



## FINAL ASSESSMENT REPORT

### Inclusive Design, Graduate Studies

<b>Prepared by:</b>	Senate Quality Assurance Committee
<b>Period of Cyclical Review:</b>	July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2018
<b>Dean, Graduate Studies:</b>	Dr. Ashok Mathur
<b>Program Review Team Lead:</b>	Dr. Peter W. Coppin
<b>External Reviewers:</b>	Dr. Ron Wakkary, Simon Fraser University Dr. Amy Hurst, New York University Ms. Kate Hartman, OCAD University

#### 1. Executive Summary of Cyclical Program Review:

A program review team was struck in October of 2016. The team was led by Dr. Peter Coppin, Associate Professor in the Faculty of Design and School of Graduate Studies, upon his appointment as Graduate Program Director in January 2017. The program review team was comprised of all faculty members with a primary teaching appointment in the program, as well as an Undergraduate Program Chair from the Faculty of Design with experience of cyclical program review. The selection of the program review team was strategic and aspired to reflect knowledge of the program's origins and intention, as well as its current structure and future development. The self-study brief is an evidence-based narrative that uses a variety of quantitative and qualitative data in its analysis of the quality of the program, some of which was collected as part of the self-study process. This material was compiled and made available to the external review team.

The external review team observed that many core and permanent affiliated INCD faculty are not provided with offices, including faculty who advise students and therefore need privacy for meetings (and within which to keep confidential materials secure). Furthermore, they observed that INCD has not been provided with physical space for the program. In terms of infrastructure for delivering the online portions of the program, they supported the creation of a networked video conferencing classroom dedicated to distance learning courses. They also noted how the program was understaffed, with too few faculty.

In terms of communications, they found that institutional decision-making processes were sometimes unclear regarding: space allocation, access to technical services and equipment, budgeting, and the allocation of teaching staff, including tenure/tenure track hires.

The review team noted that it would be advantageous to increase the applicant pool to bring in qualified candidates, improve the online aspects of INCD's delivery model to provide equitable access for remote students (including students attempting to participate in synchronous activities outside of their regular schedule, and students in diverse time zones), and develop a balanced approach to providing equitable access (via activities that can be completed remotely) with hands-on studio activities that are difficult to deploy online.

The review team also made a number of recommendations, entirely compatible with the INCD self-study, around hybrid education, mentorship, faculty development, relationship with the Inclusive Design Research Centre, and quality enhancement.

Many of the recommendations are already under consideration by various levels of program administration, while others are more aspirational and/or long-term. It is apparent from the review that the INCD program is both viable and sound, but that a variety of enhancements will improve the quality and calibre of the program considerably.

However, we should note that many of these issues have been known for almost a decade, but remain unresolved, pointing perhaps to a deeper problem that needs to be addressed as a precondition for responding to the specific recommendations. Most specifically, as identified in our self-study, there is an urgency to empower INCD to make changes in response to needs when they are detected. This includes control over technological and financial decisions, or at the very least, deep input into these areas.

External reviewers conveyed over 30 recommendations that fall under six interrelated themes (Table 1): i. Resourcing INCD by establishing transparent and evidence-based decision-making processes (this applies to 8 of the external recommendations), ii. Establishing levers for agile change in response to detected needs (4 recommendations), iii. Calibrating admissions (4 recommendations), iv. Improving internal coordination among faculty (4 recommendations), v. Increase scholarship/fellowship funding (3 recommendations), and vi. Address legacy structural problems (3 recommendations).

Table 1. Themes.

	8 Recommendations						
8	12. Intensive course cost & logistics, examine						
7	15. Reduce tuition cost						
6	16. Obtain video conferencing, facilities and support						
5	17. Allocate INCD with program space (employ co-design)	4 Recommendations	4 Recommendations	4 Recommendations			

