Sheridan Journey

PSE Quality
ENGAGEMENT TEAM

White Paper

Sumon Acharjee, Anas Alahdab, Jennifer Chambers, Joan Condie, Lori Elliot, Nagwa Abou El-Naga, James Fletcher, Cathryn Glover, Elaine Hanson, Jacquie Manes, Amira Masud, Charlene Pineda-Fischer, Susan Shepley, Pam Sondhi, Marisela Strocchia, Sylvia Teichtmeister, Aravind Venkatapathy.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

The PSE Quality Engagement Team (QET) is represented by a cross-section of Sheridan College Administrators, Support Staff, Faculty, and students. The QET is chaired by Sylvia Teichtmeister, Dean, Faculty of Continuing and Professional Studies (FCAPS).

On behalf of Sheridan, the mandate of the QET spanned four areas of concentration:

1) To conduct research to define "Quality" in PSE (Post-Secondary Education)
2) To define "Quality" for Sheridan in context of the Vision for all domains of institutional activity
3) To determine assessment strategies for each "Quality indicator"
4) To map processes to measure and refine 'Quality' as Sheridan progresses on its journey

The QET first met in January 2012 and collaborated to identify seven 'Quality indicator' themes. These themes formed the basis of the QET's research efforts and the interim recommendations entailed herein.

The seven quality indicator themes were grouped by the QET as follows:

1) Students and Class Experience

2) Faculty

3) Resources / Infrastructure

4) Student Service and Support

5) Library / Research

6) Reputation

7) Accreditation

Organizing the Effort

In terms of organizing efforts, the QET members self-assigned to workgroups dedicated to researching exemplar institutions and best practices in their chosen "Quality" theme area (theme areas as identified above). Of note, a number of QET members choose to participate in the research of more than one Quality theme. This is a testament to the membership's dedication and model involvement throughout the project's research and reporting phases. The research groups began their investigations in early February and their work continued throughout the following four months.

Beginning in late March 2012, the QET Theme Workgroups initiated presentations of their theme-focused preliminary research findings to the larger QET membership. As there were numerous quality theme presentations and rich group dialogue, the QET meetings were increased in frequency to occur every two weeks with presentations and dialogue continuing from March through to April.

In May, a White Paper Template was distributed to the QET Theme Workgroups for the consolidation of topical input and assimilation of the research findings, as well as their relevant recommendations. A total of seven quality theme reporting papers were prepared. Each report contains dozens of original ideas, tactics, recommendation and/or strategies successfully implemented by exemplar PSE institutions. We have organized this white paper to reflect the consolidated research reports in their original format to

ensure the detailed research effort / recommendations are referenced as originally presented by each of the seven quality theme workgroup. Reports are written with a view that the Quality 'journey' for Sheridan should be a meaningful, evolving and enduring effort over the long-term.

Please find below the high level summary of PSE Quality Engagement Team Final Recommendations.

Final Recommendations

1. Ensure that strategic project planning and resourcing requirements are put in place to support the implementation of the priority Quality indicators based on the themes identified.
2. Create the metrics to support continuous assessment and improvement in Sheridan's Quality criteria. Strive to be 'best-in-class' in all Quality indicators.
3. Recognizing that Quality indicators must evolve overtime, put in place a College Quality committee that is responsible for reviewing and updating Sheridan's Quality criteria, standards and performance metrics over time.
4. Celebrate successes internally at Sheridan to support the Vision as a top ranked teaching university.
5. Ensure ongoing dialogue and best practice adoption from Quality leaders across multiple sectors (academic and private sector).

Sub-recommendations Organized by Quality Theme

Students and Class Experience

- Explore the concept of the campus as a 'Living Laboratory' at Sheridan. Thereby, making the connections between creativity and innovation 'for' sustainability & global citizenship. Sheridan is well poised to do so.
- Assess KPI and student engagement surveys for fit to measure Quality criteria related to Student and Class Experience.
- Review the latest student engagement surveys that were filled out by both students and faculty to see where gaps exist in terms of quality of student experience, relevance of programs and courses to students.
Conduct a gap analysis to determine how Sheridan practices compare to other institutions in the categories of Quality related to Student and Class Experience. (ie. Registrar, admission policies) compare to where we want them to be regarding aspects of student quality. Plan policy and procedure changes based on this gap analysis.
- It is imperative that Sheridan develop its Academic Honesty policy so that the structure that it says is in place is in good, procedural working order. This may include adding teaching tools such as turnitin.com, and it should involve a clear chain of command and responsibility beyond the faculty and the student where breaches of Academic integrity take place. Without a clear, working Academic Honesty policy, Sheridan's reputation is at stake.
- Faculty are directly linked to students, and in order for Sheridan to achieve its vision of becoming the "top-ranked undergraduate teaching university," they will need to attract strong faculty. Hiring and mentoring a strong faculty will make Sheridan a desirable academic establishment for many students.
- Sheridan must consider student services (we are well served in this capacity), as well as athletics, and food as outside means for attracting and retaining students.

Please see **Appendix 1** for the full scope of research and recommendations conducted on the theme of Students and Class Experience.

Faculty

- Envision Exceptional faculty quality at Sheridan
- Shape culture of assessment, reflection, and improvement
- Improve/create quality assessment tools
- Plan policy and procedure changes to provide institutional support for teaching quality
- PD focussed on teaching quality
- Create teaching awards
- Provide funding for faculty quality

Please see **Appendix 2** for the full scope of research and recommendations conducted on the theme of Faculty.

Resources / Infrastructure

- Sheridan should set-up a cross functional (Faculty, Administration, Student) committee to formalize actions/initiative, requirements, practices and measures related to Sheridan's Infrastructure.
- Sheridan should develop Quality infrastructure targets, assessments and plans for the elements identified herein and engage in continuous review and improvement of those targets.
- Sheridan's infrastructure elements should include: Physical (Campus), Human Capital (Organizational & Service Structures), Facilities, Information Technology, and Ancillary Services
- Sheridan's progress should be monitored in a transparent manner - through Sheridan's Annual Business Plan and Viewbook. Of note: Accreditation bodies may look for evidence and documentation related to above elements.

Please see **Appendix 3** for the full scope of research and recommendations conducted on the Resources / Infrastructure theme

Student Service and Support

- Student Services planning should fall well upstream the overall college strategy. Ultimately, Student Services should contribute to academic planning so that proactive student supports can be embedded into curriculum rather than Student Services areas being reactive to policy and decision making.
- Student Services areas should be adequately funded to provide robust supports to students
- Strive to ensure that there is no marginalization of underrepresented populations -including Aboriginal students
- Ensure that there are productive partnerships between academic schools and student services that create engagement.
- Support career and professional development for preparation for future employment
- Robust programming for at-risk students to support their engagement and success
- Ensure we are collecting adequate quantitative and qualitative data from students to assess the extent to which their needs are being met by Student Services
- Improve communication channels between Faculties and Student Services

- Increase awareness of student services supports among faculty, especially part-time faculty
- Student Services planning should be integrated with Academic Planning
- Sheridan should look to best practice Universities to benchmark the percentage of overall budget allocated for student services and support

Please see **Appendix 4** for the full scope of research and recommendations conducted on the Student Service and Support theme.

Library / Research

Library and Learning Services

- Sheridan must dedicate optimal funding for library and learning services in order that they are modern, dynamic, and an essential part of the university as well as meet AUCC standards.
- User-experience principles should be embraced when designing and assessing library services in order to reflect the unique Sheridan experience. Any tools that are chosen or created to measure library quality should be relevant to Sheridan and the needs of our users.
- Library collections should be increased through the acquisition of materials that will support curriculum and faculty needs.
- Library and learning services impact on student learning outcomes and academic success should be assessed regularly.
- Develop library holdings by purchasing books, expanding e-collections, and interlibrary loans
- Have the resources in place to attract and retain sufficient numbers of highly trained library professionals
- Develop a culture of regular assessment and evaluation (collections, space, support, staff, services)

Research

- The organizational structure supporting research at Sheridan needs a clear, inclusive focus.
- It is imperative that an Academic Freedom policy be developed at Sheridan.
- The faculty workload model must be clearly delineated in order to support the institution's emphasis on excellence in teaching and research. While the tenure system at universities is clear: 40% teaching, 40% research, 20% service, the SWF model is murky as to responsibilities.
- Sheridan needs to increase the image and reputation of work done by faculty by holding events that link us with other institutions and the community. By holding regular reading series, art exhibits (that can be used as fundraisers as well), hosting conferences, encouraging faculty and staff to present works at conferences (and supporting them through PD funding), it expands Sheridan's research/resources through dissemination of ideas and works.

