

**IMPLEMENTATION EVALUATION OF
ONTARIO'S COLLABORATIVE
NURSING PROGRAMS**

FINAL REPORT

**FOR THE ONTARIO COLLEGE
UNIVERSITY CONSORTIUM COUNCIL
(CUCC)**

May 11, 2007

**Rochelle Zorzi
Anna Engman
Joanne Barry
Claude Lauzon
David MacCoy
Wendy Yen**



124 Merton St., Suite 502
Toronto, Ontario M4S 2Z2

Telephone: 416-469-9954

Fax: 416 469-8487

www.cathexisconsulting.ca

STEERING COMMITTEE

The evaluation was managed by the Ontario College University Consortium Council (CUCC). The project steering committee members are:

Lesley Beagrie
Director, School of Nursing
York University

Rosemary Knechtel
Academic Vice President
Mohawk College

Barbara Gough
Senior Policy Advisor
Universities Branch, Ministry of Training,
Colleges and Universities

Karen Poole
Director, School of Nursing
Lakehead University

Renee Kenny
Dean, School of Community & Health
Studies
Centennial College

Judy Robinson
Dean, School of Health and Community
Services
Durham College

Dale Kirby/Nelsa Roberto
Senior Policy Advisor
Colleges Branch, Ministry of Training,
Colleges and Universities

Paul Stenton
Associate Vice-President, University
Planning
Ryerson University

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The successful completion of a study of this magnitude required the support of a number of individuals. Gratitude is expressed to members of the steering committee (listed on page i). The leadership of CUCC's Executive Director, Robin Armstrong, and former acting Executive Director Liz MacLennan is appreciated, as is the logistical support provided by Hana Mouasher.

We would like to acknowledge the contribution of the staff of R.A. Malatest & Associates, who designed and implemented the student and graduate survey.

Finally, we would like to thank the students, faculty, and staff who participated in this study. Without their cooperation, this study could not have been completed.

IMPLEMENTATION EVALUATION OF ONTARIO'S COLLABORATIVE NURSING PROGRAMS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

Cathexis Consulting Inc. was engaged by the Ontario College University Consortium Council (CUCC) to evaluate the implementation of Ontario's collaborative nursing programs. The purpose of the evaluation was to help government and institutions identify best practices in college-university collaboration, and help guide policy and planning for future collaborative activity. Specifically, the report was intended to:

- provide information to the postsecondary sector and government about the successes of the programs and barriers that have been encountered in building and delivering the collaborative programs;
- provide an opportunity for college and university partners to share best practices and lessons learned, to inform and improve future collaborations, regardless of program area; and
- identify best practices, including models of collaborative work and program governance models.

METHODS

The evaluation relied primarily on three data collection methods: a review of the agreements between institutions, interviews with selected staff and faculty at the participating institutions, and an internet survey of students/graduates. The data were first analysed at the collaboration level. Analytical tables and qualitative analysis software were then used to identify common themes across the collaborations.

This study provides a high-level analysis of the issues encountered in the development and delivery of collaborative baccalaureate nursing programs in Ontario. It does not provide an in-depth analysis of any one collaboration, or of any one particular issue in the development and delivery of the programs. The study is qualitative and exploratory, and is therefore not intended to produce results that can be generalized.

LESSONS LEARNED ABOUT UNDERGRADUATE COLLEGE-UNIVERSITY COLLABORATION

There are many different ways of collaborating

The colleges and universities participating in this study had chosen to structure their relationships in many different ways, depending on their unique circumstances (e.g., geographical distance between the partners, previous relationships among the partners, the resources contributed by each partner, etc.).

Each program had a unique delivery structure. In some of the collaborations, students began their program with two years at a college site, followed by two years at the university site. Other collaborations had a similar model, but also had some students who took all four years of the program at the university. In still other collaborations, the students studied all four years at one site, with different groups of students at each site. Finally, some collaborations had all students in a cohort proceed through the program together, taking classes either at one site, or, if the sites were close together, taking some courses at one site and some courses at the other. Within these various delivery structures, some faculty taught only at their own sites, some taught only at a partner institution's site, and some taught at more than one site.

Programs also differed in terms of their admissions processes. Some of the programs had a single, shared admissions process. Some had multiple points of entry for the students, but pooled their applicants or made joint admission decisions. Others had processes where there was no pooling of applicants or joint decision making at all, with one or more partners (usually the university partner) admitting students to the program without consulting the other partner(s).

Although the funding was flowed through a college partner for all of the collaborations, the methods used to share costs and funding differed. In some cases, funding was allocated based on student full time equivalents. In others it was based on teaching contract hours. Some collaborations allocated funds in proportion to the costs incurred. One collaboration used a service purchase agreement, whereby one partner purchased the services of another at a pre-specified price. Some used a combination of these methods.

Several other differences were found. For example, in some collaborations, students had access to resources and services of all of the partners, while in others, students could only access services at the site they were attending. In some collaborations, graduates were affiliated with all partners, while in others they were affiliated only with the university. Some collaborations were carrying out joint research, others were not. In spite of the differences, some commonalities existed:

- Almost all of the collaborations had some formal agreement or memorandum of understanding to structure the relationship among the institutions.
- Most had established joint committees for decision making.
- The university's academic policies and procedures were followed in most cases.

- Most of the programs used an integrated curriculum, whereby all students learned the same content in the same ways.
- In almost all cases, hiring of new faculty was carried out independently by each institution.

Collaboration success

When we embarked on this study, there were no standard criteria for collaborative program success. Through the process of this study, success criteria were articulated and the “success” of collaborations measured. However, we still do not have a complete and satisfactory definition of what a successful collaboration is. This is an area where there is room for further development at the provincial level.

Based on the success criteria used in this study, the majority of the collaborations have been moderately successful. Every collaboration was struggling with at least some issues, but most of them had managed to make their programs work within their different systems.

Areas where most collaborations were successful included:

- All of the programs were delivered by both college and university faculty, using both college and university resources.
- All collaborations had a shared admission policy.
- All of the programs awarded a baccalaureate degree from a university upon completion of the program.
- Program length and requirements were the same for all collaborative programs as for stand-alone undergraduate university nursing programs.
- Students, faculty, and administrators generally felt that the theoretical and practical aspects of nursing were well integrated.
- In most cases, the majority of administrators, faculty and other staff expected that the collaborations would continue for the next five years, so long as the requirement to collaborate remained in place.

There was room for growth and improvement in the following areas:

- The transition between college and university was difficult for students, in those collaborations where students needed to transfer between sites.
- Very few collaborations had a single, shared admission process.
- There were issues related to joint program planning and design in the majority of the collaborations.
- There were challenges that needed to be addressed in communications between the university and the college(s) in many of the collaborations.

- In about one quarter of the collaborations, interviewees indicated that the unique needs of their institutions were not met within the collaboration. What were thought of as unique needs did, by definition, vary among institutions, but included things such as applicant pools, identity, geographical distance, class sizes, and financial structure.

Although it was not a criterion of success for this study, almost all of the collaborations were struggling with the costs of collaboration, especially in terms of the time required for joint planning, communication, working with two or more administrative systems, and travel. The lack of funding had far-reaching implications for other aspects of the collaboration, including joint decision-making and communications.

Key effective practices in collaboration

This study identified a number of practices that interviewees thought were effective in developing and delivering collaborative programs. The practices with the strongest support are described here. It is worth noting that three of the key effective practices (communication; joint decision making; and open, respectful relationships) require substantial staff and faculty time, and therefore have cost implications.

Communication

It was important to maintain positive relationships, resolve issues early, and keep everybody up to date about program decisions. Accordingly, regular communication was necessary at all levels, both between institutions and within institutions. A combination of formal and informal communication channels seemed to be effective. Quality of communication was as important as quantity.

Joint decision making

It was important that processes and structures for collaborative decision-making be transparent, consistent, and fair to all parties. It was likely not essential, nor even realistic, for all collaborative partners to have equal say. However, it was important that all partners have input into key decisions, and that individual staff and faculty have genuine opportunities to influence decisions that would affect them.

A clear and detailed Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) helped to outline the structures of communication. MOUs indicated who was responsible for which decision, and how decisions were to be made. A committee structure was typically established, with specific committees responsible for different areas of the programs (e.g., curriculum, finance, admissions, marketing). Committees had the authority to make decisions pertaining to their areas. A high-level steering committee usually oversaw all aspects, ensured that the MOU was adhered to, and resolved issues that could not be resolved at other levels.

Several MOUs outlined mechanisms for dispute resolution and included mechanisms for ensuring adherence to the structures in the MOU. These elements were helpful when conflicts arose.

Open, respectful relationships

In some of the collaborations, relationships between the college and university faculty and staff were described as “good” and “open,” and people were committed to the collaboration and willing to work together. There was a high level of respect, and people felt that their contributions to the program were recognized and valued. In other collaborations, faculty and staff felt that their strengths were not valued. This was a demoralizing experience that drained people’s energy, setting the stage for failure of the collaboration.

Senior management support

Individuals in senior management positions within the colleges and universities had the power to encourage collaboration, to build relationships and teams among the faculty and staff, to foster a common vision for the program, and to ensure that decision-making processes were followed. Collaborations with supportive senior managers were more likely to have effective practices in place.

Collaboration takes time and costs more

One of the main findings of this study is that collaboration took extra time, above and beyond what would normally be required for an undergraduate nursing program.

At the beginning, when the collaborative programs were being developed, there were differences in values and expectations, institutional policies, finances, curricula, resources, administrative policies and procedures, and collective agreements that needed to be worked through. The programs needed to be designed, including both administrative and curricular details. Working relationships among faculty and staff from the different institutions needed to be developed and strengthened so that people could work together as a team. College faculty needed to develop capacity within their departments and institutions to carry out research. College and university faculty needed to review curriculum goals, delivery methods, and assessment methods to ensure that the program delivered a single, consistent, degree-level curriculum at all sites.

Once the program was implemented, ongoing communication was needed to ensure consistency across sites, deal with separate admission and information systems, allocate funds, make decisions about students, maintain the program, and deal with unanticipated issues. The more partners there were in the collaborative program, the more people needed to be involved in the various decisions. Travel time for meetings was also an issue. Extra administrative time was also required to transfer student data between two different computer systems, or manually enter and update student data in multiple

systems. Students also needed extra help and support as they learned to navigate more than one postsecondary system.

Faculty and staff in almost all of the collaborations mentioned that collaboration was a lot of work. In several collaborations the faculty and staff said they felt overloaded, and in some cases that they were beginning to burn out. In university settings, faculty noted that collaborative activities took time away from their research, threatening their opportunities for tenure and promotion.

Because of the additional time required, the collaborative programs cost more to run than would a comparable non-collaborative program. The interviewees in this study indicated that additional funding was needed to compensate for the additional time and staff required (as described above). Costs were also incurred for travel and long-distance communication, including communication infrastructure (e.g., teleconference and videoconference).

Other challenges

Need for streamlined, shared admissions processes

Because there were two distinct systems for entering Ontario colleges and universities, it was challenging for any of the collaborations to create a single, shared admissions process. Four collaborations had done so. In these cases, the students applied through the university system, and the partnering colleges were involved in admission decisions. This appeared to be the most streamlined option for a shared admission system, but it did have some costs: college interviewees were concerned that this process would discourage students from applying to other college programs, and make it more difficult to refer students who were not admitted to the nursing program to other college programs.

Other collaborations allowed students to enter through both the college and the university systems. Some of these collaborations pooled the applicants into a single database and made shared admission decisions. Still others ran parallel admissions processes but consulted with each other about applicants whose qualifications were in question. These processes were more time consuming, especially where student data from multiple systems needed to be pooled.

If applicants are pooled, it raises the issue of how to decide which students will attend which campus. One option would be to assign them randomly to different campuses, which would result in a roughly equal student body at each campus. Another possibility is to accommodate student preferences for a specific campus to the extent possible, with students deflected to another campus if they are not accepted into their first choice. This option would likely result in different grade cut-offs for different campuses, as the most-

desired campus would have the highest grade cut-off¹. This phenomenon has already been observed in several of the collaborations.

Need for streamlined administrative structures

The main concern related to administrative structures was the transfer of student data between institutions. The partnering institutions each had different student information systems, which had troubles communicating with one another. Either the staff needed to spend extraordinary amounts of time getting the systems to communicate with one another, or student data needed to be entered manually in multiple systems. Neither of these options was considered satisfactory by the interviewees in this study. The difficulties in communicating information about students had impacts on the partners' ability to access student information in a timely way (e.g., contact information, grades, number of students), and also had impacts on the students (e.g., ability to access resources at partner institutions, timely access to grades and other performance information, needing to make address changes at multiple institutions, falling through the cracks between the institutions). In some programs, it also made it difficult to track students through all four years of the program.

Some collaborations were able to streamline some of the other administrative structures (e.g., scheduling, making routine decisions, financial operations) over time, which made collaboration a bit less onerous and time-consuming.

Collective agreements and faculty inequality

The different collective agreements at colleges and universities created significant difficulties for faculty and administrators of collaborative programs. Different expectations, schedules, vacations, roles, responsibilities, workloads, opportunities for further education, and compensation created feelings of resentment among faculty, typically in both directions. This study did not identify any ideas for how to deal with this issue.

Collective agreements also limited the amount of time that college faculty could spend on research and other scholarly activities. At some colleges, workload formulas had been adjusted to enable faculty to conduct research. For example, the number of hours allocated to teaching each week had been reduced, and those hours had been allocated to scholarly activities and other collaborative work.

Maintaining consistency in the program across sites

Consistency in the program between sites, and integrity among the different courses in the program, were considered to be very important in maintaining the quality of the program. Collaborations used a number of practices to foster consistency:

¹ All accepted students would presumably still meet the minimum requirements for admission to the program.

- Lead teachers were established for specific courses or years of study. These lead teachers were responsible for communicating with other teachers of the same course or year to ensure that the material covered was consistent.
- Course material was shared among those who taught the same course at different sites, including the syllabus, readings, textbooks, assignments, and examinations.
- Practicum teachers were invited to sit in on theory classes to ensure that the content of practicum courses built on what was taught in the theoretical courses.

As with many other solutions to collaborative challenges, these practices took time and had cost implications.

The need for consistency also had to be balanced with a need for flexibility and autonomy. Collaborations may wish to discuss the following issues:

- What types of decisions can faculty make on their own, and what types should require team or committee approval?
- To what extent do approvals processes inhibit innovation?
- Does “consistent” mean “equal,” or could each program site offer unique opportunities to students in the same program (e.g., specific interdisciplinary studies, smaller classes, better facilities, etc.)?

Scholarly research

The collaborative programs enhanced the colleges’ capacity to conduct research, both within and beyond the nursing program. In at least one collaboration, college faculty had carried out research independently and published their findings in a peer reviewed journal.

The building of research capacity in the colleges takes time. Supports need to be put in place, and faculty may need mentorship to develop their research skills. Because so much time and effort goes into the development of the collaborations, it is likely unrealistic to see much activity in the research area during the first few years. However, this is something that should be attended to as soon as it becomes practical, since it is important for baccalaureate students to be taught within a culture of inquiry.

Capacity was built effectively in collaborations where college faculty were mentored in scholarly research by university faculty who involved them as co-researchers on joint projects. However, this was demanding on the time of the university faculty. Faculty cross appointments were another successful way of building capacity among college faculty.

As mentioned previously, the collaborations had a negative impact on the research activities of faculty in many of the universities, due to the extra time spent in collaboration activities. While no solutions were identified for this problem, in at least

one collaboration the problem eased up over time as the details of the program were worked out and took less day-to-day time.

Hiring

There was a shortage of nurses in the province with the qualifications needed to teach in baccalaureate-level programs. Hiring new faculty was identified as a problem in several of the collaborations.

Costs and benefits of collaboration

It seems that, to make a collaboration really work, it is necessary to invest considerable time up front in developing a shared culture, and considerable time on an ongoing basis for communication and collaborative decision-making. Specific elements of collaboration that are considered desirable (e.g., shared admissions process) add another layer of joint administration. This raises two questions:

- In what circumstances are the benefits of collaboration worth the costs?
- What other options are there that might achieve the benefits desired from collaboration without some of the associated costs?

While it is beyond the scope of this project to answer these questions, we feel that we can contribute to the discussion by outlining the main costs and benefits of collaborations, as seen through the eyes of our key informants and the students and graduates who completed the surveys.

Perceived benefits

The main perceived benefits of collaboration were:

- Individuals participating in the collaborations had the opportunity to develop strong, positive relationships with others, and experienced personal and professional growth.
- Research capacity and educational standards increased at the colleges (both within and beyond the program), and also at some of the universities.
- The relationships between the partners and the increased knowledge of the other postsecondary system led partners to consider (and in some cases implement) collaborations in other areas.
- More students were educated, because education reached students in their home communities. In addition, those who were educated in their home communities were more likely to stay there to practice, so the supply of nurses in smaller communities was improved.
- Many students appreciated having access to the benefits of both the college and the university systems.

Perceived costs

The main perceived costs of collaboration were:

- There was a higher workload for almost everybody involved, and some faculty and administrative staff were becoming exhausted.
- Collaboration was a drain on time and the financial resources of the institutions.
- There were differences in expectations and reward mechanisms for faculty in the same program, depending on whether they were employed by a college or a university. Expectations were not always clear, especially in the colleges, where faculty were governed by both the regular college policies and expectations, and the somewhat different policies and expectations that were being applied to a baccalaureate program.
- Each partner, and each faculty or staff member, had less autonomy, flexibility, and control than they would in a program offered by a single institution.
- The ability to conduct research at the university suffered because faculty time was spent on collaboration.
- Individual institutions needed to wait until student information was provided by a partner before they could make important decisions.
- Students found the transition between college and university difficult.
- When collaboration didn't work well, people felt extremely devalued, frustrated, and stressed, which had an impact on the whole institution.
- Perceived differences in admission requirements or grading at different sites led to rivalry and elitism among the students.
- Timely, accurate communication with students was even more challenging than usual, resulting in confusion and frustration.

Suggestions for the province

If the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities wishes to enhance collaboration between colleges and universities in Ontario, it could do so by:

- Recognizing the extraordinary cost of collaboration, especially in terms of the time required for joint planning, communication, working with two or more administrative systems, and travel.
- Providing support to CUCC to develop a compendium of effective practices in college-university collaboration.
- Providing practical support for collaborations (e.g., providing templates for MOUs and other tools, facilitating information sharing about effective practices, etc.).

- Providing funding and incentives to nursing faculty and institutions, to allow nursing faculty to increase their qualifications to the PhD level, thus increasing the pool of qualified faculty.
- Determining if it is possible to facilitate, at a provincial level, the development of solutions to some of the challenges to collaboration (e.g., a streamlined/integrated admissions systems between the colleges and the universities).
- Supporting colleges in building their research capacity.
- Developing a better definition of successful collaboration (which will likely evolve out of the identification and promotion of effective practices).

In addition, for the existing collaborative nursing programs, the MTCU could:

- Provide additional funding to support these extraordinary costs;
- Provide additional funding to support the additional costs of clinical education; and
- Review the flow of funding for all nursing programs.

Suggestions for participating institutions

Institutions can enhance collaboration within their own partnerships by adopting any of the following suggestions that are relevant to their particular situation:

- Take steps to ease the transition between college and university, if students need to transfer between sites. Although efforts had been made in the past, students still found this transition difficult. Action research by faculty in the participating institutions might be one way of identifying effective strategies in this area.
- Develop a clear and detailed Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that indicates who is responsible for which decisions and how decisions are to be made, and that includes mechanisms for adherence to the structures of the MOU.
- Establish a system of formal and informal communication channels so that information can be exchanged on a regular basis at all levels, both between and within institutions.
- Attempt to identify solutions to any challenges to collaboration that are adversely affecting the partnership (e.g., streamlining administrative structures, faculty inequality, hiring difficulties, enhancing research capacity in the colleges, consistency across sites). This may be another area where action research could be helpful.
- Senior managers can champion collaboration, foster open, respectful relationships among the partners, and ensure that decision-making processes are followed.
- As part of joint planning sessions, spend some time identifying and valuing the strengths that each partner brings to the collaboration, the shared goals of the

partners, and the benefits that collaboration can bring. Focusing on these positives can increase commitment to the collaboration, increase energy levels, and reduce friction between the partners.

IMPLEMENTATION EVALUATION OF ONTARIO'S COLLABORATIVE NURSING PROGRAMS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction.....	1
1.1	Background.....	1
1.2	Purpose and scope.....	3
1.3	Methodology.....	6
II.	Summary of Evaluation Findings	12
2.1	How are Ontario's collaborative nursing programs structured?.....	12
2.2	How were the collaborative programs developed?.....	20
2.3	What contextual factors affected the development and delivery of the programs?.....	22
2.4	What has worked well in developing and delivering collaborative programs?.....	25
2.5	To what extent have the collaborations been successful?.....	32
2.6	What are the initial impacts of the collaborations?.....	36
2.7	What promising approaches, models, and practices have emerged for designing and delivering collaborative programs?	43
2.8	What are promising strategies to support more effective collaborations at the provincial, consortium, and site-specific levels?	43
III.	Lessons Learned about Undergraduate College-University Collaboration	46
3.1	There are many different ways of collaborating.....	46
3.2	Collaboration success.....	47
3.3	Key effective practices in collaboration	49
3.4	Collaboration takes time and costs more	50
3.5	Other challenges.....	51
3.6	Costs and benefits of collaboration.....	54
3.7	Suggestions for the province.....	55
3.8	Suggestions for participating institutions.....	56

IV. References.....	58
V. Bibliography	59
Appendix A: Interview Guide.....	61
Appendix B: Student/Graduate Survey.....	65
Appendix C: Collaboration Descriptions.....	73
Brock/Loyalist.....	74
Lakehead/Confederation.....	80
Laurentian/Cambrian/Northern/Sault/St. Lawrence/Boréal.....	87
McMaster/Mohawk/Conestoga.....	98
New Brunswick/Humber	107
Nipissing/Canadore.....	114
Ottawa/Algonquin/La Cité.....	120
Queen’s/St. Lawrence College.....	128
Ryerson/Centennial/George Brown	134
Trent/Fleming	142
UOIT/Durham.....	147
Western/Fanshawe	153
Windsor/Lambton/St. Clair.....	157
York/Georgian/Seneca.....	162
Appendix D: Content Headings for Analytical Matrices.....	167

IMPLEMENTATION EVALUATION OF ONTARIO'S COLLABORATIVE NURSING PROGRAMS

FINAL REPORT

I. INTRODUCTION

Cathexis Consulting Inc. was engaged by the Ontario College University Consortium Council (CUCC) to evaluate the implementation of Ontario's collaborative nursing programs. This report presents the findings of the evaluation.

1.1 BACKGROUND

1.1.1 Collaborative nursing education in Ontario

As of January 1, 2005, all new Ontario Registered Nurses must have a four-year bachelor's degree in nursing. To help meet this new education requirement, universities and colleges across Ontario have formed nursing partnerships, resulting in the creation of four-year collaborative nursing programs that lead to a baccalaureate degree in nursing granted by a university. The Collaborative Nursing Degree Programs are the first system-wide college-university collaboration in Ontario. The first cohort of students graduated in spring of 2005.

The Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities initially described a collaborative nursing program as follows (MTCU, April 12, 2000):

- There is joint college-university program planning and design.
- The program is delivered by both college and university faculty, utilizing both college and university resources.
- There is a single, shared admission policy and process for the program.
- A baccalaureate degree is awarded upon completion of the program. The new nursing registration regulation requires that this degree be awarded by a university.
- Program length and program requirements are the same for collaborative nursing programs as for stand-alone undergraduate university nursing programs.

At the time this report was prepared, 21 Ontario colleges and 12 Ontario universities were involved in 15 different collaborative nursing programs (see Table 1 for a complete

list). The University of New Brunswick was also involved in collaboration with an Ontario college. The collaborations had remained stable since 2003, with two exceptions:

- St. Lawrence College originally collaborated with Queen’s University (Council of Ontario University Programs in Nursing, 2003); and
- The collaboration between Laurentian University and Collège Boréal to offer French-language programming dissolved while the evaluation was being conducted.

Table 1: Universities and Colleges Currently Offering Collaborative Nursing Programs

College	University
English-language programs	
Loyalist College	Brock University
Confederation College	Lakehead University
Cambrian College	Laurentian University
Northern College	
Sault College	
St. Lawrence College	Laurentian University
Conestoga College	McMaster University
Mohawk College	
Canadore College	Nipissing University
Centennial College	Ryerson University
George Brown College	
Fleming College	Trent University
Humber College	University of New Brunswick
Durham College	University of Ontario Institute of Technology
Algonquin College	University of Ottawa
Fanshawe College	University of Western Ontario
Lambton College	University of Windsor
St. Clair College	
Georgian College	York University
Seneca College	
French-language programs	
La Cité collégiale	Université d’Ottawa

1.1.2 Ministry supports

The Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities provided guidelines as well as start-up and expansion funding to support the collaborative programs (MTCU, April 12, 2000; January 19, 2001). Specifically, the Ministry:

- Increased the formula funding per student associated with collaborative nursing programs at colleges so that it is equal to funding per student associated with BScN programs at universities.

- Provided one-time Start-up and Expansion Grants of up to \$20 million in 2000-01, 2001-02, and 2002-03 to support the costs of moving to collaborative programs. Start-up and Expansion Grants could be used for capital items; materials or supplies; monographs or periodicals; faculty and staff release time for activities such as curriculum design; costs associated with developing and implementing the collaborative nursing program; marketing and promotion; academic upgrading; and minor physical plant renovation costs.
- Provided \$12.6 million over seven years to create spaces in university graduate programs for college faculty teaching in an Ontario collaborative program wishing to complete the MScN degree, including a tuition waiver for those faculty, and expanded opportunities for individuals wishing to attend graduate school in order to prepare for a career in nursing education in Ontario.
- Provided additional funding to colleges and universities that wished to take extra steps to increase the supply of nurses expected to graduate in 2003-2004, the year when the normal supply of graduates would otherwise be reduced due to the transition from a three-year to a four-year program. This included \$24.3 million over three years to colleges to fund a final diploma intake, and \$14.7 million over three years to universities to fund compressed degree programs.
- Granted approval for new collaborative nursing programs.
- Consulted with colleges and universities in developing the new programs to support opportunities in graduate nursing education.

In addition, the 2004 Provincial Budget contained a new Nursing Faculty Fund, to further expand enrolment in graduate nursing programs. The Nursing Faculty Fund provided \$1M in 2004-05, growing to \$4M in 2007-08 and future years, for a further expansion of graduate nursing programs, at both the master's and PhD levels. This fund will also provide a full waiver of tuition and ancillary fees for college and university nursing faculty who are enrolled in a PhD in Nursing at an Ontario university. In spite of this additional funding, the funds available were short of enrolments by \$1.2 million in 2006-07.

1.2 PURPOSE AND SCOPE

1.2.1 Purpose

The purpose of this evaluation was to help government and institutions identify best practices in collaboration and help guide policy and planning for future collaborative activity. Specifically, the report was intended to:

- Provide information to the postsecondary sector and government about the successes of the programs and the barriers that have been encountered in building and delivering the collaborative programs;

- Provide an opportunity for college and university partners to share best practices and lessons learned to inform and improve future collaborations, regardless of program area; and
- Identify best practices, including models of collaborative work and program governance models.

1.2.2 Evaluation questions

The following questions were addressed in this evaluation:

1. How are Ontario's collaborative nursing programs structured?
2. How were the collaborative programs developed?
3. What contextual factors affected the development and delivery of the programs?
4. What has worked well in developing and delivering collaborative programs/what factors have influenced the success of the collaborations?
5. To what extent have the collaborations been successful?²
6. What are the initial impacts of the collaborations on:
 - The institutional partners;
 - The partners' ability to provide high-quality programs to a growing student population; and
 - Student, faculty, and administrative staff experiences.
7. What promising approaches, models, and practices have emerged for designing and delivering collaborative programs?
8. What are promising strategies to support more effective collaborations, at the provincial, consortium, and site-specific levels?

The report is organized by evaluation question.

1.2.3 Scope

In answering the evaluation questions, we explored the following elements in program planning and delivery:

- Partnership stability/financial issues

² Criteria for success in collaboration are defined in section 1.2.4.

- Governance, joint decision making processes
- Executive ownership/leadership, including institutional philosophy/culture/history
- Administrative policies and procedures, including issues related to
 - Admission and registration
 - Tuition and ancillary fees
 - Communication through organizational levels across all partner sites (e.g., in marketing, student recruitment, Vice-Presidents, etc.)
- Formality of collaborative agreements vis-à-vis actual practice/operation
- Human resource policies and procedures
 - Hiring
 - Collective agreements, faculty teaching time and qualifications
 - Changing expectations for faculty
 - Professional development
- Academic policies and procedures
- Quality assurance mechanisms and practices
- Scholarship issues
- External regulatory requirements
- Communications technology: competence of users and compatibility of systems
- Graduation (e.g., documents, location, participation)
- Student services
- Alumni affiliation
- Adequacy and distribution of finances
 - Policies and practices for allocation of revenue among partners
 - Policies and practices for sharing of costs
 - Capital costs
 - Financing clinical education
- Experiences of students and faculty
- Economies and diseconomies resulting from the collaboration.

1.2.4 Criteria for judging success

The following criteria were adopted by the CUCC Steering Committee for the purpose of the evaluation and were used to assess the success of a collaboration. Please note that for the purposes of this evaluation, the focus is on success of the collaboration, rather than success of the program.

- The program reflects the Ministry’s initial description of collaborative programs:
 - There is joint college-university program planning and design;
 - The program is delivered by both college and university faculty, utilizing both college and university resources;
 - There is a single, shared admission policy and process for the program;
 - A baccalaureate degree from a university is awarded upon completion of the program; and
 - Program length and program requirements are the same for collaborative nursing programs as for stand-alone undergraduate university nursing programs.
- Students, faculty, and administrators feel that the theoretical and practical aspects of nursing are well integrated.
- Administrators, faculty, and other staff expect that the collaboration will continue for the next five years, assuming that the political context is constant.
- Administrators, faculty, and other staff are satisfied with the quality of communications between the college and the university.
- Administrators, faculty and other staff feel that the unique needs (e.g., conducting research, maintaining a degree of autonomy, maintaining inter-professional relations, etc.) of their institutions are accommodated.
- The transition between college and university studies is manageable for students.
- Graduates feel the collaborative program prepared them for employment as a nurse.

1.3 METHODOLOGY

The evaluation relied primarily on three data collection methods: a review of the agreements between institutions, interviews with selected staff and faculty at the participating institutions, and an internet survey of students/graduates. These methods are described further in this section.

1.3.1 Data collection methods

Document review

The consultants reviewed any formal agreement(s) (e.g., Memorandum of Understanding, Program Agreement) developed between the institutions in each collaboration. These documents provided a description of the program. Information from the documents was confirmed in the key informant interviews, and the documents also helped the consultants identify areas where additional information was needed from the key informants.

Key informant interviews

A single consultant was assigned to work with each collaboration. The consultant conducted telephone or in-person interviews with those who were identified as being involved in the design and/or delivery of the collaborative nursing program. Potential interviewees were identified by the key contact person at each institution (typically the dean, head, or director of nursing), and may have included the administrative head(s) of the nursing program; the Vice President Academic; at least one key faculty member; and representative(s) from the registrar's office, human resources, and finance, as identified by the key contact at each institution. Across all collaborations, we interviewed 208 people (roughly six people from each participating institution). Some people were interviewed in groups, while others were interviewed one-on-one. An overview of the number of key informants interviewed in each institution is presented in Table 2. The number of people interviewed depended on whether interviews were conducted in groups or individually, the number of potential interviewees identified by the key contact person, and the availability and interest of the potential interviewees.

Table 2: Number of key informants by institution

Institution	Number of interviewees
Algonquin	5
Boreal	5
Brock	6
Cambrian	4
Canadore	2
Centennial	8
Conestoga	5
Confederation	9
Durham	5
Fanshawe	6
Fleming	5
George Brown	6
Georgian	7
Humber	6
La Cité collégiale	2
Lakehead	8
Lambton	6
Laurentian	5
Loyalist	4
McMaster	6
Mohawk	6
Nipissing	3
Northern	5
Ottawa	5
Queen's	5

Institution	Number of interviewees
Ryerson	14
Sault	5
Seneca	5
St. Clair	8
St. Lawrence	5
Trent	5
UNB	4
UOIT	8
Western	5
Windsor	6
York	9
<i>Total</i>	<i>208</i>

Interviews were held with all of the institutions that were participating in Ontario's collaborative nursing programs at the time the study began. This includes interviews with the University of New Brunswick, which is partnering with an Ontario college. In addition, interviews were conducted with Queen's University, which is no longer involved in a collaborative nursing program.

The same interview guide was used in each interview, but the consultant focused the interview on areas that were relevant to the interviewee's work. The length of the interviews ranged from 20 minutes to two hours, with most interviews taking approximately 45 minutes. The length of the interview depended on the number of people participating in the interview, the topic areas about which they were knowledgeable, and the time availability of the interviewee(s). Within each collaboration, later interviews tended to be shorter than earlier interviews, as the consultant by then had a good understanding of the program structure and did not need to probe for as many details in that section of the interview. The interview guide is attached in Appendix A.

The purpose of the interviews was to gain an in-depth understanding of promising strategies employed and barriers to success, rather than a representative overview of the opinions of those involved. It was not necessary to conduct a large number of interviews at each institution to fulfill this purpose.

Interviewees were given an opportunity to review and comment on the notes from their interviews. Eight interviewees suggested substantive corrections to the notes, which were made before the final analysis was conducted.

Student/graduate survey

An online survey was developed by R.A. Malatest & Associates Ltd. to capture the opinions of students and graduates of the programs. The survey was field tested with a

small number of students and graduates, and revised based on their feedback. The survey questions are shown in Appendix B.

Sampling and distribution methods varied between collaborations, depending on the structure of the collaboration and the availability of collaboration staff to either provide student data or administer the survey. In most cases, schools sent notifications of the survey to all students and recent graduates by email. Two follow-up reminders were also sent. For four collaborations, a sample of students and/or graduates was provided to Malatest & Associates Ltd., who contacted the students and then followed up by telephone to increase the number of responses. Survey respondents were offered a chance to win one of three \$50 book store gift certificates.

A total of 1332 students and graduates completed the surveys. Respondents represented 14 of the 16 collaborations. The number of students or graduates completing the survey from each collaboration and is presented in Table 3. Collaborations with fewer than ten respondents were excluded from the analysis, and are not reported in the table below.