<b>4</b>	18. Provide faculty w/ offices	6. Increase applicant pool	2. Clarify applicant profiles for recruitment	1. Consensus-driven updating of Program Learning Outcomes	<b>3 Recommendations</b>	<b>3 Recommendations</b>
<b>3</b>	19. Hire additional faculty based on needs assessment	10. Improve online delivery	3. Calibrate advertised expectations w/ admissions	7. Improve faculty curriculum coordination & development	14. More scholarships & fellowships for students	2. Legacy IDRC issues
<b>2</b>	29. Request institutional transparency for decisions	11. Equity access for #10	4. Clarify non-standard admissions practices	8. Clarify learning aims via curriculum mapping	23. Via #15, equitable access relative to research-funded	21. Policies, IDRC teaching
<b>1</b>	30. Training on #29	13. Improve asynchronous #11	5. Clarify role of prior learning for non-standard admissions	20. More OCADU faculty in research, advising, teaching	31. Infrastructure autonomy	32. Partnership agreement w/ IDRC
	<b>i. Resourcing via transparency &amp; evidence</b>	<b>ii. Levers for agile change in response to needs</b>	<b>iii. Calibrate admissions</b>	<b>iv. Internal coordination</b>	<b>v. Increase scholarship/fellowship funding</b>	<b>vi. Address legacy problems</b>

### i. Resourcing INCD via transparent evidence-based decision-making processes

The external review team observed that many INCD faculty are not provided with offices, including faculty who advise students and therefore need privacy for meetings (and within which to keep confidential materials secure). Furthermore, they observed that INCD has not been provided with physical space. In terms of infrastructure for delivering the online portions of the program, they supported the creation of a networked video conferencing classroom and other infrastructure and support for distance learning. They noted how the program was understaffed, with too few faculty.

That most of these have been known for almost a decade, but remain unresolved, pointed to a deeper problem identified by external reviewers: A need to clarify institutional decision-making processes regarding: space allocation, access to technical services and equipment, budgeting, and the allocation of teaching staff, including tenure/tenure track hires. **This need for resourcing via transparent and evidence-based decision-making (Table 1i)** should be addressed as part of responding to the specific recommendations. If no transparent and evidence-based decision-making processes are in place for any of these items, they should be established, in consultation with INCD.

### ii. Establishing levers for agile change in response to observed needs

The review team noted that it would be advantageous to increase the applicant pool to bring in qualified candidates, improve the online aspects of INCD's delivery model to provide equitable access for remote students (including students attempting to participate in synchronous activities from diverse time zones), and develop a balanced approach to providing equitable access (via activities that can be completed remotely) with hands-on studio activities that are difficult to deploy online.

Again, these recommendations suggest an underlying theme: **A need to establish levers to empower INCD to become more agile in response to needs as soon as they are discovered (Table 1ii)**. For example, an ability to rapidly deploy resources to improve the INCD website (through less-restricted access to funds to hire students for this work), post documentation of student work online, and to develop an online research showcase, would have

a dramatic impact on improving the applicant pool by providing a clearer representation of the program to potential applicants. In addition, iterative inclusive design of online course delivery approaches would spread the program's message via word of mouth more effectively.

The review team also made a number of recommendations, entirely compatible with the INCD self study around: **iii. calibrating admissions** (for example, by clarifying applicant profiles for recruitment, reconciling advertised expectations with admissions practices, and clarifying non-standard admissions criteria); **iv. increasing internal coordination among faculty** (via mentorship, faculty development, faculty meetings, and treating PLOs as a living document that can be updated over time); **v. increasing scholarships, fellowships, and other awards** available to INCD students (to become comparable with other OCAD U graduate programs) and to establish a balanced model between sponsored research support for students and non-sponsored support that allows for equitable learning, and project/research-based learning experiences; **vi. addressing legacy structural issues** between INCD and the IDRC (with respect to space, equipment, support staff, and other logistical matters); hybrid education (a combination of online and in-person delivery with intensive courses), and quality enhancement (of the online experience in particular).

Many of the recommendations are already under consideration by various levels of program administration, while others are more aspirational and/or long-term. It is apparent from the review that the INCD program is both viable and sound, but that a variety of enhancements will improve the quality and calibre of the program considerably.

### **1b. Next steps and other functionally oriented themes**

At this point, it is clearer that the six themes identified in Table 1 should be understood as root causes that underlie diverse INCD-university functions. For example, Theme i, which responds to a perceived lack of transparent and evidence-based decision-making, connects diverse recommendations pertaining to: tuition, e-learning, physical space, faculty offices, and faculty hiring. Although the thread connecting these functions is a lack of transparent decision making, the functions themselves are diverse. Therefore, Table 2 presents recommendations based on the functions they pertain to, such as: recruitment & marketing, equity in student learning, etc.