Please see **Appendix 5** for the full scope of research and recommendations conducted on the Library / Research theme.

Reputation

- Complete a more comprehensive literature review to study reputation as it relates to higher education. Identify more stakeholders, attributes, and indicators.
- Study Sheridan's Animation program. Ranked #1 worldwide, the staff, faculty, alumni and current students are an excellent resource by which to study / model reputation "building".
- Poll animation PAC members for thoughts on reputation.

- Complete a gap analysis between the quality indicators Sheridan is currently using and the proposed list of reputation indicators provided in this report.
- Analyze in detail responses from industry.
- Approach Sheridan Marketing as a key player in the discussion of reputation. Much of reputation is a result of efforts in marketing, promotion, and communications.
- Consider the reputation Sheridan has built as a college. What is Sheridan known for and what is its brand? Analysis required.

Please see **Appendix 6** for the full scope of research and recommendations conducted on the Reputation theme.

Accreditation

- Setup a cross functional (Faculty, Administration, Student) group to understand and formalize Sheridan's Accreditation requirements, polices, and practices within our disciplines.
- Ensure that the focus of this team is to understand our processes to strengthen and sustain the Quality and integrity of higher education, making it worthy of public confidence.
- Highlight the importance of Sheridan's integrity, public information, our continuous improvement practices including the program review process, student complaint handling, infrastructure and institutional investment plans, documentation of self-study and achievements of faculty, staff and administrators, and participation in accreditation body activities and initiatives

Please see **Appendix 7** for the full scope of research and recommendations conducted on the Accreditation theme.

Strategic Imperatives

Although much research and discovery work has been initiated by the QET in the context of examining quality in PSE over the past 6 months, the QET membership suggests that the work of the PSE Quality Engagement Team should be a sustaining and enduring effort. As such, we recommend that a Standing Committee be deployed within Sheridan with continued voluntary membership from across the broad Sheridan community with the goal of continuing the work in the quality arena to ensure that Sheridan is well positioned along the journey of quality improvement.

Also, the QET suggest that any further quality research should be considered under a continuous improvement initiative framework and that the work effort should ideally continue in the newly established Quality Charter and context of the seven Quality Theme areas. Alignment to these seven themes will introduce consistency and alignment to external academic benchmarks which will assist to further determine and provide consistency for internal assessment initiatives.

Importantly, much more work is required to map processes to measure and refine quality as Sheridan progresses on its journey. The development and further strengthening of quality 'auditing' inclusive of enhanced 'measurement' capabilities, would ensure the operationalizing of a progressive and valued quality movement within Sheridan.

In terms of 'quick-start' opportunities, once quality benchmarks are established in the relevant quality criteria, Sheridan should measure and track progress against those identified criteria to establish action

plans to address gaps. A Project Management methodology should be implemented to ensure sustainability and cohesion of effort as well as success.

Of note, there are numerous connections between the QET area of inquiry and other Engagement Teams' areas of inquiry which require further examination and the alignment of recommendations (i.e. Quality of Teaching and Learning, Infrastructure, etc.). In the future, the QET recommends that the quality movement / Standing Committee within Sheridan should be recognized as a broadly linked and influential body which is able to influence strategy through a quality improvement lens.

Conclusions

Please refer to the summary of QET's 'Final Recommendations' on **page 4**.

Notwithstanding our final recommendations, the QET suggest that a number of additional aspects should be considered by Sheridan in the Quality context. They include that:

- Sheridan should actively promote a Culture of Assessment, Reflection and Improvement
    - Include qualitative and quantitative measurements required to capture 'true' and holistic student experience
    - Assessment tool credibility – Sheridan should pay particular attention to the importance of the instruments used to measure (e.g. KPI is mistrusted, NESSI – are we measuring everything that is important to Sheridan?)
    - Sheridan should demonstrate an increased interest and value diversity in stakeholder voices along the 'quality journey'. Be creative and incorporate non-traditional measures.
- Introduce a 'Living Laboratory' approach at Sheridan – using campus operations and infrastructure as a mechanism for Faculty and Student learning related to the advancement of quality initiatives.
- The Sheridan Board and Executive level management should ensure that there is ample support for the quality movement within the organization by ensuring that there are adequate budgeting resources in place to reflect true commitment to Quality. A budgeting priority positioning for quality initiative will protect and enhance the interest of the students, employers and the Sheridan Community.

Appendix 1 - Quality Theme: Students and Class Experience

Student and Classes Quality

Introduction

The three-person team investigated student and classes quality factors by considering academic publications addressing the issues as well as our own experiences as faculty, administrators, former students, and parents to students. Quality of student experience is an area of increased interest as markets and government funding changes, and people want assurance that students are receiving quality academic education, as well as extracurricular/co-curricular activities to enhance resumes, opportunities, and self-fulfillment. "Student success" is also linked to these ideas, and it becomes problematic when it is perceived as a means by which to "get students through" programs, rather than having a clear set of academic or professional measures that a student must meet in order to achieve success in their program. The measures for student experience, success, and opportunity are almost always subjective. While rates of graduates with jobs in the field they studied is one objective measurement that can be made, measuring "value added" over the course of a degree is very difficult. Some suggested "best practices" used as the standard in most universities are to measure student achievement, graduate job links to degree and rates of employment, and surveys that go out to students and faculty to measure student engagement. The major quality themes that emerge in the research on students and classes are: academic education, student success, and extracurricular/co-curricular opportunities. The team also considered how to attract and retain the best students at Sheridan.

Discussion

Key definitions:

Students may choose a particular institution for any number of reasons (financial, geographical, social, academic); the institution chooses students based on academics or prerequisite learning achievement alone. Quality seems to relate to meeting or exceeding expectations. Those expectations differ depending on types of educational institutions, economic times, and personal values. Three themes which emerged from the research were 1) quality of student experience, 2) student success, and 3) extracurricular/co-curricular activities.

Summary of the academic literature:

Theme: Quality of Student Experience

- Top academic/creative/innovative programs
- Faculty-student ratios
- Class size
- Co-op, hybrid options in classes
- Work-related learning (internships, co-op, simulations)
- Library/Research, academic resources
- Student services (food, athletics, counselling, health care, financial aid, security, etc.)
- Green/Sustainable campus
- Real life industry experience

Theme: Student Success

- What does "student success" mean?
- What is the graduation/passing rate?
- Student satisfaction?
    - What are the entrance program requirements/standards?
    - What happens to college/diploma programs?
    - How are our programs meeting or exceeding the provincial standards?
- What policies are in place around Academic Honesty?
  Measured by graduate employment rates/
- Measured by graduate employment rate in field of study
- Using student success as a sole focus may lead to policies such as not allowing late enrollment into programs which can cause other institutional difficulties for students

Theme: Extracurricular/Co-curricular opportunities

- How can students get involved in extra-curricular/co-curricular activities to enhance student experience?

    - Portfolio/Resume skills: enhances employability
    - Related to programs, skills beyond program
    - Volunteer work, community services
    - Applied research projects; Sheridan Operations (ie. energy-sustainability) projects
    - Student government (union, Sheridan newspaper, Sheridan TV, etc.)
    - Add/drop/swap trends re student choice of teacher
    - Involvement in team teaching
    - Participating in PAC meetings

Theme: Institutional Measures to Attract and Retain High Quality Students

- How can Sheridan attract & retain the best students for our programs?