Table 3: Number of respondents by collaboration

Collaboration	Number of respondents
Brock/Loyalist	63
Lakehead/Confederation	49
Laurentian/Cambrian/Northern/Sault	88
McMaster/Mohawk/Conestoga	269
Nipissing/Canadore	27
Ottawa/Algonquin	35
Ottawa/La Cité collégiale	18
Ryerson/Centennial/George Brown	227
UNB/Humber	35
UOIT/Durham	18
Western/Fanshawe	21
Windsor/Lambton/St. Clair	191
York/Seneca	283

Due to the differences in sampling methods and the relatively low number of respondents in some instances, the student data should be interpreted with caution. It would not be appropriate to report statistical findings for each collaboration and assume that the numbers accurately reflect the opinions of all students in the programs. However, as the purpose of the evaluation was to identify higher-level themes and tendencies, the exact numbers are of limited importance for the conclusions drawn in this study.

1.3.2 Analysis methods

Collaboration summaries

Combined, the three data collection methods produced substantial data for each collaboration. The consultants prepared a summary of the findings for each collaboration based on the interviews and the review of the agreements. The summary described the key elements of the collaboration, issues encountered, successes, and changes desired by the interviewees. In addition, they indicated the extent to which the collaborations met the success criteria identified in section 1.2.4.

To protect the confidentiality of the interviewees and the institutions involved in the collaboration, the full collaboration summaries are not presented in this report. However, factual descriptions of the collaborations (without information about success criteria, issues, or successes) are attached in Appendix C. The interviewees who participated in the study were given an opportunity to review the factual description of their collaboration, and to provide feedback to improve its accuracy.

Analysis of collaboration-level student and graduate survey data

Survey data were analysed separately for each collaboration. Frequencies and/or averages were computed for quantitative items.

Qualitative data were analysed for emergent themes. Students had been asked to comment on the strengths of their program, and to identify up to three changes that they would like to see made to the program. Given limited resources and a large number of student responses, we were able to analyse the comments about the program strengths, as well as the first of the (up to three) suggested changes. Respondent comments were coded, and the key themes were identified for each collaboration.

Summaries of the student and graduate data were shared with the key contacts from each institution.

Province-level analysis

Initially, analytical tables were used to summarize the main themes from each collaboration (Miles & Huberman, 1994). The tables were based on the full collaboration summaries and the qualitative and quantitative student data analysis. The rows of the tables contained the different collaborations, and the columns contained issues of interest. A list of column headings used in the tables is shown in Appendix D.

A subsequent analysis was done of the collaboration summaries using N-Vivo (a qualitative analysis program). Opinions expressed by interviewees from the different colleges and universities were systematically coded, making it possible to determine the number of colleges and universities in which a specific opinion was expressed.

1.3.3 Strengths and limitations of the study

This study provides a high-level analysis of the issues encountered in the development and delivery of collaborative baccalaureate nursing programs in Ontario. It does not provide an in-depth analysis of any one collaboration, or of any one particular issue in the development and delivery of the programs. The study is qualitative and exploratory, and is therefore *not* intended to produce results that can be generalized.

Because there were so many institutions involved in the study, it was not possible to study each one in depth. In our interviews, we collected information from only about six key informants per institution. These key informants were selected by the main contact person at the institution, and were intended to include people who were knowledgeable about the program from different perspectives. We felt that this gave us a well-rounded view of the program, but it is important to keep in mind that other faculty and staff may have had different opinions.

The students and graduates who completed the survey did so voluntarily, and the sample was self-selected. The results of the survey therefore represented the opinions of students who were motivated enough to respond. They may not reflect the opinions of all students in the collaborative programs. One plausible scenario is that the students and graduates who responded were those who were particularly satisfied or particularly dissatisfied with the programs, and that those with more neutral feelings chose not to participate. Because we did not know how respondents differed from non-respondents, we needed to be careful in interpreting the student and graduate survey data. For each collaboration, we used the survey data to identify areas that were considered strengths or weaknesses by at least some of the students.

As we developed our summaries of the collaborations, it became apparent that many of the same themes were emerging in different collaborations, which strengthened our confidence in the results.

The factual descriptions of the collaborations were verified by interviewees, and should therefore be highly accurate.

II. SUMMARY OF EVALUATION FINDINGS

This section summarizes the findings that emerged in the province-level analysis. It is structured by evaluation question.

Before reading this section of the report, it is important to understand how numbers are used. This evaluation is, as stated earlier, a qualitative study. Our interview guides were open-ended, allowing key informants to talk about the issues that were most salient to them. They also covered a very wide range of topics, which made it impossible to cover each topic in depth. As a result, a collaboration may have experienced several issues that were not identified by any of the key informants for that collaboration. To give an indication of *how salient* each issue was to the key informants, we have provided information about the number of collaborations in which a specific issue was identified. ***Please do not assume that these numbers provide an estimate of the extent to which different issues have occurred.***

For ease of reporting, we occasionally make reference to ideas expressed by a certain number of colleges and/or a certain number of universities. These numbers refer to opinions expressed by key informants in these institutions, and are not intended to represent the institution's views on the issue, or even the viewpoint of the majority of interviewees at the institution.

2.1 HOW ARE ONTARIO'S COLLABORATIVE NURSING PROGRAMS STRUCTURED?

In answering this question, we consider different aspects of a program's structure, including governance and communications, academic policies, curriculum and delivery, scholarly activities, human resources, admissions and enrolment, graduation, student resources, finances, and quality assurance.

2.1.1 Governance and communications

A program agreement or memorandum of understanding (MOU) had been drafted for most of the collaborations. The comprehensiveness and level of detail in the MOU varied considerably, but the MOUs generally specified a committee structure and indicated which committees would be responsible for resolving which issues. Some MOUs also described processes for dispute resolution, termination, and withdrawal of a partner. Some were based on general guiding principles, while others included detailed policies and procedures for enacting the agreement.

Most of the programs were overseen by a steering committee or management committee with representation from senior-level administrators (e.g., Vice President Academics, Deans, and/or Chairs of Nursing) from all of the partnering institutions. Most of the steering committees drew on the expertise of faculty and other administrative staff as needed (particularly individuals from the Registrar's office or the Finance department). The function and mandate of the steering committees varied between collaborations, as did the frequency of their meetings. The steering committees typically dealt with all aspects of program management, including finance, admission and enrolment, human resource planning, and strategic planning. The steering committees were usually also responsible for policies and procedures for managing the programs.

Other committees were common, including faculty committees, curriculum committees, finance committees, joint marketing committees, and admission committees. As a general rule, committees included representatives from all partners in the collaboration, and in many cases the committees were reported to be effective, with open communication and equal (or close to equal) opportunities for each partner to contribute to the discussion. However, in some collaborations there were issues of trust and respect which were reported to prevent collaborative decision-making.

In all programs, high-level decisions about the program's development and design had to be approved by the university Senate.

Channels for formal communication between institutions included, but were not limited to, the following:

- *Senior management*: steering committee meetings, yearly meetings, official visits to partnering institutions to meet with faculty and students;
- *Nursing Chairs*: face-to-face meetings or teleconferences;
- *Faculty* (often including the Nursing Chairs): teleconferences/videoconferences regarding specific levels or courses, yearly or bi-yearly faculty retreats with discussions around the curriculum, professional development meetings, research meetings, communication around courses and administrative issues using electronic systems such as WebCT or Blackboard;
- *Registrars and Finance Officers*: formal meetings, in some cases only communication on an as-needed basis; and
- *Human Resources*: rarely any communication, since almost all collaborations had separate hiring practices.

2.1.2 Academic policies

In most cases, the university's academic policies and procedures were used for all students in the program, regardless of their site of study. In three cases, a combination of the university's and the college(s)' academic policies and procedures were used, where the university policies and procedures either functioned as a framework for or as a

complement to the college(s)' policies and procedures. In two collaborations, there were separate academic policies and procedures for each institution.

2.1.3 Curriculum and delivery

Almost all of the programs used an integrated curriculum, meaning that students who were in the same year but studying at different sites had the same courses and the same course content. This also meant that there generally was continuity between the college portion and the university portion of the program for students who changed sites partway through their program.

In seven cases, the joint curriculum was developed from scratch in a collaborative process among the partners. In five cases, the university curriculum was revised collaboratively. In two cases, the university curriculum was used "as is" without input from the college partner(s). In one instance, collaborative work on the curriculum was carried out but reportedly never implemented, and in one program, it was unclear whether the curriculum was jointly developed or not.

Most of the collaborations carry out regular revisions of the curriculum, typically annually in May and June, before the vacation period for college faculty. Discussions in regards to the curriculum are often held during faculty retreats and/or curriculum committee meetings. Recommendations are either forwarded to the steering committee or to the applicable university body directly.

The way the curriculum is delivered varied between collaborations. It should be noted that many of the key informants described their programs as "fully integrated," but their meanings varied widely.

Four basic types of delivery structures were identified based on the way students proceeded through the program:

- *Type 1:* Students took two years at the college, followed by two years at the university.
- *Type 2:* Students took their first two years at either the college or the university, followed by two years at the university.
- *Type 3:* All students in a cohort proceeded through the program together. Classes might have been taught at one site or, if the sites were close together, at multiple sites.
- *Type 4:* Within a given cohort, there were separate groups of students at each site.

Within these basic delivery structures, there were differences in how teaching responsibilities were allocated among the partners. In some collaborations, faculty only taught at their own sites. In others, faculty taught primarily at their own site, but some

faculty also taught at a partner site, either in person or by videoconference. In still other collaborations, all faculty taught at the single site where the students were based.

In one collaboration, a separate school of nursing was developed that seconds faculty from both institutions in one building. The school was fully integrated, had a single budget and record-keeping system, and had a separate institutional identity from both the college and the university.

The main contextual factors that influenced the choice of delivery structure are outlined in section 2.3.

2.1.4 Human resources

In almost all cases, hiring of new faculty was carried out independently by each institution. In one collaboration, the college received input from the university regarding the applicants. Joint hiring practices had been adopted by two collaborations. These collaborations had a joint hiring/search committee comprised of representatives from the partnering institutions.

As a rule, minimum qualifications were the same across the institutions in the collaborations. Almost all of the collaborations required a Master's in Nursing for new hires, with a PhD or a PhD in progress being required for tenure-track positions. Current faculty without a Master's in Nursing were either permitted to stay on with their current qualifications (e.g., Master's in Education), or were given time to upgrade their qualifications.

The collective agreements, schedules, and workload formulas differed for college and university faculty in all of the collaborations. Some of the major differences were as follows:

- The Standard Workload Formula (SWF) for college faculty generally emphasized teaching and allowed for some committee/meeting time, but often did not allow time for scholarly research. For university faculty, research was a requirement for tenure and promotion.
- College faculty were expected to abide by the hours of their SWF and to not work additional hours, while university faculty were expected to work as long as it took to carry out their research, teaching, and committee/service work responsibilities.
- College faculty had two full months of vacation each year, which had to be taken at a prescribed time. University faculty had fewer weeks of vacation, but more flexibility of when to take it. Scholarly research and teaching responsibilities determined in part when a university faculty member could take vacation.

At some colleges, workload formulas had been adjusted to enable faculty to conduct research. For example, the number of hours allocated to teaching each week had been

reduced, and those hours had been allocated to scholarly activities and other collaborative work.

At least one of the collaborations had a joint professional development committee, which arranged and coordinated joint professional development opportunities for faculty.

2.1.5 Scholarly activities

Approximately half of the collaborations conducted some scholarly research together, but the nature and frequency of these activities varied. Students were involved in conducting research in some instances. In at least one collaboration, college faculty completed and published their findings in a peer reviewed journal independently of their university partner.

A couple of collaborations had just begun to develop joint research since the development and implementation of the program had been the main priority during the first years after start-up. More attention could thereafter be turned to research.

Research capability and a culture of research were already established in the universities, but faculty noted that collaborative activities had an impact on the amount of time available for research. This is discussed further in section 2.6, which talks about the impacts of collaboration.

Establishing research capability had been challenging in many of the colleges because scholarly research traditionally had not been a role of college faculty. As mentioned earlier, the college faculty SWF did not support research particularly well. In addition, when the collaborative programs began, few colleges had institutional infrastructures to support research (e.g., research ethics board). Since then, some of the colleges had been putting these supports in place, and developing leadership capacity within the college with respect to scholarly research. For example, the activities of some of the colleges included adding dedicated research time to the SWF, making research expectations explicit, forming offices of research within the college, and setting up research ethics boards.

Other colleges still placed a low priority on research, which was challenging for faculty who wished to become more involved in research activities.

There was also variation among college faculty as to their level of interest in scholarly research. Some expressed an interest in nursing research, while others said they would prefer to continue to focus on excellence in teaching.

2.1.6 Admissions and enrolment

Only four collaborations had a single, shared admission process through either the college or the university application system.

Another five had a shared admission process that had two points of entry, where applicants could apply through either the college system or the university system (or both, if they chose). Applications at some of these sites were pooled, and some had a shared committee that considered applicants whose qualifications were in question. In several of these sites, key informants indicated that applicants who were not admitted to one institution were deflected to another campus for consideration there.

Six collaborations had a single admission process that was not shared. In these cases, the applicants could apply through the university and were accepted or declined to the program with very little or no input from the college partners.

One collaboration had an admission process where students could apply to multiple sites, but there was no information sharing or joint decision making between the sites. Decisions were made by each institution separately.

All programs had a single set of minimum requirements for students, including GPA and course requirements. These minimum levels were typically set by the university, although in four cases the minimum requirements were determined collaboratively. Although the *minimum* requirements were the same for programs with separate admissions, the *actual* GPA cut-off was typically reported to be higher at the university than at the college. The difference reported by interviewees varied from 5% to 13% for those collaborations where data were available.

The transfer of student data in-between institutions varied in nature and frequency, but the electronic systems were never completely compatible; some data always needed to be transferred manually, requiring additional staff time. In some instances, this contributed to issues with the timeliness of data sharing between the institutions.

2.1.7 Graduation and alumni affiliation

The graduation ceremonies were held at the university site in almost all cases. Some colleges held additional pinning ceremonies at their site. The role representatives from the institutions played in the ceremony varied; college faculty and staff were invited as guests in some collaborations and as key participants in others. Procedures around graduation were still evolving since most programs had only seen three classes graduate so far.

A significant portion, but not all, of the parchments recognized the college partner(s).

In at least three collaborations, students were affiliated with both the college and university partners after graduation. In at least three others, they were affiliated only with the university.

2.1.8 Student resources

Students had access to the resources of all of the partners in several of the collaborations, most often those whose partners were located close together. In other cases, students had access only to the facilities and services of the site at which they were enrolled. Students at college campuses had access to the university's online library in many (but not all) cases.

There were generally more opportunities for student scholarships at the university sites than at the college sites. Some colleges had increased the number of scholarships available to students to attract more students and/or to improve equity for the students.

2.1.9 Finances

Establishing a financial structure for the program was often described as technically challenging due to variations in accounting practices, funding sources, and institutional context. The model for cost sharing varied widely between collaborations depending on the program model and contextual preferences. The main principles for distribution of funds for the collaborations, where data were available, were:

- Allocation based on calculated or anticipated costs of the institution (distributed based on agreed-upon cost definitions or a pre-determined formula) (six collaborations);
- Allocation based on student full time equivalents (FTEs) (five collaborations);
- Allocation based on teaching contact hours (TCHs) (one collaboration); and
- A service purchase agreement, whereby one partner purchases the services of another at a pre-specified price (one collaboration).

Different funds (e.g., tuition fees, transfer funds, ancillary fees) were often distributed differently within the same collaboration and the distribution method sometimes also varied depending on what the funds were determined to cover (e.g., common collaboration expenses, course specific costs etc.).

Most collaborative programs described themselves as under-funded due to the high cost of the clinical education and due to the extra expenses associated with collaborating (transportation, coordination, meetings, staff and faculty time - please refer to section 2.6 for further details on lack of funding.)

Tuition fees for the collaborative programs were in accordance with the universities' tuition fees. The college partner was involved in discussions around tuition fees in at least one collaboration. Ancillary fees were generally determined by the individual partners, but sometimes by the university. Coordination of ancillary fee levels or transfer payments between institutions was sometimes used when students had access to both college and university resources.

It was beyond the scope of the evaluation to determine which financial structures were most successful. However, comments from interviewees suggested that clear, predictable and transparent financial arrangements caused the least confusion and conflict. Considering this, distribution models based on student FTE or a pre-determined percentage split appeared to be working. The success of models based on common costing definitions appeared to depend on how well they were developed. It should be remembered that the appropriateness and success of a funding model is heavily dependent on contextual circumstances. A unique but perhaps promising strategy for collaborations with a Type 3³ delivery structure was the distribution model based on teaching contact hours (see the McMaster, Mohawk, Conestoga collaboration description for more information). A licensing agreement, which was used in one case, also appeared to be a very straightforward financial arrangement (see the University of New Brunswick-Humber collaboration description for more information), but again, this model may not be appropriate for the way in which many collaborations are currently structured.

2.1.10 Quality assurance

There were some quality assurance mechanisms that were similar across all of the programs. For instance, there was the accreditation process through the Canadian Association of Schools of Nursing (CASN), and some of the colleges and all of the universities had their own standard program review process. Most of the programs had a formal curriculum review at the end of the school year. In addition, many of the programs had developed a common course evaluation tool that was completed by students (although some collaborations were using separate tools for this purpose).

Some other quality assurance mechanisms that were less common included:

- Forming joint quality assurance or program evaluation committees;
- Using a common student exit survey;
- Appointing course leads to ensure consistency in the content, materials, and delivery of the same course at different sites;
- Appointing 'year' leads to ensure consistency among courses in a given year;
- Holding focus groups with students;

³ In a Type 3 delivery structure, all students proceed through the program together.

- Having a program evaluation conducted by someone external to the program; and
- Hiring a program coordinator who followed the first cohort of students, to identify issues that arose as they proceeded through the program (one collaboration only).

2.2 HOW WERE THE COLLABORATIVE PROGRAMS DEVELOPED?

In most cases, talks about collaboration began before the baccalaureate entry to practice requirement was announced or government funding was available. Only a few talks began after the Ministry funding announcement. The nursing education community was clearly aware of the movement towards baccalaureate entry-to-practice, and was beginning to prepare for that eventuality.

Talks generally began in the mid 1980's or early-to-mid 1990's, depending on the collaboration. The majority of the talks remained informal until the Ministry announcement, primarily due to lack of funds for developing and implementing a collaborative program. However, there were some formal discussions, and some articulation agreements were developed. In some instances, colleges and universities began to develop and implement a shared curriculum, which later provided a foundation for the collaborative program.

In 1996, four projects received funding from CUCC to develop or explore the development of collaborative nursing programs. Two of these were successful in meeting their objectives (Tilly, 1999)⁴, and one of these began delivering the program before the Ministry announcement.

Once the ministry announced funding for collaborative nursing programs, talks became more formal. At this point, colleges and universities had to decide who they would collaborate with. Many of the partnerships were based on location, with colleges partnering with nearby universities. Some universities collaborated with a single college, while others collaborated with multiple colleges.

As discussions progressed, differences in philosophies and goals became apparent. Most colleges and universities were able to address these issues. However, in some cases there were substantial differences that resulted in the college and university parting ways. One college with a large nursing program ended talks with their original university partner at a late date. The college would likely not have been able to find another university partner within the province before the new degree requirements became effective, so permission was granted for them to collaborate with a university outside the province.

⁴ The two successful projects were York University/ Georgian and Seneca Colleges' "*Collaborative Nursing Program*" and Ryerson Polytechnic University/ Centennial/ George Brown/ Humber Colleges' "*The Development of a Multi-institutional Collaborative Baccalaureate Nursing Program*". (Tilly, 1999) Funded projects between the University of Ottawa, Algonquin College and La Cité Collégiale and between Lakehead University and Confederation College did not meet their objectives (CUCC, 1998).

During the development of the programs, each of the consortia held meetings to discuss the structure and content of their program. In almost all of the cases, collaborative working groups were created to decide upon specific elements of the program structure. For example, faculty would be involved in discussions about program philosophy, goals, and curriculum; representatives from the finance departments would meet to talk about cost and revenue sharing, and representatives from the registrar's offices would agree on the details of admission processes and transfer of student records. There appeared to have been input from all levels of the institutions in the development of the programs (i.e., administrative staff, faculty, and program and school leaders).

There was one instance where a college accepted the terms laid out by the university partner, and was not involved in development of the program structure. In other instances, the college(s) felt that, although initial discussions were collaborative, the jointly-made decisions were not adhered to, and the structure of the program was ultimately determined by the university.

The discussions typically (but not always) resulted in some form of written agreement between the institutions, as discussed in section 2.1.1.

Once the collaborative programs were implemented, the collaborations continued to address issues that challenged their partnerships. Several drafted new agreements or changed their delivery structure. New agreements were drafted in instances where the existing agreement did not meet the needs of the collaboration (e.g., non-functioning arrangements were re-negotiated or sections were fleshed out in greater detail). One collaboration changed their delivery structure, at the university's initiative, from a Type 1 model to a Type 2 model⁵ to increase enrolment numbers and the likelihood of students staying in their region upon graduation. Another collaboration, operating through a Type 2 model, made it mandatory, rather than optional, for students to return to the colleges for their last semester. This was meant to make the enrolment rates more predictable for the colleges and increase the likelihood of graduates staying in their region. A final example is of a collaboration that created a joint school of nursing to enable faculty and staff to see themselves as members of the same academic unit, which was expected to lead to an improvement in cooperation and morale for faculty and staff.

Two collaborations have terminated altogether. The collaboration between St. Lawrence College and Queen's University terminated mainly due to the lack of funds for the program, according to both partners. Other aspects of the program appeared to have been working well. St. Lawrence College then entered into a collaboration with a different university partner, while Queen's University is no longer involved in a collaborative baccalaureate-level nursing program. According to interviewees, the collaboration between Laurentian University and Collège Boréal dissolved due to a number of different factors including lack of funding, insufficient number of applicants, poor communication, lack of senior management support and a lack of respect between the institutions. At the

⁵ In a Type 1 delivery structure, students take two years at the college, followed by two years at the university. A Type 2 delivery structure is similar, but some students take all four years at the university, while others follow the Type 1 pattern.

time this report was prepared, Collège Boréal was not involved in baccalaureate-level nursing education.

2.3 WHAT CONTEXTUAL FACTORS AFFECTED THE DEVELOPMENT AND DELIVERY OF THE PROGRAMS?

There are many contextual factors that affected the development and delivery of the collaborative programs. We have grouped these into two categories: organizational factors and the larger context.

2.3.1 Organizational factors

- *Different mandates and cultures:* Both colleges and universities aim to produce highly competent nurses. Despite this common goal, there were cultural differences between the two types of institutions. Key informants from five universities and five colleges in ten different collaborations explicitly expressed that these differences had contributed to challenges in their collaboration. On the other hand, key informants from five colleges in five different collaborations stated that the differences in mandates and cultures had contributed to giving the students the best of two worlds. The following archetypical descriptions of college and university cultures and mandates are based on the descriptions of key informants and are intended to highlight differences that will facilitate the understanding of issues discussed later in the report.

In Ontario, the mandate of the community colleges was to make higher education accessible. Colleges' teaching style tended to be based on a one-on-one interaction, which was in line with many students' learning styles. The focus of the faculty had historically been on teaching rather than research, and many of the faculty had an educational background in teaching (i.e., Master's in Education). In contrast, the universities had both a research and teaching mandate and were expected to provide service to the university. The aim was to produce students with strong critical thinking and academic research skills, and generally demanded a higher level of independence from the students. Standards and expectations tended to be higher at universities (although this may not always be the case). Faculty tended to have PhDs or master's degrees in Nursing or other disciplines. This difference in mandates poses a challenge to collaborative programs, where there may be pressures to balance the accessibility mandate of the college with the higher admission and graduation criteria of the university.

- *Policies and procedures:* Specific policies and procedures at either of the institutions may pose challenges to collaboration, or may influence the way the collaboration was structured. Examples include university residency requirements (which limit the amount of teaching that can be taken on by the colleges),

different methods of calculating funding allocations, different course or exam schedules, or different academic policies.

- *Information technology*: Different institutions invariably have different information systems. The ease or difficulty of transferring student information without manual data entry had a huge impact on the administrative side of things. It affected administrative workload to the extent that information had to be entered manually in two systems, or that a lot of manipulation needed to be done in the transfer of electronic data. It had impacts on the partners' ability to access student information in a timely way (e.g., contact information, grades, number of students), as well as on the students (e.g., ability to access resources at partner institutions, timely access to grades and other performance information, needing to make address changes at multiple institutions, falling through the cracks between the institutions). In some programs, it also made it difficult to track students through all four years of the program in relation to issues of performance in clinical and classroom courses.
- *Collective agreements and faculty incentive systems*: These systems did not reward work spent on collaboration, such as collaborative meetings. In the university system, scholarly research was a requirement for tenure and promotion, while collaborative meetings took time away from research, possibly jeopardizing tenure opportunities. In contrast, college faculty were expected to adhere to their union's Standard Workload Formula (SWF), which prescribed the number of hours they could spend each week on various activities, and which placed an emphasis on teaching. Some colleges had been able to build a few hours per week into the formula for research and/or collaborative meetings, but research tended to require larger investments of time.
- *Distance between campuses*: When the partners shared the same campus, there was tremendous opportunity for face-to-face interaction, and it was easier to create a truly integrated program where all students and faculty could intermix. Short distances between campuses were inconvenient, but face-to-face contact was still practical. With larger distances, a Type 1 or Type 4⁶ delivery structure was more likely to be effective. Joint planning and ongoing communication also became more difficult when the distances between sites were large.
- *Resources contributed by each partner*: Each partner had different resources to contribute to a collaboration, such as curriculum, faculty, practice laboratories, practice equipment, classrooms, library resources, information technology, and course materials. The resources contributed by each partner influenced the structure of the program and its potential for growth. In some instances, the university partner did not have a full, four-year baccalaureate nursing program prior to the collaboration, which meant that the university could not contribute a

⁶ Type 1: students take two years at the college followed by two years at the university; Type 4: a separate group of students at each site.

pre-existing curriculum to the program, and so it needed to build its capacity to deliver nursing education (by hiring new faculty, etc.).

- *Language of instruction*: There were few colleges and universities within Ontario that provided French-language programming, so there was limited choice in terms of which colleges could partner with which universities. One Francophone college pointed out that the shortfall of Francophone students made it difficult to support a complete Francophone program. Without Francophone programs, it would be difficult, if not impossible, to meet the demand for Francophone nurses in Ontario.
- *Desire for a Type 3 model⁷*: In some instances, a fully integrated program model was preferred by the participating institutions. Some of the reasons for this were a) that a review of the available literature suggested it was the most effective model, b) that it would make it easier to draw on the strengths of all partners, c) that it enhanced continuity for the students; and/or d) that it provided an opportunity for faculty at each institution to teach in all years of the program.

2.3.2 The larger context

- *Available time*: There was a very short window of time to develop the collaborative programs and to begin implementing them (between April, 2000 and September, 2001). By necessity, colleges and universities had to make quick decisions about how the program would be structured. There was limited time for relationship building and for developing a sense of joint ownership.
- *Available funding*: Many of the colleges and universities had begun informal talks about collaborating, but none managed to begin collaborative programs without additional funding for both the development phase and the implementation. Interviewees said that current funding levels did not cover the costs of collaboration (e.g., collaborative meetings and additional administration) or the costs of clinical education, both of which make the collaborative nursing programs more expensive than other degree programs.
- *Availability of qualified faculty*: It was difficult for many of the institutions to attract qualified faculty, especially those with PhDs. This was due in part to the scarcity of nurses with graduate degrees in the province. The shortages seemed to be more acute in northern Ontario. In general, it was more difficult for colleges to recruit highly qualified faculty because of the limited emphasis on research in the college environment and because in at least some instances they offered lower pay than did universities for full time faculty.
- *Admission systems*: In Ontario when this report was prepared, there were two separate admission systems for postsecondary education: one for the community

⁷ Type 3: all students proceed through the program together, with classes taught either at one site or at multiple sites

colleges and one for the universities. Students paid a processing fee to use each system. The two systems were not compatible with one another, which meant a lot of manual data entry if the collaborations were to have a shared admission process using both systems. Some collaborations had chosen to use only the university admission system, but interviewees from colleges were concerned that this would make the programs less accessible, that students would be less likely to consider other college programs, and/or that the colleges would be excluded from the admissions process.

- *Needs of the communities being served:* Many of the colleges served smaller communities that were experiencing a shortage of nurses, especially in northern Ontario. There was a desire on the part of some of these colleges to provide nursing education to students within these communities, in part to increase accessibility to the students in the communities, and in part to increase the supply of nurses in those areas.

2.4 WHAT HAS WORKED WELL IN DEVELOPING AND DELIVERING COLLABORATIVE PROGRAMS?

This section outlines effective practices in developing and delivering collaborative programs, based on descriptions from the key informants of what has worked in their collaborations. Which practices were considered good was naturally influenced by what the key informants considered to be a “successful collaboration,” as well as the context in which their collaboration was developed and operated. For this reason, some of the recommended practices may therefore contradict each other, and some key informants may have disagreed that these practices are effective. Only the most frequently suggested practices are included in the sections below. It should, however, be noted that some of these practices were observed in other collaborations as well, but were not explicitly mentioned when interviewees were asked what worked particularly well in their collaboration. Finally, many of these effective practices have cost and time implications that need to be addressed (this is discussed further in section 2.6).

During the interviews, key informants also commented on what has not worked well, and suggested changes to their collaborative program. The key informants’ suggestions were remarkably consistent with the ideas identified as effective in other collaborations. In other words, strategies that were perceived to be working well in one collaboration were, for the most part, the same strategies that interviewees thought would help improve another collaboration. Due to this overlap, practices that were perceived as currently working and suggestions for improvement are presented together where applicable, clearly separated under each item. Suggestions that could not be related to a current, promising practice are presented separately, in the end of the section.

2.4.1 Effective practices in developing a collaborative program

Interviewees indicated that the following practices were (or would be) effective during the development phase of the collaborative program:

- Joint planning discussions were held that involved those who would take part in delivering the program on the ground level, as well as various levels of management. Individuals were involved in collaborative working groups pertaining to their areas of expertise (curriculum, finance, records management, program marketing, etc.). Senior managers with decision-making authority met with these working groups on a regular basis to provide guidance about what was feasible/desirable. Groups came together as needed to coordinate areas that impacted on other areas. Joint planning discussions were described as a success by both colleges and universities in four collaborations.
- Relationships were developed within and between the institutions through regular meetings, retreats, and team building exercises. A shared vision or goal was identified, which would motivate the partners to keep going in the face of adversity. This was explicitly highlighted by three universities and four colleges in five different collaborations. One college in one collaboration suggested that this would improve the collaboration.
- Realistic expectations were established up-front so that partners were not disappointed with the reality later on. For example, some collaborations clarified at the beginning that the partnership would not be an equal one, because the university would grant the degree and was responsible for program quality, but that the college would nonetheless have input into decisions to the extent possible. The importance of realistic expectations was highlighted as something that had helped the collaboration by one college and one university in two different collaborations.
- A written agreement or Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) was developed between the partners that specified how each element of the collaboration would be structured, provided guidelines for how decisions would be made relating to each element, and outlined dispute resolution mechanisms. This often included the development of committees with specific mandates that had the authority to make decisions about certain types of issues. It was clear how the committees should handle decisions outside of their mandate (e.g., by sending them to a higher level or a different committee). Committee chairs were rotated among the partners. This was explicitly described as a success by three universities and three colleges in four different collaborations.
- Curriculum was developed jointly, to the extent possible, to take advantage of the expertise brought by all partners, and to give all partners a sense of ownership of the program. Two colleges and one university in two different collaborations explicitly highlighted the joint curriculum development as a good practice; while four colleges and one university in four collaborations expressed that a significant

revision to an already existing curriculum had had a similar, positive effect. Absence of a jointly developed curriculum was identified as detracting from the collaboration's success by four colleges and two universities in five collaborations.

- University faculty worked with college faculty to help them understand the expectations of a degree program, which were different from those of a college program, and to ensure consistency in grading. This took the form of mentoring or co-teaching.⁸ In one collaboration, both the university and the college emphasized the importance of mentoring during the development of the program. (Mentoring and professional development was also considered to be of importance on an ongoing basis, which is highlighted in the next section.)
- Barriers to implementation of the collaborative program were identified and addressed. This could in principle have included modifications to collective agreements, changes in workload allocations within the collective agreements (e.g., "release" time for college faculty to participate in research and in collaborative meetings), changes to policies or bylaws that interfered with collaboration, modifications to the school calendar, or changes in information systems. This process was explicitly mentioned by one college and one university in two different collaborations.

2.4.2 Effective practices in delivering a collaborative program

Interviewees indicated that the following practices were (or would be) effective during collaborative program delivery.

- Team-building efforts, and frequent, high-quality communication were used to maintain relationships (mentioned explicitly by six universities and six colleges in nine different collaborations). Increased frequency of communication was a common suggestion for how collaborations could be improved (suggested in seven colleges and three universities in a total of eight collaborations). Improved quality of communication was also requested (four colleges and three universities in six collaborations). A lack of resources for communicating with a geographically distant partner was often described as a problem.
- Committees continued to meet as needed to operate the programs (steering, curriculum, finance, registration, marketing, etc.) (mentioned explicitly by one university and three colleges in three different collaborations). Key informants who generally felt their collaborations were working indicated that there was truly joint ownership of the program, with all partners having input into key decisions,

⁸ Although this was identified as an effective practice in several collaborations, mentoring and co-teaching were not always well-received by college faculty who were already highly qualified and/or experienced in diploma level nursing education. University faculty also indicated that mentoring was time consuming and detracted from their scholarly research.

and with specific faculty and staff having input into decisions that affected their work⁹. Decision-making was also transparent, so that it was clear how and why certain decisions were made. People who needed to make decisions about certain things had the authority to do so, and were not constrained by having to obtain approvals from higher levels. Six colleges and two universities in seven collaborations indicated that the lack of collaborative decision making was a barrier to success in their collaboration. In addition, interviewees in three universities felt the colleges had unrealistic expectations in terms of joint decision-making (e.g., they expected to have an equal voice in all areas or to be able to influence decisions in some areas that were under the jurisdiction of the university senate). Please refer to section 2.5 for an explicit discussion on the extent of joint decision making in the collaborations.