Table 2. Emergent themes pertaining to program functions.

## 2. Strengths and Challenges:

As noted by the reviewers' report, INCD has the potential to be an international leader in inclusive design education, research, and engagement. With the right amount of institutional support and program leadership, it could be the national and international standard for post-secondary education in inclusive design. The current and past students of the program are successful with respect to scholarly output, external projects, and postgraduate opportunities. A key challenge for the program is aligning current and future improvements with the key goals established in the founding of the program. There is an opportunity to improve on shared vision among teaching faculty and core faculty to strengthen the foundation for program learning outcomes. This common ground and the process to arrive at a common ground is a necessity to support the implementation or revision of the new program learning outcomes. The reviewers applauded the co-design process with which the faculty developed the current program learning outcomes but noted a need to continue to work on a consensus driven process. Overall, the INCD program continues to grow and its students are successful; the challenges are to ensure a more robust communication strategy and to fine-tune operational elements for a smoother experience for graduate students and faculty.

### 3. Implementation Plan:

Report Category	Emergent Category	Recommendation	Proposed Follow-up	Responsibility and Other Stakeholders	Implementation Date/Timeline
3.1 Objectives	[Iterative design of program vision]	1. Establish a consensus-driven process for a shared vision among core faculty and teaching faculty to better support the implementation or revision of the Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs).	The INCD Program Committee (PC) should meet at least three times per year. This process should include an annual review of the PLOs, following an inclusive community driven approach.	GPD and INCD program committee	Immediately
3.2 Admissions Requirements	[Recruitment & marketing]	2. Establish a clear profile for cohorts and individual applicants to target for recruitment.	The INCD Admissions Committee (in partnership with the INCD Program Committee) will work to establish a clear profile for cohorts and individual applicants to target for recruitment, keeping in mind that the program needs to be open to diverse students that might fall outside of a single profile.	Admissions and Program Committees	Spring 2020
3.2 Admissions Requirements	[Recruitment & marketing]	3. Close the gap between advertised expectations and admission practices.	In addition to the above (#2), talk to the Dean and others about securing resources to respond with greater agility to needs once they are detected.	Dean and GPD	Spring 2020
3.2 Admissions Requirements	[Recruitment & marketing]	4. Address the non-standard admissions practice - is this a choice or a necessity?	INCD uses non-standard admissions to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. reach enrollment targets that have been established by senior administrators, and</li> <li>ii. include diverse learners (outliers) with backgrounds, circumstances, or other individual differences that fall outside of the norm.</li> </ul>	Admissions and Program Committees	Spring-Summer 2020

<p>3.2 Admissions Requirements</p>	<p>[Recruitment &amp; marketing]</p>	<p>5. Address the alignment of desired cohort/individual profiles with OCAD admissions, e.g. greater weight given to Prior Learning Experience over GPAs.</p>	<p>INCD will clarify parameters for accepting candidates on an individual basis. This will entail clarifying the need for candidates to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•express their interests and alignments with inclusive design (and INCD in particular),</li> <li>•describe what lived experiences/qualities they bring to the program, and</li> <li>•what they envision getting out of (or accomplishing via) the program.</li> </ul> <p>There should be outreach to the broader inclusive design community to find breadth and diversity of candidates via non-traditional recruitment, community recruitment as well as international sources will bring in up and coming leaders across disciplinary fields of design, science, law, social activism, politics, policy and economy, etc. This type of outreach will be aided by solution that respond to Cross-Cutting Theme ii. Levers for agile responses to changes once they are detected.</p> <p>The external review committee recommended establishing a clear profile for cohorts and individual applicants to target for recruitment.</p> <p>The INCD Admissions Committee (in partnership with the INCD Program</p>	
------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	---	---	--