    - Academic standards
    - Student Success
    - Employment rates
    - Graduation rates –GPAs
    - Academic and Employment pathways—stepping stone for next move; opens doors

Best-practices in other post-secondary institutions

The standard "best practice" in other post-secondary institutions is to use graduate employment rates and student evaluations as an indication of success. This is appropriate for relating student learning to employability but not for experiences beyond such a direct correlation. For example, a student may take a Sociology elective that leads to a volunteer position that provides a job opportunity rather than a job related to, say, Computers or IT, the field in which the student earned their degree. Furthermore, student evaluations tend to be too broad. Looking at the lists of potential indicators for the themes noted above, no single measure is valid on its own, or free from bias or differing interpretation. Student quality will likely be a judgment based on multiple measures and multiple perspectives (e.g. students who feel the

professor or course engaged them (but can be marred if grades don't match student expectations); administrators who assess whether the learning outcomes were met)

Legislative and/or regulatory requirements (MTCU or AUCC[1])

According to the AUCC website, "An undergraduate experience that fuels discovery and nurtures personal growth is a priority of Canada's universities. Our member universities are committed to helping undergraduates achieve their full potential in a research-enriched environment that expands their knowledge, nurtures critical thinking and inspires creativity."

From the Literature:

Saunders, Ron. "Fostering Quality in Canada's Postsecondary Institutions," *Work Network*, **September 2006.**

- Finnie/Usher model looks at the learning process in terms of 4 components: what students bring with them at the outset; what resources and pedagogies are supplied by the schools; what learning takes place; and the extent to which societal objectives are met. Beginning characteristics, Learning inputs, Learning outputs, Final outcomes (10).

- p. 11: "The key here is the focus on value-added. 'If the data indicate that spending more money in a particular way (e.g. hiring more profs) or adopting certain kinds of pedagogy (e.g. more contact time) result in higher levels of certain kinds of learning outcomes (e.g. critical thinking, or the ability to design a house or strip down a car engine), and that those outcomes in fact generate the final outcomes deemed important (higher employment rates, higher incomes, happier graduates, better citizens), then we can say that a system (or institution) characterized by more of the inputs in question than another system (or institution) is of higher quality" (Finnie and Usher, 2005, p. 21).

Clark, I., Moran, G., Skolnik, M., and Trick, D. *Academic Transformation: The Forces Reshaping Higher Education in Ontario* **(Kingston: McGill-Queen's, 2009).**

- "In the 1970s and 1980s, university administrators defined quality primarily in terms of the resources they had available, referring to such indicators as **the faculty-student ratio, operating expenditures per student, the value of library acquisitions, and the amount of capital expenditures** (Skolnik, 1986)" (Clark, Moran, Skolnik, and Trick, 114, 2009).
- Definitions: quality and accreditation are theoretically different terms but are often interchangeable. Accreditation refers to an *external* body; quality assessments can happen internally or externally (117).
  Accreditation also assesses whether a program or institution meets minimum standards. In contrast, quality assessments result in conclusions about the level of quality of the institution or program being assessed.
- NSSE Quality Categories: Level of academic challenge, enriching educational experience, supportive campus environment, student-faculty interaction, active and collaborative learning (124-25). In Canada, research-intensive universities scored lowly on student-faculty interactions, "considered one of the most important benchmarks" (125).
- KPI: graduate employment rate, graduate satisfaction, employer satisfaction, student satisfaction, and graduate rate

---

[1] MTCU (Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities) / AUCC (Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada)

Criticism: tied to funding, and with very little distinction among the colleges, a small performance rate improvement can lead to a vast difference in funding.

- Predominant values underlying quality assurance regimes: resources, educational process, selectivity conceptions of quality. Quality, funding, access (128).
- "Measuring Quality" p. 35 "It is not satisfactory to measure the quality of a university or college by the grades of the incoming students (beginning characteristics) or the size of the library (resource inputs) or the employment rates of graduates (outcomes). What matters is the "value-added": the extent to which the students exit PSE with better skills and greater knowledge than what they came in with, and how these greater contribute to social and individual needs"
- p. 42: "What are the factors that contribute to learning at our universities and colleges, at both the graduate and undergraduate levels? What innovative approaches to teaching methods are having beneficial effects on learning outcomes, labour market outcomes, and civic engagement? …There is little systematic research in Canada on pedagogy in higher education, including little systematic evaluation of some of the more well-known innovations. Our leading institutions of research, namely the universities, need to pay attention to this research gap, to support the implementation of improved teaching methods, and to reward good teaching. Governments need to develop incentive funding to make this happen."

Defining the Campus as a Living Laboratory

On many university and college campuses, campus greening is well underway with operational efficiencies being increasingly harvested. The next phase of higher education leadership now aims to involve students and faculty (all disciplines) in making these complex and important transitions toward more sustainable operations (and beyond involving corporations and municipalities). Over the last 5 years, higher education has seen an explosion of innovative and trans-disciplinary centers for sustainability. Directors, staff, faculty, fellows, and students involved with these new centers are poised to make significant contributions to campus, regional, and global sustainability. Both AAAS and Cornell University launched a survey which indicated that this living laboratory concept has emerged as a strategic platform in the formation of campus wide and regional partnerships that strengthen the relationships between research, education and real-world impacts. These centers have identified a significant opportunity to involve students in real-world operations on campus as well as corporate and municipal sustainability transitions. This is referred to as "living laboratories for sustainability."

- http://sustainabilityscience.org/files/StoriesfromtheField.pdf
- http://www.sustainablecampus.cornell.edu/about/index.cfm
- http://secondnaturebos.wordpress.com/2010/11/10/cornell-receives-80-million-for-sustainability/
- http://www.fastcompany.com/1567840/the-campus-as-living-laboratory

Sheridan's Creative Campus Initiative

- Sheridan's Creative Campus Initiative came up with its own working definition of "student success." It is multi-faceted and considers the following aspects of academics, co-/extra-curricular activities:
  - Identify or discover career and personal goals and direction
  - The development of the whole person—intellectual, creative, personal, social
  - A passion for learning
  - Mastering skills and capabilities within the student's own field of study
  - Academic and professional achievement, a sense of personal accomplishment, prepared for next steps beyond Sheridan

Recommendations

1. Review the latest student engagement surveys that were filled out by both students and faculty to see where gaps exist in terms of quality of student experience, relevance of programs and courses to students.
2. Do a gap analysis to determine how Sheridan practices (ie. Registrar, admission policies) compare to where we want them to be regarding aspects of student quality. Plan policy and procedure changes based on this gap analysis.
3. It is imperative that Sheridan develop its Academic Honesty policy so that the structure that it says is in place is in good, procedural working order. This may include adding teaching tools such as turnitin.com, and it should involve a clear chain of command and responsibility beyond the faculty and the student where breaches of Academic integrity take place. Without a clear, working Academic Honesty policy, Sheridan's reputation is at stake.
4. Faculty are directly linked to students, and in order for Sheridan to achieve its vision of becoming the "top-ranked undergraduate teaching university," they will need to attract strong faculty. Hiring and mentoring a strong faculty will make Sheridan a desirable academic establishment for many students.
5. Sheridan must consider student services (we are well served in this capacity), as well as athletics, and food as outside means for attracting and retaining students.
6. To further explore the design of the concept of the campus as a living laboratory at Sheridan making the connections between creativity and innovation 'for' sustainability & global citizenship. Sheridan is well poised to do so.

Appendix 2 - Quality Theme: Faculty

Discussion

Faculty Quality

Introduction

The four-person team investigated faculty quality indications through examining a range of academic papers addressing the issue and through considering our own experiences as faculty and administrators. Quality of faculty is a contentious area because there is no clear definition, and the measures are often subjective. There is no history of faculty quality being measured at the college once tenure is achieved. And faculty quality in all educational institutions tends to be something that is assumed rather than measured, and addressed only when it is perceived to be lacking. The team was unable to find any accepted "best practices" as the standard in most universities seems to be to measure faculty achievement through research productivity rather than teaching facility, which is inappropriate for a college focused on teaching. Three major quality themes emerged in the research: currency in field, qualifications (which is the focus of PEQAB standards) and teaching competence. A fourth theme focused on the ways in which an institution can attract and retain high quality faculty.