- There was mutual trust and respect among the partners. In many cases, respect and trust were fostered through arrangements that made those involved feel like equal partners (mentioned explicitly by five colleges and five universities in the same collaborations). On a personal level, the relationships were described as “good” and “open.” Most people involved were committed to the collaboration and were willing to work together, rather than “doing their own thing.” The various strengths of the individuals involved were recognized, and there was little perceived elitism between the partners. Lack of respect and recognition were areas that interviewees perceived as needing improvement in several collaborations (suggested by four colleges and one university in five collaborations).
- The Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) or other formal program agreement was adhered to, with college and university leadership supporting its formal implementation (mentioned explicitly by two universities and three colleges in three different collaborations). Five colleges and two universities in seven different collaborations indicated that issues related to the MOU were a barrier to success, because the MOU was not detailed enough to provide guidance and/or it was not followed in practice.
- Senior management showed and built support for the collaborative program within and between institutions (mentioned explicitly by four universities and seven colleges in seven different collaborations). These individuals had the power to encourage collaboration or to encourage non-collaboration, to build relationships and teams among the faculty and staff, and to foster a common vision for the program. Some felt that individuals with strong personalities could either derail the collaborative process, or could become effective champions for it, either of which would impact the success of the collaboration. One college in one collaboration explicitly suggested increased senior management support as something that should be improved, and three colleges and one university in three

⁹ As mentioned earlier, some key informants indicated that it was important for there to be an equal partnership between the institutions, but others felt that it was important to recognize explicitly that the partnership was not fully equal because the university was ultimately responsible for the degree.

collaborations identified a lack of senior management support as one of the reasons that the collaboration was not successful.

- Practices were put in place to ensure consistency between sites and integrity among the different courses in the program, but that also allowed for some autonomy in delivery, to accommodate site-specific issues and opportunities. This was a delicate balance and was mentioned explicitly by two colleges and two universities in three collaborations. The following examples were reported to be effective in promoting consistency, but some had a negative impact on autonomy:
 - Lead teachers were established for specific courses or years of study. These lead teachers were responsible for communicating with other teachers of the same course or year to ensure that the material covered was consistent.
 - Course material was shared among those who taught the same course at different sites, including the syllabus, readings, textbooks, assignments, and examinations.
 - Practicum teachers were invited to sit in on theory classes to ensure that the content of practicum courses built on what was taught in the theoretical courses.

Increased quality control was presented as an area requiring improvement by four universities and one college in five collaborations (e.g., grading transparency, quality of education).

- University faculty mentored college faculty in scholarly research, involving them as co-researchers on joint projects (mentioned explicitly by three universities and two colleges in three different collaborations). Increased emphasis on professional development for faculty was suggested by three colleges and five universities in six collaborations.
- Human resource planning was done collaboratively, to ensure that the program had the right mix of faculty with different backgrounds and areas of expertise (mentioned explicitly by two universities and one college in three different collaborations). One university also suggested this as something worth exploring.
- There was a shared admission system, where, all partners had access to applicant data, decisions were made collaboratively about applicants whose qualifications were in question, and where student preferences for a specific campus were accommodated¹⁰ (mentioned explicitly by three universities in three different collaborations). Five colleges and three universities in five different collaborations suggested that some kind of streamlining of the admissions process was needed, but the preferred method varied, depending on anticipated implications for data access, ability to refer students who were not admitted to

¹⁰ There were differences in opinion about this. Two colleges in two other collaborations preferred a separate admission process because it allowed for greater autonomy.

other programs at the university/college, autonomy issues etc. Two colleges and one university in two collaborations recognized that non-sharing of admission data within the collaboration had caused significant problems in this regard.

- There was a collaborative program coordinator or collaborative office that assisted with the administration of the program (mentioned explicitly by one university and one college in two different collaborations). This was also suggested by three colleges and one university in three collaborations as something that could improve the operations of the collaboration.
- All of the collaborative partners sent a strong and consistent message to the students that the program was collaborative, and that all partners were an integral and valued part of the program (mentioned explicitly by two universities in two different collaborations).
- All collaborative partners were represented in the graduation ceremony (mentioned explicitly by one college and two universities in two different collaborations) and recognized on the parchment (one college and one university in the same collaboration). One college explicitly suggested that the college be recognized on the parchment.
- The curriculum was strong, and the faculty commitment to the curriculum helped the collaborative relationship between the partners to work better (mentioned explicitly by seven colleges and seven universities in eight different collaborations).
- Difficulties with collective agreements had been at least partly addressed to enable college faculty to engage in research (mentioned explicitly by two colleges in two different collaborations). This, along with inequalities in compensation, vacation time, and other concerns, was a major issue that needed to be addressed in many collaborations (suggested by six colleges and four universities in eight collaborations).
- The collaboration's administrative procedures were constantly improved over time, and therefore became easier to manage over time (mentioned explicitly by three colleges and three universities in four different collaborations). Seven colleges and two universities in seven collaborations explicitly suggested that administrative structures (data transfer, financial operations etc.) needed further streamlining.

2.4.3 Other suggestions regarding collaborative program delivery

Other suggestions by key informants on what might work, but not explicitly mentioned as current promising practices included:

- Faculty cross appointments or cross teaching as one way of improving communication, increasing consistency between college and university teaching, as well as building capacity in research (explicitly mentioned in five colleges and two universities in five different collaborations).
- All four years should be provided at the interviewee's institution (explicitly mentioned by six colleges and two universities in six collaborations; senior administrators in four colleges suggested that at least some colleges should be given the ability to grant degrees).
- Joint program promotion, marketing the program as a collaborative program (explicitly mentioned by three colleges and two universities in five collaborations).
- More integration of students through social activities, student associations, and/or joint educational activities (explicitly mentioned by three colleges and two universities in four collaborations).
- Because interpersonal factors were so important, staff consistency should contribute to success, according to two colleges and one university in two collaborations. High turnover interrupted the development of respect and trust among the individuals in the collaboration.

Students were also asked to provide suggestions on how their collaborative program could be improved. Student suggestions tended to focus more on program structure and delivery. In most of the programs, students suggested that they would like a greater emphasis on the practical aspect of nursing, and more and/or more varied clinical placements, particularly in hospitals. However, it should be noted that clinical practice was also considered a strength of most of the collaborative programs, as was the mix between theory and practice. In other words, most students were satisfied with their opportunities for practice, but some would still have liked more.

Another common suggestion from students was to improve communication between the partners, so that they could give students consistent and timely information about important aspects of the program, including course and administrative requirements.

In programs with more than one site, students suggested that mechanisms be put in place to ensure consistency between different sites, particularly with respect to grading and student expectations, but also with respect to admission requirements, course content and other elements of the program. They also wanted more opportunities to interact with students from the other sites, preferably early on in the program. Social events and integrated group work were suggested.

Other collaboration-related student suggestions included:

- Improving the integrity of the program across the years (reducing gaps, repetition);

- Delivering courses in the classroom rather than online or through teleconference; and
- Reducing student travel requirements (depending on the collaboration, this meant that the whole program be offered at the college so students didn't need to move partway through, or that the whole program be offered on one campus so that students didn't have to travel back and forth between the college and the university on the same day).

2.5 TO WHAT EXTENT HAVE THE COLLABORATIONS BEEN SUCCESSFUL?

Overall, the majority of the collaborations have been moderately successful according to the criteria for success outlined in section 1.2.4. Every collaboration is struggling with at least some issues, but most of them have managed to make their programs work within their different systems¹¹. This section covers the specific criteria for success in some detail, describing how success was determined, then provides an overview of the findings, and then discusses some of the other successes that key informants identified.

2.5.1 Specific success criteria

Reflects Ministry descriptions of collaborative programs

By and large, the programs do reflect the Ministry's initial description of collaborative programs, with the exception that few have a single, shared admission process.

- Joint college-university program planning and design was evident in seven (47%) of the collaborations, according to key informants. Joint college-university program planning and design took place to some degree in seven (47%) of the collaborations, but significant issues preventing their participation were identified by the college partners in these collaborations.¹² In one collaboration, there was no joint planning and design.
- All of the programs were delivered by both college and university faculty, utilizing both college and university resources. The proportion taught by college and university faculty differed from collaboration to collaboration, with some colleges and some universities playing a very minor role in course delivery, depending on needs, capacity and ambitions of the individual institutions.

¹¹ It should be noted that most have found it costly to do so.

¹² Key informants expressed a range of opinions about the extent to which joint planning was happening. We concluded that joint planning was happening if a majority of people in each site indicated that they believed it was. If a majority of people in the college site(s) reported a lack of involvement, we concluded that there was some joint planning with very limited involvement of the college. There were almost no instances where there was absolutely no evidence of any joint planning, although there were cases where college respondents felt that the joint plans had not been implemented.

- All of the collaborations had a shared admission policy, in that the minimum requirements were the same for all students in the program. In most cases, the minimum requirements were determined by the university partner, but in some instances they were determined collaboratively.
- Only four (25%) collaborations had a single, shared admission process. Another five (31%) had a shared admission process that had two points of entry. Applications at some of these sites were pooled, or there was a shared committee that considered applicants whose qualifications were in question. In several of these sites, applicants who were not admitted to one institution were deflected to another campus for consideration there. Another six collaborations (38%) had a single admission process that was not shared. In these cases, the applicants applied through the university and were accepted or declined with very little or no input from the college partners. One collaboration had an admission process where students could apply to multiple sites but there was no information sharing or joint decision making between the sites.
- All of the programs awarded a baccalaureate degree from a university upon completion of the program.
- Program length and program requirements were the same for all of the collaborative nursing programs as for stand-alone undergraduate university nursing programs.

Students, faculty, and administrators feel that the theoretical and practical aspects of nursing are well integrated¹³

Faculty and administrators in all of the collaborations indicated that they felt the theoretical and practical aspects of nursing were well-integrated, although some indicated that they would have liked to see more emphasis on the practical aspects.

On the survey of students and graduates, respondents were asked to indicate their satisfaction with the integration of the theoretical and practical aspects of nursing in their program. Two of the programs were omitted from the analysis because too few students responded. In all of the remaining collaborations, a majority of students expressed satisfaction with this aspect of their program (a rating of 4 or 5 out of 5).

Students and graduates also identified the mix of theory and practice when we asked them to comment on the main strengths of the collaborative programs. They liked that the programs had a strong emphasis on hands-on, practical education, that clinical instruction was of high quality, and that there were a variety of clinical placements. They also liked

¹³ Non-collaborative programs would also integrate the theoretical and practical aspects of nursing, so this success indicator was not unique to a collaborative program. Success in this area did not necessarily mean that the collaborations were successful, but failure would have been a cause for concern.

having the theoretical background, and learning how to apply that theory in a clinical setting. Students also commented that the programs encouraged them to think critically and to direct their own learning.

Administrators, faculty, and other staff expect that the collaboration will continue for the next five years

Interviewees were asked “On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is extremely unlikely and 5 is extremely likely, how likely is it that this collaboration will continue for the next five years? (Assume that the political context remains the same as it is now.)”

One of the collaborations dissolved during the course of this study. No data were available for another of the collaborations. In 13 of the 14 remaining collaborations (93%), a majority of administrators, faculty, and other staff expected that the collaboration would continue for the next five years (a rating of 4 or 5 out of 5). When analysing the data by type of institution, 79% of universities and 81% of colleges had an institutional average above 4.

Many of the interviewees indicated that the collaboration would continue because there was no other alternative. If the political context were to change so that collaboration was no longer necessary, the consultants’ impressions are that very few of the collaborative programs would continue, because many of the respondents qualified their responses of 4 or 5 by saying “because we have to” or “because there is no other alternative.”

Administrators, faculty, and other staff are satisfied with the quality of communications between the college and the university

Judgements of satisfaction with inter-institutional communications were made by the consultants working with each collaboration, based on the interviews they had conducted and cross referenced with qualitative coding of the collaboration descriptions. Administrators, faculty, and other staff were satisfied with the quality of communications, between the partners, in six of the 15 collaborations (40%) for which we had information, a further six (40%) were somewhat satisfied, meaning that they had significant barriers that needed to be addressed. In one of the latter cases, the university was satisfied while the college partner was only somewhat satisfied. In other cases, the satisfaction with communication was consistent among institutions in the same collaboration.

Administrators, faculty and other staff feel that the unique needs of their institutions are accommodated

Key informants at each institution were asked explicitly whether they felt that their institution’s unique needs had been met. In eleven out of 15 collaborations (73%), interviewees indicated that their needs had mostly been met. In one collaboration, the college’s needs had not been met, while the university’s had. The needs of the institutions had not been met in three collaborations. What were thought of as unique needs did, by

definition, vary among institutions, but included things such as applicant pools, identity, geographical distance, class sizes, and financial structure. It is, however, important to note that many interviewees identified that the collaboration had both positive and negative impacts on their institution (see section 2.6).

The transition between college and university studies is manageable for students

There were five collaborations in which students began their studies at a college campus and then transferred to a university campus. Of these five, there were none in which a majority of students expressed satisfaction with the transition between the college and the university (a rating of 4 or 5 out of 5 on the student survey question).

Student comments also indicated that the transition was difficult for some students. In some of the collaborations, students had to move or commute long distances to attend the university campus, which added an extra layer of difficulty. However, the transition was difficult even for students who remained in the same city. They indicated that they would have liked:

- More information in advance about such things as the university campus, registration procedures, and expectations;
- More guidance during the transition time;
- More interaction with the university campus, faculty, and staff in advance of the transition;
- More integration with students from other sites in the program prior to the transition, as well as after the transition (e.g., group projects that require students to intermix, social events, etc.)

Graduates feel the collaborative program prepared them for employment as a nurse¹⁴

Very few graduates completed the student/graduate survey, so there was limited data to answer this question. There were six collaborations with sufficient data to answer this question. In all six, a majority of the graduates indicated that they felt prepared for employment at the end of their program.

2.5.2 Overview of success criteria

The following table summarizes the extent to which the collaborative programs met the criteria for successful collaboration.

¹⁴ Non-collaborative programs should also prepare graduates adequately for employment, so this success indicator was not unique to a collaborative program. Success in this area did not necessarily mean that the collaborations were successful, but failure would have been a cause for concern.

Criteria of Success	Criteria met?
The program reflects the Ministry's initial description of collaborative programs.	Generally yes, but only four (25%) had a single, shared admissions process, and there were issues around joint planning in over half of the collaborations
Students, faculty, and administrators feel that the theoretical and practical aspects of nursing are well integrated.	Yes in all cases.
Administrators, faculty, and other staff expect that the collaboration will continue for the next five years.	Yes in all but one case, but only as long as the requirement to collaborate is in place.
Administrators, faculty, and other staff are satisfied with the quality of communications between the college and the university.	Completely in 6 (40%) and somewhat in 6 (40%) of the cases for which we had data.
Administrators, faculty and other staff feel that the unique needs of their institutions are accommodated.	Yes in 11 (73%) of the cases for which we had data.
The transition between college and university studies is manageable for students.	Applicable to only five collaborations, but students expressed low satisfaction with the transition in all of them.
Graduates feel the collaborative program prepared them for employment as a nurse.	Insufficient data to draw a solid conclusion, but yes in all six cases for which data were available.

Based on the table above, there is room for growth and improvement in the following areas:

- Transition experience between college and university, for those collaborations where students need to transfer between sites;
- Implementing a single, shared admission process;
- Joint program planning and design;
- Communications between the university and the college(s); and
- Accommodating the unique cultures, philosophies, and other needs of the institutions.

2.6 WHAT ARE THE INITIAL IMPACTS OF THE COLLABORATIONS?

In most of the collaborations, collaboration had both positive and negative impacts for all stakeholders. The impacts on institutional partners, on faculty, administrative staff and

students, as identified by key informants and students and graduates completing the survey, are outlined below.

2.6.1 General impact on the institutional partners

- Key informants in ten colleges and ten universities (in eleven collaborations) identified negative financial impacts on their institutions due to the increased cost of running a collaborative degree program. This was identified as one of the major barriers to engaging in some of the effective practices presented earlier in the report. For example, both joint research and mentoring of college faculty suffered due to financial shortfalls. Interviewees noted that there were costs associated with collaboration that were above and beyond what would normally be incurred in offering an undergraduate nursing program. These costs included:
 - Faculty and administrative staff's time for:
 - Program planning, since more people needed to be consulted when decisions needed to be made;
 - Working through the differences in expectations, cultures, and administration;
 - Relationship building, since people from different sites didn't have day-to-day opportunities to get to know one another and build trust;
 - Ongoing communication with counterparts at different sites;
 - Mentorship of faculty from other sites;
 - Quality assurance, which became more difficult as programs became larger and more complex;
 - Dealing with technical issues (e.g., managing data transfer between different systems) or manually entering and updating student information in multiple systems;
 - Negotiating allocation of funds amongst the partners;
 - Travel between sites, if the institutions were not co-located;
 - Coordination of activities, since there were more people to coordinate, with very different schedules.
 - Hiring additional staff to take on some of the responsibilities listed above.
 - Communication costs (e.g., printing of communication material).
 - Travel expenses, where the institutions were not co-located.
- In six collaborations, key informants from the college(s) indicated that being a part of a collaboration increased the standards at the college. Increasing standards at the colleges included attracting more motivated students, having higher standards for student work, conducting more research at the colleges, and being motivated to upgrade student resources such as the library. Two colleges,

however, felt that the quality of their program had decreased when they had to give up some of their clinical hours for the new curriculum.

- Two universities felt that the quality of their programs had increased since the collaboration had given them new ideas on how to improve their program by questioning their current values, procedures and problem solving methods. This was true both for administrative structures and for education. Two universities explicitly stated that the quality of their program had declined as a result of the collaboration, and two other universities had experienced a decline in their reputation within the university because the partnering college did not follow the program's admission policies, and admitted students who should not have been eligible for the program.
- Three colleges and three universities in four collaborations indicated that the contributions of the colleges were not recognized by the students. Four colleges also stated that their college had less of an external profile as a result of the collaboration.
- Four colleges and three universities in six collaborations indicated that being a part of a collaboration had fostered discussions about other possible collaborations between the colleges and the universities, had made them more aware of what collaboration entails, and had educated them about how other institutions work.
- Key informants in four colleges and four universities in seven collaborations felt that being a part of the collaboration resulted in reduced control and flexibility for both the college(s) and the university because all of the partners had to yield the ability to make decisions independently.
- Reduced access to information that was important for decision making (e.g., student enrolment and admission data, financial information) was mentioned by one college and six universities in seven collaborations. Two colleges had also been unable to refer students not admitted to the nursing program to other college programs, since the admissions process was managed by the university.
- Four colleges and five universities in seven collaborations indicated that they had experienced increased difficulty in recruiting suitable faculty as a result of the collaboration. Salary differences and difficulty attracting qualified candidates were mentioned by colleges, while universities referred to the shortage of PhD prepared nurses in the province.
- Finally, key informants in four universities that did not have a baccalaureate nursing program prior to the collaboration indicated that the collaboration had given a higher profile to the department within the university and/or to the university externally in the community. One university also indicated that the collaboration had contributed to strengthening the processes and policies within the university.

2.6.2 Impact on the partners' ability to provide high-quality programs to a growing student population

- In nine collaborations, it was noted that being part of a collaboration had improved the partners' ability to provide high-quality programs to a growing student population. In particular, the key informants noted that:
 - Students could stay in their own communities to study (three colleges and two universities in five collaborations); and
 - More students could be accepted into the program because of the resources contributed by the various partners (one university).
- Key informants in four collaborations indicated that being a part of the collaboration made it more difficult to provide high quality programming to students because they felt the quality of the program had declined (one college and three universities). One reason cited for this decline was the different admissions averages between the college and the university.
- As many as six colleges expressed that they perceived their program to reach fewer students than before due to higher admission requirements in the collaborative program than in the diploma program.

2.6.3 Impact on student experiences

The following positive impacts were experienced by students in collaborative programs, based on interviews with faculty and staff, and open-ended comments on the survey of students and graduates:

- Starting at the college was good for some students because they preferred smaller, more intimate classes. The colleges were perceived by students to provide a more nurturing and supportive environment. They were less intimidating for some students, and provided a good stepping-stone to a university environment.
- In some collaborative programs, students were able to obtain degrees in their home communities, or to take part of their program in their home town. This made the program much more affordable. It also enabled students to study nursing when they were unable to move out of their community due to family responsibilities.
- In some collaborative programs, students had access to a broader selection of resources. Students particularly appreciated online access to the university library, and state-of-the-art simulation labs in some of the collaborations.
- Students liked having the status associated with a university degree.

Some students also appreciated the joint experience of both college and university. They liked the mix of teaching approaches and the diverse backgrounds of the faculty from

both institutions. Comments on the student survey indicated that students had a good understanding of the contributions made to the collaborative program by the college and university partners. The students' perceptions of the college and university strengths are shown in Table 4.

Table 4: Students' Perceptions of the Strengths of each Partner ¹⁵

College Strengths	University Strengths
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ A practical focus ■ High quality, student-centred teaching ■ A smaller, friendlier, more personal, and less bureaucratic atmosphere ■ More support for students ■ Location in a home community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ High quality teaching that fosters critical thinking and independence ■ High expectations of students ■ The prestige of a university degree ■ More choices in electives ■ Opportunities for research and teaching assistantships ■ Quality and availability of library resources

The following negative impacts were experienced by students in collaborative programs, based on interviews with faculty and staff and from responses to the student and graduate survey:

- The transition from college to university was difficult for students, and particularly for those who had to move or commute to a different city, especially if they had families who could not move with them.
- If there were perceived or actual differences in grading and expectations between sites, students felt resentful about the inequities. If there were different expectations of students who transferred from a college to a university site, some students had trouble adjusting to the new expectations.
- In some programs, students at the colleges felt that they were looked down on by their colleagues at the university and/or by the university faculty. In some collaborations, students also noted that the college faculty were not treated as equals by the university faculty.
- The extra complexities of a collaborative program (e.g., multiple sites, different sets of policies and procedures, more indirect lines of communication, more approvals required for decision-making) could result in students not receiving the information they needed in a timely manner, or receiving inaccurate information.
- The administrative differences between the colleges and the universities could be challenging for students.

¹⁵ These results are based on comments made by students who had attended both the college and university campuses, as well as those who had attended only one or the other.

- The workload and expectations of students were higher than they would be in a college program.

Some key informants thought that, in collaborations with multiple admission processes, students were often confused by the fact that there were two systems through which they could apply. However, on the student and graduate survey, the application and admissions processes consistently received high levels of satisfaction from students, which suggests that multiple application processes may not be a serious concern.

2.6.4 Impact on faculty and administrative staff experiences

The primary impact on faculty and administrative staff was an increase in workload because of the time required for program development and revision, ongoing communication, commuting to different campuses, more complex administrative arrangements, mentoring, and so on. The extent of the workload increase varied from a small amount in some collaborations to a tremendous amount in others, with faculty feeling exhausted and burnt out. An increase in workload for faculty and/or staff was mentioned by nine colleges and eleven universities in twelve collaborations.

Other impacts on faculty and administrative staff were as follows:

- Eight universities indicated that university faculty had less time for scholarly research because of the increase in workload associated with the collaboration. This had threatened faculties' tenure in some instances. Faculty at one university indicated that research had suffered initially due to the extra time that had to be spent on collaboration, but was no longer an issue now that the collaboration was up and running. In addition, one university indicated that the collaboration had a positive impact on their research since they had more partners to do projects with.
- Nine colleges and two universities indicated that they had been increasingly engaged in professional development activities and research since the implementation of the collaborative programs. College faculty indicated that they had more opportunities to be involved in research as a result of the collaboration. Some college faculty were also taking advantage of opportunities for study at the doctoral level.
- Key informants in nine colleges and eleven universities in twelve collaborations reported that the new, and often unclear, roles and expectations of college faculty caused some confusion and frustration. College faculty were governed both by regular college policies and expectations, but they were also expected to follow policies or processes consistent with the baccalaureate program. Frustration also resulted from inequities in reward mechanisms between the colleges and the universities. Differences in workload, vacation time, and salary among faculty teaching in the same program caused friction in some instances.

- Key informants in some of the collaborations (both faculty and administrative staff) felt that they had built good, open relationships with their college or university counterparts. Some noted that they were exposed to more diverse ideas because they were interacting with more people and people from different systems. This promoted their own learning and professional growth (indicated by eight colleges and seven universities in ten collaborations).
- There was some resentment among faculty in a few of the programs where there were unresolved issues of respect, trust, or differences in vacation, status, or compensation. In some cases, the informants felt undervalued and bitter. Stress levels were high among faculty and administrative staff in these collaborations (severe stress symptoms were mentioned by both universities and colleges in three collaborations).
- Six colleges and one university in six collaborations identified the lack of autonomy over courses taught as an issue.

2.6.5 Personal high point experiences of faculty and administrative staff

Personal high point experiences can help make a difficult process worthwhile for people, and are essential for motivating people to continue with a challenging task. We asked key informants to describe a high point experience in the collaboration, a time when they felt most alive and engaged.

The most common high point was the graduation ceremony, in particular when the first graduating class walked across the stage. This was meaningful to the interviewees for a number of reasons. First, it was a concrete expression of their accomplishments over the previous four years, and they felt proud of their own accomplishments and those of the students they had come to know. Second, the ceremony reminded them of why they were collaborating, i.e., that shared common goal of preparing excellent nurses. Finally, in some collaborations, the graduation ceremony itself was quite collaborative, and it solidified the feeling that the program truly was a collaboration.

The beginning of the program was a highlight for some, when discussions culminated in an agreement to go forward with the program, because people knew that their hard work had paid off. Another high point that was mentioned by a number of people was receiving positive feedback about the program, either from students, employers, or the Canadian Association of Schools of Nursing (CASN).

Interpersonal relationships and communications were an important source of satisfaction for some of the respondents. They noted that they had developed good relationships with their counterparts at the other school(s). High points included working well as a team, as well as retreats and meetings where communication had been particularly good. In some cases, working on joint projects (such as proposals for research grants or course development) were high points. Some college faculty and administrative staff noted that

they felt particularly empowered when they were treated as equals by the university faculty and staff.

For some college faculty, becoming involved in research and having the opportunity to upgrade their qualifications were both high points. Several people also said it was satisfying when they finally found innovative solutions to particularly difficult challenges.

In some collaborations, knowing that the collaborative program better met the needs of the students in their communities was particularly satisfying for the key informants.

2.7 WHAT PROMISING APPROACHES, MODELS, AND PRACTICES HAVE EMERGED FOR DESIGNING AND DELIVERING COLLABORATIVE PROGRAMS?

This question is addressed in section 3.3.

2.8 WHAT ARE PROMISING STRATEGIES TO SUPPORT MORE EFFECTIVE COLLABORATIONS AT THE PROVINCIAL, CONSORTIUM, AND SITE-SPECIFIC LEVELS?

We asked key informants to suggest three changes that they would make to their programs, and also to identify promising strategies to promote more effective collaborations.

2.8.1 What are promising strategies at the provincial level?

The following were the most commonly suggested provincial strategies for addressing the needs of the collaborations:

- As noted earlier, key informants in almost all of the collaborations indicated that they needed extra resources to cover the additional costs of collaboration.¹⁶ A need for more funding was felt at the start-up phase, as well as for the ongoing operations (suggested by nine colleges and eleven universities in twelve collaborations).
- There were different suggestions about the method of distribution of funds, with colleges being satisfied with the current arrangement and universities preferring

¹⁶ Because nursing is a practical degree, and practice placements were becoming more difficult to arrange in certain locations, some collaborations also indicated a need for additional clinical funding. We felt it was important to make note of this, even though it did not seem to be an issue related to the collaborative nature of the program.

that funds be flowed separately to each partner, or be flowed entirely through the universities (key informants at seven universities and one college advocated for this). Some key informants from both colleges and universities suggested that the funding be flowed 'in-year,' or at least faster than is currently happening.

- Key informants in seven colleges and five universities (in eight collaborations) suggested that the province act as a facilitator for disseminating best practices in collaboration development, conducting research on what works, and providing other practical resources for developing collaborations. Some of the most common practical suggestions included:
 - A template for a Memorandum of Understanding, including what elements should be included, the level of detail required for success, and considerations that would need to be made for different areas when negotiating; and
 - Examples of successful program structures and how to successfully develop a collaborative program (e.g., developing a shared vision, team-building, working with another system, the specific elements that need to be considered, etc.).
- Another similar, proposed role for the province is to become more active in supporting the success of the collaborations, especially by facilitating the sharing of information about effective practices in collaboration (mentioned by key informants in at least two colleges). This evaluation was seen as one way of doing that. Key informants suggested that the findings of the study be disseminated to colleges and universities and that the province analyse the key issues arising from the report, and provide support in areas where it is needed. Other mechanisms proposed for facilitating the sharing of information about effective practices included a province-wide conference on collaborative programs, profiling exemplary collaborative programs, providing indicators of success, and providing a forum for collaborations to have a voice.
- Key informants from one college and two universities (in three collaborations) suggested that the province should promote the development of PhD programs in nursing to help address the shortage of qualified faculty. Additional funds for building scholarship capacity in colleges were suggested by two colleges for the same reason.
- Due to the disappointment related to lack of joint decision making in several collaborations, four colleges and one university wanted the province to publicly define what collaboration is, including what can be expected in terms of joint decision making. Many interviewees felt that the word collaboration indicated more equality than what they had experienced in practice. Three colleges and one university in three collaborations also proposed that the province make a statement emphasizing the value of the unique contribution colleges make to the collaborations.

- Finally, five colleges and six universities (in seven collaborations) wanted the province to question whether collaborative nursing programs really were the best option for graduating nurses in Ontario. As mentioned earlier, it is the consultants' impression that if the requirement to collaborate were dropped, very few of the collaborative programs would continue.

2.8.2 What are promising strategies at the consortium level?

Responses at the consortium level overlapped substantially with the suggested changes to the programs, and are summarized in section 2.4.

III. LESSONS LEARNED ABOUT UNDERGRADUATE COLLEGE-UNIVERSITY COLLABORATION

The purpose of this evaluation was to help government and institutions identify best practices in collaboration and help guide policy and planning for future collaborative activity. Specifically, the report was intended to:

- Provide information to the postsecondary sector and government about the successes of the program and barriers that had been encountered in building and delivering the collaborative programs;
- Provide an opportunity for college and university partners to share best practices and lessons learned, to inform and improve future collaborations, regardless of program area; and
- Identify best practices, including models of collaborative work and program governance models.

In this section, we have tried to summarize the key findings in a way that will contribute to these goals. We first describe the different ways that collaborations were structured and the degree of success experienced, based on predetermined success criteria. Next, we discuss some of the practices that interviewees identified as particularly effective. We then turn to some of the challenges of collaboration, including the additional time and cost involved. We were able to identify strategies that collaborations had used to deal with some of the challenges, but some other challenges remained unresolved. Finally, we provide an overview of some of the major costs and benefits of collaboration, and provide some suggestions for the province and the collaboration partners to consider.

3.1 THERE ARE MANY DIFFERENT WAYS OF COLLABORATING

The colleges and universities participating in this study had chosen to structure their relationships in many different ways, depending on their unique circumstances (e.g., geographical distance between the partners, previous relationships among the partners, the resources contributed by each partner, etc.).

Each program had a unique delivery structure. In some of the collaborations, students began their program with two years at a college site, followed by two years at the university site. Other collaborations had a similar model, but also had some students who took all four years of the program at the university. In still other collaborations, the students studied all four years at one site, with different groups of students at each site. Finally, some collaborations had all students in a cohort proceed through the program together, taking classes either at one site, or, if the sites were close together, taking some

courses at one site and some courses at the other. Within these various delivery structures, some faculty taught only at their own sites, some taught only at a partner institution's site, and some taught at more than one site.

Programs also differed in terms of their admissions processes. Some of the programs had a single, shared admissions process. Some had multiple points of entry for the students, but pooled their applicants or made joint admission decisions. Others had processes where there was no pooling of applicants or joint decision making at all, with one or more partners (usually the university partner) admitting students to the program without consulting the other partner(s).

Although the funding was flowed through a college partner for all of the collaborations, the methods used to share costs and funding differed. In some cases, funding was allocated based on student full time equivalents. In others it was based on teaching contract hours. Some collaborations allocated funds in proportion to the costs incurred. One collaboration used a service purchase agreement, whereby one partner purchased the services of another at a pre-specified price. Some used a combination of these methods.

Several other differences were found. For example, in some collaborations, students had access to resources and services of all of the partners, while in others, students could only access services at the site they were attending. In some collaborations, graduates were affiliated with all partners, while in others they were affiliated only with the university. Some collaborations were carrying out joint research, others were not. In spite of the differences, some commonalities existed:

- Almost all of the collaborations had some formal agreement or memorandum of understanding to structure the relationship among the institutions.
- Most had established joint committees for decision making.
- The university's academic policies and procedures were followed in most cases.
- Most of the programs used an integrated curriculum, whereby all students learned the same content in the same ways.
- In almost all cases, hiring of new faculty was carried out independently by each institution.

3.2 COLLABORATION SUCCESS

When we embarked on this study, there were no standard criteria for collaborative program success. Through the process of this study, success criteria were articulated and the "success" of collaborations measured. However, we still do not have a complete and satisfactory definition of what a successful collaboration is. This is an area where there is room for further development at the provincial level.

Based on the success criteria used in this study, the majority of the collaborations have been moderately successful. Every collaboration was struggling with at least some issues, but most of them had managed to make their programs work within their different systems.

Areas where most collaborations were successful included:

- All of the programs were delivered by both college and university faculty, using both college and university resources.
- All collaborations had a shared admission policy.
- All of the programs awarded a baccalaureate degree from a university upon completion of the program.
- Program length and requirements were the same for all collaborative programs as for stand-alone undergraduate university nursing programs.
- Students, faculty, and administrators generally felt that the theoretical and practical aspects of nursing were well integrated.
- In most cases, the majority of administrators, faculty and other staff expected that the collaborations would continue for the next five years, so long as the requirement to collaborate remained in place.

There was room for growth and improvement in the following areas:

- The transition between college and university was difficult for students, in those collaborations where students needed to transfer between sites.
- Very few collaborations had a single, shared admission process.
- There were issues related to joint program planning and design in the majority of the collaborations.
- There were challenges that needed to be addressed in communications between the university and the college(s) in many of the collaborations.
- In about one quarter of the collaborations, interviewees indicated that the unique needs of their institutions were not met within the collaboration. What were thought of as unique needs did, by definition, vary among institutions, but included things such as applicant pools, identity, geographical distance, class sizes, and financial structure.

Although it was not a criterion of success for this study, almost all of the collaborations were struggling with the costs of collaboration, especially in terms of the time required for joint planning, communication, working with two or more administrative systems, and travel. The lack of funding had far-reaching implications for other aspects of the collaboration, including joint decision-making and communications.