3.2 Admissions Requirements	[Recruitment & marketing]	<p>6. Consider increasing the number of applicants to lower the acceptance rate.</p> <p>Committee) will work to establish a clear profile for cohorts and individual applicants to target for recruitment, keeping in mind that the program needs to be open to diverse students that might fall outside of a single profile.</p> <p>The following steps are being employed to close the gap between advertised expectations and admissions practices:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. As part of this cyclical review, the INCD IQAP team undertook the co-design of program learning outcomes (PLOs) with INCD faculty and instructors:</li> <li>2. These were used to develop a curriculum map that aligned INCD courses to PLOs.</li> <li>3. Curriculum mapping is now complete and the results are informing the refinement of course learning outcomes (CLOs).</li> <li>4. The PLOs are the basis for the updated program description that will be posted on INCD's main website (and other materials about the program).</li> <li>5. Thus, during the application process, applicants will review the description (that is based on the PLOs) and describe their approach, understanding, desire and ability to engage with them.</li> </ol>		
-----------------------------	---------------------------	---	--	--

3.3 Curriculum	[Curriculum, Teaching & Assessment]	<p>7. Ensure faculty are able to collaborate to deploy revised curriculum and implement these changes through faculty consensus.</p>	<p>To ensure that faculty are able to collaborate to deploy revised curriculum and implement these changes through faculty consensus we will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Re-establish regular faculty meetings that include tenure/tenure track faculty, sessional faculty, Teaching Assistants, and where appropriate, Classroom Assistants.</li> <li>•Continue to effectively utilize routine Program Committee (PC) meetings for developing consensus around curriculum and any needed revisions.</li> <li>•Develop an annual or bi-annual retreat to align on program goals and curriculum strategies.</li> </ul>	GPD and program committee	Spring-Summer 2020
3.4 Teaching and Assessment	[Curriculum, Teaching & Assessment]	<p>8. Increased coordination between faculty and across courses, to ensure consistency in teaching methods and pedagogy.</p>	<p>To ensure that faculty are able to collaborate to deploy revised curriculum and implement these changes through faculty consensus we will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Re-establish regular faculty meetings that include tenure/tenure track faculty, sessional faculty, Teaching Assistants, and where appropriate, Classroom Assistants.</li> <li>•Continue to effectively utilize routine Program Committee (PC) meetings for developing consensus around curriculum and any needed revisions.</li> <li>•Develop an annual or bi-annual retreat to align on</li> </ul>	GPD and INCD faculty	Ongoing

			program goals and curriculum strategies.		
3.3 Curriculum	[Hybrid Learning]	9. Provide clarity on the aims of the learning, what can be expected and what can be delivered upon.	Through the cyclical review process, the program team has undertaken the development of program learning outcomes using a participatory, co-design methodology. The program learning outcomes were used in the development of a curriculum map, aligning courses to program-level outcomes. The curriculum mapping process is now complete and the results are being used to guide curriculum content and structure moving forward. Specifically, the results are being used to revise courses by adding or refining course learning outcomes.	INCD program committee	Completed, Fall 2019

3.3 Curriculum	[Hybrid Learning]	<p>10. Address constraints with learning environments, e.g. lack of studio learning balanced with making the program more inclusive and accessible globally.</p>	<p>Employ inclusive design practices to refine the hybrid delivery model by developing an understanding regarding the needs of students and instructors relative to available technology in order to invest in and support a high-quality learning experience. While the program has evolved since the original proposal of providing a primarily online learning experience, responding to the wants and needs of students is good inclusive design and is a source of innovation toward a flexible paradigm to support the needs of our design-oriented pedagogy. Indeed, the development of the Inclusive Design program should provide a model of inclusive practice in program development for the whole university and beyond.</p>	GPD in consult with Dean	Ongoing
----------------	-------------------	--	--	--------------------------	---------

3.3 Curriculum	[Equity in student learning]	11. Address equity and access issues for remote students	<p>Increase web presence; research showcase; empower INCD to do this by coordinating with the Dean of Graduate Studies to consider restoring budget line items and to coordinate with marketing and communication. Improving the online aspects of INCD's delivery model to provide equitable access for remote students</p> <p>Connects with cross-cutting themes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Resourcing via transparency &amp; evidence</li> <li>ii. Levers for agile change in response to needs</li> </ul>	GPD and Dean	Spring, 2020
3.3 Curriculum	[Equity in student learning]	12. Address planning challenges with the summer intensives for financial reasons	Changes to summer intensive have been introduced.	Dean; VP Students, Senate	Completed
3.3 Curriculum	[Equity in student learning]	13. Explore what can be done to meet the need of students attempting to participate in synchronous activities outside their regular schedule	Program committee will review to determine how to meet these needs.	Program committee	Ongoing

