The assessment criteria are				
comprehensive in their range and in their use across programs and units;	Yes	Yes	See Appendix A	Appendix A of the August 26, 2021 UNB report on its QA policies includes citation of the MPHEC guidelines for assessment criteria as embedded in its current Framework
they have a strong focus on students and	Yes	Yes		Agreed
reflect the institutional mission and values.	Yes	Yes		Agreed
They are published and include at a minimum the following:				
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		This work is underway in the restructuring of the PRC and the articulation of its practices.
5.2.2 The achievement by students and graduates of the learning outcomes in light of				
the program's stated goals,	Yes	Yes		Agreed, but this practice needs to be strengthened as per our comments in Recommendation 18.
the degree level expectations, and,	Yes	Yes		Agreed but please see comment directly above.
where relevant, the standards of any relevant regulatory, accrediting or professional body;	Yes	Yes		Agreed but please see comment directly above.
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		Agreed but please see comment directly above.
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		As delineated in the Panel's commentary on Learning Outcomes at UNB, more consistent definition, implementation, and measurement of learning outcomes at several levels – individual course outlines and assignments; departmental levels; and Faculty levels – needs to take place.

MPHEC 2016 Guidelines	Guideline met by institution? Policy (Yes/No/Somewhat)	Practice	Comments (From Institution)	Comments (From Panel)
to meet the needs of the existing and anticipated student enrolments;	Yes	Yes		Please see comment directly above.
5.2.5 The continuing performance of the faculty, including				
the quality of teaching and supervision, and	Yes	Yes		These qualities (in the three boxes below) are cited and measured in the documents found in the appendices to the dossiers.
their continuing progress and achievement in research, scholarship or creative activity, and	Yes	Yes		(As above.)
professional activity in light of the program under review;	Yes	Yes		(As above)
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		The panel saw clear evidence of evaluation of these kinds of units in the Student Services dossier we examined.
5.2.7 The effectiveness and appropriateness of the use made of				
the existing human resources	Yes	Yes		These elements were difficult to measure in any thoroughgoing way, given the documentation provided by UNB. We have no reason to doubt that these resources are adequate; however, we note the widespread perception at the Departmental level that generally, resources are increasingly thin and strained across the institution.
the existing physical resource	Yes	Yes		Please see comment directly above.
the existing technological resources	Yes	Yes		Please see comment directly above.
the existing financial resources; and	Yes	Yes		Please see comment directly above.
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	Somewhat	Somewhat	The University's academic policies are made available to reviewers, should they wish to consider them. However, the specific admission and promotions requirements for the program/unit under review are considered as a part of the broader review. Units that have articulated programs may request that a reviewer consider components of programs that are integral, which may include transfer credits.	The panel's perception is that policies and practices related to entities such as Admissions are functioning smoothly across both campuses.

MPHEC 2016 Guidelines	Guideline met by institution? Policy / Practice (Yes/No/Somewhat)		Comments (From Institution)	Comments (From Panel)
of the governing and decision making structures of the academic unit; and	Yes	Somewhat	Although reviewers may choose to comment on the governing structures of the unit, it has not traditionally been included as a component in unit reviews. Comment on organizational structure is more likely to occur in the review of proposals for novel programs. Units may identify an issue to a reviewer for comment that references governance structure as part of their guidelines for the external review report.	Agreed. (Except for the dossier from Student Services, which does address governance structures extensively.)
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		These indicators are provided both in the dossiers and in the dossiers' appendices.
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		Agreed

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		Agreed.
6.2 The capacity of the unit or program to deliver the service or support which its mandate defines;	Yes	Yes		Agreed.
6.3 The appropriateness and efficiency of the use made of				
the existing human resources	Yes	Yes		Agreed
the existing physical resource	Yes	Yes		Agreed
the existing technological resources	Yes	Yes		Agreed

MPHEC 2016 Guidelines	Guideline met by institution? Policy Practice (Yes/No/Somewhat)		Comments (From Institution)	Comments (From Panel)
the existing financial resources; and	Yes	Yes		Agreed
6.4 The contribution of the unit or program to other aspects of the institution's mission and to the student experience.	Yes	Yes		Agreed
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		These policies are articulated in various UNB documents (such as the August 26, 2021 document, "University of New Brunswick Quality Assurance Monitoring Progress Report"). But the panel notes that UNB is at present (2021-22) in the midst of a major review of its QA policies and practices that will undoubtedly strengthen its QA framework.
GUIDELINES FOR THE PREPARATION OF THE SELF-STUDY				
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		Agreed, but please note proviso directly above. The proviso applies to al of the boxes below.
GENERIC TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR EXTERNAL REVIEWERS	Yes	Yes		Agreed
COMMON STUDENT COURSE EVALUATION FORM	Yes	Yes		Agreed
TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR RELEVANT COMMITTEE(S)	Yes	Yes		Agreed
GUIDELINES FOR THE REVIEW OF PROGRAMS THAT ARE ALSO SUBJECT TO ACCREDITATION	Yes	Yes		Agreed