3.3 KEY EFFECTIVE PRACTICES IN COLLABORATION

This study identified a number of practices that interviewees thought were effective in developing and delivering collaborative programs. The practices with the strongest support are described here. It is worth noting that three of the key effective practices (communication; joint decision making; and open, respectful relationships) require substantial staff and faculty time, and therefore have cost implications.

3.3.1 Communication

It was important to maintain positive relationships, resolve issues early, and keep everybody up to date about program decisions. Accordingly, regular communication was necessary at all levels, both between institutions and within institutions. A combination of formal and informal communication channels seemed to be effective. Quality of communication was as important as quantity.

3.3.2 Joint decision making

It was important that processes and structures for collaborative decision-making be transparent, consistent, and fair to all parties. It was likely not essential, nor even realistic, for all collaborative partners to have equal say. However, it was important that all partners have input into key decisions, and that individual staff and faculty have genuine opportunities to influence decisions that would affect them.

A clear and detailed Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) helped to outline the structures of communication. MOUs indicated who was responsible for which decision, and how decisions were to be made. A committee structure was typically established, with specific committees responsible for different areas of the programs (e.g., curriculum, finance, admissions, marketing). Committees had the authority to make decisions pertaining to their areas. A high-level steering committee usually oversaw all aspects, ensured that the MOU was adhered to, and resolved issues that could not be resolved at other levels.

Several MOUs outlined mechanisms for dispute resolution and included mechanisms for ensuring adherence to the structures in the MOU. These elements were helpful when conflicts arose.

3.3.3 Open, respectful relationships

In some of the collaborations, relationships between the college and university faculty and staff were described as “good” and “open,” and people were committed to the collaboration and willing to work together. There was a high level of respect, and people felt that their contributions to the program were recognized and valued. In other collaborations, faculty and staff felt that their strengths were not valued. This was a

demoralizing experience that drained people's energy, setting the stage for failure of the collaboration.

3.3.4 Senior management support

Individuals in senior management positions within the colleges and universities had the power to encourage collaboration, to build relationships and teams among the faculty and staff, to foster a common vision for the program, and to ensure that decision-making processes were followed. Collaborations with supportive senior managers were more likely to have effective practices in place.

3.4 COLLABORATION TAKES TIME AND COSTS MORE

One of the main findings of this study is that collaboration took extra time, above and beyond what would normally be required for an undergraduate nursing program.

At the beginning, when the collaborative programs were being developed, there were differences in values and expectations, institutional policies, finances, curricula, resources, administrative policies and procedures, and collective agreements that needed to be worked through. The programs needed to be designed, including both administrative and curricular details. Working relationships among faculty and staff from the different institutions needed to be developed and strengthened so that people could work together as a team. College faculty needed to develop capacity within their departments and institutions to carry out research. College and university faculty needed to review curriculum goals, delivery methods, and assessment methods to ensure that the program delivered a single, consistent, degree-level curriculum at all sites.

Once the program was implemented, ongoing communication was needed to ensure consistency across sites, deal with separate admission and information systems, allocate funds, make decisions about students, maintain the program, and deal with unanticipated issues. The more partners there were in the collaborative program, the more people needed to be involved in the various decisions. Travel time for meetings was also an issue. Extra administrative time was also required to transfer student data between two different computer systems, or manually enter and update student data in multiple systems. Students also needed extra help and support as they learned to navigate more than one postsecondary system.

Faculty and staff in almost all of the collaborations mentioned that collaboration was a lot of work. In several collaborations the faculty and staff said they felt overloaded, and in some cases that they were beginning to burn out. In university settings, faculty noted that collaborative activities took time away from their research, threatening their opportunities for tenure and promotion.

Because of the additional time required, the collaborative programs cost more to run than would a comparable non-collaborative program. The interviewees in this study indicated that additional funding was needed to compensate for the additional time and staff required (as described above). Costs were also incurred for travel and long-distance communication, including communication infrastructure (e.g., teleconference and videoconference).

3.5 OTHER CHALLENGES

3.5.1 Need for streamlined, shared admissions processes

Because there were two distinct systems for entering Ontario colleges and universities, it was challenging for any of the collaborations to create a single, shared admissions process. Four collaborations had done so. In these cases, the students applied through the university system, and the partnering colleges were involved in admission decisions. This appeared to be the most streamlined option for a shared admission system, but it did have some costs: college interviewees were concerned that this process would discourage students from applying to other college programs, and make it more difficult to refer students who were not admitted to the nursing program to other college programs.

Other collaborations allowed students to enter through both the college and the university systems. Some of these collaborations pooled the applicants into a single database and made shared admission decisions. Still others ran parallel admissions processes but consulted with each other about applicants whose qualifications were in question. These processes were more time consuming, especially where student data from multiple systems needed to be pooled.

If applicants are pooled, it raises the issue of how to decide which students will attend which campus. One option would be to assign them randomly to different campuses, which would result in a roughly equal student body at each campus. Another possibility is to accommodate student preferences for a specific campus to the extent possible, with students deflected to another campus if they are not accepted into their first choice. This option would likely result in different grade cut-offs for different campuses, as the most-desired campus would have the highest grade cut-off¹⁷. This phenomenon has already been observed in several of the collaborations.

3.5.2 Need for streamlined administrative structures

The main concern related to administrative structures was the transfer of student data between institutions. The partnering institutions each had different student information systems, which had troubles communicating with one another. Either the staff needed to

¹⁷ All accepted students would presumably still meet the minimum requirements for admission to the program.

spend extraordinary amounts of time getting the systems to communicate with one another, or student data needed to be entered manually in multiple systems. Neither of these options was considered satisfactory by the interviewees in this study. The difficulties in communicating information about students had impacts on the partners' ability to access student information in a timely way (e.g., contact information, grades, number of students), and also had impacts on the students (e.g., ability to access resources at partner institutions, timely access to grades and other performance information, needing to make address changes at multiple institutions, falling through the cracks between the institutions). In some programs, it also made it difficult to track students through all four years of the program.

Some collaborations were able to streamline some of the other administrative structures (e.g., scheduling, making routine decisions, financial operations) over time, which made collaboration a bit less onerous and time-consuming.

3.5.3 Collective agreements and faculty inequality

The different collective agreements at colleges and universities created significant difficulties for faculty and administrators of collaborative programs. Different expectations, schedules, vacations, roles, responsibilities, workloads, opportunities for further education, and compensation created feelings of resentment among faculty, typically in both directions. This study did not identify any ideas for how to deal with this issue.

Collective agreements also limited the amount of time that college faculty could spend on research and other scholarly activities. At some colleges, workload formulas had been adjusted to enable faculty to conduct research. For example, the number of hours allocated to teaching each week had been reduced, and those hours had been allocated to scholarly activities and other collaborative work.

3.5.4 Maintaining consistency in the program across sites

Consistency in the program between sites, and integrity among the different courses in the program, were considered to be very important in maintaining the quality of the program. Collaborations used a number of practices to foster consistency:

- Lead teachers were established for specific courses or years of study. These lead teachers were responsible for communicating with other teachers of the same course or year to ensure that the material covered was consistent.
- Course material was shared among those who taught the same course at different sites, including the syllabus, readings, textbooks, assignments, and examinations.
- Practicum teachers were invited to sit in on theory classes to ensure that the content of practicum courses built on what was taught in the theoretical courses.

As with many other solutions to collaborative challenges, these practices took time and had cost implications.

The need for consistency also had to be balanced with a need for flexibility and autonomy. Collaborations may wish to discuss the following issues:

- What types of decisions can faculty make on their own, and what types should require team or committee approval?
- To what extent do approvals processes inhibit innovation?
- Does “consistent” mean “equal,” or could each program site offer unique opportunities to students in the same program (e.g., specific interdisciplinary studies, smaller classes, better facilities, etc.)?

3.5.5 Scholarly research

The collaborative programs enhanced the colleges’ capacity to conduct research, both within and beyond the nursing program. In at least one collaboration, college faculty had carried out research independently and published their findings in a peer reviewed journal.

The building of research capacity in the colleges takes time. Supports need to be put in place, and faculty may need mentorship to develop their research skills. Because so much time and effort goes into the development of the collaborations, it is likely unrealistic to see much activity in the research area during the first few years. However, this is something that should be attended to as soon as it becomes practical, since it is important for baccalaureate students to be taught within a culture of inquiry.

Capacity was built effectively in collaborations where college faculty were mentored in scholarly research by university faculty who involved them as co-researchers on joint projects. However, this was demanding on the time of the university faculty. Faculty cross appointments were another successful way of building capacity among college faculty.

As mentioned previously, the collaborations had a negative impact on the research activities of faculty in many of the universities, due to the extra time spent in collaboration activities. While no solutions were identified for this problem, in at least one collaboration the problem eased up over time as the details of the program were worked out and took less day-to-day time.

3.5.6 Hiring

There was a shortage of nurses in the province with the qualifications needed to teach in baccalaureate-level programs. Hiring new faculty was identified as a problem in several of the collaborations.

3.6 COSTS AND BENEFITS OF COLLABORATION

It seems that, to make a collaboration really work, it is necessary to invest considerable time up front in developing a shared culture, and considerable time on an ongoing basis for communication and collaborative decision-making. Specific elements of collaboration that are considered desirable (e.g., shared admissions process) add another layer of joint administration. This raises two questions:

- In what circumstances are the benefits of collaboration worth the costs?
- What other options are there that might achieve the benefits desired from collaboration without some of the associated costs?

While it is beyond the scope of this project to answer these questions, we feel that we can contribute to the discussion by outlining the main costs and benefits of collaborations, as seen through the eyes of our key informants and the students and graduates who completed the surveys.

3.6.1 Perceived benefits

The main perceived benefits of collaboration were:

- Individuals participating in the collaborations had the opportunity to develop strong, positive relationships with others, and experienced personal and professional growth.
- Research capacity and educational standards increased at the colleges (both within and beyond the program), and also at some of the universities.
- The relationships between the partners and the increased knowledge of the other postsecondary system led partners to consider (and in some cases implement) collaborations in other areas.
- More students were educated, because education reached students in their home communities. In addition, those who were educated in their home communities were more likely to stay there to practice, so the supply of nurses in smaller communities was improved.
- Many students appreciated having access to the benefits of both the college and the university systems.

3.6.2 Perceived costs

The main perceived costs of collaboration were:

- There was a higher workload for almost everybody involved, and some faculty and administrative staff were becoming exhausted.
- Collaboration was a drain on time and the financial resources of the institutions.

- There were differences in expectations and reward mechanisms for faculty in the same program, depending on whether they were employed by a college or a university. Expectations were not always clear, especially in the colleges, where faculty were governed by both the regular college policies and expectations, and the somewhat different policies and expectations that were being applied to a baccalaureate program.
- Each partner, and each faculty or staff member, had less autonomy, flexibility, and control than they would in a program offered by a single institution.
- The ability to conduct research at the university suffered because faculty time was spent on collaboration.
- Individual institutions needed to wait until student information was provided by a partner before they could make important decisions.
- Students found the transition between college and university difficult.
- When collaboration didn't work well, people felt extremely devalued, frustrated, and stressed, which had an impact on the whole institution.
- Perceived differences in admission requirements or grading at different sites led to rivalry and elitism among the students.
- Timely, accurate communication with students was even more challenging than usual, resulting in confusion and frustration.

3.7 SUGGESTIONS FOR THE PROVINCE

If the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities wishes to enhance collaboration between colleges and universities in Ontario, it could do so by:

- Recognizing the extraordinary cost of collaboration, especially in terms of the time required for joint planning, communication, working with two or more administrative systems, and travel.
- Providing support to CUCC to develop a compendium of effective practices in college-university collaboration.
- Providing practical support for collaborations (e.g., providing templates for MOUs and other tools, facilitating information sharing about effective practices, etc.).
- Providing funding and incentives to nursing faculty and institutions, to allow nursing faculty to increase their qualifications to the PhD level, thus increasing the pool of qualified faculty.
- Determining if it is possible to facilitate, at a provincial level, the development of solutions to some of the challenges to collaboration (e.g., a streamlined/integrated admissions systems between the colleges and the universities).

- Supporting colleges in building their research capacity.
- Developing a better definition of successful collaboration (which will likely evolve out of the identification and promotion of effective practices).

In addition, for the existing collaborative nursing programs, the MTCU could:

- Provide additional funding to support these extraordinary costs;
- Provide additional funding to support the additional costs of clinical education; and
- Review the flow of funding for all nursing programs.

3.8 SUGGESTIONS FOR PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS

Institutions can enhance collaboration within their own partnerships by adopting any of the following suggestions that are relevant to their particular situation:

- Take steps to ease the transition between college and university, if students need to transfer between sites. Although efforts had been made in the past, students still found this transition difficult. Action research by faculty in the participating institutions might be one way of identifying effective strategies in this area¹⁸.
- Develop a clear and detailed Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that indicates who is responsible for which decisions and how decisions are to be made, and that includes mechanisms for adherence to the structures of the MOU.
- Establish a system of formal and informal communication channels so that information can be exchanged on a regular basis at all levels, both between and within institutions.
- Attempt to identify solutions to any challenges to collaboration that are adversely affecting the partnership (e.g., streamlining administrative structures, faculty inequality, hiring difficulties, enhancing research capacity in the colleges,

¹⁸ “Action research can be described as a family of research methodologies which pursue action (or change) and research (or understanding) at the same time. In most of its forms it does this by

- Using a cyclic or spiral process which alternates between action and critical reflection and
- In the later cycles, continuously refining methods, data and interpretation in light of the understanding developed in the earlier cycles.

“It is thus an **emergent** process which takes shape as understanding increases; it is an **iterative** process which converges towards a better understanding of what happens

“In most of its forms it is also participative (among other reasons, change is usually easier to achieve when those affected by the change are involved) and qualitative.”

From Dick, Bob (1999). *What is action research?*

Available on-line at <http://www.scu.edu.au/schools/gcm/ar/whatisar.html>

consistency across sites). This may be another area where action research could be helpful.

- Senior managers can champion collaboration, foster open, respectful relationships among the partners, and ensure that decision-making processes are followed.
- As part of joint planning sessions, spend some time identifying and valuing the strengths that each partner brings to the collaboration, the shared goals of the partners, and the benefits that collaboration can bring. Focusing on these positives can increase commitment to the collaboration, increase energy levels, and reduce friction between the partners.

IV. REFERENCES

- College-University Consortium Council (CUCC) (1998). *Report of the College-University Consortium Council 1996-1998*. Toronto, ON: Author.
- Miles, M.B. & Huberman, A.M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities (MTCU) (April 12, 2000). *Memorandum to Presidents, Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology and Executive Heads, Publicly-assisted Universities re: Collaborative Nursing Education*.
- Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities (MTCU) (January 19, 2001). *Memorandum to Presidents, Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology; and Executive Heads of Publicly-assisted Universities, Algoma, Dominican, Hearst and OCAD re: Increased Funding Support for Transition to Baccalaureate Nursing Education*.
- Tilly, T. (1999). *CUCC brief to the Nursing Education Implementation Committee*. Toronto, ON: College University Consortium Council.

V. BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson-Rowland, Mary R., Banks, Debra L., Zerby, Donna M., & Chain, Elizabeth A. (2005). *Evaluating a collaborative program to increase the enrollment and retention of community college transfer students*. Paper presented at the 35th ASEE/IEEE Frontiers in Education Conference, October 19-22, 2005, Indianapolis, IN.
- Kezar, Adrianna (2005). Redesigning for collaboration within higher education institutions: An exploration into the developmental process. *Research in Higher Education*, 46(7): 831-60.
- Molzahn, Anita E. & Purkis, Mary Ellen (2004). Collaborative nursing education programs: Challenges and issues. *Nursing Leadership*, 17(4), 41-53.
- Nursing Education Implementation Committee (1999). *Report of the Nursing Education Implementation Committee*. Toronto, ON: Author.
- Orchard, Carole (2004). Commentary: The case for national standards. *Nursing Leadership*, 17(4): 54-55.
- Stanyon, Wendy (2003). College university collaboration: An Ontario perspective. *College Quarterly*, 6(1). Accessed September 7, 2006 at <http://www.senecac.on.ca/quarterly/archive.html> .
- Tilly, Tony (1999). *CUCC brief to the Nursing Education Implementation Committee*. Toronto, ON: College University Consortium Council.

APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW GUIDE

Please note that the following introduction was slightly modified in some cases to meet the requirements of different Research Ethics Boards.

As you know from the information sheet you have received, the College University Consortium Council (CUCC) has contracted with Cathexis Consulting Inc. to evaluate the Collaborative Baccalaureate Nursing Programs in Ontario. If you take part in the evaluation, you will be asked questions about your experiences with and knowledge of the program. The interview will take approximately one hour.

Before you give your consent to participate, it is important that you have read the information sheet sent out to you. Do you have any questions you would like to ask in regards to the information sheet or the evaluation?

Before you give your consent to participate in the study, I will now ask you to confirm that you have understood all the information you have been provided, including:

- That your individual interview answers may be shared with the CUCC, but you will not be identified by name,
- That you can change your mind, withdraw your consent and stop your participation at any time up until the results have been reported without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are allowed,
- That you have been sent a copy of this agreement, and
- That, by giving your consent to participate, you are not giving up any of your legal rights.

Do you want to participate in this study?

To be filled in by the phone interviewer (check either yes or no and write the date):

___ Yes ___ No Date: _____

1. How have you been involved in the collaborative nursing program?
 - *Probes: # years, role, involvement in drafting of the MOU, involvement in other collaborations in addition to this one*
2. *[Interviewer to provide a description of the program based on the Memorandum of Understanding, and to note that we understand they may not be able to comment on all aspects of the program].*

Is this how the program works in reality? Please describe any differences, as well as any aspects of the program I did not cover. The following list may provide some ideas:

- Governance structure (*how collaborative is the decision-making?*)
 - Approvals processes
 - Communications about the program (*quality of communications between institutions*)
 - Academic policies and procedures
 - Human Resources (*hiring, collective agreements, faculty qualifications, workload, who faculty report to*)
 - Research
 - Administration
 - Finances (*how funds are disbursed, sufficiency of funds, sharing of costs and revenues, decisions, transparency*)
 - Admission, registration and enrolment (*single shared admission policy/process, data transfer, who does what?*)
 - Student resources (*access to both college and university resources*)
 - Tuition and ancillary fees
 - Joint curriculum (*program length, how developed, how divided between two institutions, who teaches, evaluation and review, integration between theoretical and practical aspects of nursing*)
 - Quality assurance mechanisms and practices
 - Graduation and alumni affiliation (*baccalaureate degree awarded, college recognized on the parchment, grads alumni of both institutions, who participates in graduation*)
 - Accreditation (*collaboration-related issues raised in accreditation review, whole program or individual sites accredited?*)
3. *For interviewees who have been involved since the inception of the program:* What was your nursing program like before the collaboration?
4. *For interviewees who have been involved since the inception of the program:* Please describe the history of the collaboration.
- *Probes: When did talks begin? What prompted them? What processes were used to design the program? Who was involved? What were the roles of the college and university in planning and design? Why was the program structured the way it was?*
5. *For interviewees who have been involved in the design of the program:* Thinking back to when you were first designing the program and drafting the Memorandum of

Understanding, what were some of the more challenging parts? How have you handled them? What were the keys to success?

6. Describe a high point experience in the collaboration – a time when you were most alive and engaged. What made this occasion special?
7. Without being modest, what is it that you most value about yourself and your work with the collaboration?
8. What parts of the collaboration are working particularly well? What factors contribute to it working well?
9. In your opinion, how has the collaboration affected:
 - You (either personally or professionally)
 - Your institution? *Probes: To what extent are the unique needs of your institution accommodated? How does the collaboration affect your ability to provide high-quality programs to a growing student population? What have been the opportunity costs of collaboration?*
 - Student experiences? *Probes: How are students treated by faculty and other students? Are all students treated the same way? How do they manage the transition between institutions? How many have transferred from the baccalaureate program to a practical nursing program?*
 - Faculty experiences? *Probes: Curriculum development? Research?*
 - Administrative staff experiences?
10. If you could make three changes to your collaborative nursing program, what would those three changes be? How would they result in an improved program?
11. In your opinion, what could the province, the consortiums, or the individual sites do to promote more effective collaborations?
12. On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is extremely unlikely and 5 is extremely likely, how likely is it that this collaboration will continue for the next five years? (Assume that the political context remains the same as it is now.) Please explain your rating.

Thank you for your participation. If you have any other questions, please feel free to contact me (*provide business card*). I will send you a copy of the summary for your collaborative program early in October.

APPENDIX B: STUDENT/GRADUATE SURVEY



EVALUATION OF THE ONTARIO COLLABORATIVE NURSING PROGRAM *STUDENT AND GRADUATE SURVEY*

Introduction

Hello, may I please speak to _____ (name of student/graduate)?

[If the individual is not available, try to find out when they might be available. Explain purpose of study (see below) if requested. Thank the person providing the information. Do not collect survey information from parents, roommates or others.]

[If the individual does not live in this household, try to obtain a new telephone number. Explain purpose of study (see below) if requested. Thank the person providing the information.]

Hi, my name is _____ and I'm with (Malatest). I'm calling on behalf of Ontario College University Consortium Council (CUCC, _____ (name of college) and _____ (name of university). We are doing a study of the people who are currently enrolled or who have completed the Collaborative Nursing Program. The purpose of the study is to provide the Ontario College University Consortium Council with information about students' satisfaction and about their employment and educational experiences, and to provide detailed information to colleges and university partners, and government on best practices and also provide ideas about how to improve future collaborations.

Before you give your consent to participate, it is important that you have read the information sheet sent out to you. Have you read the information sheet about the evaluation that was sent to you earlier?

If No, we can send this sheet to you:

- by email;
- or through giving you the following link: (enter link here)

[If they have read the information sheet] Do you have any questions you would like to ask in regards to the information sheet or the evaluation? Have you understood the information that has been provided?

Before we start, I'd like to assure you that your participation is voluntary and that any information you give us will be kept completely confidential. Your responses will be combined with the responses from other students and will not be attributable on an individual basis. When results are published, only summary or aggregated information will be provided, and no individuals will be identified. Your personal information is protected by the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act. By giving your consent to participate, you are not giving up any of your legal rights.

Do you want to participate in this study?

To be filled in by the phone interviewer (check either yes or no):

___ Yes ___ No

[If the student questions the validity of the study, or has any questions about the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, please check the contact list to find the appropriate survey contact by institution.]

The study should only take about 15 to 20 minutes. Would you have time to speak to me now?
[If the individual is unwilling to be interviewed at this time, try to arrange another more convenient time.]

SECTION A: STUDENT BACKGROUND

**A1. Which collaborative nursing program are you in?
 (DO NOT READ LIST)**

- Brock / Loyalist
- Lakehead / Confederation
- Laurentian / Cambrian / Northern / Sault
- Laurentian / St. Lawrence
- Laurentienne / Boréal
- McMaster / Conestoga / Mohawk
- New Brunswick / Humber
- Nipissing / Canadore
- Ottawa / Algonquin
- Ottawa / La Cité
- Queen's / St. Lawrence
- Ryerson / Centennial / George Brown
- Trent / Fleming
- UOIT / Durham
- Western / Fanshawe
- Windsor / Lambton / St. Clair
- York / Georgian / Seneca

A2. In what month and year did you begin the Collaborative Nursing Program?

Month Year

[Options for year are 1995 or earlier, 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006]

A3. Have you graduated from the program?

___ Yes ___ No

A4a. What month and year do you expect to graduate/did you graduate from the Collaborative Nursing Program?

Month Year

[Options for year are 2003 or earlier, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010 or later]

A4b. In what year of study in the Collaborative Nursing Program are you in?

NOTE: If you are between years in the program, please choose your next year of study.

1

2

3

4

88 NO RESPONSE

**A5. During the Collaborative Nursing Program, are/were you:
(READ LIST)**

A full time student

A part time student

Both a full time and a part time student, at different times

**A6. Where have you taken/did you take courses for the Collaborative Nursing Program?
(READ LIST)**

At the college site

At the university site

At **both** the college and the university sites

SECTION B: STUDENT SATISFACTION

Using a scale from 1 to 5 where one is very dissatisfied and 5 is very satisfied, please rate your satisfaction with each of the following aspects of your educational experience. How satisfied are/were you with the...

	Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Don't Know / Not Applicable
B1. General Program Area						
a. Program application process	1	2	3	4	5	9
b. Program admission requirements	1	2	3	4	5	9
c. Program admission process	1	2	3	4	5	9
d. Recognition of previously taken academic courses	1	2	3	4	5	9
e. Recognition of relevant experience	1	2	3	4	5	9
f. Transfer of records between the college and university ¹⁹	1	2	3	4	5	9
g. Transition between college and university	1	2	3	4	5	9
h. Integration of clinical and theoretical aspects of the program	1	2	3	4	5	9
i. Consistency in the messages provided by college and university communications	1	2	3	4	5	9
j. Distance education opportunities	1	2	3	4	5	9
k. Availability of scholarships	1	2	3	4	5	9
l. Tuition fees	1	2	3	4	5	9
B2. College-related						
a. Student fees at the college	1	2	3	4	5	9
b. Registration process at the college	1	2	3	4	5	9
c. Accessibility of the college campus	1	2	3	4	5	9

	Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Don't Know / Not Applicable
d. Quality of teaching from the instructors from the college	1	2	3	4	5	9
e. Quality of teaching from clinical instructors at the college	1	2	3	4	5	9
f. College professors' expectations	1	2	3	4	5	9
g. Extra help provided by instructors from the college	1	2	3	4	5	9
h. Workload from college professors	1	2	3	4	5	9
i. Availability of courses at the college	1	2	3	4	5	9
j. Physical facilities/equipment at the college	1	2	3	4	5	9
k. Quality of library materials at the college	1	2	3	4	5	9
l. Availability of college library resources	1	2	3	4	5	9
m. Communication from the college	1	2	3	4	5	9
n. Student services at the college	1	2	3	4	5	9
o. The level of stress you experienced at college	1	2	3	4	5	9
p. Respect college program staff show you	1	2	3	4	5	9
q. Acceptance of cultural diversity at the college	1	2	3	4	5	9
B3. University-Related						
a. Student fees at the university	1	2	3	4	5	9
b. Registration process at the university	1	2	3	4	5	9
c. Accessibility of the university campus	1	2	3	4	5	9
d. Quality of teaching from professors from the university	1	2	3	4	5	9

	Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Don't Know / Not Applicable
e. Quality of teaching from clinical instructors at the university	1	2	3	4	5	9
f. University professors' expectations	1	2	3	4	5	9
g. Extra help provided by professors from the university	1	2	3	4	5	9
h. Workload from university professors	1	2	3	4	5	9
i. Availability of courses at the university	1	2	3	4	5	9
j. Physical facilities/equipment at the university	1	2	3	4	5	9
k. Quality of library materials at the university	1	2	3	4	5	9
l. Availability of university library resources	1	2	3	4	5	9
m. Communication from the university	1	2	3	4	5	9
n. Student services at the university	1	2	3	4	5	9
o. The level of stress you experienced at university	1	2	3	4	5	9
p. Respect university program staff show you	1	2	3	4	5	9
q. Acceptance of cultural diversity at the university	1	2	3	4	5	9
B4. Overall						
a. College experience	1	2	3	4	5	9
b. University experience	1	2	3	4	5	9
c. Satisfaction with the collaboration between the university and the college(s)	1	2	3	4	5	9
d. Degree to which the curriculum was consistent and integrated						
e. Opportunities for interaction among students from different sites in your program						

	Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Don't Know / Not Applicable
f. Quality of interaction among students from different sites in your program						
g. Satisfaction with overall nursing program	1	2	3	4	5	9
B5. For Graduates Only						
a. Graduation application process	1	2	3	4	5	9
b. Career work prospects as a result of completing the program	1	2	3	4	5	9

For Graduates Only

B6. Do you feel that the education from the Collaborative Nursing Program prepared you for employment as a nurse?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

For All Students

B7. What are the strengths of the Collaborative Nursing Program?

B8a. If you could change three things about the program, what would those changes be? and how would they improve the program?

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

B8b. How would [B8a1.] improve the program?

B8c. How would [B8a2.] improve the program?

B8d. How would [B8a3.] improve the program?

B9. On a scale of 1 to 5, how would you rate the fit between the college and university portions of the program?

Poor	Not very good	Neutral	Good	Excellent	Don't know
1	2	3	4	5	<input type="checkbox"/>

B10. Would you recommend the Collaborative Nursing Program in which you studied to people interested in a career in nursing?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

SECTION C: STUDENT DEMOGRAPHICS

C1. Are you...? (CHECK ONE)

- Male
- Female

Thank you for your participation.

Would you like us to enter your name in the draw for one of three \$50 Indigo/Chapters gift cards?

- Yes
- No

If yes:
Name: _____
Phone number: _____
Alternate phone number: _____

We will be making the draw in early October. Thank you once again.

APPENDIX C: COLLABORATION DESCRIPTIONS

Brock University-Loyalist College Collaborative Baccalaureate Nursing Program COLLABORATION SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

The following is a description of the collaborative baccalaureate nursing program provided by Brock University and Loyalist College of Applied Arts and Technology. The description is based on

- Documents provided by the collaboration
- Interviews with faculty and staff at the two institutions
 - Four interviewees at Loyalist
 - Six interviewees at Brock

BACKGROUND

Brock University is located in St. Catharines and Loyalist College in Belleville. It is a three hour drive between the institutions. Prior to the collaborative nursing program, Loyalist offered a diploma program in nursing. Brock University did not offer an undergraduate Nursing Program, but had begun to offer a Post Diploma Degree Completion Program.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

PROGRAM MODEL

As of 2005, the consortium operated through a Type 2 model (two years at either the college or the university, followed by two at the university). A Type 1 model (two years at the college followed by two years at the university) was originally adopted because of the distance between the two institutions. Brock started offering all four years at the Brock site, to increase the number of students in the third and fourth years and to attract students from the Niagara Region in response to community requests to address the shortage of nurses in the Niagara Region.

GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE

The initial Proposal to Offer a Collaborative Nursing Baccalaureate Nursing Program briefly outlined the structure of the program. The process to develop a more detailed and up-to-date MOU had begun, but had not yet been finalized when this report was prepared.

The program also had a five year plan for developing the collaboration, including analysis of principles, strengths, opportunities, challenges, goals, strategies and evaluation mechanisms.

Some decisions about the collaboration were made by Brock since they were the degree granting institution. The Administrative Committee oversaw the program in terms of administrative issues and policy changes (MOU, financial issues, operations of the program, admission). Membership in this committee included the Dean, Faculty of Applied Health Sciences, Brock University, Vice President, Academic, Loyalist College, Chair, Brock University Department of Nursing, Dean, School of Health and Human Studies, Loyalist College, and Registrars from both institutions. Representatives from the financial department of each institution participated on an ad hoc basis. It was the Faculty Committee that dealt with changes to the curriculum (and the university senate if the changes were major). All faculty members from both institutions were members of the Faculty Committee.

COMMUNICATIONS BETWEEN INSTITUTIONS

The main ways of formal communication between institutions are outlined in the table below:

Primary Communication Channels in the Collaboration

Individuals from	Type of gathering	Location	Function	Frequency of communication
Management Committee - Senior Management (Brock Dean of Applied Health Sciences, Chair of Nursing; Loyalist VP academic, Dean, School of Health and Human Studies, Registrars,)	Administrative committee	Brock and Loyalist - formal meeting	Discuss administrative matters and arising issues, policy changes	2/year

Nursing Chair\Dean	Meetings, email\telephone	Rotating sites	Discuss ongoing administrative, curriculum, program matters	Bi-weekly communication with twice\semester meetings
Dean Faculty of Applied Health Sciences at Brock	Visit senior administrators and students	Loyalist	To enhance general communication	2-3/year
Faculty	Faculty committee/retreat	Rotating sites	Curriculum, program delivery, emerging issues, student progress, faculty communication strategies, graduation	One day meeting 1\year and a two day retreat 1\year
Faculty and students	Orientation to Brock, meeting for students	Brock	Orientation for students	1/year
Faculty and students	Student services committee	Brock/Loyalist teleconference	Discuss student issues and concerns	2/year
Faculty	WebCT	online	Course outlines, bulletin boards (content is under development)	Ongoing

The collaboration was in the process of developing their videoconferencing capability to enhance communication between the two institutions.

ACADEMIC ISSUES

Students registered at Loyalist College followed academic policies and procedures of the College and students registered at Brock University followed those of the university. Policies were reviewed regularly through the Joint Admissions Committee.

Joint Curriculum

The curriculum was developed from scratch by faculty from both sites during a series of meetings and was approved by the senate. Meetings were held in Toronto and by teleconference. Faculty from each of the institutions brought back drafts to their institutions for feedback before meeting again.

When Brock decided to provide the first two years at Brock, they developed the course structure independently, and, while the courses offered varied slightly from those offered

at Loyalist, students at both sites who registered for year three would have achieved the same Program Learning outcomes for Level 2.

Admission Requirements

The admission criteria were determined by the two institutions as a part of the initial negotiations. The minimum GPA was the same for both sites, but the cut-off varied depending on how many students applied and what their GPA was.

Research

A couple of joint research projects had been explored but had not yet been undertaken and the college had become increasingly involved in scholarly activities and in development of faculty scholarship portfolios. According to the five year plan, time was to be allocated for discussing collaborative research projects during the faculty retreats. Students who became involved in collaborative research as well as faculty at all sites were to report on research activities at the end of each year.

HUMAN RESOURCES

The two institutions had separate hiring practices and policies regarding minimum qualifications Faculty hired by the College were required to have a minimum of a master's degree, while tenure-track faculty hired by the university were required to be PhD prepared.

ADMINISTRATION & STUDENT SERVICES

Application/Admissions Process and Student Records

Students could apply to the collaborative program through either the Ontario College Application Services (OCAS) or through the Ontario Universities' Application Centre (OUAC) depending on whether they preferred to take their first two years at the college or at the university.

When students had been admitted by Loyalist, the admission data were forwarded to Brock via an excel spread sheet. The information was entered manually into Brocks system. The students were then given a Brock id-number which they could use to access the online library. Student records were also transferred over to Brock from Loyalist when the students started their third year at the university. At that point, students could also request a transcript from Brock.

Graduation and Alumni Affiliation

The graduation ceremony took place at Brock, with Loyalist faculty invited as guests. Both Brock and Loyalist were identified on the parchment. Graduates were considered as alumni from Brock only.