Discussion

Key definitions:

The team found no agreement on a definition of quality in faculty. Quality seems to relate to meeting expectations. Those expectations differ in different types of educational institutions.

Summary of the academic literature:

The research yielded three themes that could be taken as aspects of faculty quality (currency in field, qualifications, teaching competence) and a theme related to the institutional measures that can be taken to attract and retain high quality faculty. Each of the four themes is listed below with details on potential indicators

Theme: Currency in Field

- Publications (research, articles, texts) and conference presentations
- Involvement in applied research
- Curriculum renewal activities
- Awards
- External reviewer feedback (from program review or accreditation)
- Participation in competitions (e.g. design)
- Participation in PD activities
- Participation in PAC meetings

Theme: Qualifications

- Meet industry and Ministry standards (as defined by field)

Theme: Teaching Competence

- Course evaluation feedback
- Other student feedback (e.g. program review focus groups)
- Observations from ADs
- Awards (internal and external)
- KPIs
- Participation in PD
- Student performance on accreditation assessments/national exams
- Involvement in research on Scholarship of Teaching and Learning
- Involvement in Communities of Practice
- Involvement in co-curricular activities
- Add/drop/swap trends re student choice of teacher
- Involvement in team teaching
- Participating in PAC meetings

Theme: Institutional Measures to Attract and Retain High Quality Faculty

- Orientation/training for FT and PT
- Part-time support
- Class size
- Student/faculty ratio
- PD money and time
- Workload
- Library resources
- Technology and support to use effectively
- Salaries/benefits
- Classroom and office environment (appealing, functional, promote effective communication and mixing)
- Hosting conferences
- Support for curriculum development and revision
- Support for teaching enhancement (e.g. coaching, peer support, PD activities)
- Effective performance feedback for teachers
- Strong relationship between faculty and management
- Reputation (for best faculty, best programs, strong students)
- Interdisciplinary opportunities (access to peer groups)
- Opportunities for team teaching
- Academic freedom
- Culture (an enabling culture that trusts employees, supports experimentation and applied research and cross-disciplinary activities, that focuses on student and industry needs balanced with academic rigour)

Best-practices in other post-secondary institutions

The only standard "best practice" in other post-secondary institutions is to use research publications as an indication of success. This is appropriate for research-focused universities but not for teaching-focused colleges. Looking at the lists of potential indicators for the themes noted above, no single measure is valid on its' own, or free from possible bias or differing interpretation. Faculty quality will likely be a judgment based on multiple measures and multiple perspectives (e.g. students who feel the teacher engaged them; administrators who assess whether the learning outcomes were met).

Legislative and/or regulatory requirements (MTCU or AUCC[2])

According to AUCC, "Each Canadian university is autonomous in academic matters including the determination of its own quality assurance policies and procedures." But the expectation is that quality in all aspects is assessed and addressed by the institution, including quality of faculty.

MTCU (as indicated by PEQAB's stated standards in the 2010 Handbook for Ontario Colleges) specifies faculty quality requirements in terms of qualifications primarily, but also addresses other aspects of the emergent faculty quality themes. It requires that college degree programs are taught by faculty who "hold an academic credential at least one degree higher than that offered by the program in the field or in a closely related field/discipline" and "no fewer than 50% of all faculty teaching in the professional or main field of study…hold the terminal academic credential in the field or in a closely related field/discipline." This requirement also applies to those teaching non-core courses. MTCU also requires that faculty have "professional credentials and related work experience" and "engage in a level of scholarship, research or creative activity sufficient to ensure their currency in the field."

MTCU also requires that institutional policies support faculty quality by:

- defining the academic/professional credentials required of present and future faculty teaching all courses in the program;
- having on file evidence, supplied directly to the college from the granting agency, of the highest academic credentials and any required professional credentials claimed by faculty members
- requiring the regular review of faculty performance, including student evaluation of teaching and/or supervision;
- identifying the means of ensuring that faculty knowledge of the field is current
- supporting the professional development of faculty including the promotion of curricular and instructional innovation, as well as technological skills, where appropriate; and
- specifying faculty teaching and supervision loads and availability to students.

PQAPA also has relevant expectations. Specifically the PQAPA audit looks for:

4.3 Academic policies and practices that provide for the development and continuous improvement of teaching and learning methods are valued, documented, and supported. This would include:

- regular experimentation with new teaching methods; and,
- systematic measuring of the results of these new methods to support currency and relevancy of teaching and learning.

5.1 Teaching staff involved in the program:

- meet the needs of the students and facilitate the achievement of the program learning outcomes

---

[2] MTCU (Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities) / AUCC (Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada)

- possess the combination of experience and credentials appropriate to, and required by, the program of study
- have the level of expertise and ability to provide the advertised learning experiences
- are oriented, coordinated, and evaluated.

5.2 Teaching staff execute their professional responsibilities including, and not limited to:

- working within clear and well-structured instructional plans;
- providing prompt and constructive feedback to students;
- promoting a positive attitude to learning in students;
- participating in reflective practice; and,
- undergoing initial and continuing professional development to enhance their teaching skills and ensure currency.

Recommendations

Envision exceptional faculty quality at Sheridan
- Hold focus groups with Sheridan faculty, student and administrative groups to get their perspective on faculty quality. Use these as a basis to create a definition of faculty quality at Sheridan.

Shape culture of assessment, reflection, and improvement
- Support the shaping of a culture of assessment, reflection and continuous improvement (through faculty development and professional development, through annual and comprehensive program review, through applied research particularly in the scholarship of teaching and learning).

Improve/create quality assessment tools
- Investigate possible additional tools for assessing teaching competence and how to improve the response rate on current quality tools (course evaluations, KPIs).

Plan policy and procedure changes to provide institutional support for teaching quality
- Do a gap analysis to determine how Sheridan practices compare to where we want them to be regarding aspects of faculty quality (e.g. evaluating, coaching, giving feedback). Plan policy and procedure changes based on this gap analysis.

PD focused on teaching quality

- Provide professional development opportunities (e.g. workshops, speakers) on best practices in teaching, with a focus on exceptional Sheridan teachers sharing their successes, tools and techniques.

Create teaching awards
- Using the inspiration of the 3M Teaching awards, consider the development of a Sheridan teaching awards program. The 3M program looks for evidence of "Excellence in teaching over a number of years, principally (but not exclusively) at the undergraduate level" and "Commitment to the improvement of university teaching, with emphasis on contributions beyond the nominee's discipline or profession to as broad an audience as possible." A variation of this could be created to reflect Sheridan's vision of faculty quality.

Funding for faculty quality initiatives
- Provide funding to support faculty quality initiatives (e.g. teaching awards, applied research in the scholarship of teaching and learning, professional development activities focused on enhancing teaching quality, piloting new assessment tools to gather evidence).

Appendix 3 - Quality Theme: Resources/Infrastructure

Introduction

Per Wikipedia, **Infrastructure** is defined as the basic physical and organizational structures needed for the operation of a society or enterprise or the services and facilities necessary for an economy to function.

Applying the above definition in terms of Sheridan, Infrastructure is the basic physical and organizational structures or services and facilities needed for teaching and learning. Typically these are covered in the following areas of an institution: Physical (Campus), Human Capital (Organizational & Service Structures), Facilities, Information Technology, Ancillary Services (Cafeteria).

A review of recent projects has identified that Sheridan delivers services based on infrastructure designed using the following design principles:
- Flexibility/Scalability
- Innovation
- Reliability
- Value
- Sustainability

Our research has found that institutions assess quality in campus infrastructure includes ranking the collective efforts to maintain a standard of excellent practice, manage costs and achieve the institutional mission and following the continuous improvement of each of these elements:

Physical (Campus)

- The fit within respective communities and how the institution plays a prominent role in our portfolio of academic programs and our applied research agenda.
- The efficiency with which the campus operates - Benchmarks for campus units to gauge efficiencies and time-saving practices.

Human Capital (Organizational & Service Structures)

- Training opportunities at all appropriate levels to improve the responsiveness and effectiveness of administrative operations.
- Incentive and reward systems.
- Structures in place to assess staffing in all areas of the institution.