**2nd Cycle of the Quality Assurance Monitoring Process** **Site visit to the University of New Brunswick November 22 and 23, 2021**
**Day 1**
Time slot	**Participants**
11:00-11:15	**Review Panel Set-Up** Ron Bond – Former Provost, University of Calgary; PSEConsultant; QA practitioner Neil Besner-Former Provost, University of Winnipeg;Professor Emeritus; QA practitioner Catherine Stewart-Chief Executive Officer, MPHEC
11:15-11:45	Dr. Paul Mazerolle, President, UNB
11:55-1:10	Dr. Kathy Wilson, Acting Vice-President (Academic) And Dr. Petra Hauf Vice-President, Saint John
12:55-1:10	Health Break
2:20-2:50	Kimberly Macklin, QA coordinator
2:50-3:30	**Review Panel Lunch Break**
3:30-4:10	Dr. Kevin Englehart, Acting Dean, School of Graduate Studies Dr. David Magee, Vice-President (Research)
4:20-5:20	**Program Review Committee**: Kathy Wilson, Acting VP Academic, Co-Chair Petra Hauf, VP Saint John, Co-Chair Kevin Englehart, Acting Dean of SGS, Co-Chair Fam Loufti Arts UNBSJ Jim Kieffer, SASE UNBSJ Carmen Gill, Arts UNBF Rene Malenfant, Science UNBF Michael Fleming, Computer Science UNBF Jeremy Noble, Kinesiology UNBF James MacKenzie, Libraries UNBF Joshua Makarov, Student UNBF Kim Macklin, QA Coordinator
5:30-6:20	**Senate Representatives:** Daniel Downes, UNBSJ Paula Kristmanson, UNBF Sandra Bell, UNBSJ Sue Blair, UNBF Rebecca McKay, UNBSJ
**Day 2**
10:45-11:00	**Review Panel – set up** Ron Bond Neil Besner Catherine Stewart
11:00-11:45	**Academic Support Units that contribute to the quality of academic programs:** Leslie Balcom, Librarian Shawna Bergin, Registrar UNBF Wahkuna Lisik, Registrar UNBSJ Stephen Dove, Manager, Office of Institutional Analysis UNBF

11:55-12:40	Dr. Lisa Todd, Chair, History Department Dr. Gary Waite, Former Chair, History Department Dr. Carol Nemeroff, Dean, Renaissance College Dr. Paul Howe, Former Dean, Renaissance College
12:50-1:35	Josee Tasse, Acting Chair, Computer Science Department Lisa Best, Chair, Psychology Department
1:35-1:50	**Health Break**
1:50-2:35	**Faculty from Renaissance College and History Department (2 to 3 from each)**: John Valk (Renaissance College) Mira Bacharova (Renaissance College) Thomas Mengel (Renaissance College)
2:45-3:30	**Faculty from Departments of Psychology and Computer Science (2 to 3 from each)**: Katherine McGuire (Psychology) Mary Anne Campbell (Psychology) Owen Kaser (Computer Science) Janet Light (Computer Science)
3:40-4:25	Sara Rothman, Senior Director, Academic Success Angela Garnett, Senior Director, Residence Ruth Buckingham, Senior Director, Finance and Operations
4:30-5:00	**Lunch Break**
5:00-6:00	**Student Panel:** MacKenzie Smith (History) Paul Adams (History)
6:00-6:30	**Panel only – Debrief**
6:30-7:00	**Closing Session** Dr. Kathy Wilson, Acting Vice-President (Academic) Petra Hauf, VP Saint John, Co-Chair Kevin Englehart, Acting Dean of SGS, Co-Chair Fam Loufti Arts UNBSJ Jim Kieffer, SASE UNBSJ Carmen Gill, Arts UNBF Rene Malenfant, Science UNBF Michael Fleming, Computer Science UNBF Jeremy Noble, Kinesiology UNBF James MacKenzie, Libraries UNBF Joshua Makarov, Student UNBF Kim Macklin