Student Services and Financial Assistance

Which scholarships students in the collaborative program had access to depended on which of the institutions they attended. At the time this report was prepared, Brock had more scholarships available for students than Loyalist. However, the number of scholarships available for students at Loyalist was planned to increase over the next few years, according to the collaboration's five year plan. All students had access to the Brock online library.

PROGRAM PROMOTION

Loyalist developed a program brochure prior to the inception of the program and Brock provided input. When Brock had an open house, Loyalist sent one representative to attend. Loyalist College had a strategic marketing plan, and the Nursing Program was promoted as part of that plan.

FINANCES

For funding purposes, students registered at the college were counted by the college and students registered at the university were counted by the university. As per the MTCU policy, all grant monies flowed through the college and those monies were distributed based on enrolment at each site.

Tuition fees paid by students were the same at both sites, as defined by the university, but the ancillary fees varied.

QUALITY CONTROL

The institutions had their own course evaluations. In 2003, a Program Evaluation Framework that served as a guide for overall quality assurance was developed. The ultimate mechanism for quality control was the accreditation process.

PROCESS FOR DEVELOPING A COLLABORATIVE PROGRAM

Loyalist did not have an obvious partner to enter into collaboration with, due to geography, and Brock only had an RN degree completion nursing program at that time.

The two institutions decided to develop a collaborative nursing program together and entered into an agreement. Members of senior administration from both sites developed the administrative structure of the program, and faculty participated in the development of a program philosophy (that would support and implement the mission statements) and the curriculum (see section on curriculum).

Some of the challenging parts in the initial negotiations were the admissions process, the administration of student records, and understanding the differences in accounting practices. These issues were resolved through effective communication and discussions.

LAKEHEAD/CONFEDERATION

Lakehead University and Confederation College Bachelor of Science in Nursing Program Collaboration Summary

INTRODUCTION

The following is a description of the collaborative baccalaureate nursing program provided by Lakehead University and Confederation College. The description is based on

- the *Agreement in Principle* dated June 14, 2001
- the *Agreement* dated May 30, 2004
- the *Agreement* dated September 10, 2004
- interviews with nine faculty and staff at Confederation College
- interviews with eight faculty and staff at Lakehead University

BACKGROUND

Lakehead University and Confederation College are both located in Thunder Bay, Ontario. Each institution has its own campuses, but the main campuses are geographically quite close to one another (between five and 15 minutes).

Prior to the development of the collaborative program, both institutions provided nursing programs leading to a RN designation. Confederation College program offered a three-year diploma program. Lakehead University offered a four-year degree program, a post-RN program, and a compressed program (two-year fast tracked). The post-RN program was available at a distance as well as on campus. Both programs were reported to be very well respected in the community.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

PROGRAM MODEL

At the time this report was prepared, the partnership operated two programs. The first used a Type 3 delivery model where both institutions provided courses to students throughout the four-year program. Approximately 15% of the courses were taught by

Confederation College Faculty, and 85% were taught by Lakehead University faculty. The program used both sites.

In 2004, Type 4 program model was proposed in which the university would be primarily responsible for delivering the first three years of the program to the students assigned to the university campus, and the college would be primarily responsible for delivering the program to the students assigned to the college campus. All students from both campuses, would complete the theory courses from the fourth year at the university campus. The faculty from both the college and university were in support of the Type 4 model. The current *Agreement in Principle*, signed September of 2004, specified the use of a Type 4 delivery model for students beginning the program on or after September, 2005, but this had not occurred.

A second externally-funded collaborative program pilot project was being offered through Confederation College's community campuses, which were spread out across north-western Ontario. The nursing courses were delivered by Confederation faculty. Lakehead faculty had taught non-nursing required courses and electives in the program, and would be teaching one of the nursing courses in winter of 2007.

GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE

The first *Agreement in Principle*, outlining the intent to operate a collaborative program and the principles of collaboration, was approved June 2001. A more detailed *Agreement* was signed in 2004 and revised in September of 2004. The *Agreement* included details about the delivery structure, governance, scholarship, uniformity, communication, financing, dispute resolution, marketing, student information, property rights, student matters, enrolment and admissions, amendments, and termination.

The collaborative nursing program had to meet Lakehead University Senate approval.

The chair or director of the nursing program from both institutions provided leadership and direction for the program, subject to the Lakehead University Act. According to the *Agreement*, program decisions were to be made:

- By agreement between the university and college Directors;
- By the Faculty Council;
- By the Steering Committee of the collaborative program.

In practice, program decisions were made by the Directors.

Directors

The college and university Directors had general oversight and responsibility over the delivery, leadership, administration, management, and functioning of the program within their institutions. They jointly had oversight over matters that impacted on the general

interpretation, administration and application of the agreement or that touched on the program at both campuses, and consulted one another before acting in these matters.

Faculty Council

The Faculty Council was responsible for making recommendations to the institutions and the Steering Committee relating to the general functioning and administration of the program, and the application and administration of the *Agreement*.

According to the *Agreement*, membership on the Faculty Council included the university and college Directors and any full-time nursing faculty member of the university or the college that taught in the collaborative program. By some reports, the Faculty Council met twice a year, but by other reports it met less frequently.

The Faculty Council had a standing curriculum committee, called the Curriculum Committee of the Whole (CCW), which was charged with issues relating to the curriculum as well as with other program issues. This committee was reported to meet on a monthly basis, and included nursing faculty from both institutions teaching in the BScN program.

Steering Committee

The program Steering Committee was composed of the VPs (Academic) of the college and the university, the Directors of the college and the university, the VP (Administration and Finance) of the university, the VP (Administration Services) of the college, and the Dean of Professional Schools of the university. All but the Dean of Professional Schools were voting members.

The role of the Steering Committee was, to resolve issues that could not be resolved by the Faculty Council and/or Directors, to deal with any budgetary or financial issues relating to the program, and to deal with any matter delegated to it by the Presidents of the institutions.

Presidents

If the Steering Committee was unable to resolve an issue, they could refer it to the two Presidents of the institutions, who would try to resolve the matter. The decision of the Presidents bound the parties. The Agreement provided for mediation/arbitration in the event that the Presidents were unable to resolve a matter.

COMMUNICATIONS BETWEEN INSTITUTIONS

Aside from the formal mechanisms for decision making, communication seemed to take place between the institutions on a one-on-one basis. For instance, the VP Academics of

the college and university talked with one another, and college faculty communicated with their counterparts at the university as part of course delivery.

ACADEMIC ISSUES

Joint Curriculum

The program offered a single curriculum, which was the curriculum offered in Lakehead's pre-collaborative program. Confederation faculty were involved in the development of the curriculum in 1997-98, but their involvement was reportedly limited to the development of philosophy and objectives of the courses.

Students took most of their courses on the university campus, taught primarily by university faculty. They travelled to the college campus for approximately 10% to 25% of their courses, which were taught primarily by college faculty. Some courses were taught jointly by university and college faculty (e.g., alternating each week, classes at both the college and university campuses).

A university faculty member was usually the lead teacher on all courses, including those that were taught exclusively by college faculty. University academic standards, rules and criteria were applicable to the administration and delivery of the program.

Admission Requirements

Admission requirements were based on the university requirements. Provisions for exceptions in considering admissions were in place. Applicants lacking a required subject were considered on an individual basis.

Scholarly Activity

Scholarly activity was valued at both the college and the university, but took different forms. At the university, there was an explicit expectation that all faculty members engaged in research and scholarly activity, and tenure was based on such activity. Each faculty member's scholarly activity was reviewed annually.

At the college, faculty were expected to be involved in scholarly activities. Faculty were given release time to develop scholarly profiles and to upgrade their credentials. While there was an interest among faculty in conducting research, it was time consuming and difficult to carry out within the constraints of the workload agreement at the college. Few faculty were engaged in research at the time this report was prepared, but there did appear to be a dedication to scholarly activity related to teaching/learning. There were collaborative research projects that involved nursing faculty from both institutions.

HUMAN RESOURCES

Minimum faculty qualifications were based on the requirements and standards normally imposed on Bachelor of Science in Nursing programs that were delivered collaboratively in the Province of Ontario. New faculty were expected to have a completed (or nearly completed) doctoral degree, with at least one graduate degree in nursing. Existing faculty without a graduate degree in nursing were eligible to teach first and second year courses, as well as a selection of third year courses.

The university Dean of the Faculty of Professional Schools was responsible for assigning teaching responsibilities for university faculty on an annual basis (July 1 to June 30), based on input from the university School of Nursing Director. The college faculty preferences were submitted to the university Director for consideration on a term-by-term basis. When this report was prepared, it had been possible to accommodate college faculty preferences, but the differences in the terms of the assignments (term by term vs. annual) had made human resource planning difficult.

The college and university made hiring decisions independently of one another. Employees of the college and the university remained employees of their own institution, and were bound by any collective agreement that applied. Employees were expected to follow their own institution's internal procedures (with the exception that all faculty teaching in the program adhered to Lakehead University's academic policies).

ADMINISTRATION & STUDENT SERVICES

Program Promotion

The *Agreements* required that the program be referred to in all communications as the "Lakehead University and Confederation College Bachelor of Science in Nursing Program." The program was intended to have an identity separate from the college and the university.

Each institution included the program on its own website and promoted the program in their other promotional materials.

Application

Students applied to the program through the university application system. The admissions process was administered by the university.

Student Registration and Enrolment

Students were registered at Lakehead University. They were recorded in the university student information system and pay university tuition fees. In theory, students were affiliated with both institutions, but it was unclear if this happened in practice.

There had been issues with respect to transfer of applicant and student data from Lakehead University to Confederation of College because of concerns related to the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*.

Students had access to facilities and services (e.g., libraries, fitness centre, and student success office) at both institutions.

Graduation and Alumni Affiliation

Graduates were considered alumni of both institutions. The degree given to graduates recognized the collaborative partnership between the two institutions.

The first graduate pinning ceremony included the President and faculty of Lakehead University and the Dean and senior nursing faculty/staff from Confederation College.

FINANCES

Tuition and ancillary fees were set and collected by the university.

Grant revenue (except for base funding) flowed through the college. The college was to forward to the university any excess of grant funding over and above the full amount of Collaborative Nursing Program expenses spent by the college, including labour, fixed costs, and operating costs incurred by the college plus a percentage for overheads (a minimum of 25% in 2005-2009).

During the first year of the program, ancillary fees were shared between the college and the university, with the college receiving 33% of the fees collected from collaborative nursing students. Since then, the university had kept 100% of the fees.

QUALITY CONTROL

Each institution had its own quality assurance and accountability mechanisms in place. For example, the college had a credential validation service, and the university participated in an internal undergraduate program review process. Because it was a university program, the program did not go through the usual program renewal process at the college.

The *Agreement* required that there be consistency in course outlines and evaluation methods within each course.

The Thunder Bay collaborative BScN program and the community-based BScN program each underwent separate CASN accreditation processes. The Thunder Bay collaborative BScN program had received Stage 1 (candidacy) Accreditation from CASN.

PROCESS FOR DEVELOPING A COLLABORATIVE PROGRAM

Discussions regarding the development of a collaborative program began in 1994 as entry to practice issues were becoming important across the country. At the time, there was no government support to develop collaborations. The groundwork for a joint curriculum was prepared in 1997. Faculty from the college and the university discussed the philosophy and goals of the program, but a joint curriculum was not ultimately developed.

The two institutions began to set the framework for an agreement to develop and deliver a collaborative program in 1999, in anticipation of a Ministry announcement regarding funding. A committee was established with representatives from both institutions, including directors of the Schools of Nursing, faculty members, the VP Academics, other senior administrators, and student representatives. Other individuals attended the meetings as needed. The first *Agreement in Principle* was signed on June 14, 2001. It contained general principles according to which the collaboration would operate. September 2002 marked the intake of the first collaborative BScN students.

Although the program being delivered to the students was of high quality, there were relationship issues between the two institutions that came to light during the candidacy process for accreditation. The two schools went through an intensive mediation process with an external facilitator, which resulted in the creation of the more detailed *Agreement* on May 30, 2004. The agreement outlined a Type 4 delivery structure (proposed by the university faculty taking part in the mediation), which was to begin in September, 2005. Although the agreement was signed, a Type 4 delivery model was not implemented in 2005, and was again postponed for implementation for September 2006.

A third *Agreement* was signed on September 10, 2004. There was general consensus that the current agreement was not sufficiently detailed. A fourth Agreement was being drafted by the VP Academics of the two institutions when this report was prepared.

LAURENTIAN/CAMBRIAN/NORTHERN/SAULT/ST. LAWRENCE/BORÉAL

**Laurentian University
and
1- Northern College, Sault College, Cambrian College.
2- Collège Boréal
3- St. Lawrence College (Brockville, Cornwall, and Kingston
Campuses)**

INTRODUCTION

The following is a description of the collaborative baccalaureate nursing program provided by Laurentian University and Collège Boréal, Laurentian University and Northern College, Sault College, Cambrian College and Laurentian University and St. Lawrence College. The description is based on

- The *Protocole d'entente* with Collège Boréal
- The *Application for Collaborative Nursing Programs* (2000) submitted to the MTCU on behalf of all Laurentian University, Northern College, Sault College, Cambrian College and
- Interviews with faculty and staff at Laurentian University [five interviews], Northern College [five interviews], Sault College [five interviews], Cambrian College [four interviews] and Collège Boréal [five interviews].

Five interviews were conducted with St. Lawrence College, however the focus of these interviews was on their previous collaboration with Queen's University rather than their current collaboration with Laurentian University.

BACKGROUND

When this report was prepared, there were three separate collaborations with the Laurentian University (two English collaborative partnerships, and one French collaborative partnership). One was with Northern College, Sault College, and Cambrian College; the second with Collège Boréal; and the third with St. Lawrence College. Each collaboration was negotiated separately.

Northern College, Sault College, Cambrian College

Laurentian University is located in Sudbury, Cambrian College is located in Sudbury, Northern College and Sault College are located in Timmins and Sault Ste-Marie respectively or about 300 kms away from Laurentian University. Prior to this collaboration, each College offered a three-year Nursing diploma program.

Collège Boréal

Collège Boréal is located in Sudbury, within commuting distance from Laurentian University. Prior to this collaboration, Collège Boréal offered a three-year Nursing diploma program. Prior to this collaboration, the two institutions engaged in discussions for over ten years regarding a baccalaureate degree in nursing.

St. Lawrence College

No Data

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Program Model

Northern College, Sault College, Cambrian College

The university and the colleges offered a Type 4 program where most of the program was taught by one partner, with limited involvement from the other. Each college offered all four years of the BScN on campus, with the exception of the third and fourth year research courses, which were offered via videoconference from the university because of the need for faculty with adequate credentials, research programs, and publications record to teach the courses. The program model was selected in part due to the distances separating the partner sites from the university.

The collaboration integrated all caring curriculum models previously adopted by the colleges into the Laurentian curriculum structure. The goal was to achieve an integrated program across all sites, where faculty and teaching resources would be directed in an optimal fashion to ensure that quality standards were met throughout the different sites. It was anticipated that each of the partners would add key strengths to the collaborative program that other partners could benefit from. The collaborative program would be subject to accreditation with the Canadian Association of Schools of Nursing (CASN) and would share the costs equally. The university would issue the degree, bearing its name, and mention that the program was offered in partnership with Northern, Cambrian and Sault Colleges.

Collège Boréal

Laurentian University and the Collège Boréal offered a Type 3 program, where courses were taught by faculty from all partners throughout the program. The college agreed in their Memorandum of Understanding to be equal partners with university in the delivery of a four-year BScN program. Both institutions agreed that the collaborative BScN program would be subject to the periodic academic review in accordance with the requirements and policy of the Senate of Laurentian University. There were reported challenges in offering the entire program in two different Sudbury sites due to the limited number of potential students in the North, which led to the decision to offer the program through both institutions. First and third year courses were offered at the college site, while remaining courses were offered at the university site. The parties agreed to share human and physical resources equally, to accomplish the goals of the program. The university delivered 50% of the course load of this program and the college the other 50%. Courses were co-taught, that is, faculty members from both institutions facilitated a course, and together decided on a delivery model i.e., split subject matter, split class time etc.

St. Lawrence College

No Data

GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE

Northern College, Sault College, Cambrian College

The university and the colleges never drafted a formal memorandum of agreement; they used the MTCU Application for Collaborative Nursing Programs as their MOU.

A Collaborative Nursing Program Committee (CNPC) was created to deal with administrative issues related to the delivery of the program, with special responsibility for Curriculum and admission standards, program planning and development, research development, appeals policy standards, program delivery and library resources. This committee was at the upper echelons of decision making. This committee had equal membership that included one Dean/Director of Nursing from each institution, a Chair and the Registrars, who were there only on an as needed basis.

Several subcommittee s were created to deal with most matters, but they deferred aspects that would impact on policy or finances to the CNPC. The Quality Assurance and Appeals subcommittee 's membership consisted of the collaborative program coordinator and a site coordinator for each of the four partner sites. This subcommittee dealt with the day to day responsibilities of the program. Additionally, the subcommittee ensured that students followed a standard set of policies and procedures. A nursing faculty member from each centre sat on this subcommittee . The Scholarships subcommittee 's main mandate was to address scholarship. Finally, a college/university liaison committee was

set up for the first two years of the collaboration, whose mandate was to address issues specific to the relationship between each member of the partnership.

Collège Boréal

The university and the college together elaborated upon and signed the entente. The college also had a committee structure similar to that of the “northern” collaboration, having at its head a Comité de collaboration en Sciences infirmières (CCSI), and having the mandate to create sub committees on an as needed basis to deal with more specific matters. These subcommittees were never created. The CCSI met infrequently. There were few administrative meetings. There were monthly professorial meetings to discuss matters relating to program delivery.

St. Lawrence College

No Data

COMMUNICATIONS BETWEEN INSTITUTIONS

Northern College, Sault College, Cambrian College

Depending on the nature of the information exchange, communications were either handled at the committee level or by the individuals working in site specific departments. Everyday logistical matters were generally handled by individuals working in the departments themselves. So for example, people in admissions generally dealt directly with one another, while people in finance generally did the same. When logistical matters became too complex, the matter was delegated to the appropriate. All committees in the collaboration met face to face at least once or twice a year to deal with ongoing issues. For example, if admissions were not receiving student enrolment figures in a timely manner, and the issue could not be resolved by the individuals within the respective departments, then the appropriate committee(s) would address the issue at their regular meetings and find solutions.

Collège Boréal

The CCSI met infrequently. There were few administrative meetings. There were monthly faculty meetings to discuss matters relating to program delivery. Everyday logistical matters were generally handled by individuals working in the departments themselves. So for example, people in admissions generally dealt directly with one another, while people in finance generally did the same. When logistical matters were raised or became too complex, the matter was delegated to the faculty and/or administrators. Faculty met on a regular basis in the start up phase of the collaboration (years one and two) to deal with ongoing issues.

St. Lawrence College

Communications between the university and the three St. Lawrence campuses occurred at different levels, meeting face to face annually, and more frequently by phone or email. With the collaboration in its second year, communications occurred quite frequently. A coordinator from the university, dedicated to this collaborative process, regularly communicated with the Coordinator's Committee as well as individually with the three coordinators at Cornwall, Kingston and Brockville campuses.

ACADEMIC ISSUES

Northern College, Sault College, Cambrian College

Laurentian provided the academic policies and procedures under which the colleges adapted and implemented their own policies. For example, the colleges applied their own policies in cases of appeals, and if the students felt the results were not satisfactory, defaulted to the university policies. Depending on the college, they used the university policies 'as is' or used a different set of policies drafted for the BScN students attending the colleges, such as some specific notation, created for administrators, to apply to BScN students.

Collège Boréal

The college adopted the university policies and implemented them at their institution with no modifications.

St. Lawrence College

No Data

Joint Curriculum

Northern College, Sault College, Cambrian College

The partners set up a joint program planning and design process with a joint Collaborative Nursing Program Committee. The partners agreed to adopt a four-year curriculum. A quality assurance committee was set up to ensure standards were met throughout all sites. In adopting a curriculum, the partners recognized that Laurentian's strengths lay in a history of having baccalaureate-level teaching supported by a strong research and publication track record. The college's strengths lay in their strong history of pedagogical delivery of diploma nursing programs in North-eastern Ontario and in their expertise in clinical education. This integration was characterised as being grounded in shared teaching and other resources, augmented with co-teaching and mentorship where appropriate. The role of mentorship was part of a quality assurance program across

all sites. The process of curriculum development began with the Laurentian curriculum where through a process of collaboration and discussion, a unique curriculum was established to address the unique needs of Nursing in North-eastern Ontario.

Collège Boréal

As early as 1993, the college and the university worked on elaborating a common philosophy and curriculum. From the common curriculum, Collège Boréal delivered the first three years of their own nursing diploma program from 1997 to December 2003 in the hope that students would be able to enter directly into the fourth year of the BScInf. When the collaboration was initiated between the two institutions, the program was based on what had been developed together over the years. The faculty at the college were familiar with the caring curriculum and the course contents.

St. Lawrence College

No Data

Admission Requirements

Northern College, Sault College, Cambrian College

The minimum admission requirements were defined by Laurentian. The entrance requirements to the BScN Collaborative program were three U courses: one biology, one chemistry, one English at U-level and three U/C courses with a minimum overall average of 60% or equivalents. It was the same at all sites.

Collège Boréal

The minimum admission requirements were defined by Laurentian. The entrance requirements to the BScN Collaborative program were three U courses: one biology, one chemistry, one English at U-level and three U/C courses with a minimum overall average of 60% or equivalents.

St. Lawrence College

The minimum admission requirements were defined by Laurentian. The entrance requirements to the BScN Collaborative program were three U courses: one biology, one chemistry, one English at U-level and three U/C courses with a minimum overall average of 60% or equivalents.

Research

Northern College, Sault College, Cambrian College

There was an expectation that faculty at Laurentian University demonstrate scholarship. Research expectations were not specified in the agreement between the colleges and the university. The Boyer model of scholarship had been adopted by the colleges, and all facets of scholarship were being delivered at all sites. This was an ongoing developmental process and fell under the mandate of the scholarship committee.

Collège Boréal

The college system was generally not set up for engaging in research. The Collaboration never got to a point where research could be undertaken at the college level. Getting through the logistics of the first four years was enough work for all parties to undertake. However, one college faculty member with a PhD in nursing had been involved in research. Faculty and administrators at the college recognized the importance of engaging in scholarly activities.

St. Lawrence College

No Data

HUMAN RESOURCES

Northern College, Sault College, Cambrian College

Each institution managed its own human resource issues through their own collective agreements. Hiring had to comply with agreed upon minimum standards (master's degree or exceptional clinical expertise, if master's candidates were not available). Some staff were pursuing master's degrees, while a number of staff were reported as already having a master's degree. The calculation of a faculty member's workload at the college level was based on a mathematical formula. This required colleges to analyse the university delivery model, and translate it into a college model, in order to respect its collective agreement. With small faculty numbers, faculty were required to teach several different kinds of courses, often not limited to those matching their areas of expertise.

It was a program goal that all faculty who taught in the program have at least a master's degree, regardless of their location. This goal had not yet been achieved at the time this report was prepared.

Collège Boréal

Each institution managed its own human resources through their own collective agreements. As of July 2002, the college was expected to hire individuals having at least a master's or doctoral-level qualification. The partners agreed that if such qualified personnel were not available, individuals with lesser qualifications would be allowed to teach clinical components of the program. It was the understanding that these individuals would obtain the required qualifications as soon as possible. The parties agreed that faculty at both institutions would be treated equally and that their qualifications and experience would carry equal rights. In terms of teaching, faculty autonomy was to be respected. The collective agreements from each institution applied to each institution's respective staff. The model meant that human resources could be shared and optimized for student learning. The college staff did not have the human resources available to allow faculty to easily engage in research, however courses that were normally taught by faculty could be substituted for research projects at the discretion of the college.

St. Lawrence College

No Data

ADMINISTRATION & STUDENT SERVICES

Northern College, Sault College, Cambrian College

Students applying to study at the university site did so through The Ontario University Application Centre (OUAC). Students wishing to study at one of the college sites applied through the Ontario College Application Service (OCAS). Once admitted, they were considered to be registered in the collaborative BScN program. Colleges adopted the university tuition. Ancillary/user fees were set at each institution based on the protocols/processes established at each institution. All admission data were shared with Laurentian University to ensure that admission requirements were met. The colleges collected tuition fees upon admission. Each institution maintained its own records. The colleges transferred paper based enrolment data of admitted students to the university. These data were reviewed for admission requirements and then manually entered into the university databases. OCAS and OUAC databases were designed for different clients and were not compatible with one another. The college processed all applications, while the university processed only those individuals who were admitted to the program. This reduced the total number of applicants that Laurentian had to deal with. Issues were dealt with among the various Registrars' offices, and the system worked very well.

Collège Boréal

College students were admitted through the university. All admissions were processed at the university. In applying, students did so through The Ontario University Application Centre (OUAC). Students had to have completed six university preparatory high school

courses to qualify. The university was responsible for the collection and maintenance of registration data and academic records for all students. Students registered online at Laurentian University.

St. Lawrence College

In the first year of the collaboration, students applied through Laurentian (OUAC), and then in the second year of the collaboration, applications were handled through the college and OCAS. Once admitted, they were considered to be registered in the collaborative BScN program. Students paid a tuition fee that was set by the university. Ancillary/user fees were set at the college. All admission data were shared with Laurentian University to ensure that admission requirements were met. The college collected tuition fees upon admission. Each institution maintained its own records. The colleges transferred paper based enrolment data of admitted students to the university. This data were reviewed for admission requirements and then manually entered into the university databases. OCAS and OUAC databases were designed for different clients and were not compatible with one another. The college processed all applications, while the university processed only those individuals who were admitted to the program. This reduced the total number of applicants that Laurentian had to deal with.

FINANCES

Northern College, Sault College, Cambrian College

Each institution was financially responsible and accountable for the collaborative program. Cambrian College received government grant funding on behalf of the collaboration. Its distribution was based on the government audited enrolment figures. The university collected and provided these figures to the government. Each institution collected tuition, administrative and ancillary fees. The partners negotiated the distribution of both the start-up funding and the incremental operating funding generated by the program. The guiding principle in revenue sharing was that revenue be allocated to the partner institutions in proportion to the costs incurred and level of contribution by each institution supporting the agreement. The partners agreed to full financial disclosure of all collaborative program revenue and expenditure data. The College/University Liaison Committee had the responsibility for setting policy and made recommendations with regard to the allocation of common funding. The parties agreed to cover the cost of a Collaborative Program Coordinator and funded the cost from the common revenue pool. Laurentian participated in this collaboration on the premise that it not be out of pocket. This resulted in recovering such costs from the colleges, that it had incurred as a result of the collaboration, for such items as mentoring, attending meetings, teleconferencing,, technology, etc.

Collège Boréal

Each institution was financially responsible and accountable for the collaborative program. The college received government grant funding on behalf of the collaboration. Revenue sharing was mutually agreed upon by both institutions. The finance directors in both institutions worked out the details and had a good working relationship. Sharing of costs was set at 50% per institution. Monies were disbursed at the end of the fiscal year. Tuition fees were collected at the university, and university rates were charged.

St. Lawrence College

St. Lawrence College collected all of the government grants and retained these, since all students attended at the college, and the college was responsible for all costs to deliver the program. Laurentian participated in this collaboration on the premise that it not be out of pocket. This resulted in recovering such costs that it had incurred as a result of the collaboration for such items as mentoring, attending meetings, teleconferencing, technology, etc.

QUALITY CONTROL

Northern College, Sault College, Cambrian College

The goal of the collaboration was to ensure that the nursing program experience was equitable for students at all sites. The accreditation was approached collaboratively with each institution involved. Quality assurance was achieved through the adoption of common admission standards at all sites, common coursework and the use of a common template for assignments and examinations for each of the courses. Quality assurance was part of the responsibility of the Collaborative Program Coordinator. The Quality Assurance Committee, a subcommittee of the Collaborative Nursing Program Committee, was responsible for the monitoring of quality. This committee had representation from each of the collaborative partners. Consistency in appeals was handled by the Appeals subcommittee of the Collaborative Nursing Program Committee, which developed a standard set of policies and procedures. Appeals began at the colleges and ended up at Laurentian if satisfaction was not obtained locally. Colleges implemented their own policies and procedures and adapted Laurentian's to their own where appropriate. Any revisions to the policies made by the Senate were communicated to the colleges.

Collège Boréal

As this program was implemented, the college adopted the Laurentian policies. The college included the BScN program (years one and three) in their KPI survey and administered course evaluations for those courses taught by a college faculty. Collège Boréal continuously invested in the professional development of nursing faculty by seconding faculty on a rotational basis. Within this period, two faculty members

successfully completed master's programs. The college also invested in upgrading equipment in its Biology labs to ensure nursing students had the necessary equipment.

St. Lawrence College

No Data

PROCESS FOR DEVELOPING A COLLABORATIVE PROGRAM

Northern College, Sault College, Cambrian College

Discussions over collaboration began in the mid 1980s. Cambrian worked closely with Laurentian to elaborate an articulation agreement, which was the foundation for the collaboration.

Collège Boréal

The idea of facilitating transition from diploma to baccalaureate nursing programs began over twenty years ago. Laurentian engaged in more formal discussions with Collège Boréal in the mid 1990s, with the understanding that collaboration would be imminent in the future. Over the past ten years, meetings were held between faculty members of both institutions. The process focused on how to implement the existing common philosophy and curriculum. The individuals involved in these discussions were faculty, registrars, deans, academic VPs and VPs of finance.

St. Lawrence College

No Data

McMaster Mohawk Conestoga Nursing Education Consortium COLLABORATION SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

The following is a description of the collaborative baccalaureate nursing program provided by McMaster University, Mohawk College and Conestoga College. The description is based on

- Documents provided by the collaboration
 - The Articles of Agreement (2006)
 - The Policies and Procedures Manual (2004)
 - Minutes from the Collaborative Steering Committee
 - Minutes from the Collaborative Operations Group
- Interviews with faculty and staff at the three institutions:
 - Six interviewees at McMaster
 - Six interviewees at Mohawk
 - Five interviewees at Conestoga

BACKGROUND

The BScN Program at McMaster University and Mohawk College is located on the McMaster campus in Hamilton; Conestoga College is located in Kitchener, about a one hour drive from Hamilton. Prior to the collaborative nursing program, McMaster offered a baccalaureate nursing program; Mohawk and Conestoga offered a nursing diploma program. The colleges' curriculum was lecture/discussion and clinical based. The university program utilized a problem-based, self-directed, small group process for nursing theory classes.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

PROGRAM MODEL

When this report was prepared, the Consortium operated a Type 3 model where all institutions provided courses to students throughout the four-year program. Faculty from

McMaster taught courses at Mohawk and Conestoga. Conestoga students attended all classes over the four years at Conestoga. Reasons for adopting a Type 3 model included:

- Students would not have to travel or move between locations;
- McMaster and Mohawk could enrol a larger number of students in Hamilton if both institutions were involved in the delivery of all four years;
- The philosophy of problem-based learning would be better integrated in the program if presented to students in their first year by faculty that had previous experience using that approach;
- To achieve a fully integrated program, which was the mandate given by the ministry;
- A Type 1 model (two years at the college, followed by two years at the university) would devalue the contribution that the college faculty could have for the program; and,
- A literature review was conducted and suggested this model to be most successful.

GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE

The original Articles of Agreement outlining the structure for the collaboration was approved in 2001. The Agreement was revised and approved in 2006. One of the components of the Articles of Agreement was a chart that outlined all core support functions and administrative tasks for the delivery of the program, identifying each responsibility to be either site-specific or common.

The Consortium's Steering Committee developed a Policies and Procedures Manual that was approved in 2004 and was to be subject to revision starting in the fall of 2006. The Policy and Procedures Manual covers the following areas in detail: Governance/Administration, Financial Management, Admission/Registration, Academic Policies/Regulations, Non-Academic Policies/Regulations, BScN Program, Faculty, Candidacy/Accreditation and Associations. The manual was developed to communicate the operational structure of the collaboration to all involved and promote consistency and predictability in policies and procedures.

Non-academic matters were governed by site specific policies and procedures of the respective sites. Students registered at the colleges and attending a function on the McMaster site were governed by the non-academic policies of both parent institutions.

The Steering Committee

The Steering Committee oversaw the administration of the program. Its purpose was to direct the administration needs of the Consortium, including approval of policies, enrolment management, financial decisions regarding the Consortium Office and sharing of revenue, human resource planning and strategic planning for the Consortium. The committee also discussed and assessed the implications of policy decisions from a

resource perspective. Decisions made by the committee were then approved by the individual institutions according to their internal processes. This refers to the Undergraduate Nursing Education Committee (UNEC) at McMaster (see below); the Academic Coordinating Committee at Conestoga; and, the Senior Leadership Team at Mohawk, accountable to the President or to the college's Board of Governors respectively. Advocacy was also a function of the Steering Committee (e.g., writing letters to various Ministries).

Recommendations concerning academic matters were made by the Steering Committee through UNEC, and if approved by UNEC, those recommendations were forwarded to the Senate at McMaster.

The Steering Committee consisted of two voting members of senior management at each institution (including the Committee Chair – the Associate Dean, Health Sciences (Nursing) at McMaster), four resource members from McMaster and support personnel. Decisions were reached by consensus unless voting was required to finalize a decision (rendered with 51% voting agreement by members). The Associate Dean, Health Sciences (Nursing) at McMaster holds the position of Director of the Consortium and Chair of the Steering Committee.

Subcommittees were struck on an ad-hoc basis. For example, representatives from the Registrar's and Finance offices met once or twice a year.

The Undergraduate Nursing Education Committee (UNEC)

UNEC implemented policies approved by McMaster's Faculty Council and Undergraduate Council as well as provided recommendations to these bodies (through the Health Sciences Education Committee) with respect to undergraduate nursing education (curriculum, evaluation of students, faculty and program, and admissions). The committee also ensured that applicable policies, procedures and standards for the nursing program were followed.²⁰ Final decisions regarding changes to undergraduate nursing education was the responsibility of the Senate at McMaster.

UNEC was governed by the McMaster Faculty of Health Sciences By-laws and had four standing committees:

- Undergraduate Nursing Education Reviewing Committee
- BScN Executive Committee
- BScN Undergraduate Nursing Admissions Committee
- Curriculum Innovation Committee

UNEC membership included representatives from each of the partner sites, including the Chair/Assistant Dean of the BScN Program at each site. UNEC reported to the Health Sciences Education Committee and McMaster Undergraduate Council and thus was chaired by the Assistant Dean, Undergraduate Nursing Programs at McMaster.