Facilities

- Master Plans – A proper implementation of a Campus Master Plan ensures the highest possible level of input from the institution and local communities as financially feasible components of the plan are implemented
- Building Currency & Interconnectivity - Special Focus Sets or adjacencies are often identified such as Classrooms and Learning Spaces - to create the highest quality learning environments, and to advance the application of new pedagogies and technologies.
- Library - Plans and directions regarding the "library of the future" that identify state-of-the-art facilities, collections, technology and collaborations that meets current and emerging instructional and research needs, and that support goals and priorities.

Information Technology

- Information Technology services necessary to conduct teaching, learning, research, and administrative functions should be monitored to ensure adequacy. Metrics to include Governance, Security (physical & data), Staffing, Network, Systems. This can be Benchmarked and evaluated against industry best practices.

Ancillary Services

- Many Ancillary Services are outsourced and as such, service levels are contractually specified. These services include Cafeteria, Bookstore, Cleaners, Print shop, and Security guards. These services directly or indirectly affect the Student Experience. KPI metrics are captured for some of these services i.e. Cafeteria.

Recommendations

Setup a cross functional (Faculty, Administration, Student) group to understand and formalize actions/initiatives, requirements, practices and measures for Sheridan's Infrastructure   The focus of this team is to measure (baseline) and understand how are efforts and improving this measures (continuous improvement).   The Institution should develop quality targets, assessments and plans for the identified Infrastructure elements above and engage in continuous review and improvement of such targets. This could be monitored amongst Sheridan's Annual Business Plan and Viewbook. Accreditation bodies may look for evidence and documentation related to above elements.

Appendix 4 - Quality Theme: Student Services

Discussion

Quality in Student Services Defined

- Quality in Student Services: Student Services function to create programs that encourage individuals to pursue higher education, convert applications into successful students, assist students in making sense of their experience and in connecting them to the institution, foster students' self-sufficiency and support graduates in reaching their other career and educational goals upon completion of their program.

Student Engagement Defined

- "Student engagement represents the time and effort students devote to activities that are empirically linked to desired outcomes of college and what institutions do to induce students to participate in these activities" (Kuh, 2009, p. 683). This is critical to higher education as institutions are faced with increasing pressure to improve student outcomes such as retention, persistence and completion (Zepke &Leach, 2005; Astin, 1999).

A Conceptual Framework for Student Engagement.

Strands of engagement chosen indicators:

Motivation and agency
Engaged students are intrinsically motivated and want to exercise their agency

Indicators:

- A learner feels able to work autonomously
- A learner feels they have a relationship with others
- A learner feels competent to achieve success

Transactional engagement
Learners and teachers engage with each other

Indicators:
- Students experience academic challenge
- Learning is active and collaborative in and out of the classroom
- Students and teachers interact constructively
- Students have enriching educational experiences

Institutional support

Institutions provide an environment conducive to learning

Indicators:
- There is a strong focus on student success
- There are high expectations of students
- There is investment in a variety of support services
- Diversity is valued
- Institutions continuously improve

Active citizenship
Students and institutions work together to enable challenges to social beliefs and practices

Indicators:
- Students are able to make legitimate knowledge claims
- Students can engage effectively with others including the 'other'
- Students are able to live successfully in the world
- Students have a firm sense of themselves
- Learning is participatory, dialogic, active and critical

Russell and Slater: Factors that encourage student engagement in a NZ university
Produced by The Berkeley Electronic Press, 2011

Summary of the academic literature and/or other reports/publications:

Best practices would be outlined below and, according to academic literature, should result in the following outcomes;

1. Encourages contact between students and faculty
2. Develops reciprocity and cooperation amongst the students
3. Encourages active learning
4. Gives prompt feedback
5. Emphasizes time on task
6. Communicates high expectations
7. Respects diverse talents and ways of learning

Good practices in students affairs:

1. Engages students in active learning
2. Helps students develop coherent values and ethical standards
3. Sets and communicates high expectations for student learning
4. Uses systematic inquiry to improve student and institutional performance
5. Uses resources effectively to achieve institutional missions and goals
6. Forges educational partnerships that advance student learning
7. Build supportive and inclusive communities

(Checkering and Gamson: 1987)

Best-practices in other post-secondary institutions:

Factors associated with best-practices that may derive metrics:

- Integration of SS and Academics - i.e. does the Head of SA sit on the academic leadership team and are they credentialed to do so?
- Supportive leadership - President understands the role SS plays in a learner-centered institution
- Mission-driven org structure - enables partnering of academics and SA staff. Inclusion of SA staff in planning, programming, space allocation, budgets and shaping culture
- Data-based culture - culture of evidence that provides data on how programs matter to the mission of the institution i.e. learning and success
- Adequate resources – Sa distributes resources in a way that maximizes benefits to students and the organization and demonstrates that these decision are based on data
- Collaborative institutional culture - academics and SA professional work together and value each other
- Learning-centered Policies and procedures - set your policies up to foster student success and include SA in data collection and decision making
- Student Engagement - programming that engages students in and out of the classroom
- Valued and well-trained staff - invest in learning and professional development in SA staff
- Effective partnerships - internal and external. "When subject matter [faculty] partner with learning and human development specialists (student affairs practitioners) to create learning-centered institutions, retention and graduation rates increase." (Culp, 2005.   p80).
- Intelligent use of technology - use it to transform the institution, not merely enhance it
- Emphasis on quality - quality experiences, quality people, quality results
- Investment - Astin (1993) investing in student services results in a ROI in favourable cognitive and affective outcomes.
- Partnerships with business and community groups – assess community needs, identify gaps, lobby for resources, evaluate services. Identify and develop jobs, work-integrated learning opportunities, mentoring etc.
- Programming for at-risk students
- Using orientation as a meaningful process that increases student success, introduces culture and expectations, leverages technology and involves families
- Advising – not just creating a good advising model but creating a model where advisors listen and act on the information being provided by students on emerging trends, registration problems, student course creativity.
- Counselling effectiveness and scope – help students prevent potential problems and assist faculty in aiding students with cognitive and emotional issues to be successful

Eight Principals of Good practice in student engagement:

These principals are intended to serve as a set of standards by which excellence in graduate education could be benchmarked and assessed. Using Chickering and Gamson (1987), the ACPN/NASPA Study Group (1997), and the large body of evidence related to the positive effects of student engagement, seven principles were crafted. Regarding student engagement, it was maintained that a student affairs division is most effective when it addresses these efforts:

1. Continually strive to eradicate marginalization among underrepresented populations (good practice in student engagement occurs when student affairs divisions offer support groups, special interest student organizations and mentoring programs for students in departments that lack racial/ethnic and gender diversity as well as those in academic disciplines that typically enroll fewer students)
2. Provides meaningful orientation to the institution beyond academic units (offering a coordinated and multiple-day series of orientation activities for new students and programs for prospective students that present the realities of under-graduate education constitutes good practice in student engagement)
3. Invests resources in communication with students (timely distribution of important materials, announcements, and information e.g. brochures, newsletters and websites for students)
4. Facilitates opportunities for community building and multicultural interaction across academic units (student learning is enhanced by planning, executing, and participating in purposeful campus activities, both educational and social)
5. Partners with academic schools and departments to create engagement plans for students (Cooperation, meaningful dialogue and strategic planning)
6. Enhances career and professional development (in preparation for future roles)
7. Systematically assesses satisfaction, needs and outcomes (ongoing data collection and analysis)
8. Student union

Legislative and/or regulatory requirements (MTCU or AUCC)

Recommendations

1. Student Services planning should fall well upstream the overall college strategy. Ultimately, SS should contribute to academic planning so that proactive student supports can be embedded into curriculum rather than Student Services areas being reactive to policy and decision making.
2. Student Services areas should be adequately funded to provide robust supports to students
3. Strive to ensure that there is no marginalization of underrepresented populations, Including Aboriginal students
4. Ensure that there are productive partnerships between academic schools and student services that create engagement.
5. Support career and professional development for preparation for future employment
6. Robust programming for at-risk students to support their engagement and success
7. Ensure we are collecting adequate quantitative and qualitative data from students to assess the extent to which their needs are being met by Student Services
8. Improve communication channels between Faculties and Student Services
9. Increase awareness of student services supports among faculty, especially part-time faculty

Appendix 5 - Quality Theme: Research and Library

Introduction

The three-person team investigated quality factors related to: **1) library and learning services; 2) research** in higher education by considering academic papers and publications that address the issues as well as our own experiences as librarians, faculty, and administrators.