3.6 Quality Enhancement	[Equity in student learning]	14. The Dean of Graduate Studies and Vice-President Academic make more internal funding in the form of scholarships, fellowships, and other awards available to INCD students comparable with other OCAD U graduate programs;	In addition to requesting that the Dean of GS and V-PA make more internal scholarship and fellowship funding available, INCD also recognizes that such resources are limited overall at OCAD U.	Dean, Director Grad Studies, VP Students	Ongoing
3.6 Quality Enhancement	[Equity in student learning]	15. The Vice-President Academic consider reducing tuition costs to align with the majority of the graduate programs out of fairness and possible reduced tuitions for remote students who personally bear many of the overhead costs of the learning.	GPD has brought this to the attention of Graduate Studies, and while it is unlikely the overall tuition will be decreased, by reducing the number of semesters students are enrolled, previous ineligibility for OSAP should be eliminated, resulting in a net financial gain for students.	VPA, Dean, GPD	Completed
3.5 Resources	[Dedicated Space]	16. Creation of a networked video conferencing classroom dedicated to distance learning courses.	A dedicated program space with a conferencing system that supports Zoom will be sought after. Further investment in online resources	Dean, GPD	Spring, 2020

3.5 Resources	[Dedicated Space]	17. INCD be given dedicated and shared space equivalent to other OCAD grad programs of comparable size;	INCD should be given dedicated and shared space equivalent to other OCAD graduate programs of comparable size (352). While steps have been taken to ensure space has been allocated, there remains a concern that this is not in close enough proximity to the maker lab and rapid prototyping stations.	Dean, GPD	Completed
3.5 Resources	[Dedicated Space]	18. Office space be allocated for non-core faculty who advise students (e.g. continuing) to have confidential meetings with students and keep confidential materials.	Office space should be allocated for faculty, particularly those who advise students, to have confidential meetings with students and to keep confidential materials secure (3.5.3).	Dean, GPD	Ongoing
3.5 Resources	[Faculty]	19. Creation of an additional tenure-track line for INCD by the VP Academic that will increase the number of core faculty to allow for robust Graduate Program Director succession planning.	Ongoing discussions with the Dean of Design regarding future hiring plans.	Dean of Design, VP Academic, GPD	Ongoing
3.7 Quality Indicators	[Faculty]	20. The program actively seek and support stronger connections and involvement of other OCAD faculty in teaching, research, and projects.	A regular communication between decision-making parties within INCD, Grad Studies, and the University at large to review infrastructure needs	Deans of Grad and Design, VP Academic, VP Research	Ongoing

3.7 Quality Indicators	[Faculty]	21. The VP Academic consider and explore policies to allow IDRC staff to contribute to INCD through teaching, research, and projects.	GPD to broach this subject with the Dean of Graduate Studies to be considered by the VPA-Provost.	Dean, VP Academic, GPD	Ongoing
3.6 Quality Enhancement	[Advising Model]	22. Establish an equitable model for students accessing advisors to gain experience with projects, access resources, and access faculty.	GPD will continue to work with the Faculty of Design and other faculties to increase access to faculty supervisors.	Deans, Design, and Grad	Ongoing
3.6 Quality Enhancement	[Advising Model]	23. Establish a balanced model between research funding support, financial support and allows for equitable learning and project/research experience.	Considerations to be undertaken by the INCD program committee.  To discuss: A larger conversation about research overhead and coordination with OCAD U's Development Office is needed to support these efforts.	GPD, INCD program committee, Development office, Exec Director/Advis or to Provost	Spring and onward, 2020
3.6 Quality Enhancement	[Quality Enhancement]	24. Establish at the program or institutional level, data collecting processes that can be routinized on an annual or bi-annual basis for students, alumni, and external stakeholder experiences with INCD.	INCD program committee will take this into consideration for future planning.  GPD, Dean and Provost will consult with FCDC on enlisting their support.	GPD, Director FCDC, Dean	Spring, 2020