²⁰ UNEC also had other responsibilities that are not presented here.

The Consortium Office

The Consortium Office was responsible for the administrative functions of the Consortium and was financed jointly by the partnering institutions. The office currently employs one staff member.

COMMUNICATIONS BETWEEN INSTITUTIONS

There was a high level of communication among the different sites, on all levels, due in large part to the fact that the delivery model was highly integrated (e.g., faculty, Level Coordinators/Planners, intra-Level Planner/Coordinators, Finance offices, Registrar's, Senior Management, administration etc.).

The main ways of formal communication between institutions are outlined in the table below:

Individuals from	Type of gathering	Location	Function	Frequency of communication
Senior Management	Steering Committee	University – in person	Implementation and coordination of policy decisions Resource discussions/decisions Advocacy	Every 3 months (or when deemed necessary by the Chair)
Senior Management – Nursing Chairs	Conferences	All sites – teleconferences	All areas that need to be discussed.	Monthly and more frequently if needed
Senior Management	UNEC	University – in person	Decisions and forward those in terms of recommendations on curriculum, evaluation of students, faculty and program, and admissions	1/month
HR	Contact around hiring of part time faculty hired by more than one site	As needed	Hiring	Very rarely
Faculty	4 day retreat before academic year commences	One of the sites (varies)	Update on curriculum changes, vision planning, ensure consistency between sites	1/year
Faculty	1 day discussion at the completion of the academic	One of the sites (varies)	Get feedback from the Level Coordinators/Planners from all levels.	1/year

Individuals from	Type of gathering	Location	Function	Frequency of communication
	year		Changes are discussed based on input from faculty and students.	
Faculty	Course meetings	One of the sites (varies)	Discuss the courses	As needed
Faculty	Tool for communication – LearnLink	Online	(Toolkits for each course and conference information is available as well as forms and references.)	Ongoing
Registrar	Subcommittee of Steering Committee	University – in person	Communication around admissions and student records	1-2/year
Finance	Subcommittee Steering Committee	University – in person	Communication around resource implications, funding etc.	1-2/year
Students	MUNSS – McMaster Undergraduate Nursing Science Society	Teleconferences	Discuss and advocate for student issues in the program.	1/month

ACADEMIC ISSUES

The collaborative nursing program complied with the academic policy statements and academic regulations of McMaster University. McMaster was responsible and accountable for the academic integrity of the program.

Joint Curriculum

The decision to adopt McMaster’s curriculum was made by the Steering Committee following the recommendation of the Core Working Group. The educational outcomes were updated, with the intention of having the Curriculum Innovation Committee look at revising the curriculum the following year, as there was inadequate time prior to the start of the collaborative program.

The curriculum was updated every year based on the course feedback from each site. The Coordinators/Planners received feedback from their respective years; changes to the curriculum were discussed during the yearly faculty meetings and brought to the Steering Committee for consideration. Final decisions on significant changes were the responsibility of the Senate at McMaster after being approved by UNEC.

Approximately 50% of the courses were taught by McMaster faculty and 50% by the colleges. In terms of teaching contact hours (TCH), approximately 40% of the direct TCH's were delivered by McMaster faculty and 60% were delivered by the college faculty in the collaborative college site programs. At the McMaster site, TCH delivery was completed solely by McMaster faculty.

Admission Requirements

All sites had the same admission course requirements. The Grade Point Average (GPA) on admission differs between sites due to the number of applicants across sites. At the time collaboration commenced, the minimum admission average for McMaster University was 70%. In 2004, this minimum average was raised to 75% at McMaster University given the high application rates for all McMaster undergraduate programs.

Academic Policies

All students in the BScN program, irrespective of site, were governed by McMaster academic policies. Site specific Reviewing Committees were responsible for making decisions re student progression through the program based on university policies.

RESEARCH

The college faculty were required to engage in scholarly research and to publish, which was a requirement of Accreditation conducted by the Canadian Association of Schools of Nursing (CASN).

McMaster had a Nursing Education Research Unit (NERU) prior to collaboration. College faculty had been invited to become involved as well. The policy was that any new research applications with respect to undergraduate nursing education should include college faculty if appropriate. (Research in areas other than undergraduate nursing education was not done jointly, partly due to the different mandates of colleges and universities.)

McMaster co-hosted an annual National Nursing Research Day in October. College faculty and community agencies were encouraged to submit papers and poster presentations for this conference. Mohawk and Conestoga BScN faculty members sat on the planning committee. This research conference was normally co-hosted by a clinical partner agency.

Since the collaboration started, the colleges had put mechanisms in place to increase their research capacity. For example, Mohawk had encouraged faculty to engage in research by arranging workshops to assist faculty refresh their skills, by providing funding for faculty led research projects, and by encouraging faculty to work together in collaborative teams as they continued to build their confidence and competence in research skills.

HUMAN RESOURCES

Each institution managed its own human resources, complying with the agreed upon minimum credentials (master's degree or exceptional clinical expertise if master's candidates were not available). Human resource management at each site was based on the number of Teaching Contact Hours (see the section on finance) that each institution contributed to the program. The college faculty were unionized and had a different workload formula than the university faculty.

The Consortium had a joint professional development committee, which offered professional development activities for faculty teaching in the undergraduate nursing program. McMaster included the college faculty in a variety of its in-house professional development activities.

ADMINISTRATION & STUDENT SERVICES

Application/Admissions Process and Student Records

Students applying to the college sites of the collaborative program did so through the Ontario College Application Services (OCAS); and, students applying to McMaster did so through the Ontario Universities' Application Centre (OUAC). For students who applied through OCAS and were accepted the admission data were forwarded in electronic format from the colleges to the Registrar's Office at McMaster. Student records were inputted manually since the record structures at the colleges and the university were incompatible. A congratulatory letter was sent to all students admitted to the program regardless of site. Once the student data had been inputted, all students registered for their courses through McMaster's website (SOLAR). Both colleges had access to this system as well (via the McMaster Student Advisor on site), which enabled them to respond to their students. The official transcript was produced by McMaster.

Graduation and Alumni Affiliation

The collaboration had graduated two classes when this research was conducted. All graduates of the program received a nursing degree from McMaster. There was a single convocation ceremony for all nursing graduates followed by a site specific pinning ceremony. Although part of the McMaster convocation ceremonies, each partner site had visibility on the convocation program cover and in the academic party. The parchment did not identify any of the partner sites other than McMaster. This was a preference expressed by students on a program wide survey.

Student Services and Financial Assistance

Students at the Mohawk and Conestoga sites accessed student services and financial aid through their respective college sites. These services included counselling, access to disability services, financial assistance, entrance scholarships and bursaries. College site

BScN students accessed the online library resources at McMaster University in addition to those at their respective college sites. Students from the college sites had two student cards, one from the college and one from the university.

There were some difference between awards, scholarships and bursaries at each site. All McMaster NURSING Awards and Scholarships were accessible to all BScN students. Some college awards and scholarships had been opened to students from other sites. This decision was dependent on the donor's wishes.

All BScN students were members of the McMaster Undergraduate Nursing Science Society (MUNSS).

PROGRAM PROMOTION

The Coordinator of Studies from McMaster chaired all Reviewing Committees regardless of site. Each site was responsible for advertising the program and for developing promotional materials. A common webpage, "Choose Nursing" had been constructed for the collaborative program. The webpage was jointly funded and had links to all three sites.

FINANCES

All three institutions were financially responsible and accountable for the collaborative program. Mohawk received the funds from the Ministry and forwarded them to the other institutions.

The revenue of the program was, split between institutions, based on the number of Teaching Contact Hours (TCH) each institution contributed. Distribution of funds was calculated and adjusted on a yearly basis. Each institution was responsible for balancing their respective budgets.

Students enrolled in the program at any of the three sites paid tuition fees set by McMaster, but ancillary fees varied among sites. Students enrolled at the college sites paid the McMaster administrative, learning resource and the McMaster Undergraduate Nursing Science Society (MUNSS) fees. There was a difference between McMaster-Mohawk and McMaster-Conestoga ancillary fees based on the services McMaster was able to provide to the Conestoga students at a distance. Students attending the Mohawk site were required to pay a student services fee for access to services available on the McMaster campus. Ancillary fees were collected by the colleges and then transferred to McMaster.

The start-up funding for the program was used for the development of a Consortium Office and covered additional costs that were equally beneficial to all sites. Some of these costs were: equipment, travel, staffing, faculty development, development of a website and library material upgrades.

QUALITY CONTROL

Mandatory accreditation was approached collaboratively, with each institution being evaluated as per the Canadian Association of Schools of Nursing (CASN) requirements.

The course evaluations were consistent for each course at all sites. Upon graduation, all students were expected to complete the exit survey commenting on the quality of the program and to participate in graduate follow-up surveys.

PROCESS FOR DEVELOPING A COLLABORATIVE PROGRAM

McMaster and Mohawk had informal discussions about developing a collaborative program prior to the announcement from the Ministry. After the announcement, Conestoga contacted McMaster. All three institutions were involved in the drafting of the Articles of Agreement.

The Steering Committee and a Core Working Group consisting of faculty from all sites were active in the development of the collaborative framework. The Steering Committee decided to adopt a Type 3 model. The governance structure of the collaboration was built upon a philosophy of equal partnership and decision making. The Steering Committee met once a month for the first four years and the subcommittees (e.g., curriculum) met more frequently as deemed necessary.

A series of meetings were held for drafting and finalizing the Articles of Agreement (10-12 drafts). A policy and procedures manual was developed to clarify which policies were shared or site specific, including policies on decision making.

The decision to adopt McMaster's curriculum was made by the Steering Committee following the recommendations of the Core Working Group. The educational outcomes were updated with the intention of having the Curriculum Committee look at revising the curriculum for the following year, since there was inadequate time to revise the curriculum prior to the start of the collaborative program. The Core Working Group also articulated a philosophy for the program.

During the start up phase of the program at the college sites, university faculty mentored college faculty as they delivered the program using the self-directed, problem-based format for the nursing theory courses. Currently, TCH delivery is negotiated each year based on the 60:40 TCH ratio and the financial planning and qualifications of individual faculty members.

NEW BRUNSWICK/HUMBER

University of New Brunswick and Humber College Institute of Technology and Advanced Learning Nursing Education Consortium COLLABORATION SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

The following is a description of the collaborative baccalaureate nursing program provided by

- Documents
 - The Memorandum of Agreement (2006)
 - PEQAB Executive Summary
- Interviews with faculty and staff at the three institutions
 - Six interviewees at Humber
 - Four interviewees at UNB

BACKGROUND

The collaborating institutions were located in different provinces: Humber College Institute of Technology and Advanced Learning (Humber) in Toronto, Ontario and University of New Brunswick (UNB) in Fredericton, New Brunswick. UNB offered the nursing program at four sites in New Brunswick: Fredericton, Saint John, Moncton, and Bathurst. When this research was conducted, Humber operated several degree programs in addition to nursing. Prior to the collaborative nursing program, Humber offered a diploma nursing program, while UNB offered a multi-site generic degree program as well as a degree program for Registered Nurses. The latter program was available via distance at Humber.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

PROGRAM MODEL

At the time this report was prepared, the consortium operated through a model where Humber faculty taught all courses for all four years at the Humber site (Type 4 model). The model was adopted because both sites agreed that the professional socialization of a

nursing student was a critical component of undergraduate education, beginning in year one.

GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE

The first Memorandum of Agreement, outlining the detailed structure of the collaboration, was approved in 2001. The document was revised and approved in 2006 for five additional years. The everyday operation of the program was overseen by the Associate Dean of Nursing at Humber, who had regular meetings and teleconferences with the Assistant Dean at UNB. In addition to established processes between UNB and Humber, the program met the approval of the UNB Senate and Board of Governors.

The Governance Committee oversaw the agreement and any amendments. The committee included the Dean of Nursing at UNB, the Dean of Health Science at Humber College, the Vice-Presidents Academic, (or their appointee) and the Vice Presidents Finance (or their appointee), at the two partner institutions. Each institution was to accommodate the Governance Committee within its own respective operational and administrative structures.

All faculty members were invited to participate in the UNB Faculty Council. The Faculty Council passed on recommendations (e.g., admissions, curriculum), through voting if necessary, to the Senate at UNB. There were other committees at UNB in which Humber had representation: curriculum, coordinators' and admissions committees.

COMMUNICATIONS BETWEEN INSTITUTIONS

The main ways of formal communication between institutions are described in the table below:

Primary Communication Channels in the Collaboration

Individuals from	Type of gathering	Location	Function	Frequency of communication
Senior Management – Nursing Chair/Associate Dean of Nursing	Face to face meetings and teleconferences	Both sites	Administrative matters: e.g., student issues, courses, planning for visits, professional development, research linkages	5 times/year face to face and teleconferences
Faculty	Faculty meetings	UNB/teleconference	Session of professional development (during the summer meeting) Discussions around the curriculum	4 day meeting in the summer ½ day teleconference in December

Faculty	Curriculum committee	Teleconference	Discuss changes in the curriculum	1/month
Faculty + assistant/associate deans	Faculty council	Teleconference	Recommendations to senate Policy Changes	1/month
Curriculum coordinator and new faculty at Humber	N/A	Humber	Curriculum orientation with new faculty	3/year
Registrar	Formal meeting between registrars	Face to face and teleconference	Interpretation on academic policies, discussion around academic records	1 face to face meeting/year and 1 formal teleconference per year
Faculty + assistant/associate deans	Admissions Committee	Teleconference	Policy Changes Decisions to re-admit students or accept "special case" students	2/year
Faculty + assistant/associate deans	Coordinators' Committee	Teleconference	Discuss issues; Pose curriculum changes; suggest policy changes	4/year

ACADEMIC ISSUES

UNB's framework of academic policies and procedures applied to both sites. Within the policy framework, Humber developed policies and procedures specifically relevant for its site. UNB was consulted during this process.

Joint Curriculum

The institutions had a joint curriculum, but some adjustments were made to accommodate the differences between the contexts in which the institutions operated, such as placement opportunities, number of students, size of classes and availability of elective courses.

At the initiation of the collaboration, UNB was in the process of revising the curriculum for the baccalaureate nursing program, and Humber faculty members were active in that process and took part in face to face meetings as well as teleconferences.

Curriculum issues, which had an impact on all sites, were forwarded to the Faculty of Nursing Curriculum Committee. This committee included:

- Two faculty members each from Fredericton, Humber and Saint John,
- One faculty member each from Moncton and Bathurst,
- Ad hoc members as required,

- One student member and one alternate member from each year at each site appointed by the student body from each site for a maximum two-year renewable term (Students had voting privileges. When there was a committee meeting, one student from each site was selected to attend the meeting.), and
- A Curriculum coordinator who chaired the committee.

The purpose of the curriculum committee was to maintain a “common UNB nursing curriculum” and to ensure its ongoing advancement. The Committee considered issues and made recommendations to Faculty Council about decisions that impacted on the development and implementation of the common UNB undergraduate nursing curriculum. These decisions were discussed in curriculum meetings attended by all members of the faculty of nursing, and then were voted upon at Faculty Council. Each site established a mechanism for dealing with procedural and/or operational issues pertaining to the implementation of curriculum changes recommended by the Curriculum Committee and other site-specific issues.

A systematic evaluation of the new curriculum was conducted by a UNB faculty member after the first year of the collaborative program.

Admission Requirements

The two institutions had the same minimum criteria for admission, but the cut-off grade point average varied between sites. This was to accommodate differences in the recruitment pool of students at the different sites. UNB assessed the eligibility of transfer credits for both sites.

Research

The two institutions did not have any joint research projects when this research was conducted, since the focus in the collaboration had been on planning, implementing and evaluating the new curriculum. However, the partners were looking at developing collaboration in this area. Some workshops had been held at Humber by UNB faculty on scholarly teaching. The former Dean at UNB was currently a scholar in virtual residence at Humber and was helping Humber faculty fine tune manuscripts for submission to peer review publications and also coached the development of proposals for external funding.

HUMAN RESOURCES

The institutions had separate hiring practices. Humber forwarded résumés of potential candidates to UNB for input. The minimum qualifications at each of the institutions were the same: a master’s degree in nursing.

ADMINISTRATION & STUDENT SERVICES

Application/Admissions Process and Student Records

Applications from students applying to Humber, through the Ontario College Application Services (OCAS), were assessed by Humber in accordance with UNB's admission policies. The student records were created and updated by Humber, but shared with UNB so that the university could issue transcripts to students if requested. Transcripts from the university were sometimes requested to verify a student's credentials by organizations and institutions outside Canada, since a college transcript might not be considered adequate. Once the students were admitted, the records were transferred electronically from Humber to UNB. An updated version of the student records were also provided to UNB in the middle of the semester and after the final grades had been submitted. After UNB had received the final grades, UNB calculated the GPA and updated the academic standings for students, at which time the information was forwarded to Humber.

Graduation and Alumni Affiliation

Students at Humber attended the convocation ceremony at Humber. The President or Presidential Representative and the Dean and Assistant Dean from UNB attended the convocation at Humber. The parchment students received had UNB's logo on it. Students at Humber were considered graduates from UNB at Humber.

Student Services and Financial Assistance

Student services and financial assistance offered to students varied between sites, but the students at Humber had access to the UNB online library.

FINANCES

The two institutions had a licensing agreement where Humber paid UNB for the degree granting, including supervision, curriculum and instruction. The tuition and ancillary fees were set separately by the institutions.

QUALITY CONTROL

The format of the course evaluations varied between sites, but students at all UNB sites completed a common evaluation of the program content each semester. The results from these evaluations were analyzed by UNB and focus groups were conducted at all sites on a regular basis.

The UNB Bachelor of Nursing program offered in collaboration with Humber met all of the university's academic standards, including admission requirements, curriculum, qualifications of faculty, the hours of instruction received by students, access to library resources, availability of laboratory facilities, provision of clinical experience and the

requirements for promotion and graduation. Building on UNB's experience in delivering off-campus Bachelor of Nursing programs, provisions were made and followed for systematic reviews and quality assurance processes to ensure that academic standards were effectively and consistently met.

Commitments with respect to quality assurance were outlined in the initial Academic Plan and referred to in the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) signed by both institutions. Processes that enhanced both the effectiveness and efficiency of this collaboration, including communications and data exchange systems and financial audit requirements, were developed under the direction of the joint governance process.

Both institutions had program quality assurance processes. UNB followed a program evaluation process established by the Faculty of Nursing. This process was used annually, to ensure that it offered a common curriculum, across all five delivery sites (including Humber every year since its arrival) and was used for gathering information about aspects of the program that students and faculty indicated needed revision.

As a nursing education program, the UNB program was also accredited by the Canadian Association of Schools of Nursing (CASN) which required for its candidacy a review of the UNB program at Humber, through a two-day site visit to the Humber north campus.

The UNB baccalaureate program (all five sites, including Humber) was also reviewed every five years by the provincial nursing body i.e., the Nurses Association of New Brunswick, which is responsible for standards of nursing education in New Brunswick. The latest approval process included the Humber site and UNB received the maximum five-year approval in 2003.

Not long before this report was prepared, the University of New Brunswick instituted a review process for all of its programs, and Nursing was to undergo that review process in the fall of 2006. This process involved a self-study portion, submitted in advance of the review, and site visit reviews by academic peers from other programs chosen by the approving body.

These activities included things such as access to information, opportunities for input and consultation, work relationships and methods as well as specific monitoring activities.

PROCESS FOR DEVELOPING A COLLABORATIVE PROGRAM

During the 1996/97 academic year, Humber entered into negotiations with Ryerson Polytechnic University to develop a "Collaborative Nursing Program," but in September 2000, Ryerson's executive team indicated that they could not obtain Senate approval of the proposed, jointly developed program. Since Ryerson did not approve the proposed collaborative BScN program, Humber approached UNB to expand on an existing partnership to include, subject to approval, offering the UNB Bachelor of Nursing program at Humber College under Ministerial Consent. This opportunity was directly relevant to the UNB Faculty of Nursing's mandate to deliver a Bachelor of Nursing

program at off-campus locations. The UNB Faculty of Nursing was expanding at both the undergraduate and graduate levels and the proposal for a collaborative program was aligned with UNB's strategic plan. A Letter of Understanding was signed on September 26th, 2000, which laid out the principles to be followed in the development of the academic plan and the formal Memorandum of Understanding to offer the UNB Bachelor of Nursing in Toronto.

The two institutions worked together prior to the collaborative program, to allow for students to transfer between institutions. The discussions between the institutions began around six to nine months before the program started. The collaboration presented opportunities for both institutions: UNB would reach a higher number of students with their program while allowing for students to transfer between institutions, and Humber would be able to continue providing a nursing program by complying with the new requirements from the ministry. A number of face-to-face meetings were held during the negotiations and in the beginning of the program with all players involved to help build transparent strong communications and trust.

The governance structure was established early in the discussions between the two institutions. The University of New Brunswick's Faculty of Nursing entered into this partnership, with several other collaborative programs already in place, including a nursing degree completion program with Humber. However, clarity with respect to the partners' separate and joint responsibilities for the governance and management of the collaborative integrated program was critical. At the outset of the partnership, and included in the initial proposal to the Minister, was a set of principles and guidelines which formed the basis of the memorandum of understanding between the two institutions. These principles and guidelines became the basis for making a number of decisions pertaining both to governance and as a way to address academic differences.

Humber assigned a program coordinator (a faculty based position) to look after the first cohort of students. This coordinator, rather than being assigned to a specific year, stayed with the assigned cohort of students as they moved through the program. In September 2004, these students started their final year. Having someone in place, monitoring the progression of the initial cohort, has yielded a rich base of knowledge regarding the curriculum and the issues commonly faced by students as they progress through the program, according to the two institutions. In addition, the students have benefited by having the same person to rely on for program advice. It is rare in any post-secondary program for faculty to have the opportunity to gain first-hand program and student information in this manner.

Nipissing University and Canadore College COLLABORATION SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

This is a summary report on the Collaborative BScN program operated by Nipissing University and Canadore College in North Bay, Ontario. Information for this report was obtained from the following sources:

- *The Collaborative Bachelor of Science in Nursing Program Agreement (Feb 2003).*
- *The Collaborative BSCN Program Candidacy Report.*
- Website information of Nipissing University and Canadore College.
- Interviews conducted on August 31, 2006 with two nursing faculty from Canadore College; three individuals from Nipissing University, the Dean, Arts & Science (Interim) who was previously acting Director of the Collaborative Nursing Program, the Registrar and the Vice President, Academic and Research.
- Assistance was also provided by the Secretary, School of Nursing who shared the candidacy report, other background materials, contacts and information.
- Responses by email to specific questions about the collaboration were provided by the Nipissing University Director of Finance and the Dean, Arts and Science (Interim).
- At the time of the interviews, the Director Nursing and the Dean of Health and Human Services positions were vacant. Both positions have been filled since that time and the Director of Nursing is an interim appointment.

BACKGROUND

Nipissing University and Canadore College collaborated to offer the Bachelor of Science in Nursing Degree at the Education Centre in North Bay beginning in 2001 for several reasons:

- The high shortage of nurses in northern Ontario that was expected to worsen.
- The difficulty in recruiting and retaining nurses who are trained in other regions.

- The change in educational entrance requirements to practice as a Registered Nurse (RN) required a BScN by 2005.
- As of January 1, 2005, graduates of college diploma nursing programs would no longer be eligible to write nurse registration examinations.

Prior to the implementation of the collaborative nursing program, Canadore College offered a three-year nursing diploma program. Nipissing did not offer a nursing program. Collaboration was assisted by the fact that Nipissing and Canadore are located on the same campus in North Bay, with adjoining buildings and shared common areas.

The process began in 1999/2000 with a small group committed to collaboration, and the collaborative nursing program commenced in 2001 with 18 students. The first Director of the program was hired in 2001. The curriculum was developed by a joint committee whose members contributed volunteer time to get the program started. The nursing courses were developed specifically for the BScN program and support courses from Nipissing were developed with the nursing program in mind.

The *Collaborative Bachelor of Science in Nursing Program Agreement* (i.e., Memorandum of Understanding or MOU) outlining the structure for the collaboration was signed and approved in 2003, two years after the program started. The original document was developed by a Vice President of Nipissing and a Vice President of Canadore. This agreement was used to guide areas like staffing, hiring of new positions and distribution of resources. It gave the 'rules' and provided guidance, serving as a reminder should either party stray from the process.

According to the MOU, the two institutions agreed to jointly fund (50/50) the position of Director of Nursing (a Nipissing University faculty member), jointly administer a separate cost centre, track all revenue/expenditures related to delivery of the program, and share responsibility for recruitment.

Students were governed by the academic policies of Nipissing University and were registered as Nipissing University students. Canadore was provided with all enrolment data and reported the BScN students as part of its full-time enrolment count to the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities.

At the time this report was prepared, the program had 179 students: 53 students in the first year, 45 in the second, 37 in the third and 44 in the fourth year) in the BScN program.

The program has had two graduating classes as of 2006. Their graduates have had a 100% pass rate in the registered nurses examination.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Program Model

The Nipissing/Canadore consortium operates a Type 3 model where both institutions provide courses to students throughout the four-year program. Faculty from Nipissing teach courses at Nipissing and Canadore faculty teach courses at Canadore. This allows students to do the academic work of all four years walking to classes down corridors of interconnected buildings on the one campus.

Although recommendations for a Type 1 model were made to the Canadore president by the group designing the program, it was declined. A joint decision with the Nipissing president was taken to adopt the integrated model. The fact that both institutions shared one campus was seen as one factor favouring an integrated program.

Originally, it was expected that Canadore staff would teach nursing courses in the first three years of the program and Nipissing staff would teach the fourth year. Reports were that this had not worked well and had caused some problems for faculty and administration of both institutions. The Nipissing view was that there was insufficient rationale for the course design and there was a lack of recognition of the differences between college and baccalaureate programs.

Reporting Relationships and Teaching Assignments

Nipissing faculty assigned to the collaborative BScN program were accountable to the Dean of Arts and Science. Canadore faculty and staff were accountable to the Canadore Dean, Health and Human Sciences.

Teaching assignments for Nipissing nursing faculty were made by the Dean of Arts and Sciences after consultation with the Interim Director of the Collaborative Nursing Program.

Teaching assignments for the Canadore nursing faculty assigned to the BScN program were made by the Dean, Health and Human Services after consultation with the Interim Director of the Collaborative Nursing Program.

GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE

Informants indicated that the key element in the governance of the collaborative nursing program was the Nipissing University Senate. Proposals for new programs and modifications were received and approvals were made by the Senate. Canadore was involved in all program related issues prior to submissions to the Senate.

In design and practice, the Director (who reports to a Dean at both institutions) was expected to represent both institutions on governance committees, especially the

university side. As well, Canadore and Nipissing had a ‘shared services’ agreement, master land use agreements, shared library and shared security that ensured that they worked together in a cooperative way. Because of this, senior administration met on a regular basis with each other to govern the two institutions and the shared services.

COMMUNICATIONS BETWEEN INSTITUTIONS

Information was shared regularly between the two institutions. Co-habiting the Education Centre Campus had its advantages, but also created some difficulties, if assumptions were made about expectations and agreements. On the technology side, the college and the university operated two quite different computer systems that “didn’t talk to one another.”

Nipissing and Canadore had ongoing collaboration experience in Environmental Biology & Technology, and Criminal Justice, Police & Corrections. An earlier collaboration in Business Education proved to be too complex and was discontinued. As relatively small institutions, faculty and staff believed that close proximity had led generally to a great deal of face-to-face problem solving in the BScN Program. However, faculty and staff agreed that even with this personal touch, it took a lot of time to make it work, even if the colleague was “just down the hallway”.

ACADEMIC ISSUES

The collaborative nursing program complied with the academic policy statements and academic regulations of Nipissing University. Nipissing was responsible and accountable for the academic integrity of the program.

Admission Requirements

Published admission requirements stated that a 70% average was required to enter the BScN program.

Students wanting to enrol in the Collaborative Nursing Program applied to the University Application Centre and applicants were considered by Nipissing University.

Joint Curriculum

The curriculum was developed first at the departmental level (School of Nursing curriculum committee worked out the changes, details and resource allocation) and then the nursing faculty members approved the changes. Following the university policies and procedures, the curriculum was vetted with the Dean of Arts and Science office (against resources, policies, impact etc) and the Senate level University Curriculum Committee approved the changes, followed by final Senate approval before implementation.

Curriculum issues or changes were handled at the School of Nursing (departmental level); issues were not submitted to the Dean or university level until there was departmental support and sign-off.

The clinical practicum began in year one and continued through to graduation. It covered nursing healthy individuals, older adults, acute care settings, specialized settings, diverse settings and communities and populations.

Nipissing offered several university courses to nursing students in biology, mathematics, psychology and sociology. Informants stated that Nipissing's non-nurse academics had demonstrated real interest in the Collaborative Nursing Program and had been an important part of building the program.

Diplomas

The diploma was for a Nipissing University BScN There was a section in small print at the bottom of the parchment that stated "In collaboration with Canadore College." It was signed by the Nipissing President and Dean Faculty of Arts & Science but not by Canadore College.

FINANCES AND ADMINISTRATION

Budgets were reviewed on an annual basis, and the actuals were compared to the budget at year end. That is, at year end, Canadore and Nipissing sorted out the revenues and expenditures, reimbursing either institution based on the actual results and established a budget for the following year. Direct revenues and expenses were pooled and shared on a 50/50 basis.

Payroll was based on contracts issued to faculty/staff. Accounts payable disbursements were based on university policies and procedures including supervisor signoff and attached supporting documentation.

Human Resources

Each institution recruited its faculty independently.

Human resource management processes were significantly different between the institutions. Canadore had a collective agreement negotiated at the provincial level. Nipissing had a faculty association that was local. These different arrangements affected people's perceptions of what they should and should not do. As one respondent reported, "Faculties respond to those who pay them."

Student Services

Nipissing University set tuition fees, made available scholarships and provided residences. Financial aid was available to students from a variety of resources. All students were eligible for ongoing awards based on grades. Financial aid officers were available to provide information about scholarships, bursaries and special awards for which students might be eligible. The Ontario Student Assistance Program was available to students enrolling in at least 60% of a full course load. Nipissing also offered a Work Study program for students in need to work part-time on campus.

Health services were available on campus through college/university health nurses with referrals made to a physician if needed.

The Nipissing Library was an important resource for nursing students, as was a media lab at Canadore.

Computer labs were situated at Nipissing for word processing and internet access. Nipissing University had a “wireless” environment, but Canadore’s infrastructure was not as advanced.

QUALITY CONTROL

The nursing faculty and Dean of Arts & Science had started working on a plan for accreditation. It was expected to be completed in the autumn of 2007. As part of this process, the partners were planning to revisit the MOU between Canadore and Nipissing.

University of Ottawa – Algonquin College – La Cité Collégiale Education Consortium COLLABORATION SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

The following is a description of the collaborative baccalaureate nursing program provided by The University of Ottawa, Algonquin College and la Cité Collégiale. The description is based on

- The *Protocole d'entente* (2000) with La Cité Collégiale
- The *Memorandum of Understanding* (2003) with Algonquin College
- Interviews with faculty and staff at the three institutions, including five with Algonquin, five with Ottawa and two with la Cité.

BACKGROUND

At the time this report was prepared, there were two separate collaborations with the University of Ottawa. One was with Algonquin College, offering an Anglophone program and the other was with la Cité Collégiale, offering a Francophone program. Each collaboration was negotiated separately.

Algonquin College

The University of Ottawa is located in downtown Ottawa, whereas Algonquin College has a campus in the west end of Ottawa (ten kilometres), and a campus in Pembroke (150 kilometres). Prior to this collaboration, Algonquin College offered a three-year nursing diploma program. Since the early 1990s, Algonquin, La Cité and the university worked together to create an integrated generic program. The curriculum was developed, but could not be implemented as designed because of government resistance. Therefore, the colleges modified the curriculum to provide a three-year diploma. The university has had a post RN baccalaureate since the 30s. The policy had been to give blanket recognition of the diploma, no matter where it was. As a result of these efforts, the first three years of the Nursing diploma program were very similar to the first three years of the university BScN program just prior to the start of the collaboration.

La Cité Collégiale

La Cité Collégiale is located in the east end of Ottawa, approximately eight kilometres from the university. Prior to this collaboration, la Cité collégiale offered a three-year nursing diploma program. The nursing program at la Cité was discontinued for approximately four years due to lack of sufficient enrolment, though the RPN never ceased to be offered.. La Cité was an active participant in the creation of the joint generic curriculum that was instituted in 1996 at the university. They used a similar curriculum to the one adopted by Algonquin when they re-opened their RN diploma program. The Ottawa area could not sustain two Francophone nursing programs due to the limited number of Francophones living in the area.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

PROGRAM MODEL

Algonquin College

The university and Algonquin College offered a Type 3 program, where most of the program was taught by one partner with limited involvement from the other. At its Woodroffe campus, the college delivered the core nursing courses to a selected number of students, while elective and support courses were delivered at the university site. The Pembroke campus of the college delivered all courses to a selected number of students located on its site, with the exception of three elective courses and four core nursing courses (NSG3103, NSG3302, NSG4132, NSG4134) which were delivered at a distance by the university.

Cité Collégiale

The university and the Cité Collégiale offered a Type 3 program, where most of the program was taught by the university, with limited involvement from the college. The college originally agreed to offer the equivalent of two years' worth of credits in the collaborative program on the basis of being equal partners with the university. However, human resource constraints made it difficult for the college to provide faculty for the program. At the time this report was prepared, the college provided a single professor to the university and office space for this individual. She was housed at the university. All courses were delivered on the university campus, with the exception of a laboratory course, which was delivered at the college campus.

GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE

Algonquin College

The university and Algonquin College initially drafted a memorandum of agreement and amended it in June of 2003. Separate agreements were drafted for the Woodroffe campus and the Pembroke campus. A Collaborative Executive Committee was created to deal with administrative issues related to the delivery of the program and the development of policies and procedures for the management of the collaborative nursing program. It was represented by individuals from the university and both the Pembroke and Woodroffe campuses. It also dealt with student appeals from the university and Algonquin sites. An Undergraduate Program Committee focusing on curriculum issues and an Admissions Committee focusing on admissions issues were also struck. Finally, a Collaborative Nursing Program Coordinator was hired as a means of facilitating the collaborative process. This person oversaw the program offerings at the partner institutions, and became a member of the latter two committees. The cost of this individual was shared equally by both institutions. At the time this report was prepared, this person had fulfilled the mandate of providing a smooth transition, and was no longer filling the Coordinator role.