Quality of research and library and learning services are of interest to all post-secondary institutions. They tend to demarcate an assurance that students are receiving quality academic education, and that they have access to the best academic resources throughout their postsecondary career.

There are a variety of quality measures that appear throughout the literature related to research in universities and colleges as well as academic libraries. The group surveyed these measures and has suggested quality measures that should be considered by Sheridan's administration as it leads the institution to a university model.

The group has also identified gaps related to current quality that need to be addressed before Sheridan can make this transition successfully. Due to the work done by other engagement teams, this paper focuses primarily on Library and Learning Resources quality, however it does make recommendations that impact the research focus at Sheridan.

Discussion

Definitions

For the purposes of this paper, the group has defined research and library and learning services within a Sheridan context.

Library and Learning Services ideally supports the teaching, learning, and research needs of the academic institution to which it is aligned and supports academic success. Traditionally this refers to library collections, physical and virtual library space, research and information support for staff, faculty, and students, and copyright expertise.

Research comprises applied research, faculty research (that may include applied research), as well as the scholarship of teaching and learning (SOTL).

Applied Research can be defined as "research directed primarily towards specific practical or commercial objectives" (Clark, Moran, Skolnik and Trick, 2009, 63). At Sheridan, applied research is connected with curriculum and involves student learning.

Scholarship of Teaching & Learning (SOTL) "…generally includes: rigorous, systematic, and evidence-based study of student learning in one's own course; the understanding and improvement of student learning and/or teaching practice as its ultimate goal; commitment to disciplinary and/or interdisciplinary peer review and appropriate public dissemination." (Mount Royal University).

Summary of the academic literature

Theme: Library and Learning Services

The AUCC considers library quality to be crucial to the successful operation of a degree-granting university in Canada. With its goal of becoming a top-ranked undergraduate level teaching university focused on the student experience, Sheridan must make a significant investment in Library & Learning Services in order to build a library with sufficient staffing and resources.

In recent years, quality in academic libraries, along with library assessment, has been the subject of much discussion. While libraries have traditionally collected numerous data related to their daily operations (for example, gate count, number of questions asked, number of books owned, number of e-journal downloads) these are not necessarily indicative of a library's quality. To remain relevant in the 21st Century, academic libraries must align closely with the goals of the institutions and the users they serve. Libraries should constantly scan for and develop new methods to measure quality. Academic libraries must collect data through methods that are relevant to their unique organizations in order to ensure that the decisions they make have value and reflect the needs of their communities.

Quality in libraries can be defined in a variety of ways. There are existing quality assessment tools and traditionally accepted quality indicators for libraries, all with their own strengths and weaknesses.

At Sheridan, it is imperative that quality assessment tools be chosen that measure library and learning services against comparator schools and take into account the unique nature of Sheridan. Quality of Sheridan's library must reflect the needs of the school's students, staff, and faculty. Given the major transformation in modern libraries with increased online resources and support, the potential libraries have to impact academic success is great and must be measured. The concept of measuring "user experience" is becoming increasingly important in the world of academic libraries, in order to capture the full picture of libraries and their impact on academic success. Traditional indicators and measurement tools can hold value, but do not necessarily reflect the complexities of a modern academic library.

MacLean's magazine rankings

Maclean's magazine releases yearly rankings of Canadian post-secondary institutions. Libraries and their resources are a key part of the system Maclean's uses to rank each school. In fact, the library is weighted at 15% of the final score MacLean's awards.

"Maclean's measures the percentage of the operating budget committed to library funding, as well as the collection's size and currency. Given the shift from a traditional model—books on shelves—to an electronic-access model, *Maclean's* captures spending on electronic resources in both library expenses and acquisitions." (2011 Maclean's rankings, p. 148). Along with percentage of operating budget, MacLean's considers acquisitions and holdings per students.

MacLean's categorizes the library rankings by type of institution; medical doctoral, comprehensive, and primarily undergraduate. It is clear that in order for Sheridan to meet its vision of being top-ranked in Canada, sufficient library funding is critical.

Indicators of Library and Learning Services Quality

Collections (print and digital)
- can support curriculum in a range of programs
- can support research and teaching needs of faculty
- can support information needs and the training and development of Sheridan staff
- robust networks for institutional resource sharing (ex. Interlibrary loan)
- can be measured against similar institutions

Space (physical and virtual)
- sufficient space for variety of learning – individual, group, quiet, online
- physical and virtual space is accessible and welcoming
- offers resources like tutoring, accessible learning, etc.

Support (in person and online)
- information and research support for students, faculty, and staff
- offer innovative research workshop and curriculum integrated support for students
- staff are highly trained professionals supported in ongoing professional development

Copyright
- library acts as a leader to provide awareness, training, knowledge and expert opinion

Some existing quality measurement tools include LibQual, ServQual, Balanced Scorecard, and the new information literacy module from NSSE (National Survey on Student Engagement) which measures student learning related to the development of skills related to finding, using, and evaluating information.

Standard library quality indicators and assessment tools should be considered, however, each has its own strengths and weaknesses. Therefore, any measures should be relevant to Sheridan's unique learning environment.

"Uniquely Sheridan" quality indicators and measurements for library and learning services

- Library and Learning Services' strategic plan should be reflective of, and integrated with, Sheridan's strategic plan
- Assessment plan should developed by Library and Learning Services in order to measure overall impact on academic success, teaching and learning.
- Sheridan's funding model for Library and Learning Services must be in line with comparator institutions
- User-experience principles should be embraced when designing and evaluating services
- Ethnographic study and similar tools should be considered to analyze the information, research, and study habits of Sheridan students
- Statistics should continue to be collected and analyzed to measure library quality, particularly by using tools that are relevant to Sheridan
- Usability testing should be done regularly for library website and electronic research tools
- Libraries' impact on student learning outcomes and academic success should be assessed
- Research workshops and support should be evaluated by students and faculty, and measured against curriculum learning outcomes
- Library should be involved with program reviews and PEQAB process
- Library should be consulted when curriculum is developed or revised

Summary of the academic literature

Theme: Research

As Sheridan moves toward its new university model, a focus on applied research and the scholarship of teaching and learning has emerged. Research done by faculty, as well as staff and students, can be a strong indicator of the quality of the institution. In the case of the scholarship of teaching and learning, research can enhance the quality of curriculum. Research output in the form of journal articles, presentations, art exhibits, performances, awards, etc. can also be considered as an indicator of success as it lends itself to the reputation of an institution. Many schools are known for their innovative research and for encouraging the research efforts of faculty. This in turns brings in research dollars, top talent, and excellent students. In an applied learning environment such as Sheridan's, the possibilities for research projects are endless.

Much has been written about the importance of institutional resources being dedicated to research. In order for Sheridan to compete on the national and international stage, a thoughtful and well-articulated research mission must be developed. The necessary resources must also be put in place, whether monetary or infrastructure, to support the development of research and research talent.

While Sheridan has put an Applied Research initiative together, it is either too broad in focus as to be unfocused (come to us with your ideas), or too narrow in focus as to be exclusionary (only those academics in fields that can be linked very directly and obviously to industry, and therefore to outside funding, need apply). The organizational structure supporting research would benefit from a clear, inclusive focus.

Research quality can be measured by a variety of factors in the post-secondary environment. Many of these indicators will be useful as Sheridan establishes its reputation as a university, and in order to benchmark against other institutions.

MacLean's magazine rankings: Research

MacLean's considers research and the amount of money available to faculty to engage in research, to be important criteria for its ratings of Canadian universities.