	3.6 Quality Enhancement	[Quality Enhancement]	25. Establish an external advisory committee consisting of external stakeholders and alumni that meets at least annually.	GPD will broach this subject with Dean of Graduate Studies to determine how best to implement.	GPD, Dean	Spring, 2020
	3.7 Quality Indicators	[Mentorship & Professional Development for Faculty]	26. Establish a mentorship program for junior faculty that focuses on internal and external mentoring.	GPD will consider models for implementation in consultation with deans and faculty.	GPD, faculty deans, faculty members	Spring and onward, 2020
	3.7 Quality Indicators	[Mentorship & Professional Development for Faculty]	27. Leadership training for senior faculty and the Graduate Program Director.	Consultation with FCDC on such leadership and professional development opportunities.  In addition to the above, explore models for faculty mentorship as a potentially more effective avenue.	GPD, FCDC	2020
	3.7 Quality Indicators	[Mentorship & Professional Development for Faculty]	28. Provide a professional development for all teaching faculty for technical teaching, pedagogy, and research (e.g. grants and grant management, plus student supervision).	Explore models for faculty mentorship.	Dean, VP Research, GPD	2020

4 Further Observations	[Transparency]	29. Establish or clarify institutional decision making processes and policies on matters of space allocation, technical services and equipment, budgeting, and teaching staff that affect the operations and planning of INCD.	<p>A regular communication between decision-making parties within INCD, Grad Studies, and the University at large to review infrastructure needs.</p> <p>Connects with cross-cutting themes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Resourcing via transparency &amp; evidence</li> <li>ii. Levers for agile change in response to needs</li> </ul>	GPD, Dean and Director, Grad Studies	Ongoing
4 Further Observations	[Transparency]	30. Support the Graduate Program Director and senior faculty with training on the institutional decision making processes and policies related to budgeting, technical services, and space.	<p>Consult with the Dean of GS to determine how best to support such training.</p> <p>Connects with cross-cutting themes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Resourcing via transparency &amp; evidence</li> <li>ii. Levers for agile change in response to needs</li> </ul>	GPD, Dean	2020-21
4 Further Observations	[Relationship w/ IDRC]	31. Establish clear autonomy between INCD and IDRC with respect to space, equipment, support staff, and other logistical matters.	<p>Establish a partnership agreement or something similar between INCD and IDRC on matters of :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•sharing staff,</li> <li>•academic and external</li> </ul>	GPD, Director IDRC	2020

4 Further Observations	[Relationship w/ IDRC]	<p>32. Establish a partnership agreement or something similar between INCD and IDRC on matters of sharing staff, academic and external partners, research collaboration, and especially access to projects and training for students that are mutually beneficial.</p>	<p>partners,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•research collaboration, and</li> <li>•especially access to projects and</li> <li>•training for students that are mutually beneficial.</li> </ul> <p>Communication between INCD and IDRC through respective leadership.</p>	GPD, Director IRDC	2020	
------------------------	------------------------	--	---	--------------------	------	--

#### 4. Recommendations:

Some of the prioritized recommendations are already complete, substantially underway, or fairly easy to undertake in short order. For instance, work on admissions requirements is an ongoing process and much of those recommendations can be implemented efficiently within the next months. In terms of curriculum, these too can be implemented forthwith, but some of these elements will require ongoing discussions and continued communication to ensure adequate follow-through. Other elements, such as an increased web presence and refining the hybrid delivery model, are currently being developed through resources allocated through graduate studies and regular strategy meetings between the GPD and Dean of Graduate Studies.

#### 5. Conclusion:

The Senate Quality Assurance Committee (SQAC) was provided with the documents pertaining to the Inclusive Design cyclical program review, including the self-study brief; the responses of the Dean, Graduate Studies and the Vice-President, Academic and Provost; the External Review Report; and the Internal Response. In their review of the final report, the SQAC focused discussion around student needs, resources and faculty professional development. The feedback was recognized and acknowledged, and the committee recommended the report to Senate for approval. The report received approval from Senate on February 24, 2020.