Cité Collégiale

The college also participated in a committee structure similar to that of the Algonquin Collaboration, with the exception of the Admissions Committee, since all students were admitted at the university and received almost 90% of their instruction at the university campus. It was agreed that the degree was sanctioned by the university's Senate, and that any approval processes required by the Senate from the college would be handled by the Board of Directors at the college. The college and the university had representation on both the Collaborative Executive Committee and the Undergraduate Program Committee.

COMMUNICATIONS BETWEEN INSTITUTIONS

Algonquin College

Depending on the nature of the information exchange, communications were either handled at the committee level or by the individuals working in various departments. Everyday logistical matters were generally handled by individuals working in the departments themselves. So, for example, people in admissions generally dealt directly with one another, while people in finance generally did the same. When logistical matters became too complex, the matter was delegated to the committee level. Committees met on an ongoing basis to deal with ongoing issues. For example, if admissions was not receiving student enrolment figures in a timely manner, and the issue could not be resolved by the individuals within the respective departments, then the committees addressed the issue at their regular meetings and found solutions. In short, whichever

committee was responsible for a particular area of the collaboration assumed the responsibility of resolving any arising issues.

Cité Collégiale

The college and the university's Collaborative Executive Committee met about three to four times per year to deal with various issues under its mandate. The professor teaching at the university sat on the Undergraduate Programs Committee. By virtue of being located on the university campus, the professor from the college was integrated into virtually all pertinent communication channels.

ACADEMIC ISSUES

Algonquin College

The collaborative nursing program complied with the academic policy statements and academic regulations of the University of Ottawa. The university was responsible and accountable for the academic integrity of the program. In most cases, many of the academic rules were the same for both institutions, however where differences lay, the university's academic policies were applied.

The university issued the degree, bearing its name and mentioning that the program was offered in collaboration with Algonquin College.

Cité Collégiale

Since the students in the Francophone program were so interwoven into the university program from the moment they were admitted, to the moment they graduated, all university policies and procedures applied to these students as well.

Joint Curriculum

Algonquin College

The Undergraduate Program Committee was set up to review the curriculum. The collaboration had a joint curriculum that was developed collaboratively by the two institutions. Courses taught at Algonquin were the same as those taught at the university. The work done in previous years to integrate college and university courses greatly accelerated the process of curriculum development. The main focus was to agree on learning outcomes and when it came to delivery, each institution had the autonomy to infuse its own content to achieve those outcomes.

Cité Collégiale

The curriculum at the college was developed jointly with the university. Consultations were conducted from parties on both sides, and even went so far as to invite potential employers, to ensure relevance.

N.B. The development of the curriculum was elaborated jointly by the university, Algonquin and la Cité Collégiale. All had representation on the Undergraduate Programs Committee.

Admission Requirements

Algonquin College

The minimum admission requirements were defined by the university. All admissions were processed at the university. In applying, students did so through The Ontario University Application Centre (OUAC). When applying, students had to indicate whether they wished to attend the university or the college (Woodroffe or Pembroke campuses). The university was responsible for the collection and maintenance of registration data and academic records for all students. Students had to have completed six university preparatory high school courses to qualify.

Cité Collégiale

All admissions were processed at the university. In applying, students did so through the Ontario University Application Centre (OUAC). The university's admissions criteria were used. Students had to have completed six university preparatory high school courses to qualify. The university was responsible for the collection and maintenance of registration data and academic records for all students. Students were all registered as University of Ottawa students.

Research

Algonquin College

Research expectations were not specified in the agreement between the college and the university. University faculty had extended invitations to the college faculty to participate in research, mostly from colleague to colleague. Some college faculty had been involved as co-researchers. The college system and the collective agreements in colleges tended not to support research. College faculty that were pursuing a master's degree were getting exposure to research, and also there were some cases of these individuals working as graduate students with university faculty.

Cité Collégiale

The college instructor's on-site location at the university provided increased opportunity to participate in research activity. There was comparatively more involvement in research than when this individual had been occupying an office at the college site in the earlier years of the collaboration.

HUMAN RESOURCES

Algonquin College

Faculty qualifications differed at both institutions in that all faculty at the University of Ottawa possessed their PhD, while none of the college faculty did. Each institution managed its own human resource issues, through their own collective agreements, which differed substantially. Hiring had to comply with agreed upon minimum standards (master's degree to teach theory courses, baccalaureate for clinical supervision or exceptional clinical expertise if appropriately prepared candidates were not available). Some staff were pursuing master's degrees, while many were reported as already having a master's degree.

The chain of command was respected between both institutions, where, for example, college faculty reported to their Chair, and to University of Ottawa Chair.

Cité Collégiale

It is the same situation for la Cité as described above. The only instructor was master's prepared.

La Cité could not oblige faculty to participate in the collaborative nursing program. Their participation was entirely voluntary. Faculty hired to teach in the collaborative program could request, at any time, to be reassigned to the RPN program. This made it challenging to offer the BScN program in the manner in which the original agreement was drafted. This therefore led to providing only one committed faculty member to the collaboration and the teaching of all courses, except for some labs at the university campus.

ADMINISTRATION & STUDENT SERVICES

Algonquin College

All new students were admitted through the university. They were offered the opportunity to enrol at either institution. A minimum of 80 full time equivalent students in level one were required at the Woodroffe site in order to sustain a financially viable site. Subsequent levels needed to maintain a minimum of 40 full time equivalent students per level. A minimum of 25 full time equivalent students in level one were required at the

Pembroke site, while subsequent levels needed to maintain a minimum of 20 full time equivalent students per level. Records were kept at the university and the data were transferred to admissions at the college. Student records were entered into the college system so as to provide them with various services and a student card.

Cité Collégiale

College students were admitted through the university. There was no transfer of data to the college; all records were kept and managed at the university.

FINANCES

Algonquin College

Each institution was financially responsible and accountable for the collaborative program. The college received government grant funding, while the university collected tuition, administrative and ancillary fees and both institutions redistributed it according to an agreed upon rate structure. Tuition fees and grants were shared in years one and two, with 45% going to the college and 55% to the university. In years three and four, the college received 85% and the university 15% in recognition of the higher program delivery costs for those years.

Cité Collégiale

Each institution was financially responsible and accountable for the collaborative program. Cost sharing of administrative expenses for the program was left up to the university and the college to agree to mutually. The college presently charged the university for use of its laboratories. Students admitted to the program paid University of Ottawa ancillary fees.

QUALITY CONTROL

Algonquin College

Both institutions agreed that the collaborative BScN program would be subject to periodic academic review in accordance with the requirements and policy of the Senate of the University of Ottawa.

The accreditation was approached collaboratively and costs of accreditation were shared proportionately. Course evaluation instruments were designed and implemented at both institutions, where university standards were applied. When graduating, all students at all sites were asked to complete the same survey, commenting on the quality of the program. Other evaluations components included annual meetings with all faculty involved in the

program to discuss more formative issues or ways in which the program could be improved

Cité Collégiale

With the total integration of the sole college professor into the university structure, quality assurance was closely monitored through the sharing of the university evaluation structures and protocols.

Both institutions agreed that the collaborative BScN program would be subject to the periodic academic review in accordance with the requirements and policy of the Senate of the University of Ottawa. The collaborative program would be subject to accreditation with the Canadian Association of Schools of Nursing (CASN) and would share the costs proportionately.

PROCESS FOR DEVELOPING A COLLABORATIVE PROGRAM

Discussions over collaboration began in the early 1990s. There was growing evidence that a baccalaureate nursing program was soon going to be a reality and that colleges would have to be involved in the process due to the shortage of nurses in Ontario.

Negotiations were held with individuals from Algonquin College, the University of Ottawa and la Cité Collégiale with individuals involved in clinical, administration, finances, admissions, marketing, etc. Issues were identified along the way and all parties mutually agreed on a proper course of action.

QUEEN'S/ST. LAWRENCE COLLEGE

Queen's University and St. Lawrence College COLLABORATION SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

The following is a description of the collaborative baccalaureate nursing program provided by Queen's University and St. Lawrence College. The description is based on:

- Interviews with faculty and staff at the two institutions.
- Draft Memorandum of Agreement

BACKGROUND

Queen's University and St. Lawrence College are located in Kingston along the banks of the St. Lawrence River, located about two hours east of Toronto. Though St. Lawrence College has three campuses, one in Brockville and one in Cornwall, it was only St. Lawrence College's Kingston campus that participated in the collaboration. Throughout the 1990s, Queen's, St. Lawrence College, and Loyalist College were negotiating an articulation agreement amongst the three institutions. The articulation agreement proposed a two plus two model, where students, upon graduating from the college nursing diploma program, would only be required to complete two years at Queen's in order to obtain their baccalaureate degree in nursing. The process reached its zenith in 1999, and the proposal was nearly accepted, however the plan was dropped because the government brought in a requirement for a baccalaureate degree as entry to practice. Shortly afterwards, Loyalist College went its separate way, when in the year 2000, negotiations for the Queen's/St. Lawrence College collaboration began.

The collaboration between Queen's University and St. Lawrence College was short-lived. When it ended, Queen's University maintained its nursing program at its original size, and St. Lawrence College partnered with Laurentian University.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

PROGRAM MODEL

The consortium adopted an integrated model of program delivery. Queen's and St. Lawrence both contributed human resources and facilities for the program. All courses were provided at the Queen's campus except for the nursing lab courses, which were

offered at the St. Lawrence College campus. The rationale for this model was to make the best use of the space and equipment that was provided by the institutions. Prior to the collaborative program, each of these two institutions recruited approximately 75 students per year. Combined enrolments were expected to be approximately 150 for the first year of the collaboration. St. Lawrence College had very large nursing laboratories and a decision was made to invest initial collaboration start up funding to modernize its nursing laboratories. St. Lawrence College was then the logical place to send students for this component of the program, while Queen's was capable of accommodating students for the remaining program delivery. Faculty from both institutions taught at both institutions.

GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE

Being truly collaborative in spirit, both institutions agreed that the final plans for the financing and delivery of the program required approval by Queen's University and St. Lawrence College.

An Executive Committee was created to address any policy or process issues arising from this collaboration that affected the function or the delivery of the program. The Committee was composed of the Vice Principal Academic of Queen's University and Vice President Corporate Services of St. Lawrence College or their designates and the administrative head of each Nursing School. The Executive Committee met at least once a year or at the request of either party.

The Curriculum Steering Committee, composed of faculty from both institutions, developed the initial curriculum for the program. The curriculum proposal was submitted to the Academic Council of the School of Nursing of Queen's, and then forwarded to the Faculty Board of the Faculty of Health Sciences and to the Senate, as required. It was also submitted to the St. Lawrence College Nursing Advisory Committee and the Board of Governors for approval.

The Curriculum Committee, composed of faculty from both institutions, was established to monitor implementation of the program curriculum on an ongoing basis. They developed recommendations for change, to be submitted to the Academic Council of the School of Nursing of Queen's.

An Academic Progress and Graduation Committee, composed of faculty from both institutions, reviewed the progress of students in the program and made recommendations to the Academic Council of the School of Nursing of Queen's, which then forwarded its decisions to the Faculty Board and Senate, as required. Where there were nursing appeals, a member of the nursing faculty from St. Lawrence College was to be a member of the Faculty of Health Sciences Discipline and Appeal Board.

The administrative heads of the nursing programs at Queen's University and St. Lawrence College engaged in joint administrative planning on an ongoing basis. Each administrative head assigned teaching for their faculty members, facilitated faculty representation on joint committees for the program and undertook joint activities that

benefited the program. The Director of the School of Nursing from Queen's and the Dean of the School of Health Sciences from St. Lawrence College then provided the overall leadership for this collaboration at the logistical level. They met on a weekly basis to discuss challenges and resolve issues. They periodically involved individuals from other committees depending on the agenda items being discussed.

Committees' terms of reference were such that decisions were made and courses of action agreed upon by the members of a given committee. Committees enjoyed complete autonomy within the confines of the Queen's decision making infrastructure. In the case of the final curriculum, for example, the Curriculum Steering Committee presented its proposed curriculum for approval to the Academic Council from the Queen's School of Nursing, who then handed it off to the Faculty of Health Sciences, followed by a senate committee and then it was ultimately presented to the Senate for final approval.

COMMUNICATIONS BETWEEN INSTITUTIONS

There was a high level of communication between the two institutions on all levels, largely due to the highly integrated delivery model. Almost all of the planning and implementation activities were carried out within the committee infrastructure of Queen's University, and members from the St. Lawrence College institution provided equal representation at this level. Communications were characterised as open and productive throughout the entire collaboration. Committees met regularly, and meetings would not be held unless there was representation from both institutions.

ACADEMIC ISSUES

The collaborative nursing program complied with the academic policy statements and academic regulations of Queen's University. Queen's University's academic regulations and associated processes governed all academic aspects of the program, including: admissions, grades, scholastic progress, promotions, academic probation, requirements to withdraw, voluntary withdrawal, conditions of readmissions, academic dishonesty, examinations, code of conduct, academic and non-academic appeals and student records. Queen's was responsible and accountable for the academic integrity of the program.

Joint Curriculum

The consortium had a joint curriculum that was developed by the Curriculum Steering Committee, which was struck in the early stages of the collaboration or in the spring of 2000. Its mandate was to develop the initial curriculum for the program. This committee was made up of four individuals, two from each institution. Both institutions brought their respective programs to the table and both institutions worked together to decide what was going to be included in the final curriculum. Several factors influenced how decisions would be made. Both institutions felt strongly about certain aspects of their own curriculum that should remain in the program, and both parties discussed and presented arguments to justify their positions. Another factor included the relevance of

their existing curriculum in the context of the evolving nature of new and emerging standards of practice in the nursing field. Outside forces demanded that certain components of the curriculum reflect these emerging standards. Finally, the timing of this review was such that it coincided with a curriculum review that Queen's had intended to undertake regardless of this collaboration occurring at the same time. The latter two factors created an ambiance where Queen's university was already predisposed to change.

The basic premise behind the design of the collaborative curriculum was for both parties to bring what was best from their own curriculum and negotiate what was to be included in the revised collaborative curriculum. Both parties recognized one another's strengths, and also the fact that this was a degree program, and that the latter placed certain constraints regarding which courses had to remain in the program, which St. Lawrence College recognized. Queen's recognized St. Lawrence College's strengths in the area of clinical nursing and incorporated much of the St. Lawrence College clinical nursing content into the new curriculum. The end result was an integrated curriculum that both parties negotiated together and agreed upon by consensus.

Admission Requirements

The minimum admission requirements were defined by Queen's. The entrance requirements to the BScN Collaborative program were four grade 12U courses in English, Biology, Chemistry and Math, and two U/C courses with a minimum overall average of 70%, or equivalents.

Research

There were no formal research projects that involved parties from both institutions at the time of the collaboration. Queen's faculty engaged in research activities as part of their conditions of employment. St. Lawrence College faculty were not required to engage in research activities as per their conditions of employment. There were opportunities to take advantage of presentations from visiting scholars, where research was presented in multidisciplinary faculty settings. In spite of the lack of formal research opportunities, Queen's encouraged St. Lawrence College faculty to participate in events, and created a welcoming environment.

HUMAN RESOURCES

Each institution agreed to manage its own human resource issues with its respective collective bargaining units and human resource departments. Faculty at each institution respected their own chain of command, and reported to their immediate supervisory personnel.

Queen's hiring requirements dictated that all tenure-track faculty must possess a degree at the PhD level and all sessional faculty must have at least a master's degree. Full time faculty at St. Lawrence College who possessed a Master of Nursing degree or a graduate

degree in a related field were eligible to teach in the program. Existing full time faculty at St. Lawrence College who did not have a graduate degree were required to complete a master's program within a 7-year period. Any new full time faculty members hired after the fall term of 2001 had to meet the academic qualifications required by Queen's University School of Nursing in order to teach in the program.

Staff at both institutions were governed by differing collective agreements. University workloads dictated that 40% of faculty time was teaching related, whereas St. Lawrence College faculty spent a greater percentage of their time teaching students. University faculty were required to pursue research activities while St. Lawrence College faculty, under their collective agreement, were not required to pursue any research activities. Though St. Lawrence College faculty spent more hours with students in classrooms, St. Lawrence College faculty accepted this situation, realizing that they did not have to deal with the demands of engaging in scholarly activities. The accreditation process, however, stipulated that there was an expectation for all faculty involved in the collaborative nursing program to be involved in some scholarly activities.

Other areas of workload were impacted by the collective agreements. According to their collective agreement, St. Lawrence College staff were on vacation for an eight week period during the summer, while Queen's faculty were not. Planning for a fall term required significant amount of time, which was invested mainly by Queen's personnel. St. Lawrence College personnel however made themselves available during this eight week period, and responded to emails and requests for information by Queen's staff, in spite of not being required to do so.

ADMINISTRATION & STUDENT SERVICES

All students applied through a single admission process to the program through the Ontario University Application Centre (OUAC). The Admissions Committee, composed of faculty from both institutions, worked with the Queen's Admissions Office to select candidates to the program, reviewed admissions policies and processes and made recommendations, as needed, to the Academic Council.

Applications were reviewed individually. When based on marks, decisions to admit students were made automatically, without further consultation. In instances when supplementary information was required, the cases were taken up by the Admissions Committee.

The university was responsible for the collection and maintenance of registration data and academic records for all students at a central processing office that served the needs of all of Queen's students. All students applying to the collaborative nursing program were considered Queen's University students. Students paid Queen's tuition fees and ancillary fees. They had open access to all services that were available to student populations at both institutions. Upon graduation, they became Queen's alumni. Students spent most of their time on the Queen's campus, since most of the programming was offered there.

FINANCES

Each institution was financially responsible and accountable for the collaborative program. The college received government grant funding while the university collected tuition, administrative and ancillary fees and both institutions redistributed it according to an agreed upon rate structure. The Draft MOU stipulated that operating overhead would be split on the basis of 78% Queen's' and 22% St. Lawrence. Each institution was responsible for its own operating losses.

The main sources of revenue to support the program on an ongoing basis were:

1. MTCU funding at \$7,700 per student [two x basic income unit (BIU)] funded from Special Purpose Operating Funds;
2. Tuition fees from students in the program.

QUALITY CONTROL

A Program Evaluation Committee, composed of faculty from both institutions, developed a plan for evaluation of the program, made recommendations on the program evaluation process and participated in preparations for internal and external reviews of the program.

There existed a variety of instruments and processes that were already in place at Queen's to evaluate the performance of their programs in general. These included, but were not limited to, course reports, year end surveys done by students, surveys of employers, teaching evaluations, and exit polls of graduating students. By virtue of the fact that faculty from both institutions taught at both institutions, and that most of the program was delivered on the Queen's campus, both institutions agreed to adopt the processes and methods that were already in place at Queen's. However, members of the Program Evaluation Committee did have the ability to make modifications to the existing processes and documents so as to adapt them to the program.

Insofar as accreditation goes, the collaboration was successful in achieving candidacy. However, the collaboration expired prior to reaching its first graduating class, which would have become the next milestone in the accreditation process. Following dissolution of the Queen's/St. Lawrence College partnership, Queen's University continued to offer the same curriculum and subsequently underwent full accreditation in the fall of 2006.

Ryerson, Centennial, George Brown Collaborative Nursing Degree Program COLLABORATION SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

The following is a brief description of the collaborative baccalaureate nursing program provided by Ryerson University, Centennial College and George Brown College. The description is based on

- The *Collaborative Nursing Program Agreement* (2001),
- Interviews eight with faculty and staff at Centennial College,
- Interviews with six faculty and staff at George Brown College, and
- Interviews with 14 faculty and staff at the Ryerson University,

BACKGROUND

Ryerson University, Centennial College, and George Brown College are all located in Toronto. Ryerson and George Brown are both in the downtown core, relatively close to one another, while Centennial College is in Toronto's east end, a considerable commute from the other two partners.

All three of the partners had nursing programs prior to the collaboration. The colleges both had three-year diploma programs and the university offered a four-year baccalaureate program.

Centennial College had a three-year diploma program with a curriculum that had undergone a major revision in 1996, incorporating a substantial community nursing component. When this report was prepared, the college had an articulation agreement with the University of Calgary that would allow diploma graduates to receive a degree from the university for 12 additional credits, which could be obtained on-line.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

PROGRAM MODEL

During the first two years of the program, students were enrolled at, and attended, one of the three campuses (their *home institution*) and were taught primarily (but not exclusively) by faculty from that institution. Students at all three institutions took the same core courses. In the final two years of the program, students were enrolled at, and attended, Ryerson University. Their clinical placements continued to be overseen by faculty from their home institution.

GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE

The collaboration was based on a comprehensive *Collaborative Nursing Program Agreement* (2001). The Agreement:

- Described the program, including the responsibilities of the participating institutions, teaching activity, enrolment targets, tuition and ancillary fee rates and collection, and the management structure of the program;
- Divided responsibility for program costs, including collaborative costs and described how revenues (both ongoing and start-up) would be allocated;
- Outlined the term of the agreement, including its length, provisions for renewal, voluntary withdrawal, or termination, and continuing obligations in the event of termination or withdrawal;
- Provided structure for dispute resolution and mediation;
- Outlined the academic policies and procedures for the program, including those relating to admission requirements and procedures, course equivalencies, the name of the program, academic appeals policies, codes of student conduct, course codes, the statement of course offerings, the degree document, translation of grades between the colleges (numeric) and university (letter), student promotion, assessment of graduation eligibility, record keeping, student transcripts, residency requirements, and course and exam schedules;
- Included a terms of reference for the Administrative Management Committee, as well as Rules of Procedures for all program-related committees; and
- Provided Human Resources Protocols.

The Director of Ryerson's School of Nursing was the Director of the Collaborative Nursing Program, and had the overall responsibility for the administration of the program. Site Directors conducted the day-to-day operations of the program at the institutions. A number of committees were involved in the ongoing operation of the program:

- An Executive Committee oversaw activities and monitored the program. It included the VP Academic and the Dean responsible for nursing in each institution. The Site Directors at all three campuses also attended the meetings, as did other administrative staff when needed. Although the meetings were held at Ryerson, the chair was rotated among the three partners, and the agenda was set collaboratively.
- An Administrative Management Committee included the Site Directors of the program. It was chaired by the Site Director of Ryerson. This committee appointed all Course Lead Teachers, and developed, implemented, and maintained procedures to facilitate the delivery of the program.
- A Collaborative Curriculum Committee maintained the quality and integrity of the courses, monitored development and implementation of the curriculum, and suggested revisions to the curriculum as appropriate. The Curriculum Committee included from each institution a Year Lead Teacher for each level of the four-year program, and an Arts or General Education Department Faculty representative.
- A Collaborative Evaluation Committee coordinated activities related to the evaluation of the implementation and achievement of the program. It included a faculty member from each institution.
- A Collaborative Finance Committee included representatives from finance at each institution as well as the Site Directors. This relatively new committee discussed and approved the budget for shared collaborative costs.
- A Collaborative Admissions Committee reviewed applications from students and made decisions about admissions.

COMMUNICATIONS BETWEEN INSTITUTIONS

In addition to the myriad of formal decision-making committees, there appeared to be substantial communication between the institutions on an informal basis (e.g., faculty communicating with other faculty, deans communicating with deans, registrars with registrars, and so on).

There also appeared to be considerable communication within institutions. Those who attended committee meetings kept others in their institution apprised of what was happening at those committees.

ACADEMIC ISSUES

Joint Curriculum

The curriculum was based on the original Ryerson curriculum, but underwent an extensive review by all three partners prior to the beginning of the collaborative program.

The curriculum was reviewed again each year in May and June, and course outlines were drafted by all of the faculty involved in teaching the course. Any major changes in curriculum needed to be approved by the Ryerson Academic Council.

Ryerson's residency policy required students to complete a minimum of 50% of their course requirements at the university. The teaching responsibilities needed to comply with this requirement. The first two years of the curriculum were taught primarily by faculty at each of the institutions, and the last two years were taught primarily at the university by Ryerson faculty. There were some exceptions to this: Ryerson faculty taught some specific courses (e.g., nutrition, biology) at the college sites during the first two years, and college faculty served as faculty advisors for students in the practicum courses in the third and fourth years.

Students at all of the sites wrote the same exams at approximately the same time.

Admission Requirements

Admission requirements were established and reviewed by the institutions annually, subject to the approval of Ryerson's Academic Council. Grade cut-offs tended to be higher at Ryerson than at the college campuses (because more students selected the Ryerson campus as their first preference), but there was an absolute minimum cut-off that was the same across all sites. Admission was subject to competition at all three sites.

Student Promotion

Nursing students were subject to Ryerson promotion policy, based on academic standings. Policy variations for the collaborative program were developed collaboratively by all partners.

Scholarly Activity

Scholarly research was being carried out at each of the sites, and a number of collaborative research projects were underway. In instances where college faculty did not have the experience to lead research studies on their own, they participated as collaborators on research that was led by Ryerson faculty, so they could develop their skills. There was a Collaborative Scholarly Research Committee, and scholarly activity days had been organized for people to share their scholarly activities.

Centennial College was building its research capacity, and had obtained funding to establish a Research Office. The college had created a Health Studies Research and Scholarship Committee to encourage interdisciplinary research by faculty in the health-related programs. The research being undertaken at Centennial was celebrated during an annual Research Day. College faculty were granted release time to carry out scholarly activities, and were encouraged to apply for external or internal money for release time.

George Brown was in the process of setting up infrastructure to support research. Scholarly research had been included as a component of the college's new academic strategy. The college had hired a VP of Research and will be hiring a Director of Research and establishing a research office. The college also had a Scholarly Activity Committee for the school of nursing, a college-wide Applied Research Committee, and was reconstituting a Research Ethics Committee. Attempts were made to arrange release time for faculty who were interested in pursuing scholarly activity.

HUMAN RESOURCES

Faculty from each institution remained employees of the institution through which they were hired and were governed by their respective policies and collective agreements.

As a general rule, hiring was carried out autonomously by each institution. Some positions (e.g., Program Coordinator, central placement office staff) were shared amongst the collaborative partners. These staff were hired by one of the institutions, but all three partners were represented in the hiring process.

A master's degree was the minimum requirement for new full time faculty, with a PhD being preferred.

Course Lead Teachers were assigned amongst the institutions. These assignments were credited towards the workload provisions of the applicable collective agreements.

ADMINISTRATION & STUDENT SERVICES

Program Promotion

The name of the program was "Ryerson, Centennial, George Brown Collaborative Nursing Degree Program."

There was a Collaborative Marketing Committee that had input into the design of the collaborative website (www.nursingdegree.ca). The committee developed a marketing plan and a basic look for program marketing materials. The committee planned activities, brochures, and so on.

Admissions Procedures

Students applied to the program through both the college and the university application systems. On their application form, students indicated which campus they preferred. Students that applied through the college system were manually entered into the Ryerson admissions database, and their applications were handled manually.

The registrars of the different sites handled applications that were straightforward and met the admissions criteria. Applicants who were mature students or who did not clearly meet the requirements were considered by the admissions committee, which included representatives from all three institutions. Some of these applicants were interviewed by the committee when necessary.

Typically, the available spaces at Ryerson filled up first. Ryerson applicants who were not accepted at the Ryerson campus were then deflected to the colleges for consideration there.

Registration, Enrolment and Record Keeping

Once a decision had been made to accept a student, Ryerson issued the offer. Students confirmed their acceptance to Ryerson, and paid a deposit of their tuition to Ryerson. Ryerson sent the colleges a report of which applicants had accepted the offers. Students paid the balance of their tuition for the first year to their home institution.

Students whose home institution was a college were registered at both Ryerson and the college throughout their program. The colleges worked with Ryerson to develop a comprehensive Ryerson record of each student's academic history. The colleges maintained a similar record.

Because the student record keeping systems at the colleges and the university were different from one another, it was necessary to enter data manually in two systems for the students whose home institution was a college.

Grading at the colleges was done on a numeric basis and translated to Ryerson letter grades when the grades were transferred to the Ryerson system. College site grades were communicated to Ryerson each semester. Students at all campuses had access to their grades through the Ryerson website.

Student Services and Resources

Students had use of the facilities and services available at the campus on which they were registered at the time, but not at the other two sites. There was a wide range of services and facilities at each site.

There was a student orientation session at each site, before school started in the first year, and another at Ryerson before the beginning of the third year.

Central Placement Office

A central placement office was created to coordinate the clinical placements for all of the students in the program. Students therefore had the opportunity to complete their placement all across Toronto, not just in facilities near their home institution.

Graduation and Alumni Affiliation

The degree was granted by Ryerson. Ryerson also carried out the assessment of graduation eligibility. The degree document was developed by all three institutions and approved by Ryerson's Academic Council. It indicated that the degree was granted by Ryerson University in collaboration with Centennial College and George Brown College.

The graduation ceremony was attended by faculty and directors from all three institutions. During the first and second graduation, there were welcoming speeches by all three Presidents.

FINANCES

Each institution was responsible for direct and indirect costs associated with the classroom or clinical courses taught by its faculty. A specific budget was maintained for shared collaborative costs (e.g., infrastructure and administrative costs of the central placement office, etc.). These costs were generally shared among the partners relatively evenly.

Grant revenue flowed through George Brown College. Allocation of grant and tuition fee revenue among the partners was based on the actual FTE enrolment data in a fiscal year. Calculations of revenue and its distribution were made by Ryerson, who notified the institutions in writing of any necessary transfers of funds.

Tuition fees were set by Ryerson in accordance with MTCU policies for universities. Ryerson consulted with the colleges prior to setting tuition fee rates. Tuition was collected by the home institution for the first two years and Ryerson for the last two years. Ancillary fees were set and collected by the home institution in the first two years and Ryerson the last two years.

QUALITY CONTROL

There was a Collaborative Evaluation Committee that reviewed the program on a regular basis.

The program had Course Leads who facilitated meetings among all faculty teaching the same course, to ensure that there was consistency in instruction across sites. Course Leads may be faculty at the university or at either of the colleges. The faculty divided the

responsibility for developing course materials, including exams and assignments. There were also Year Leads at each site, and overall Year Leads at Ryerson. Finally, there were meetings across years, to ensure the program was a coherent whole, and that content in any one course complemented or built on content in other courses.

A standardized form was used for students to give feedback about the program at all sites.

In addition, there appeared to be a review built in to every aspect of the program. For example, the curriculum for the entire program was reviewed each year in May and June, a process that involved the entire faculty from all of the sites. Likewise, the admissions process was examined by those involved before the beginning of the admissions period, to review what had occurred the year before and to determine if any changes needed to be made.

The program hired an external consultant to evaluate the implementation of the program, looking at the experience of students in transition from the college to the university, the experience of students who attended the university throughout, and the extent to which graduates felt prepared for practice.

PROCESS FOR DEVELOPING A COLLABORATIVE PROGRAM

Talks about collaboration had begun in the 1980s amongst colleges and universities in the GTA (University of Toronto, York University, Ryerson University, George Brown College, Humber College, Centennial College, Seneca College, Georgian College, and Sheridan College).

Because of this early work, much of the groundwork was in place when the government announced the collaboration requirement. Four partners were involved at the time: Ryerson University, Centennial College, George Brown College, and Humber College. Humber College later opted out of this collaboration in favour of another arrangement.

All of the people who were to ultimately be involved in running or delivering the program were given an opportunity to contribute to the development of the Agreement. Committees were struck to discuss such things as program philosophy, curriculum, admissions, tuition fees, grading structure, examinations, transcripts, student promotion, allocation of funds, program promotion, human resource policies, and union agreements. People volunteered in the areas that were of interest to them. There were a lot of meetings, both within and between institutions.

A draft agreement was written, reviewed by everyone involved, reviewed by lawyers, and expanded upon. It was ultimately finalized by the VP Academics and Presidents of the three institutions.

Trent/Fleming School of Nursing COLLABORATION SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

The following is a description of the Trent/Fleming School of Nursing. The description is based on:

- the *Articles of Agreement* (2005)
- interviews with five faculty and staff at Trent and five faculty and staff at Fleming.

BACKGROUND

Trent University and Sir Sandford Fleming College had been operating a collaborative BScN program since September 2001. In 2004, the MOU Task Force was created to address issues that affected the collaboration within the Trent/Fleming School of Nursing (e.g., differences in terms of employment, differing approaches to curriculum and differing student processes between the two institutions). The new academic unit was to be financially managed between the two institutions. Faculty from Fleming College were to be appointed to teach in the Collaborative BScN Program. Learning laboratory space was to be shared by BScN students and those programs at Fleming College. Trent University was to provide office space, furniture, technology and IT support, library facilities, email, office supplies and secretarial support. The degree was to be awarded by Trent. With the new single site university based model, the faculty and Trent staff could see themselves as members of the same academic unit. It was thought that proximity would lead to an improvement in cooperation and morale for faculty and staff.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

PROGRAM MODEL

When this report was prepared, the program model was a four-year Type 3 model based in a School of Nursing, which was a new academic unit managed jointly by the college and the university. Most faculty taught across all years of the program depending on their expertise and/or willingness to be mentored.

Prior to the development of the School of Nursing, college faculty taught the clinical and theory in the first and second year of the program while university faculty taught the third and fourth years. Trent faculty taught clinical and theory courses at all levels. In some cases, college faculty taught in year three if the need arose.

GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE

The Director of the School of Nursing was a faculty member of Trent University. The Director reported to the Vice-President Academic at Trent on matters relating to the partnership with Fleming College (as one example). The Vice-President Academic at Trent had in turn liaised with the Vice-President Academic at Fleming around matters pertaining to the Collaborative BScN Program. The Director reported to the Dean of Arts and Science for academic program delivery, academic staffing and curriculum development. The Director collaborated with the Academic Team Leader, Institute School of Health Aging/Nursing and Wellness at Fleming College regarding hiring of Fleming College faculty, shared Fleming College faculty evaluation, workload, space issues and other matters as were considered appropriate. The Director liaised with the Associate Dean of Science at Trent around science components and space for the nursing program. The Director was a member of the Committee of Science Chairs, Faculty Board, Faculty Council and other committees at Trent and sat on the External Advisory Committee for Health Sciences at Fleming College. In the prolonged absence of the Director, the Associate Dean of Science served as Acting Director of the School of Nursing. All courses offered in the School of Nursing must be approved through the normal channels at Trent University.