The magazine notes that "The financial resources at a university's disposal have an impact on its ability to provide students with educational opportunities, including the chance to conduct research. *Maclean's* measures the size of the operation budget per weighted full-time-equivalent student, as well as the amount of money available to faculty for research." (142)

Maclean's weights a university's **Resources** at 12% of the final ranking it awards. Included in resources are total research dollars (6%) and operating budget (6%) (130). Total research dollars refers to the total income from sponsored research divided by the number of full-time faculty. They write that "research dollars include grants and contracts, federal, provincial and foreign government funding, as well as funding from non-governmental organizations" (142). The operating budget refers to operating expenditures per weighted full-time equivalent student.

MacLean's categorizes the research rankings by type of institution; medical doctoral, comprehensive, and primarily undergraduate. It is clear that in order for Sheridan to meet its vision of being top-ranked in Canada, sufficient funding for research is of great importance.

Indicators of Research Quality

- Research dollars awarded to projects by outside sources and/or funded internally
- Dissemination of knowledge, research, projects (journals, conferences, speaking engagements, judging art shows, etc.)
- Number of partnerships created among community and businesses
- Successful integration of research with curriculum
- Enhances student learning
- Publishing of original works in professional journals,
- Presentations at conferences, at art exhibitions, film festivals, etc.
- Research dollars awarded to projects by outside sources and/or funded internally as well
- Dissemination of knowledge, research, projects

"Uniquely Sheridan" quality indicators and measurements for library and learning services

- Support for research opportunities in every field of study, including the arts and humanities
- Dedicated funding for faculty research projects and professional development
- Forum to share research findings institution-wide
- Encouragement of cross-disciplinary research projects
- Infrastructure in place to support well-established researchers and those beginning
- Academic freedom in place
- Culture that encourages independent research work and places trust in employees
- Focus on student and industry needs balanced with academic rigour

Legislative and/or regulatory requirements (MTCU or AUCC)

According to AUCC, "Prosperous societies are innovative societies, and innovation begins with basic research. The research conducted at Canada's universities provides the basis for innovation throughout our economy. This is evident not only in new and improved products, goods, services and processes, but also through new approaches to marketing, organizational behaviour, business practices and external relations (MTCU Website).

Today, more than ever, university research matters to Canadians. The importance of university research to Canadian innovation and quality of life is reflected in investments by the federal government and other external funding partners. Funding from the federal research granting agencies – the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council, and the Canadian Institutes of Health Research – not only supports graduate and post-graduate scholarships, but also allows faculty members to engage students in their research" (AUCC website).

Aside from this, PEQAB requires libraries to accommodate degrees; without sufficient library holdings, research resources, and support, it will not allow institutions to grant degrees. In addition, The Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents has issued new guidelines on University Undergraduate Degree Level Expectations which require students to develop strong skills in research and the navigation of information in order to successfully graduate (UDLE website). The Library is required to be a key player when programs develop their curriculum to reflect these guidelines. As a university, Sheridan will most likely be required to participate.

Key Recommendations

Library and Learning Services

1. Sheridan must dedicate optimal funding for library and learning services in order that they are modern, dynamic, and an essential part of the university as well as meet AUCC standards.

2. User-experience principles should be embraced when designing and assessing library services in order to reflect the unique Sheridan experience. Any tools that are chosen or created to measure library quality should be relevant to Sheridan and the needs of our users.

3. Library collections should be increased through the acquisition of materials that will support curriculum and faculty needs.

4. Library and learning services impact on student learning outcomes and academic success should be assessed regularly.

Research

1. The organizational structure supporting research at Sheridan needs a clear, inclusive focus.

2. It is imperative that an Academic Freedom policy be developed at Sheridan.

3. The faculty workload model must be clearly delineated in order to support the institution's emphasis on excellence in teaching and research. While the tenure system at universities is clear: 40% teaching, 40% research, 20% service, the SWF model is murky as to responsibilities.

4. Sheridan needs to increase the image and reputation of work done by faculty by holding events that link us with other institutions and the community. By holding regular reading series, art exhibits (that can be used as fundraisers as well), hosting conferences, encouraging faculty and staff to present works at conferences (and supporting them through PD funding), it expands Sheridan's research/resources through dissemination of ideas and works.

References and Suggested Readings

American Library Association (2010). *Articles and studies related to library value (return on investment)*. Retrieved from http://www.ala.org/ala/research/librarystats/roi/index.cfm

Association of College & Research Libraries (2012). *Value of academic libraries tool kit*. Retrieved from http://www.ala.org/acrl/issues/value/valueofacademiclibrariestoolkit

Association of College & Research Libraries (2010). *Value of academic libraries comprehensive research review and report*. Researched by Megan Oakleaf. Chicago: ACRL. Retrieved from: http://www.acrl.ala.org/value

Association of Research Libraries (2010). *Special issue on value in libraries: assessing organizational performance*. Retrieved from: http://www.arl.org/resources/pubs/rliarchive/rli271.shtml

Cornell University Libraries. *Library Research & Assessment Unit website.* Retrieved from: http://research.library.cornell.edu/value

Dube, L. (2011). Quality assurance practices in university libraries in South Africa. *South African Journal of Library & Information Science, 77*(1), 26-36. Retrieved from

http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=65123317&site=ehost-live&scope=site

Fain, M. (2011). Assessing information literacy skills development in first year students: A multi-year study. *Journal of Academic Librarianship, 37*(2), 109-119. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=59830119&site=ehost-live&scope=site

Franklin, B. (2012). Surviving to thriving: Advancing the institutional mission. *Journal of Library Administration, 52*(1), 94-107.

Fried-Foster, N. & Gibbons, S. (2009). Studying Students: The Undergraduate Research Project at the University of Rochester. ACRL: New York.

Jackson, H. L., & Hahn, T. B. (2011). Serving higher education's highest goals: Assessment of the academic library as place. *College & Research Libraries, 72*(5), 428-442. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=66170019&site=ehost-live&scope=site

Kaske, N. (2007). *Turning Data into Information: details behind telling the library valuation story*. Second Library Assessment Conference Workshop. http://libraryassessment.org/bm~doc/tdi_handout.pdf

Nitecki, D. A. (2011). Space assessment as a venue for defining the academic library. *Library Quarterly, 81*(1), 27-59. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=59257517&site=ehost-live&scope=site

Oakleaf, M. (2011). Are they learning? Are we? Learning outcomes and the academic library. *Library Quarterly, 81*(1), 61-82. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=59257515&site=ehost-live&scope=site

Snavely, L., & Dewald, N. (2011). *Developing and implementing peer review of academic librarians' teaching: An overview and case report* Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=63191942&site=ehost-live&scope=site

Sobel, K., & Wolf, K. (2011). Updating your tool belt redesigning assessments of learning in the library. *Reference & User Services Quarterly, 50*(3), 245-258. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=59736944&site=ehost-live&scope=site

Appendix 6 - Quality Theme: Reputation

Introduction

The Reputation Team researched how ***reputation*** in higher education is defined and considered by internal and external stakeholders.

The group conducted an informal survey of members of the Program Advisory Committee (PAC) for Manufacturing Management Program. PAC members were invited to share their impressions of what comes to mind when they consider the term "reputation" as it relates to a post-secondary institution.

Recommendations at the conclusion of this summary relate to measuring reputation within Sheridan. These indicators for reputation will require the full support of departments and faculties across the organization.

Literature Review

A range of literature was surveyed while gathering research for this project. While much of it discussed "quality", not all consider "reputation" and "quality" to be synonymous. Debate exists as to whether reputation can be seen as one way to measure quality, or if it is a separate entity. The team has taken this into account when assembling our recommendations.

According to the joint declaration of the Canadian Ministers of Education, "Education is a lifelong process…the future of our society depends on informed and educated citizens who, while fulfilling their own goals of personal and professional development, contribute to the social, economic, and cultural development of their community and of the country as a whole" (www.cmec.ca) At its base, a college or university should strive to meet this vision for education, however, there are many other considerations when one is examining reputation. What makes one institution have a certain kind of reputation versus another? Does reputation matter?