Academic policies and procedures that govern baccalaureate programs at Trent were applied to the School of Nursing. Additional policies and procedures were reviewed by the Senate and were stated in the Trent Academic Calendar

The Collaborative BScN Program Coordinator was hired from Fleming College, with primary responsibilities of, student advising around nursing, student clinical, appeals, continuing education for clinical faculty, assessing and discussing hiring with Fleming faculty, the Director and ATL, working with the Director on all academic issues collaboratively, program administration and program development, and quality assurance. The Program Coordinator hired by Fleming worked with the Director on all day to day operations within the school. The Program Coordinator worked with the Academic Team Leader or anyone else as appropriate on matters that required coordination between the two institutions (e.g., data for budget submission). The Collaborative BScN Program Coordinator workload was 0.5 FTE administration, and 0.5FTE teaching and scholarship. This position was posted for a four-year term.

The college Academic Team Leader (ATL) retained responsibility for Fleming faculty members, appointed to or teaching at the School, regarding the terms and conditions of their employment at the college and was involved in evaluation. There was consultation between the Director and the Academic Team Leader on such matters.

As of December 2005, Fleming faculty members worked with the Director on all academic issues.

School of Nursing Committee Structure

The MOU outlined the committees to be implemented in the School of Nursing. It was stated that, with the development of the School of Nursing, the committee structure would be reviewed after one full year of operation. Committees had been organized into three streams:

- **Administrative** (requires high level members of both institutions): Enrolment Management, Finance, Hiring of tenure Track Faculty
- **Academic Scholarship and Research:** Scholarships and Awards; Ethics and REB review Panel; Faculty Scholarship
- **Academic Programming and Policy:** Curriculum, Policy, Library

ACADEMIC ISSUES

All university academic standards, rules and criteria were followed for the administration and delivery of the Trent/Fleming School of Nursing.

Admission Requirements

There was a single-shared admission policy at the School of Nursing, which was administered by Trent. Admission requirements were set forth by the university. The Registrar's Offices at each institution shared student data. This process was being worked on to make it more efficient.

HUMAN RESOURCES

As stated in the MOU, it was projected that 12 full-time faculty appointments were required as projected for the School of Nursing which, at that time, enrolled approximately 200 collaborative students. Six full-time faculty appointments from each institution would service the Collaborative BScN Program. The Collaborative BScN Program Coordinator (Fleming) and the Director (Trent) were included, but one teaching FTE was added between them, leaving 11 functional teaching FTEs. When this report was prepared, they had 380 FTEs in the collaborative program and 129 compressed students.

Full-time positions were posted at Fleming College and were open to nursing faculty with a minimum of a master's degree (preferably with a nursing master's degree) and a baccalaureate in nursing. The hiring committee was comprised of representatives from both institutions. It was stated in the MOU that each faculty member appointed to the School of Nursing was responsible for scholarly activities and was to work with the

Director for development and accountability for this activity. The Trent workload model was to be applied for all faculty teaching in the BScN program. An equivalence template had been developed to translate Fleming work units into Trent work units. Fleming faculty were to follow the guidelines for vacation in their collective agreements but could request special holiday arrangements if it benefited the program. The program ran three semesters each year and Fleming faculty were asked to reconsider taking all six weeks in July and August to support summer courses and sustain curricular development and upgrades. According to the MOU, consultation with Fleming's Academic Union (OPSEU) needed to occur prior to implementing any new workload model for Fleming faculty, although it was not clear who would take on this role from either institution.

Trent faculty were hired through three mechanisms. Clinical Faculty were hired through CUPE contracts by course and term. Course based faculty were hired through CUPE stipends. Program Faculty were hired either as TUFA limited term appointments or tenure track. TUFA faculty were expected to produce scholarly and research materials during their position at Trent. Trent Faculty teaching in the Collaborative Program were subject to the policies and regulations for their category. Conflict resolution followed the process above, except that all players were Trent funded.

ADMINISTRATION & STUDENT SERVICES

The MOU did not address administration or students services, but staff and faculty interviews revealed that students had full access to resources at both institutions. Both Tuition allotments and services were being reviewed by the Trent student association and the Registrar's and Finance Offices at both institutions (inclusive of the Director and Program Administrative Assistant).

FINANCES

Prior to 2005, the two institutions used different methods to calculate instructional and overhead costs, and this impacted the financing for both institutions. These procedures were examined, common definitions were accepted for budget modelling purposes, and new models for costing were proposed. There was disclosure of cost at the college and the university and decisions were made within the Finance Committee. It was stated in the MOU that this model was to be reviewed after one year of operation. It had been modified in 2005/6 to allow more clinical faculty hires through Trent, although all clinical faculty could choose their point of entry to employment. This was done after full exploration with the Human Resource departments at both sites and full disclosure to the clinical faculty previously hired by both institutions. Trent hires of clinical faculty allowed the program to exceed the limit of 12 hours clinical supervision per week stipulated by Fleming union, and provided continuity of supervision for students requiring 12-36 hours per week of clinical instruction. Students in the program then met academic, CASN and registration standards for clinical practice hours.

QUALITY CONTROL

In terms of quality control, the main mechanism was the accreditation process completed in October 2005. Additional measures included the graduate survey, annual curriculum review process, the faculty review process, and the program review process.

A formal dispute resolution process did not exist; issues that could not be resolved were taken to the VP level.

The roles and responsibilities of the Director and ATL had been examined vis-à-vis conflict resolution. All individual issues, whether they be student to faculty, faculty to faculty or faculty to Director or to Collaborative BScN Program Coordinator, were to be handled directly, in a face to face meeting. Where resolution was not possible, the next level was brought in, either CBPC or the Director as appropriate. Any Trent/Fleming faculty/workload or other issues that could not be addressed within the School required the addition of the Fleming ATL and might have required Human Resource support as well. All students had the right of appeal (internal or senate) according to university regulations but students must have first met the criteria outlined above to resolve the issue. Upon agreement, faculty and students could include a support person at any stage.

A formal faculty dispute resolution process needed to be defined between the college and university for issues crossing both boundaries of both institutions.

PROCESS FOR DEVELOPING A COLLABORATIVE PROGRAM

Since the mid 1990's, there was a special relationship between the two institutions, whereby students did a three-year nursing diploma program at Fleming College and then completed a special concentration general degree in nursing consisting of nine university general course credits at the first and third year university level. Students were granted six university level credits from the nursing diploma by Trent. Trent did not have a nursing program before the collaboration, while Fleming had an RN nursing diploma program. This partnership laid the groundwork for the BScN collaboration.

UOIT/Durham Collaborative Nursing Program COLLABORATION SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

The following is a description of the Collaborative Baccalaureate Nursing Program provided by the University of Ontario Institute of Technology (UOIT) and Durham College (Durham). The description is based on:

- the *Articles of Agreement* (2004)
- Eight interviews with faculty and staff members at UOIT and five interviews with faculty and staff members at Durham; interviewees included faculty members, institution/program leaders, and individuals involved in the administration of the program.

BACKGROUND

UOIT and Durham are located on the same campus in Oshawa, Ontario. Prior to the inception of the UOIT/Durham Collaborative BScN program, Durham offered a three-year nursing diploma program which produced its last graduates in June, 2004. Durham established a successful partnership with Georgian College, Seneca College, and York University in September, 2001 to offer a Collaborative BScN program (Type 1 structure, with two years being offered at the college and two years at the university). The Durham/York component of the partnership produced Collaborative BScN graduates from 2003-2006. Bill 139, An Act to Establish UOIT received first reading in November, 2001 and UOIT was proclaimed by the Provincial Government in 2002. When UOIT was being built on the Durham campus and enrolling students for the fall of 2003, it made evolutionary sense for the two institutions to enter into a collaboration. The needs of the community underscored the collaboration as it was the mission of the university to create market-oriented programs. UOIT did not have a nursing program prior to the collaboration. The UOIT/Durham Collaborative BScN curriculum was designed and developed utilizing the expertise of the college faculty, the expertise of newly hired UOIT faculty, and the expertise of the Deans of UOIT and Durham. The first students were enrolled in the fall of 2003.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

PROGRAM MODEL

When this report was prepared, the program model was a Type 3 four-year degree program. Faculty members from both the university and college taught across all years of the program and the planning, delivery, and evaluation of the curriculum was a joint process. All students completed their studies in the UOIT/Durham Collaborative program at one campus location.

GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE

The MOU stated that the Collaborative Program was to be governed in such a way as to meet the reasonable expectations of the university for the granting of a Bachelor of Science in Nursing degree. All university academic standards, rules and criteria were followed for the administration and delivery of the Bachelor of Science in Nursing program.

Faculty Council

The academic portion of the Collaborative Program was the responsibility of the Faculty Council. Academic portions included the approval of new courses, academic standards, curriculum, evaluation, and degree requirements. The Faculty Council was established by the Academic Council at the university and was permitted to establish committees related to the academic portion of the collaboration. All such committees had equal representation from both college and university faculty. Faculty Council had two subcommittees: the Executive Committee and the Curriculum Committee.

University Dean and College Dean

The administration and delivery of the program was the responsibility of the two Deans and the Steering Committee, but the Deans had the primary responsibility. The university Dean and the college Dean made minor decisions without consulting each other; however, neither of the Deans acted unilaterally with respect to policies related to the Collaborative Program.

The university Dean and the college Dean were responsible for the following:

- a) The overall direction and development of their respective faculty and staff and, in particular, for authority over the budget and recommendations for faculty appointments;
- b) The management of their respective faculties and the respective implementation of university and college policy;

- c) The effective and efficient management of the external relations of their respective faculties, within both the university and the college and the wider community;
- d) The representation of their respective faculties' policies and points of view and making independent judgements on academic matters; and
- e) The facilitation of learning within their respective faculties and the career development of their respective staff.

Both Deans were responsible to the university Provost and the college Vice-President Academic, respectively.

Steering Committee

The role of the Steering Committee was to facilitate the implementation of the Collaborative Program and to ensure that the terms of the MOU were adhered to. Any matters to be addressed by the Steering Committee may be referred by the university Provost, the college Vice-President Academic, the university Dean or the college Dean. The Steering Committee had the following responsibilities:

- a) To resolve any issue that could not be resolved by the Deans; and
- b) To deal with matters relating to the Collaborative Program, including, but not limited to:
 - (i) Budgetary or financial issues;
 - (ii) Government funding and enrolment questions; and
 - (iii) Long range administrative planning.

Steering Committee members included:

- The college Vice-President Academic;
- The university Provost;
- The university Associate Provost, Academic and Strategic Planning;
- The college Dean;
- The university Dean; and
- The Vice-President, Strategy and Finance.

COMMUNICATIONS BETWEEN INSTITUTIONS

Interviewees from both the college and the university described the quality of the communications between the two institutions as excellent. Many attributed this success to

the fact that all the academic components of the programs were located on the same campus. The physical proximity of members of the program had facilitated frequent, informal communications about the program as well as a sense of camaraderie among faculty and staff. The respect the two Deans had for each other and their commitment to the collaboration were also cited as key factors for successful communications.

ACADEMIC ISSUES

All university academic standards, rules and criteria were followed for the administration and delivery of the Bachelor of Science in Nursing program.

Joint Curriculum

The curriculum was completely integrated. This integration was described by an interviewee as “strong and seamless”.

Admission Requirements

There was a single and unified admissions process for the Collaborative Program that was administered by the university through the Ontario Universities’ Application Centre. The admissions standards for the program were set by the university and were approved by the university Academic Council.

Research

While it is still early to determine the impact of the collaboration on research at the two institutions, interviewees were generally supportive and optimistic about collaborating on joint research projects between the college and the university.

HUMAN RESOURCES

As outlined in the MOU, all university faculty members were subject to the university Academic Staff Employment Policies while all college faculty members were subject to the college Academic Collective Agreement. The two Deans collaboratively created a staffing plan for faculty and administrators. Search committees had representatives from both institutions and the Deans were voting members on all search committees for Collaborative Program hires. Nursing faculty members from both the university and the college had the option to teach both theory and practicum courses across all years of the program. All faculty in the tenure stream at the university held PhDs. No full-time faculty member was eligible to teach the nursing theory component of the Collaborative Program unless they held a master’s degree in a relevant health or allied field. Existing full-time college faculty members who were already enrolled in a master’s program in the health or allied field continued to be eligible to teach in the Collaborative Program provided that they completed a master’s degree within five (5) years from the date of the MOU. The

above information was verified in staff and faculty interviews. Workload for individual faculty members was determined by discussions with the relevant Dean.

ADMINISTRATION & STUDENT SERVICES

Because the program was located on the same campus, the sharing of resources was not an issue for students. During staff and faculty member interviews, the fact that the program was located on the same campus was often cited as a success factor for the administration of the program. The MOU provided that student data were to be shared between the two institutions.

FINANCES

The UOIT/Durham Collaborative Program was unique in that it shared a Planning and Budget Officer, who was responsible for the financial aspects of the collaboration under the direction of the two Deans. As outlined in the MOU, tuition and ancillary fees were determined by the university partner. The collaboration had a completely integrated fund that was created by pooling all grant and tuition revenues from students in the Collaborative Program. The program was still being phased in and the partners were still monitoring it at this point. Faculty professional development was dealt with separately by the two institutions.

QUALITY CONTROL

Quality assurance mechanisms and practices included the accreditation review process, the university's Undergraduate Program Review Policy, focus groups with students, and course evaluation forms at the college and the university. The program was successfully accredited and course evaluations had been quite positive.

PROCESS FOR DEVELOPING A COLLABORATIVE PROGRAM

In 2002, UOIT was proclaimed by the provincial government and it was confirmed that the university would be built on the Oshawa campus. Durham and UOIT had originally wanted to give their students a choice as to where they would like to obtain their degree: through a continuation of the existing partnership with York or through the new partnership with UOIT. York was not in favour of continuing the partnership, given these options. At that point, Durham's role in the partnership with York became one of meeting the commitment to students who were already enrolled in the Durham/York Collaborative partnership (the last cohort of the Durham/York partnership graduated in June, 2006). The Deans of UOIT and Durham moved forward, focusing on the implementation of the UOIT/Durham BScN collaboration to be ready for September, 2003. The most challenging part was determining how to structure the program with the reduced flexibility that is inherent in collaborations. The two unique differences in the UOIT/Durham collaboration from the Durham/York collaboration were the ability of the

students to study at one campus site for the duration of the program, and the introduction of an innovative curriculum supported by a mobile learning (laptop) environment. This new vision of collaboration, once agreed upon, was embraced and supported by both Deans and their respective faculty.

Western-Fanshawe Collaborative BScN Program COLLABORATION SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

The following is a description of the Western-Fanshawe Collaborative BScN Program. The description is based on:

- The *Draft Guiding Principles* (2005)
- Five interviews with faculty and staff at UWO and six interviews with faculty and staff at Fanshawe College.

BACKGROUND

Discussions around developing a partnership between UWO and Fanshawe began in the late 1980s. During these first discussions, the focus was on developing an articulation agreement but the differences in the cultures of the two institutions proved to be a limiting factor. In the 1990s, the two institutions worked together to develop a BScN program with a joint curriculum. Unfortunately, funding was not available for this initiative at the time. As a result, both sides implemented the new curriculum at their respective sites. Finally, the change to the entry to practice requirements implemented in 2001 provided the impetus to implement the UWO/Fanshawe collaborative nursing program.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

PROGRAM MODEL

At the time this report was prepared, the program model could be described as a Type 2 model. Students began the program at either UWO or Fanshawe in years one and two. In their third year, all students merged on the UWO site. The fourth year was a preceptored integration year and equal numbers of nursing faculty from both sites facilitated groups of students in their clinical placements.

GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE

The collaborative program was governed by a Steering Committee with equal representation from UWO and Fanshawe. Composition of the Steering Committee was agreed to annually by the partners. The Steering Committee had responsibility for the implementation of academic and operational issues, as defined by both institutions, and in compliance with various policies, regulations and collective agreements at both sites. The Steering Committee provided policy recommendations to both institutions as required. To the extent possible, Fanshawe students followed the student policies at Fanshawe and were treated as any other Fanshawe student. The central administrators at each institution agreed upon administrative and non-classroom issues as necessary. Dispute resolution of issues related to the program and workload activities of the Joint Steering Committee were addressed by those responsible for the program at UWO and Fanshawe College. Institution-wide issues were referred to the Vice Presidents (Academic) at both Western and Fanshawe College.

ACADEMIC ISSUES

The guiding principles stated that the program would operate with one set of standards, with minimal variations between the students entering the program via either the Western site or Fanshawe site. UWO and Fanshawe determined their first year enrolments annually. Entrance requirements for all students had to be approved by both the UWO Senate and the established processes at Fanshawe College. It was stated that efforts to reduce the disparity in the admission averages between the two sites would continue to be worked on. During the staff and faculty interviews, interviewees indicated that both institutions had to make adjustments to their policies to accommodate the collaborative program.

Joint Curriculum

It was outlined in the guiding principles that there was to be one curriculum in which all four years were to be developed collaboratively. All required courses were to have common evaluative procedures. Changes to common nursing courses had to be approved by both institutions. Ongoing monitoring of the curriculum implementation occurred through a Joint Education & Curriculum Program Committee. The program was to be reviewed for accreditation and approval in October 2006, and both institutions were committed to awaiting recommendations from this review before carrying out curriculum revisions. Both Fanshawe and UWO taught years one and two of the program at their respective sites, while year three was taught by UWO only. The second half of year four was reserved for clinical placements, which were supervised by both UWO faculty and Fanshawe faculty.

Admission Requirements

Prior to the 2005-06 school year, both Fanshawe and UWO separately admitted students into the collaborative program. This policy was changed, and the collaboration has since piloted a single shared admission process administered by the university. The new process was to be piloted for a second time in the 2006-07 school year. The idea behind the new admissions process was that the collaborative program was considered a single program and not two programs being offered at different campuses. The applicant pool was to be considered as a whole, and the data were to be centrally located. A joint Admissions Committee, with representation from both sites, then established policies and procedures for assignment of students to each site. The goal was to fill the seats at each. When students were applying to the collaborative program, they were asked to indicate whether they wished to apply to both the UWO and Fanshawe site or to a single site, UWO or Fanshawe.

HUMAN RESOURCES

In terms of human resources, there was agreement on the required qualifications, but hiring processes for Fanshawe and UWO were separate due to different collective agreements.

ADMINISTRATION & STUDENT SERVICES

In terms of students' experiences, it was stated in the guiding principles that the collaborative program was to be a single program with one set of standards, and that there were to be minimal variations between the experiences of students at the two sites. Students had full access to the resources available at both UWO and Fanshawe.

FINANCES

The guiding principles stated that the allocation of government funding was to be distributed to each institution proportional to the number of collaborative students enrolled in the respective institutions. Students paid ancillary fees where they were enrolled, which had to be approved at each institution. Tuition fees were the same at both sites.

PROCESS FOR DEVELOPING A COLLABORATIVE PROGRAM

Discussions around developing a partnership between UWO and Fanshawe began in the late 1980s. During these first discussions, the focus was on developing an articulation agreement but the differences in the cultures of the two institutions proved to be a limiting factor. In the 1990s, the two institutions worked together to develop a BScN program with a joint curriculum. Unfortunately, funding was not available for this initiative at the time. As a result, both sides implemented the new curriculum separately.

Finally, the change to the entry to practice requirements implemented in 2001 prompted the implementation of the UWO/Fanshawe collaborative nursing program.

WINDSOR/LAMBTON/ST. CLAIR

University of Windsor, Lambton College and St. Clair College Nursing Education Consortium COLLABORATION SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

The following is a description of the collaborative baccalaureate nursing program delivered by University of Windsor, Lambton College and St. Clair College. The description is based on

- Documents provided by the collaboration
 - Lambton College/St. Clair College/University of Windsor Collaborative Bachelor of Science Nursing Program Agreement
 - Program promotional material
- Interviews with faculty and staff at the three institutions
 - Six interviewees at Windsor
 - Six interviewees at Lambton
 - Eight interviewees at St. Clair

BACKGROUND

University of Windsor is located in Windsor, Lambton College in Sarnia and St. Clair College in both Windsor and Chatham. There is a two hour drive between Windsor and Sarnia and a one hour drive between Windsor and Chatham. Prior to the collaborative nursing program, the colleges offered diploma programs in nursing and the university a baccalaureate nursing program.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

PROGRAM MODEL

When this report was prepared, students took their first two years either at the university or at one of the college sites, then took the third year and first semester of their fourth year at the university (Type 2). Students were expected to return to the college site for the last semester; however, some students decided to stay at the university because of personal or financial issues. Having students return to the college made the enrolment rates more predictable at the colleges and reduced the pressure on finding clinical

placements in Windsor. Other reasons for why a Type 2 model was employed included the different areas of expertise at the colleges and the university, indication from other collaborations on what model worked (University of Western Ontario and Fanshawe), as well as the desire to accommodate student access to the program and the supply of nurses to local communities.

GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE

The Lambton College/St. Clair College/University of Windsor Collaborative Bachelor of Science Nursing Program Agreement from 2001 outlined the structure of the collaboration. The collaboration did not have a joint policies and procedures manual, but followed either the university's or colleges' procedures depending on the site the student was currently attending.

The Program Management Committee acted as an advisory committee to the Dean, Faculty of Nursing, University of Windsor and oversaw the ongoing planning, development and operation of the program. One administrative representative from each partner institution and the Undergraduate Director from the University of Windsor site comprised this committee. The committee had a rotating chair. The Program Management Committee forwarded recommendations to the Faculty Council at the University of Windsor. The Faculty Council had autonomy over all matters that pertained to the operation of the nursing program, provided that decisions were made within the regulations of the university.

Lead teachers at the university were responsible for coordinating and leading courses provided at all sites.

COMMUNICATIONS BETWEEN INSTITUTIONS

The main ways of handling formal communication between institutions are outlined in the table below:

Primary Communication Channels in the Collaboration

Individuals from	Type of gathering	Location	Function	Frequency of communication
Presidents and VPs	-	Rotating sites	Dispute resolution, make decisions when agreement can't be reached in the Program Management Committee	1-2 times/year
Nursing Chairs and Deans	Program Management Committee	Teleconferencing, but face to face 4/year.	Ongoing planning, development and operation of the program	1/month

Individuals from	Type of gathering	Location	Function	Frequency of communication
Faculty representatives from each site Student reps and graduates	Curriculum committee	Teleconferences, plus face to face 2-4/year	discuss changes in curriculum	1/month
Faculty	Faculty retreat	Rotating sites	Discuss curriculum, philosophy	1-2/year
Faculty	Faculty retreat	Rotating sites	Discuss curriculum, philosophy	1-2/year
Faculty	-	WebCT	Teachers for different courses can communicate with each other	Ongoing
Faculty – lead teachers - Faculty teaching particular courses	-	Teleconference, e-mail etc.	Communicate around courses with faculty at the college sites: test development, student issues, joint class material	Daily/as needed
Registrar	All registrars	Teleconferences	Admission protocol, admission guidelines	2/year

ACADEMIC ISSUES

The academic policies and procedures for the collaboration were the University of Windsor's policies and procedures.

Joint Curriculum

Mainly due to the short timelines, the Windsor curriculum was used and revised for the purpose of the development and implementation of the collaborative program. In the process of revising of the Windsor curriculum, faculty from all sites provided input and the Program Management Committee drafted a curriculum based on these ideas. Planning meetings were held with the Program Management Committee and the developing teams for each year (faculty). Each of the courses was approved by the Curriculum Committee and subsequently, where necessary, by the university Senate. The model with lead teachers was adopted from Ryerson University.

The teachers for the first and second year courses shared learning material (power point presentations, lecture notes etc.) among and between sites.

Research

College participation in the meetings of the Research Committee at the University of Windsor had just begun. There had also been a joint research workshop organized.

HUMAN RESOURCES

The institutions had separate hiring practices. All new faculty had to have a master's degree in nursing.

ADMINISTRATION & STUDENT SERVICES

Application/Admissions Process and Student Records

Students applying to the collaborative program did so either through the Ontario College Application Center (OCAS) or the Ontario Universities' Application Centre (OUAC) depending on which institution they wanted to attend during their two first years and for their last semester.

The university Registrar reviewed applicants to the collaborative program for all sites, where there was a question about applicants' qualifications for the program. Communication around admission policies between sites took place as part of this process.

The students admitted through OCAS registered at the college. When they were to start their third year at the university, the college provided official transcripts to the university plus information from their student file. The Dean at the university reviewed the grades before they were entered into the student system.

Students were considered students of the institution where they were enrolled. The Faculty of Nursing Academic Standing Committee reviewed the records of all nursing students who had not met the requirements to continue in the program.

Graduation and Alumni Affiliation

As of 2006, the college crests were included on the parchment. College representatives participated during the convocation ceremony. Students were considered alumni of the university only.

Student Services and Financial Assistance

Student services and financial assistance were site specific. The prices in the bookstores on course materials were the same at all sites.

PROGRAM PROMOTION

Each site did its own program promotion, but followed the policies set by the University of Windsor. However, the program had a common brochure that could be used by all sites.

FINANCES

The grant from the ministry was distributed via Lambton College to the other partners based on the number of students enrolled at each site, as defined in the program agreement and by the Program Management Committee. Given the program model, the funding structure was relatively simple.

All students in the collaboration paid the same tuition fees, but the ancillary fees varied among the sites.

QUALITY CONTROL

The quality control mechanisms and practices were separate for each site (apart from the course evaluations for years one and two), but the collaboration was in the process of developing tools for evaluating the program together with a consultant.

PROCESS FOR DEVELOPING A COLLABORATIVE PROGRAM

St. Clair College and the University of Windsor had already had informal dialogues about collaborating prior to the announcement from the Ministry, mainly because the two institutions were geographically close to each other. Lambton College and the university had had informal discussions about partnering as well.

It was the Program Management Committee and the Coordinators that drove the process of developing the program, but other faculty were involved as well (see the section about curriculum). The three Vice Presidents of finance met to draft an agreement about how revenue would be shared and how the start-up grant would be divided. At the meeting, they also outlined assumptions around enrolment and transfer students.

York University/Georgian & Seneca Colleges COLLABORATION SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

The following is a description of the York University/Georgian College & Seneca College Collaborative Nursing Program. The description is based on:

- The Articulation Agreement among the three institutions
- The Terms of Reference & Mandates for the committees from the CASN Accreditation Binder (2003)
- Nine interviews with faculty and staff at York, seven interviews with faculty and staff at Georgian and five interviews with faculty and staff at Seneca.

BACKGROUND

In 1999 (before the change to the requirements for entry to practice), an articulation agreement was created between York University, Seneca College and Georgian College. Durham College joined the partnership and subsequently left the collaboration to partner with the university of the Ontario Institute of Technology (2003). The four-year curriculum was developed by York, Georgian and Seneca during the early stages of the collaboration. The agreement was updated in 2000 to represent a collaborative four-year baccalaureate program in nursing with university admission requirements. The curriculum was updated to reflect university-level courses for all years of the program.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

PROGRAM MODEL

When this report was prepared, the program delivery model was a model where students spent their first two years at either Georgian or Seneca and completed the final two years of the program at York. The program was collaboratively developed and the curriculum for the program was fully integrated.

GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE

The initial articulation agreement did not address the governance structure of the program. The Terms of Reference & Mandates document provided the following information: each of the three institutions had their own approval processes and the governance structure operated on a committee structure. The four different committees were the Steering Committee, the Finance Committee, the Registrars Committee, and the Collaborative Coordinating Committee. The Collaborative Coordinating Committee oversaw the academic program and it had several subcommittees including the Program Evaluation Committee, the Marketing Committee, the Theory and Practice Committee and the Research Committee. Each of the committees reported to the Collaborative Coordinating Committee. All committees had full representation from all three partners. For a short time all committees also had representation from Durham College.

ACADEMIC ISSUES

To progress in the BScN Collaborative Program, all students had to maintain an overall (all courses) cumulative average (GPA) of 5.0 (C+ or 65%) with no nursing course having a grade of less than 60%. The passing grade for all other courses was 50%.

While there were shared academic policies, there were also site-specific policies which were found in the Program Handbook available to faculty and students.

All academic issues were discussed at the joint committee meetings, with recommendations made to the Collaborative Coordinating Committee. The Collaborative Coordinating Committee approved program decisions and/or made recommendation to the Steering Committee. Any unresolved academic and program issues were referred to the Steering Committee for resolution. Although discussion and planning involved the partners, York set forth the academic policies and procedures and non-academic policies were site specific.

Joint Curriculum

It was outlined in the agreement that the curriculum was to be collaboratively developed and approved based on a shared philosophy. All program objectives, course titles, course outlines, and learning outcomes were to be consistent across all programs at each level. Any changes to the curriculum had to be approved by Senate as well as by the appropriate academic authorities at the colleges and the university. It is important to note that curriculum revisions could not be made in isolation, as both the colleges and the university had approval processes which needed to be followed even though Senate had the final approval.

Admission Requirements

Students had to have a minimum of a “B” average in order to qualify for admission into the collaborative nursing program. Up until the fall of 2004 entry, students interested in the BScN (Collaborative) degree program could apply through OCAS only; effective the fall of 2005 entry, students were able to apply through either the Ontario Universities’ Application Centre or OCAS. Admission requirements were set forth by all partners in the collaboration.

Effective 2005, the data of students applying through the Universities’ Application Centre (OUAC), were being transmitted to the respective college Partners on a regular basis. Data elements were supplied by the college. Admissions decisions on applications received through OUAC were made by the Admissions Office at York University in consultation with the respective college partner. Files of admitted students were forwarded to the college partner, who then mailed out the registration packages.

Research

The mandate of the research committee was to promote the dissemination of research and scholarly activity within the collaboration and to support the development of nurse researchers. There was membership from all three institutions on this committee. Faculty from all three institutions may have been involved in research, some of which was collaborative.

HUMAN RESOURCES

Hiring practices were completely separate for the three institutions. All parties agreed to a master’s preparation as the minimum criteria for faculty hiring. In the early days of the partnership there was occasion for college-university representation on selection committees, this no longer occurs and as such the colleges and the university do not sit on one another’s hiring committees. Faculty credentials were set out through the accreditation process with CASN and the academic institutions.

ADMINISTRATION & STUDENT SERVICES

Students had access to both their college’s and York University’s resources as soon as they were admitted to the collaborative program. Because years one and two were completed at the colleges, students also had access to college resources, (for example, access to the library and Knowledge Hub). These resources were still available to students when they moved to York for years three and four, as many commuted to the university while living at home. Entering students did not have access to York’s entrance scholarships.

FINANCES

Financing for the collaborative program was not discussed in the agreement. There was a separate financial model that was developed. Funding from the government was flowed to the colleges to be distributed to the colleges and to the university by the college administration. The tuition for the collaborative program was set forth at the university rate.

QUALITY CONTROL

Quality assurance mechanisms and practices included accreditation, student evaluations of the collaborative program, student-faculty council meetings, faculty performance reviews, forums and activities of the Program Evaluation Committee, the Collaborative Coordinating Committee and the Steering Committees. In 2003, the program received a full 7-year accreditation from CASN.

PROCESS FOR DEVELOPING A COLLABORATIVE PROGRAM

Prior to the collaborative program, York did not have a four-year baccalaureate nursing program although they did have a post-RN program. In the mid 90's, in preparation for the new entry to practice requirements that would be mandated by the College of Nurses of Ontario (CNO), the colleges and university began to have discussions about what the philosophy of the collaborative program should be. As York did not have a generic program, they were very open to discussions and ideas about the caring curriculum. Seneca, Georgian and York engaged in a partnership to develop an integrated four-year collaborative nursing program. In the initial agreement and program, students from either Georgian or Seneca who were achieving high academic standards in the second year of their diploma program could apply to York with advanced standing to complete their degree in nursing. Students started at York in 1999 and the first collaborative BScN class graduated in 2001. As a result of the CNO legislation in 2000 and because a transfer approach and an articulation agreement already existed among the partners, along with a jointly developed curriculum already in existence and being used, the four-year collaborative nursing program evolved. In moving to the four-year nursing program, all the curriculum was revisited to ensure that all four years of the program reflected a university-level curriculum and, as such, the readmission and application to third year was dropped.

APPENDIX D: CONTENT HEADINGS FOR ANALYTICAL MATRICES

Matrix 1: Program Descriptions

- Delivery Structure
- Governance
- Communications
- Curriculum
- Scholarship
- HR
- Admissions/enrolment
- Graduation and affiliation
- Services/resources
- Academic policies
- Finances and fees
- Quality assurance

Matrix 2: Development of the Programs & Contributing Factors

- Process for developing program
- Factors affecting development and delivery
- Elements that worked well in development and delivery
- Elements not working well in development and delivery

Matrix 3: Impacts

- On institutions
 - Benefits
 - Costs
- On ability to provide programs to growing student population
- On students
- On faculty
- On admin staff

Matrix 4: Suggested Changes & High Points by Faculty and Staff

- High points
- Suggested changes at the individual site level
- Suggested changes at the consortium level
- Suggested changes at the provincial level
- Suggested changes for other groups

Matrix 5: Success Indicators

- The program:
 - Has joint planning and design
 - Is delivered jointly
 - Uses joint resources
 - Has a single shared admissions process
 - Awards a baccalaureate degree upon completion
 - Is the same length as non-collaborative Baccalaureate nursing programs
 - Has not received any major negative collaboration-related comments from CASN
- Staff impressions
 - Practical and theoretical aspects are well integrated
 - % of staff indicating that the program will continue for five years
 - Satisfaction with communication
 - Institutions' needs met
 - Overall tone of the interviews (positive, negative, or mixed)
- Student impressions
 - Practical and theoretical aspects are well integrated

- Transition between institutions (if applicable)
- Perception regarding level of preparedness for employment
- Retention and graduation rates

Matrix 6: Student Feedback (Part 1)

- Percent somewhat or very satisfied with the college experience
- Percent somewhat or very satisfied with the university experience
- Percent somewhat or very satisfied with the degree to which the curriculum was consistent and integrated
- Percent somewhat or very satisfied with the opportunities for interaction among students from different sites in the program
- Percent somewhat or very satisfied with the quality of interaction among students from different sites in the program
- Percent somewhat or very satisfied with the collaboration between the university and the college(s)
- Percent somewhat or very satisfied with the overall nursing program
- Percent rating the fit between the college and university portions of the program as good or excellent
- Percent who would recommend the program to other people who are interested in a career in nursing

Matrix 7: Student Feedback (Part 2)

- Items from the student survey indicating high degree of satisfaction (average rating of 4 or higher on a 5 point scale)
- Items from the student survey indicating low degree of satisfaction (average rating of 3 or lower on a 5 point scale)
- Items from the student survey for which the satisfaction level varied between the university and the college(s) (difference of 1 scale point in average scores for respondents who rated the item for both the college and the university).
- Strengths of the collaboration based on student comments
- Suggested changes