While reputation may not be clearly defined in the literature, the group did determine that the definition of quality that fits most closely with an academic institution's reputation is known as "quality as fitness for purpose". Fitness for purpose judges the quality of a service in terms of the ability to meet its mission and objectives. (Nicholson, 2) Since some of the surveys are targeting how Sheridan is viewed internationally, it is important that Sheridan consider the reputation (or in some cases, reputations) has globally.

Though the literature does not overtly mention the role of marketing and communications when it comes to reputation, it was clear that this is an area that needs attention. Publications such as the MacLean's university rankings are often cited as a sign of a post-secondary institution's good (or bad) reputation. University's often jump on these rankings as a way to highlight certain aspects of a school's reputation. An effort must be made internally to plan for ways communicate the reputation Sheridan is making – or would like to make - now and in the future. Data from KPIs, student and alumni surveys, stories about faculty and staff achievements and backgrounds, could all be used to share the Sheridan story and increase its reputation regionally and on the world stage.

More research is needed to examine other factors related to reputation in higher education.

Stakeholders

A number of stakeholders were considered when examining the idea of reputation. This list is not exhaustive, and the group recommends that other stakeholders be considered going forward.

Employers	• **Those who currently employ Sheridan graduates and co-op students, and potential employers.**
Students	• **Past, present, and future students in a range of programs and faculties**
Government	• **Federal, provincial, and municipal**
Faculty	• **Full time, part time**
Internal community	• **Staff, students, Board of Governors, alumni**
External community	• **PACs, alumni, employers, partners, donors, potential employers, neighbours, community agencies and organizations, parents and families, prospective students, secondary school boards, associations, other post-secondary educational institutions (articulated programs)**

One assumption might be that strong positive reputation can attract excellent faculty. Another might be that strong alumni loyalty might demonstrate excellent reputation.

Attributes of Reputation

The perceptions and impressions of reputation that stakeholders hold can vary greatly and depend on a variety of factors. These factors might include personal history, educational background, professional background, cultural background, age, etc. With this in mind, the group chose to examine the following attributes that are often associated with reputation.

Services	• **Career Services, Co-op Education, Library, Tutoring, Counselling, International Centre, Student Advisement, Student Union, Recreation, etc.**
Infrastructure	• **Buildings, physical plant, technology, cafeterias, residence halls, classrooms, dynamic learning environments, social space, etc.**
Faculty	• **Top talent, strong connections with industry, leading thinkers in their fields**
Management	• **Well run institutions with competent, talented people**
Curriculum	• **Leading edge curriculum tied to real world needs with areas that are considered "niche" areas of expertise in the program offerings.**

Surveying Industry

The group informally surveyed members of the **Program Advisory Committee** (PAC) for the Manufacturing Management Program at Sheridan. Because the literature was so unclear about the lines between quality and reputation, the answers from members of this PAC were useful in emphasizing reputation themes that emerged from the literature as well as those that were not initially apparent.

The group recommends that further surveys like this be done with other members of industry for a variety of Sheridan programs. Other tools will be needed to assess reputation institution-wide, but a program level start would be useful.

Question: What attributes come to mind when you think about the reputation of an educational institution?

Answers from PAC Members (sample):

Program costs and perceived value
Institution's involvement in business projects/research
Number of program graduates in workforce (speaks to reputation)
Offer a full range of programs
Level of education attained by faculty (Ph.D)
Specialization – deep experience and knowledge in a particular area
Practical experience students receive prior to graduation (co-op, industry projects)
Institution bundles programs relevant to industry needs
Positive press/media attention for institution ("Best of" lists)
Institution has leadership role in community
Commitment to institutional vision
Quality of staff; an institution's most important asset
Quality of graduates from the institution; well-rounded along with academics
Accreditation of the curriculum
Modern teaching practices with hands-on learning emphasized
Recognition of faculty and student academic achievements by peers and industry
Visual appeal of campus

Indicators

Based on the literature and survey data gathered, the group has assembled a list of indicators that could be used to measure reputation.

- See **'Reputation team April 26th'** document for chart of reputation indicators by stakeholder group

Sheridan currently collects data that could be considered when examining the institution's reputation.
- See **'KPI Review – Sheridan overall'** document for KPI data that relates to reputation
- However, a question might be "Do the KPIs reflect the current reputation of the institution?" especially since the samples are generally very small and possibly do not have validity.

Recommendations

1. Complete a more comprehensive literature review to study reputation as it relates to higher education. Identify more stakeholders, attributes, and indicators.
2. Study Sheridan's Animation program. Ranked #1 worldwide, the staff, faculty, alumni and current students are an excellent resource by which to study reputation.
3. Poll animation PAC members for thoughts on reputation
4. Complete a gap analysis between the quality indicators Sheridan is currently using and the proposed list of reputation indicators provided in this report.
5. Analyze in detail responses from industry.
6. Approach Sheridan Marketing as a key player in the discussion of reputation. Much of reputation is a result of efforts in marketing, promotion, and communications.
7. Consider the reputation Sheridan has built as a college. What is Sheridan known for   and what is its brand? Analysis required.

Appendix 7 - Quality Theme: Accreditation

Introduction

Accreditation is a form of independent, professional certification that assures our institution and stakeholders adhere to particular standards. Since Canadian education is regulated provincially (not by the federal government), there is no national university accreditation system. Public institutions are given authority to grant degrees, diplomas and certificates through specific provincial regulations, and these institutions are therefore "recognized." Government recognition is a form of quality assurance, but is not official accreditation. Another form of quality assurance is membership in national associations like the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC). The AUCC establishes standards of quality, and a school's membership means it has been evaluated as meeting those standards. Professional accreditation means a specific university department or program has been evaluated as meeting the standards of the accrediting agency of a certain profession.

The accreditation process incorporates the principles of quality assurance and continuous improvement that is transparent, fair and objective. The purpose of accreditation status is to maintain the quality of programs and to promote their continuing improvement. Typically, accreditation standard effectively address the quality of the institution or program in following areas:

1. Success/KPI
   a. Identify Success with respect to student achievement in relation to the institution's mission, which may include different standards for different institutions or programs, as established by the institution, including, as appropriate, consideration of course completion, licensing examination, and job placement rates.
2. Faculty
   a. There should be a clear institutional statement of the vision and mission, which reflect the teacher education goals and objectives, and are compatible with the regional, national and global expectations.

3. Curricula and Program
   a. The institution undertakes curriculum revision on a regular basis in the form of continual deliberations on its substance, adequacy and up datedness.
   b. Support and enhance the quality of the product of the program to be satisfactory in terms of expectations from the field
   c. The institution has an admission policy, which is appropriate, clear, inclusive and widely publicized.

4. Student Support Services
   a. Institution must be well structured, organized, proactive guidance and counseling unit which is accessible to all students.

5. Facilities, equipment, and supplies
   a. Necessary learning material and organizational arrangements should be discerned and developed and utilized as part of regular practice.
   b. The institution has to adopt policies and strategies for adequate technology deployment and to use it for learning enhancement.
   c. The Physical Infrastructure is designed to implement all components of the programme effectively and is in keeping with the strength of staff and students.
   d. The institution promotes active participation of the students in social, cultural and leisure activities
   e. The teaching-learning material, laboratories & learning resource centre necessary for

implementing the programme are available and utilized on a regular basis.

6. Governance
   a. The institution clearly defines the roles and functions of staff involved and they collectively identify activities as well as evolve modalities for implementation.
   b. The institutional leadership adopts professional management approach.
   c. The institution has adequate financial resources to run the programme without any financial constraints.
   d. In the management of the programme the institution adopts a participatory approach involving all the employees.

Recommendations

Setup a cross functional (Faculty, Administration, Student) group to understand and formalize Sheridan's Accreditation requirements, polices, practices within our disciplines based on accreditation standards identified above. The focus of this team is to understand our processes to strengthen and sustain the quality and integrity of higher education, making it worthy of public confidence.   This includes integrity, public information, our continuous improvement practices including the program review process, student complaint handling, infrastructure and institutional investment plans, documentation of self-study and achievements of faculty, staff and administrators, and participation in accreditation body activities and initiatives.